



Challenges and opportunities for the future of Brain-Computer Interface in neurorehabilitation

Simon, C., Bolton, D., Kennedy, N., Soekadar, S., & Ruddy, K. (2021). Challenges and opportunities for the future of Brain-Computer Interface in neurorehabilitation. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 15, 1-8. Article 699428. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.699428>

[Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal](#)

Published in:
Frontiers in Neuroscience

Publication Status:
Published online: 02/07/2021

DOI:
[10.3389/fnins.2021.699428](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.699428)

Document Version
Author Accepted version

General rights

The copyright and moral rights to the output are retained by the output author(s), unless otherwise stated by the document licence.

Unless otherwise stated, users are permitted to download a copy of the output for personal study or non-commercial research and are permitted to freely distribute the URL of the output. They are not permitted to alter, reproduce, distribute or make any commercial use of the output without obtaining the permission of the author(s).

If the document is licenced under Creative Commons, the rights of users of the documents can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/share-your-work/licenses/>.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk

Challenges and opportunities for the future of Brain-Computer Interface in neurorehabilitation

Colin Simon¹, David A. Bolton², Niamh Kennedy³, Surjo R. Soekadar⁴, Kathy L. Ruddy^{1*}

¹Trinity College Institute for Neuroscience, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland, ²Utah State University, United States, ³Ulster University, United Kingdom, ⁴Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

Submitted to Journal:
Frontiers in Neuroscience

Specialty Section:
Neuroprosthetics

Article type:
Mini Review Article

Manuscript ID:
699428

Received on:
23 Apr 2021

Revised on:
01 Jun 2021

Journal website link:
www.frontiersin.org

In review

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest

Author contribution statement

CS wrote the first draft and edited the final draft. KR and CS conceptualised the idea for the manuscript. KR, SS, NK and DB worked on subsequent drafts of the manuscript editing and providing feedback. All authors reviewed the final version and were involved in discussions throughout.

Keywords

Brain Computer Interface, Stroke, Neurorehabilitation, Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation, Neurofeedback

Abstract

Word count: 249

Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCI) provide a unique technological solution to circumvent the damaged motor system. For neurorehabilitation, the BCI can be used to translate neural signals associated with movement intentions into tangible feedback for the patient, when they are unable to generate functional movement themselves. Clinical interest in BCI is growing rapidly, as it would facilitate rehabilitation to commence earlier following brain damage and provides options for patients who are unable to partake in traditional physical therapy. However, substantial challenges with existing BCI implementations have prevented its widespread adoption. Recent advances in knowledge and technology provide opportunities to facilitate a change, provided that researchers and clinicians using BCI agree on standardisation of guidelines for protocols and shared efforts to uncover mechanisms. We propose that addressing the speed and effectiveness of learning BCI control are priorities for the field, which may be improved by multimodal or multi-stage approaches harnessing more sensitive neuroimaging technologies in the early learning stages, before transitioning to more practical, mobile implementations. Clarification of the neural mechanisms that give rise to improvement in motor function is an essential next step towards justifying clinical use of BCI. In particular, quantifying the unknown contribution of non-motor mechanisms to motor recovery calls for more stringent control conditions in experimental work.

Here we provide a contemporary viewpoint on the factors impeding the scalability of BCI. Further, we provide a future outlook for optimal design of the technology to best exploit its unique potential, and best practices for research and reporting of findings.

Contribution to the field

In the transition from laboratory research to clinical application, BCI for neurorehabilitation remains stuck in the lab despite largely promising findings demonstrating a unique promise for restoring movement in brain injured patients. We take a cautionary standpoint in this review of the state of the art, outlining reasons why current implementations of BCI for clinical intents are fraught due to remaining technical, practical and theoretical issues. We critique each of the barriers to clinical implementation of the technology, providing evidence-based solutions that would advance the state of this field and enable BCI to become more widely used in clinical environments. We believe that this article will impact widely upon neuroscientists, engineers, and clinicians alike, encouraging a consensus approach to promote quality research improving existing BCI implementations. We hope this will pave the way for future work tackling remaining uncertainties regarding the neural mechanisms that underlay how BCI can improve motor function. Ultimately, we hope that this article will accelerate efforts to bring BCI technology closer to the bedside, so that brain injured patients can begin to benefit from what it has to offer.

Funding statement

KLR and CS are supported by a grant from the Health Research Board of Ireland [HRB-EIA-2019-003]. KR would also like to acknowledge grant funding relating to this work from Enterprise Ireland [SI20203045] and [CS20202099].

Challenges and opportunities for the future of Brain-Computer Interface in neurorehabilitation

Simon, C.¹, Bolton, D.A.E.², Kennedy, N.C.³, Soekadar, S.R.⁴, Ruddy, K.L.^{1*}

1. Trinity College Institute of Neuroscience and School of Psychology, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland
2. Department of Kinesiology and Health Science, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, USA
3. School of Psychology, Ulster University, Northern Ireland, UK
4. [Clinical Neurotechnology Laboratory, Neurowissenschaftliches Forschungszentrum \(NWFZ\), Department of Psychiatry and Neurosciences \(CCM\), Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany](#)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

*Corresponding Author K.L Ruddy

ruddykl@tcd.ie

Trinity College Institute of Neuroscience and School of Psychology, Lloyd Building, Trinity College Dublin, College Green, Dublin 2.

Deleted: <#>Clinical Neurotechnology Laboratory, Neurowissenschaftliches Forschungszentrum (NWFZ), Department of Psychiatry and Neurosciences (CCM), Charité , Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCI) provide a unique technological solution to circumvent the damaged motor system. For neurorehabilitation, the BCI can be used to translate neural signals associated with movement intentions into tangible feedback for the patient, when they are unable to generate functional movement themselves. Clinical interest in BCI is growing rapidly, as it would facilitate rehabilitation to commence earlier following brain [damage and](#) provides options for patients who are unable to partake in traditional physical therapy. However, substantial challenges with existing BCI implementations have prevented its widespread adoption. Recent advances in knowledge and technology provide opportunities to facilitate a change, provided that researchers and clinicians using BCI agree on standardisation of guidelines for protocols and shared efforts to uncover mechanisms.

Deleted:

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: damage, and

We propose that addressing the speed and effectiveness of learning BCI control are priorities for the field, which may be improved by multimodal or multi-stage approaches harnessing more sensitive neuroimaging technologies in the early learning stages, before transitioning to more practical, mobile implementations. Clarification of the neural mechanisms that give rise to improvement in motor function is an essential next step towards justifying clinical use of BCI. In particular, quantifying the unknown contribution of non-motor mechanisms to motor recovery calls for more stringent control conditions in experimental work.

Here we provide a contemporary viewpoint on the factors impeding the scalability of BCI. Further, we provide a future outlook for optimal design of the technology to best exploit its unique potential, and best practices for research and reporting of findings.

Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCI) are hailed as a promising approach to overcome paralysis by translating brain signals from movement intentions into computerised or motorised feedback. ~~They can be used to restore, replace, enhance, supplement or improve the natural output of the Central Nervous System (CNS), hence providing opportunities for motor rehabilitation from a range of conditions including spinal cord injury, traumatic brain injury and stroke.~~ Following a stroke, approximately 77% of survivors are left with some degree of upper limb impairment (Lawrence et al., 2001; Nakayama et al., 1994), which is a key factor in preventing their engagement in normal activities of daily living and rendering them dependant on caregivers. Rehabilitation approaches that actively promote intensive and prolonged functional use of the paretic limb result in the largest gains in movement capability (Veerbeek et al., 2014). However, the gold standard approaches such as Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy (CIMT) require the patient to be capable of producing a sufficient level of functional movement in order to partake (Kwakkel et al., 2015). This prevents participation for those who are more severely impaired, or patients in the early weeks after ~~brain injury~~, who have not yet regained any function. With mounting recent evidence indicating that early intervention is crucial to harness the brain's endogenous recovery processes (Stinear et al., 2020), therapies that can support the patient to generate appropriate functional patterns of brain activity and motor behaviour are greatly needed, during the period when they are unable to generate actual movement unassisted.

Brain-Computer Interface for Neurorehabilitation; Basic premise and scope of the review

Non-invasive Brain-Computer (and Brain-Machine) Interfaces provide an advanced technological solution, decoding brain signals directly from the scalp and translating them into movement of a virtual (on screen) or robotic effector. ~~The effector can also be the user's own limb, with electrical stimulation of muscles triggered by brain activity (Biasiucci et al., 2018; Bai et al., 2020).~~ By closing the disrupted sensorimotor loop and providing tangible feedback, the patient learns to control the effector by motor imagery or movement intentions. Restoring relevant sensory feedback in relation to volitional movement attempts is believed to mobilise the fundamental mechanisms of motor learning (Mrachaz-Kersting et al., 2021). As such, they

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted:

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Veerbeek et al., 2014)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: stroke

Formatted: Font colour: Red

can engage in mental practise of movement and keep their motor neural circuitry active, warding off the detrimental effects of limb non-use (Buxbaum et al., 2020), its associated white matter degeneration (Egorova et al., 2020), and promote use-dependant neuroplastic processes (Xing & Bai, 2020). Despite largely encouraging evidence suggesting that functional gains are produced exceeding those of standard care (Carvalho et al., 2019; Cervera et al., 2018; Coscia et al., 2019; Hatem et al., 2016; Kovyazina et al., 2019; López-Larraz et al., 2018; McConnell et al., 2017; Monge-Pereira et al., 2017; Raffin & Hummel, 2018; Remsik et al., 2016; Xing & Bai, 2020) substantial challenges with existing BCI implementations have prevented widespread adoption of the technology clinically (Baniqued et al., 2021). Here we provide a viewpoint on the practical, technical and mechanistic factors impeding the scalability of BCI into rehabilitative care packages. Further, we provide a future outlook for optimal design of the technology to best exploit its unique potential, and best practices for research and reporting of findings.

Deleted: Eduardo

Non-invasive BCI typically consists of three key components: A recorder, a decoder, and an effector. The recorder acquires brain signals from the scalp surface. The decoder analyses the recorded data, and the effector acts upon the information. In most cases the recorder is an electroencephalogram (EEG) detecting scalp electrical fluctuations associated with neuronal activity. In practise, any neural signal could be incorporated into a BCI, and implementations using Magnetoencephalography (MEG) (Buch et al., 2008; Foldes et al., 2015), functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) (Thibault et al., 2018) and functional Near **Infrared** Spectroscopy (fNIRS) (Soekadar et al., 2021) have also shown merit. The decoder is usually a program run on a computer, extracting desired aspects from the signal and conducting analyses in real-time. The analysis process may be as simple as measuring amplitude or frequency of ongoing brain activity (Wierzgała et al., 2018), or more complex decompositions of inter-regional connectivity or dynamic changes to spatial patterns of activation (Rathee et al., 2017). The effector of a BCI can take multiple forms. For neurorehabilitation, it may be a device that assists the patient to complete movements, such as a robotic **limb** (Khan et al., 2020; Soekadar et al., 2019; Tariq et al., 2018), a device that gives virtual (eg. on-screen) feedback to the participant to promote appropriate patterns of neural activity (de Castro-Cros et al., 2020; Kerous et al., 2018; Si-Mohammed et al., 2018), or a trigger to induce electrical stimulation of muscles in order to evoke movement (Bai et al., 2020; Biasiucci et al., 2018). **Even in the absence of evoked movement, electrical stimulation**

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Khan et al., 2020, Tariq et al., 2018, Soekadar et al., 2019)

Deleted:)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Castro-Cros et al., 2020; Si-Mohammed et al., 2018; Kerous et al., 2018)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

can be used below motor threshold to provide continuous somatosensory feedback as the BCI signal (Corbet et al., 2018).

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Corbet et al., 2018). (Biasiucci et al., 2018; Bai et al., 2020)(Bai et al., 2020; Biasiucci et al., 2018)).

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Practical and technical challenges with clinical implementation of BCI

For the BCI participant, learning to control the effector requires multiple practise sessions, viewing continuous feedback and learning by reward (Chavarriaga et al., 2017; Mrachacz-Kersting et al., 2021). While passive/implicit learning is known to play a role in BCI control (Othmer, 2009), most human participants report developing and fine-tuning mental strategies throughout the course of training, usually involving imagination of movement (Khan et al., 2020; Majid et al., 2015; Ruddy et al., 2018), or in the case of brain injured patients, attempts to make movement with the paretic limb (Bai et al., 2020; Balasubramanian et al., 2018; Blokland et al., 2012). Even for neurologically healthy participants, gaining effective control of an EEG-BCI takes many distinct sessions (Pfurtscheller et al., 2003; Stieger et al., 2021). Without seeing tangible results within the first training sessions, it is likely that patients loose motivation to continue investing effort into trying to control the BCI. Another factor known to influence learning is the large variation in individual capability for motor imagery, contributing to the fact that 10-30% (Allison & Neuper, 2010; Lotte & Jeunet, 2015; Vidaurre & Blankertz, 2010) of users never achieve control over the BCI; a phenomenon historically referred to as BCI illiteracy but more recently coined BCI inefficiency (Thompson, 2019). For BCI to serve as a useful therapeutic tool for neurorehabilitation, solutions that allow users to achieve control within a shorter time frame, and that are effective across a wider range of motor imagery capabilities, are needed to secure the future of this technology.

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Mrachacz-Kersting et al., 2021; Chavarriaga et al., 2017)

Deleted: (Othmer, 2009)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (XXX)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted:) (Majid et al., 2015; Ruddy et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2020)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Pfurtscheller et al., 2003; Stieger et al., 2021)

Deleted: (Thompson, 2019)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

As the neural signals used to drive effectors in an EEG-BCI are heavily influenced by ongoing mental state, the individual capacity to generate high quality mental imagery of movement dictates how easily detectable the relevant motor signals will be (Chavarriaga et al., 2017; Marchesotti et al., 2016). Visual motor imagery, imagining observing yourself perform a movement, produces less pronounced scalp-recorded signals than kinaesthetic motor imagery where the feeling of movement is effectively experienced (Neuper et al., 2005). Kinaesthetic motor imagery produces more easily detectible neural signals, at scalp locations overlying motor cortical brain regions, and additionally modulates corticospinal excitability

measured via Motor Evoked Potentials (MEPs) in response to Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (TMS) (Stinear et al., 2006). However, about half of participants find it difficult to perform kinaesthetic motor imagery (Seiler et al., 2017), and those are the lowest performers on BCI (Vuckovic & Osuagwu, 2013). In some circumstances, it may be more beneficial to request that the patient make attempts to execute movements, rather than simply imagine movement (Bai et al., 2020; Balasubramanian et al., 2018; Blokland et al., 2012). For motor imagery-based BCI, multimodal or multi-phase BCI approaches (Fazli et al., 2012; Leamy et al., 2011) may lead to better accuracy, as different neuroimaging modalities may be more sensitive than EEG to detect very weak motor signals (albeit, technologies such as MRI, fNIRS, MEG or TMS may be less practical for long-term practise of BCI). As an example of a potential multi-phase approach, using a BCI based not upon scalp signals but upon muscle responses to TMS over the motor cortex, control of on-screen feedback using motor imagery could be achieved within just two training sessions (Ruddy et al., 2018). Whereas EEG scalp signals associated with movement intentions have poor spatial resolution, TMS can be used to target the motor cortical representations for specific muscles, selectively providing feedback of excitability of corticospinal pathways by measuring the amplitude of motor evoked potentials (MEPs) recorded at the muscle with electromyography (EMG). When tested in a sample of stroke patients, most were capable of learning to increase the excitability of their corticospinal pathways with TMS neurofeedback, using only motor imagery (Liang et al., 2020). Using a multimodal approach it may be possible to train individuals to develop robust motor imagery strategies that optimally excite the targeted brain-muscle pathways using TMS neurofeedback within just two sessions, that then translates to better subsequent performance using functionally relevant signals on an EEG BCI that has better portability options. This hypothesis remains to be tested empirically, and it is notable to point out that the approach may only be applicable to patients who exhibit MEPs when stimulated. Approximately 13.4% (Stinear et al., 2017a) are deemed 'MEP negative', and those tend to be the most severely affected (Lundquist et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2019; Stinear et al., 2017b). Incorporating multimodality into BCI paradigms may also extend beyond the aforementioned suggestions concerning acquisition modalities. Multimodal feedback (ie. visual plus auditory or somatosensory) can also enhance the BCI learning experience (Sollfrank et al., 2016) and improve the quality of detectable brain signals (Sollfrank et al., 2015).

In order for BCI for neurorehabilitation to become scalable, it needs to answer to the current requirements of healthcare providers. Namely, it should reduce rather than increase

Deleted: (Stinear et al., 2006)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (SAME TWO REFS AS BEFORE COLIN_BOTH IEEE)...

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: M

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: excitit

Deleted: X

Deleted: a

Deleted: bout

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Escudero et al., 1998)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (ref

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Sollfrank et al., 2016)

Deleted:

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Sollfrank et al., 2015)

burden and need for expert supervision, and instead place high quality rehabilitation into the hands and home of the patient in a cost effective manner. Even if initial control of the EEG BCI can be achieved more quickly using multimodal or multiphase approaches, longer term use over weeks or months would still be required alongside the patient's standard rehabilitative care in order to promote functional upper limb improvement. Current implementations of EEG-BCI are not well adapted for this purpose as they are cumbersome, require lengthy setup times with wet electrolyte-filled sensors, and a skilled operator to ensure sufficient signal quality, positioning of the headgear and execution of (often custom written and not user friendly) software. Recent technological advances in wireless, high impedance (dry electrode) EEG systems may enable better scalability. Using tablet-based software allowing real-time wireless streaming from a comfortable, wearable EEG cap with dry electrodes, signals of sufficient quality can be recorded even in home environments by elderly participants without assistance (McWilliams et al., 2021; Murphy et al., 2018a, 2018b, 2019). Advancing this new technology to additionally provide real-time feedback to the participant is a necessary next step towards home-based BCI that would allow extended training to be conducted in the weeks and months following brain injury. Further, it encourages the patient to feel in control of their own recovery process, rather than dependant on professionals or their caregivers. To date, existing implementations of wireless BCI for neurorehabilitation are at an early stage of technology readiness, with none reaching even small scale clinical trials (Baniqued et al., 2021).

Challenges for elucidating mechanisms underlying BCI-induced functional improvements

Advocating for clinical use of BCI is difficult when the specific mechanisms underlying functional improvements remain largely unknown. In order to make justifiable predictions regarding whether a patient is likely to benefit from BCI training, clinicians need to know what aspects of neural function are being targeted. The vast heterogeneity of available BCI methods further complicates attempts to elucidate mechanisms, as it is likely that different approaches target different aspects of neural circuitry to bring about functional improvements. A key issue to shed light upon across all types of BCI for neurorehabilitation is the potential contribution of unspecific (ie. non-motor) mechanisms for recovery. Ros et al., (2020) name four non-specific factors that may contribute to overall BCI performance improvement. These include
i) Factors unique to the neurofeedback environment (such as trainer-participant interaction in a neurotechnology context). ii) Factors that are common across interventions (such as benefits from engaging in a form of cognitive training, as well as psychosocial and placebo mechanisms

Deleted:

Deleted: stroke

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Ros et al., 2020). These may include, for example, effects from sustained exertion of effort or engagement, feelings of empowerment or competence from achieving control of the BCI, or general improvements in mood or enjoyment resulting from engaging with a challenging gamified task.

Deleted: Ros et al., (2020)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (

Formatted: Font colour: Red

related simply to participating in an experiment). iii) Repetition-related effects and iv) Natural effects occurring during the intervention period such as cognitive development (in children/adolescents) or age-related cognitive decline in elderly participants. This list is, however, not exhaustive. Additional to the aforementioned mechanisms, BCI performance may also be influenced by effects from sustained exertion of effort or engagement, feelings of empowerment or competence from achieving control of the BCI, or general improvements in mood or enjoyment resulting from engaging with a challenging gamified task. Even with seemingly adequate control groups, it may be challenging to match aspects such as effort, attention, enthusiasm and enjoyment between those receiving real neurofeedback and those receiving pseudofeedback which may be less intrinsically motivating. While it is encouraging that many studies are now including explicit measures to monitor training-induced changes to motor neural circuitry (ie. using neuroimaging), measures of the aforementioned unspecific effects are rarely included. Thus, their contribution cannot be evaluated with the currently available evidence.

Deleted: These may include, for example, effects

While the presence of unspecific BCI effects makes it more difficult to draw conclusions on how motor improvement for neurorehabilitation is achieved, it leaves open the intriguing possibility that although BCI training is conducted in the motor domain (ie. using motor imagery), beneficial effects may not be exclusive to the motor system. For instance, it is conceivable that increased effortful focus on the BCI task over a sustained training period may lead to a top-down, generalised improvement in brain health, materialising as motor gains (measured by most studies) but also gains in other (eg. cognitive) domains, which are not routinely quantified in BCI studies. This may materialise in the form of improved executive function, memory, attention or processing speed. Such general improvements may be brought about by, for example, increased blood flow to the brain, enhanced neurochemical environment promoting plasticity induction, or simply increased traffic in neural circuitry sustaining healthy activity-induced myelination processes. Generalised (cross-domain) transfer from trained to untrained tasks is greatest when the trained task requires a high degree of attentional focus and cognitive flexibility. (Bavelier et al., 2018; Green & Bavelier, 2008). In this regard, it is debatable whether the motor imagery BCI is primarily a motor task, or a cognitive task, making direction of transfer difficult to ascertain. Future work may focus on whether motor improvements arise as a result of transfer from improved cognitive function, or whether a portion of the specific motor improvements transfer to improve cognitive function. To test this empirically, design of future BCI studies should routinely include cognitive performance

Deleted:

Deleted: (Bavelier et al., 2018; Green & Bavelier, 2008)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

measurements alongside motor function tests, with measures taken at multiple timepoints throughout the learning process.

A small proportion of Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs) investigating BCI for neurorehabilitation have made efforts to measure and/or discuss potential mechanisms that give rise to functional improvements. Of these, candidate neural changes that co-occur with improvement in motor function include enhanced desynchronisation of sensorimotor rhythms (ie. neural oscillations in the alpha 8-12Hz and beta 13-30Hz frequency range) over scalp locations corresponding to motor cortex (Buch et al., 2008; Li et al., 2014; Ono et al., 2015; Prasad et al., 2010), changes in functional connectivity (Biasucci et al., 2018; Pichiorri et al., 2015; Varkuti et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2020), lateralisation of neural activity (Ramos-Murguialday et al., 2013), or changes to white matter microstructure (Hong et al., 2017; Song et al., 2015). Others have speculated that BCI works by mobilising the brain's intrinsic learning mechanisms, adapting behaviour using classical and/or operant conditioning giving rise to neural adaptations (Mrachacz-Kersting et al., 2021). To date, there has not been a comprehensive account that successfully resolves the aforementioned different perspectives into a holistic mechanistic model encompassing the electrophysiological, haemodynamic, and neurochemical components. Multimodal investigations measuring BCI-related neural changes simultaneously in each of these different modalities (eg. EEG, fMRI, MR-spectroscopy) are warranted in order to understand how the neural elements interact to bring about functional motor improvements. A point to note is that in none of the above studies were non-motor, unspecific mechanisms tested, so their contribution to improving motor function remains unknown. Transfer of benefits to the non-motor domain were also not quantified, leaving open the possibility that improvement in motor function may be a result of general brain health improvement.

Elucidating mechanisms of functional improvement from BCI is further complicated by the fact that brain injured patients have widely heterogenous lesions, and lesion size and location do not predict functional outcomes in a straightforward manner (Umarova et al., 2021). Even in patients with similar extents of impairment, lesion location influences performance of BCI decoding of movement intentions (López-Larraz et al., 2017), and the scalp detected signals are qualitatively different when comparing cortical vs subcortical lesions in particular (López-Larraz et al., 2019). This poses challenges for a 'one size fits all' approach to BCI for neurorehabilitation and stresses the importance of adaptive algorithms that do not make rigid a-priori assumptions regarding location or characteristics of scalp detected signals, but rather

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Ramos-Murguialday et al., 2013)

Deleted:

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Mrachacz-Kersting et al., 2021)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.5 cm, Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Deleted:

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: (Umarova et al., 2021)

Deleted: (López-Larraz et al., 2017)

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: Eduardo

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted:

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: Eduardo

Deleted: (López-Larraz et al., 2019)

Deleted: neurorehabilitation, and

allow flexibility to detect idiosyncratic patterns of neural activity that could be used to drive the BCI in an individually tailored fashion.

Deleted: ¶

Outlook for future scalability and justification of BCI use clinically

The field of BCI for neurorehabilitation has benefitted in recent years from collaborative efforts to standardise approaches using the best evidence-based technologies, and with recommendations for best practise in conducting research. For instance, the MT-BCI consortium is a multinational effort collecting the largest existing sample of BCI data across 9 countries, with the objective to deepen understanding of learning mechanisms in mental-task based BCI (MT-BCI), improve efficiency and reliability of MT-BCI and make them more useable for clinical and non-clinical applications (Jeunet et al., 2020). This 'big data' approach to BCI breaks away from the typical small scale studies that are characteristic in this field, and may facilitate more advanced analyses techniques such as machine learning.

Deleted:
Deleted: (Jeunet et al., 2020)
Formatted: Font colour: Red

A key challenge is to make BCI tasks more user friendly, providing motivating feedback in a style that the user finds useful (Kübler et al., 2014; Pillette et al., 2017). Both hardware and software must be simple to use for patients and caregivers alike, which may result in greater enthusiasm towards the technology (Käthner et al., 2017). Tasks should avoid being fixed and repetitive, but rather should have an adaptive nature allowing the user to clearly see progression through stages as performance improves (Jeunet et al., 2016). BCI approaches that focus on assistance with activities of daily living (Soekadar et al., 2016) (particularly bimanual tasks in stroke patients) during physiotherapy may foster motivation and generalization of skills towards everyday life (Soekadar et al., 2019). Additional to this, attempts to improve scientific rigour and reproducibility in neurofeedback research have established the CRED-nf framework for reporting of results, and recommendations for future design of studies (Ros et al., 2020). It is hoped that these collaborative efforts will improve understanding of BCI mechanisms by establishing a degree of standardisation of measurement, and ensuring that adequate experimental controls are in place.

Formatted: Font colour: Red
Formatted: Font colour: Red
Deleted:
Formatted: Font colour: Red
Deleted: (Käthner et al., 2017)
Deleted:
Formatted: Font colour: Red
Deleted: (Jeunet et al 2016)
Formatted: Font colour: Red
Formatted: Font colour: Red

Conclusions

The technological and practical scalability and clinical justifiability of BCI still pose challenges preventing widespread use for neurorehabilitation. Recent advances in knowledge and

technology provide opportunities to facilitate a change, provided that researchers and clinicians using BCI agree on standardisation of guidelines for protocols and shared efforts to uncover mechanisms. Addressing BCI inefficiency and speed of learning are priorities for the field, which may be improved by multimodal or multi-stage BCI approaches harnessing more sensitive neuroimaging technologies in the early learning stages, before transitioning to more practical, mobile implementations. Clarification of the neural mechanisms that give rise to improvement in motor function is an essential next step towards justifying clinical use of BCI. In particular, quantifying the unknown contribution of non-motor mechanisms to motor recovery remains elusive and calls for more stringent control conditions in experimental work. Measurement of additional neural (non-motor) systems and of performance on non-motor tasks is also essential to demonstrate specificity or transfer of the improvements across cognitive and motor domains. If the effects of motor imagery based BCI are found to generalise beyond the motor system, for instance to improve cognitive control or gait, the potential relevance of BCI is expanded presenting an intriguing opportunity for the field. Ultimately, if the benefits are further found to generalise beyond lab-based experimental settings to more ecologically valid aspects affecting quality of life such as competence and autonomy (Cremen & Carson, 2017; Lövdén et al., 2010), the intervention can truly be deemed as effective and worthwhile implementing clinically for neurorehabilitation.

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Deleted: illiteracy

Deleted:

Deleted: (Lövdén et al., 2010; Cremen & Carson, 2017)

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Alison Buick, Claire Donnellan and Nicole Wenderoth for helpful comments and discussions relating to this work.

Funding Sources

KLR and CS are supported by a grant from the Health Research Board of Ireland [HRB-EIA-2019-003]. KR would also like to acknowledge grant funding relating to this work from Enterprise Ireland [SI20203045] and [CS20202099].

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest

Author Contributions

CS wrote the first draft and edited the final draft. KR and CS conceptualised the idea for the manuscript. KR, SS, NK and DB worked on subsequent drafts of the manuscript editing and providing feedback. All authors reviewed the final version and were involved in discussions throughout.

REFERENCES

- Allison, B. Z., & Neuper, C. (2010). Could Anyone Use a BCI? In D. S. Tan & A. Nijholt (Eds.), *Brain-Computer Interfaces: Applying our Minds to Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 35–54). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-272-8_3
- Bai, Z., Fong, K. N. K., Zhang, J. J., Chan, J., & Ting, K. H. (2020). Immediate and long-term effects of BCI-based rehabilitation of the upper extremity after stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, *17*(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-020-00686-2>
- Balasubramanian, S., Garcia-Cossio, E., Birbaumer, N., Burdet, E., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2018). Is EMG a Viable Alternative to BCI for Detecting Movement Intention in Severe Stroke? *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, *65*(12), 2790–2797. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBME.2018.2817688>
- Baniqued, P. D. E., Stanyer, E. C., Awais, M., Alazmani, A., Jackson, A. E., Mon-Williams, M. A., Mushtaq, F., & Holt, R. J. (2021). Brain–computer interface robotics for hand

rehabilitation after stroke: A systematic review. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, 18(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-021-00820-8>

Bavelier, D., Bediou, B., & Green, C. S. (2018). Expertise and generalization: Lessons from action video games. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 20, 169–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.01.012>

Biasiucci, A., Leeb, R., Iturrate, I., Perdikis, S., Al-Khodairy, A., Corbet, T., Schnider, A., Schmidlin, T., Zhang, H., Bassolino, M., Viceic, D., Vuadens, P., Guggisberg, A. G., & Millán, J. d R. (2018). Brain-actuated functional electrical stimulation elicits lasting arm motor recovery after stroke. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2421. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04673-z>

Blokland, Y., Vlek1, R., Karaman, B., Özin, F., Thijssen, D., Eijsvogels, T., Colier, W., Floor-Westerdijk, M., Bruhn, J., & Farquhar, J. (2012). Detection of event-related desynchronization during attempted and imagined movements in tetraplegics for brain switch control. *2012 Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society*, 3967–3969. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2012.6346835>

Buch, E., Weber, C., Cohen, L. G., Braun, C., Dimyan, M. A., Ard, T., Mellinger, J., Caria, A., Soekadar, S., Fourkas, A., & Birbaumer, N. (2008). Think to move: A neuromagnetic brain-computer interface (BCI) system for chronic stroke. *Stroke*, 39(3), 910–917. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.505313>

Buxbaum, L. J., Varghese, R., Stoll, H., & Winstein, C. J. (2020). Predictors of Arm Nonuse in Chronic Stroke: A Preliminary Investigation. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 34(6), 512–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968320913554>

- Carvalho, R., Dias, N., & Cerqueira, J. J. (2019). Brain-machine interface of upper limb recovery in stroke patients rehabilitation: A systematic review. *Physiotherapy Research International*, 24(2). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pri.1764>
- Cervera, M. A., Soekadar, S. R., Ushiba, J., Millán, J. D. R., Liu, M., Birbaumer, N., & Garipelli, G. (2018). Brain-computer interfaces for post-stroke motor rehabilitation: A meta-analysis. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, 5(5), 651–663. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acn3.544>
- Chavarriga, R., Fried-Oken, M., Kleih, S., Lotte, F., & Scherer, R. (2017). Heading for new shores! Overcoming pitfalls in BCI design. *Brain Computer Interfaces (Abingdon, England)*, 4(1–2), 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326263X.2016.1263916>
- Corbet, T., Iturrate, I., Pereira, M., Perdakis, S., & Millán, J. del R. (2018). Sensory threshold neuromuscular electrical stimulation fosters motor imagery performance. *NeuroImage*, 176, 268–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.04.005>
- Coscia, M., Wessel, M. J., Chaudary, U., Millán, J. D. R., Micera, S., Guggisberg, A., Vuadens, P., Donoghue, J., Birbaumer, N., & Hummel, F. C. (2019). Neurotechnology-aided interventions for upper limb motor rehabilitation in severe chronic stroke. *Brain*, 142(8), 2182–2197. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awz181>
- Cremen, I. A., & Carson, R. G. (2017). Have Standard Tests of Cognitive Function Been Misappropriated in the Study of Cognitive Enhancement? *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00276>
- de Castro-Cros, M., Sebastian-Romagosa, M., Rodríguez-Serrano, J., Opisso, E., Ochoa, M., Ortner, R., Guger, C., & Tost, D. (2020). Effects of Gamification in BCI Functional Rehabilitation. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2020.00882>

Formatted: German

- Egorova, N., Dhollander Thijs, Khlif Mohamed Salah, Khan Wasim, Werden Emilio, & Brodtmann Amy. (2020). Pervasive White Matter Fiber Degeneration in Ischemic Stroke. *Stroke*, *51*(5), 1507–1513. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.028143>
- Fazli, S., Mehnert, J., Steinbrink, J., Curio, G., Villringer, A., Müller, K.-R., & Blankertz, B. (2012). Enhanced performance by a hybrid NIRS–EEG brain computer interface. *NeuroImage*, *59*(1), 519–529. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.07.084>
- Foldes, S. T., Weber, D. J., & Collinger, J. L. (2015). MEG-based neurofeedback for hand rehabilitation. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*, *12*(1), 85. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12984-015-0076-7>
- Green, C. S., & Bavelier, D. (2008). Exercising your brain: A review of human brain plasticity and training-induced learning. *Psychology and Aging*, *23*(4), 692–701. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014345>
- Hatem, S. M., Saussez, G., Della Faille, M., Prist, V., Zhang, X., Dispa, D., & Bleyenheuft, Y. (2016). Rehabilitation of Motor Function after Stroke: A Multiple Systematic Review Focused on Techniques to Stimulate Upper Extremity Recovery. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *10*, 442. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00442>
- Hong, X., Lu, Z. K., Teh, I., Nasrallah, F. A., Teo, W. P., Ang, K. K., Phua, K. S., Guan, C., Chew, E., & Chuang, K.-H. (2017). Brain plasticity following MI-BCI training combined with tDCS in a randomized trial in chronic subcortical stroke subjects: A preliminary study. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 9222. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-08928-5>
- Jeunet, C., Benaroch, C., Cabestaing, F., Chavarriaga, R., Colamarino, E., Corsi, M.-C., Coyle, D., De Vico Fallani, F., Enriquez-Geppert, S., Figueirédo, P., Grosse-Wentrup, M., Kleih, S., Kober, S., Kübler, A., Lotte, F., Maby, E., Mattia, D., Mattout, J., Müller-Putz, G. R., ... Wriessnegger, S. (2020, September 11). *A user-centred*

Formatted: German

approach to unlock the potential of non-invasive BCIs: An unprecedented international translational effort.

<https://www.chistera.eu/conference/2020/abstract/camille-jeunet-0>

Jeunet, C., Jahanpour, E., & Lotte, F. (2016). Why standard brain-computer interface (BCI) training protocols should be changed: An experimental study. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 13(3), 036024. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2560/13/3/036024>

Formatted: German

Käthner, I., Halder, S., Hintermüller, C., Espinosa, A., Guger, C., Miralles, F., Vargiu, E., Dauwalder, S., Rafael-Palou, X., Solà, M., Daly, J. M., Armstrong, E., Martin, S., & Kübler, A. (2017). A Multifunctional Brain-Computer Interface Intended for Home Use: An Evaluation with Healthy Participants and Potential End Users with Dry and Gel-Based Electrodes. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00286>

Kerous, B., Skola, F., & Liarokapis, F. (2018). EEG-based BCI and video games: A progress report. *Virtual Reality*, 22(2), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10055-017-0328-x>

Khan, M. A., Das, R., Iversen, H. K., & Puthusserypady, S. (2020). Review on motor imagery based BCI systems for upper limb post-stroke neurorehabilitation: From designing to application. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 123, 103843. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2020.103843>

Kovyazina, M. S., Varako, N. A., Lyukmanov, R. K., Asiatskaya, G. A., Suponeva, N. A., & Trofimova, A. K. (2019). Neurofeedback in the Rehabilitation of Patients with Motor Disorders after Stroke. *Human Physiology*, 45(4), 444–451. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S0362119719040042>

Formatted: German

Kübler, A., Holz, E. M., Riccio, A., Zickler, C., Kaufmann, T., Kleih, S. C., Staiger-Sälzer, P., Desideri, L., Hoogerwerf, E.-J., & Mattia, D. (2014). The User-Centered Design as

Novel Perspective for Evaluating the Usability of BCI-Controlled Applications. *PLoS ONE*, 9(12). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0112392>

Kwakkel, G., Veerbeek, J. M., van Wegen, E. E. H., & Wolf, S. L. (2015). Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy after Stroke. *The Lancet. Neurology*, 14(2), 224–234. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(14\)70160-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70160-7)

Lawrence, E. S., Coshall Catherine, Dundas Ruth, Stewart Judy, Rudd Anthony G., Howard Robin, & Wolfe Charles D. A. (2001). Estimates of the Prevalence of Acute Stroke Impairments and Disability in a Multiethnic Population. *Stroke*, 32(6), 1279–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1161/01.STR.32.6.1279>

Leamy, D. J., Collins, R., & Ward, T. E. (2011). Combining fNIRS and EEG to Improve Motor Cortex Activity Classification during an Imagined Movement-Based Task. In D. D. Schmorow & C. M. Fidopiastis (Eds.), *Foundations of Augmented Cognition. Directing the Future of Adaptive Systems* (pp. 177–185). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21852-1_22

Li, M., Liu, Y., Wu, Y., Liu, S., Jia, J., & Zhang, L. (2014). Neurophysiological substrates of stroke patients with motor imagery-based brain-computer interface training. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, 124(6), 403–415. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00207454.2013.850082>

Liang, W., Xu, Y., Schmidt, J., Zhang, L., & Ruddy, K. L. (2020). Upregulating excitability of corticospinal pathways in stroke patients using TMS neurofeedback; A pilot study. *NeuroImage : Clinical*, 28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2020.102465>

López-Larraz, Eduardo, Ray, A. M., Birbaumer, N., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2019). Sensorimotor rhythm modulation depends on resting-state oscillations and cortex integrity in severely paralyzed stroke patients. *2019 9th International IEEE/EMBS*

Formatted: German

Conference on Neural Engineering (NER), 37–40.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/NER.2019.8717112>

López-Larraz, Eduardo, Ray, A. M., Figueiredo, T. C., Bibián, C., Birbaumer, N., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2017). Stroke lesion location influences the decoding of movement intention from EEG. *2017 39th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*, 3065–3068.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/EMBC.2017.8037504>

López-Larraz, Eduardo, Sarasola-Sanz, A., Irastorza-Landa, N., Birbaumer, N., & Ramos-Murguialday, A. (2018). Brain-machine interfaces for rehabilitation in stroke: A review. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 43(1), 77–97. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-172394>

Lotte, F., & Jeunet, C. (2015). Towards improved BCI based on human learning principles. *The 3rd International Winter Conference on Brain-Computer Interface*, 1–4.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/IWW-BCI.2015.7073024>

[Lövdén, M., Bäckman, L., Lindenberger, U., Schaefer, S., & Schmiedek, F. \(2010\). A](#)

theoretical framework for the study of adult cognitive plasticity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(4), 659–676. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020080>

Formatted: German

Formatted: German

Lundquist, C. B., Nielsen, J. F., Arguissain, F. G., & Brunner, I. C. (2021). Accuracy of the Upper Limb Prediction Algorithm PREP2 Applied 2 Weeks Poststroke: A Prospective Longitudinal Study. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, 35(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968320971763>

Majid, D. S. A., Lewis, C., & Aron, A. R. (2015). Training voluntary motor suppression with real-time feedback of motor evoked potentials. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 113(9), 3446–3452. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00992.2014>

- Marchesotti, S., Bassolino, M., Serino, A., Bleuler, H., & Blanke, O. (2016). Quantifying the role of motor imagery in brain-machine interfaces. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 24076. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24076>
- McConnell, A. C., Moioli, R. C., Brasil, F. L., Vallejo, M., Corne, D. W., Vargas, P. A., & Stokes, A. A. (2017). Robotic devices and brain-machine interfaces for hand rehabilitation post-stroke. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 49(6), 449–460. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.2340/16501977-2229>
- McWilliams, E. C., Barbey, F. M., Dyer, J. D., Islam, Md. N., McGuinness, B., Murphy, B., Nolan, H., Passmore, P., Rueda-Delgado, L. M., & Buick, A. R. (2021). *Feasibility of repeated assessment of cognitive function in older adults using a wireless, mobile, dry-EEG headset and tablet-based games*.
- Monge-Pereira, E., Ibañez-Pereda, J., Alguacil-Diego, I. M., Serrano, J. I., Spottorno-Rubio, M. P., & Molina-Rueda, F. (2017). Use of Electroencephalography Brain-Computer Interface Systems as a Rehabilitative Approach for Upper Limb Function After a Stroke: A Systematic Review. *PM and R*, 9(9), 918–932. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2017.04.016>
- Mrachacz-Kersting, N., Ibañez, J., & Farina, D. (2021). Towards a mechanistic approach for the development of non-invasive brain-computer interfaces for motor rehabilitation. *The Journal of Physiology*, 599(9), 2361–2374. <https://doi.org/10.1113/JP281314>
- Murphy, B., Aleni, A., Belaoucha, B., Dyer, J., & Nolan, H. (2018). Quantifying cognitive aging and performance with at-home gamified mobile EEG. *2018 International Workshop on Pattern Recognition in Neuroimaging (PRNI)*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PRNI.2018.8423954>
- Murphy, B., Barbey, F., Buick, A. R., Dyer, J., Farina, F., McGuinness, B., Passmore, A. P., & Whelan, R. (2019). F3-03-03: Replicating lab electrophysiology with older users in

the home, using gamified dry eeg. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 15(7S_Part_16), P867–P867. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2019.06.4606>

Murphy, B., Buick, A. R., Dyer, J., Nolan, H., McGuinness, B., & Passmore, A. P. (2018). P4-317: Measuring cognitive decline with home-based gamified mobile eeg. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, 14(7S_Part_30), P1579–P1579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalz.2018.07.140>

Nakayama, H., Jørgensen, H. S., Raaschou, H. O., & Olsen, T. S. (1994). Recovery of upper extremity function in stroke patients: The Copenhagen Stroke Study. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 75(4), 394–398. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9993\(94\)90161-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9993(94)90161-9)

Neuper, C., Scherer, R., Reiner, M., & Pfurtscheller, G. (2005). Imagery of motor actions: Differential effects of kinesthetic and visual–motor mode of imagery in single-trial EEG. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 25(3), 668–677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.08.014>

Ono, T., Tomita, Y., Inose, M., Ota, T., Kimura, A., Liu, M., & Ushiba, J. (2015). Multimodal Sensory Feedback Associated with Motor Attempts Alters BOLD Responses to Paralyzed Hand Movement in Chronic Stroke Patients. *Brain Topography*, 28(2), 340–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-014-0382-6>

Othmer, S. (2009). Neuromodulation technologies: An attempt at classification. In T. H. Budzynski, H. K. Budzynski, J. R. Evans, & A. Abarbanel (Eds.), *Introduction to quantitative EEG and neurofeedback: Advanced theory and applications* (2nd ed). Academic Press/Elsevier.

Pfurtscheller, G., Neuper, C., Muller, G. R., Obermaier, B., Krausz, G., Schlogl, A., Scherer, R., Graimann, B., Keinrath, C., Skliris, D., Wortz, M., Supp, G., & Schrank, C. (2003). Graz-BCI: State of the art and clinical applications. *IEEE Transactions on*

Formatted: German

Formatted: German

Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering, 11(2), 1–4.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/TNSRE.2003.814454>

- Pichiorri, F., Morone, G., Petti, M., Toppi, J., Pisotta, I., Molinari, M., Paolucci, S., Inghilleri, M., Astolfi, L., Cincotti, F., & Mattia, D. (2015). Brain-computer interface boosts motor imagery practice during stroke recovery: BCI and Motor Imagery. *Annals of Neurology*, 77(5), 851–865. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24390>
- Pillette, L., Jeunet, C., Mansencal, B., N 'Kambou, R., N 'kaoua, B., & Lotte, F. (2017, September). PEANUT: Personalised Emotional Agent for Neurotechnology User-Training. *7th International BCI Conference*. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01519480>
- Prasad, G., Herman, P., Coyle, D., McDonough, S., & Crosbie, J. (2010). Applying a brain-computer interface to support motor imagery practice in people with stroke for upper limb recovery: A feasibility study. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation*, 7, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-0003-7-60>
- Raffin, E., & Hummel, F. C. (2018). Restoring Motor Functions After Stroke: Multiple Approaches and Opportunities. *The Neuroscientist : A Review Journal Bringing Neurobiology, Neurology and Psychiatry*, 24(4), 400–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858417737486>
- Ramos-Murguialday, A., Broetz, D., Rea, M., Laer, L., Yilmaz, ˆ., Brasil, F. L., Liberati, G., Curado, M. R., Garcia-Cossio, E., Vyziotis, A., Cho, W., Agostini, M., Soares, E., Soekadar, S., Caria, A., Cohen, L. G., & Birbaumer, N. (2013). Brain-machine interface in chronic stroke rehabilitation: A controlled study: BMI in Chronic Stroke. *Annals of Neurology*, 74(1), 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.23879>

Rathee, D., Cecotti, H., & Prasad, G. (2017). Single-trial effective brain connectivity patterns enhance discriminability of mental imagery tasks. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, *14*(5), 056005. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/aa785c>

Remsik, A., Young, B., Vermilyea, R., Kiekhoefer, L., Abrams, J., Evander Elmore, S., Schultz, P., Nair, V., Edwards, D., Williams, J., & Prabhakaran, V. (2016). A review of the progression and future implications of brain-computer interface therapies for restoration of distal upper extremity motor function after stroke. *Expert Review of Medical Devices*, *13*(5), 445–454. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17434440.2016.1174572>

Ros, T., Enriquez-Geppert, S., Zotev, V., Young, K. D., Wood, G., Whitfield-Gabrieli, S., Wan, F., Vuilleumier, P., Vialatte, F., Van De Ville, D., Todder, D., Surmeli, T., Sulzer, J. S., Strehl, U., Sterman, M. B., Steiner, N. J., Sorger, B., Soekadar, S. R., Sitaram, R., ... Thibault, R. T. (2020). Consensus on the reporting and experimental design of clinical and cognitive-behavioural neurofeedback studies (CRED-nf checklist). *Brain*, *143*(6), 1674–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awaa009>

Formatted: German

Ruddy, K., Balsters, J., Mantini, D., Liu, Q., Kassraian-Fard, P., Enz, N., Mihelj, E., Subhash Chander, B., Soekadar, S. R., & Wenderoth, N. (2018). Neural activity related to volitional regulation of cortical excitability. *ELife*, *7*, e40843. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.40843>

Seiler, B. D., Newman-Norlund, R. D., & Monsma, E. V. (2017). Inter-individual neural differences in movement imagery abilities. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *30*, 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.02.007>

Formatted: German

Si-Mohammed, H., Petit, J., Jeunet, C., Argelaguet, F., Spindler, F., Evain, A., Roussel, N., Casiez, G., & Lecuyer, A. (2018). Towards BCI-Based Interfaces for Augmented

Reality: Feasibility, Design and Evaluation. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 26(3), 1608–1621. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2018.2873737>

Smith, M.-C., Ackerley, S. J., Barber, P. A., Byblow, W. D., & Stinear, C. M. (2019). PREP2 Algorithm Predictions Are Correct at 2 Years Poststroke for Most Patients.

Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair, 33(8), 635–642.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968319860481>

Soekadar, S. R., Kohl, S. H., Mihara, M., & von Lümann, A. (2021). Optical brain imaging and its application to neurofeedback. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 30, 102577.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2021.102577>

Soekadar, S. R., Nann, M., Crea, S., Trigili, E., Gómez, C., Opisso, E., Cohen, L. G., Birbaumer, N., & Vitiello, N. (2019). Restoration of Finger and Arm Movements Using Hybrid Brain/Neural Assistive Technology in Everyday Life Environments. In C. Guger, N. Mrachacz-Kersting, & B. Z. Allison (Eds.), *Brain-Computer Interface Research: A State-of-the-Art Summary 7* (pp. 53–61). Springer International Publishing.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05668-1_5

[Soekadar, S.R., Witkowski, M., Gómez, C., Opisso, E., Medina, J., Cortese, M., Cempini,](#)

[M., Carrozza, M.C., Cohen, L.G., Birbaumer, N., Vitiello, N. \(2016\). Hybrid EEG/EOG-based brain/neural hand exoskeleton restores fully independent daily living activities after quadriplegia. *Science Robotics*, 1\(1\), eaag3296. \[https://doi: 10.1126/scirobotics.aag3296\]\(https://doi.org/10.1126/scirobotics.aag3296\).](#)

Sollfrank, T., Hart, D., Goodsell, R., Foster, J., & Tan, T. (2015). 3D visualization of movements can amplify motor cortex activation during subsequent motor imagery.

Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00463>

Sollfrank, T., Ramsay, A., Perdikis, S., Williamson, J., Murray-Smith, R., Leeb, R., Millán, J. d. R., & Kübler, A. (2016). The effect of multimodal and enriched feedback on SMR-

Formatted: German

Formatted: Font colour: Red

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.25 cm, Line spacing: Double

BCI performance. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 127(1), 490–498.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2015.06.004>

Song, J., Nair, V. A., Young, B. M., Walton, L. M., Nigogosyan, Z., Remsik, A., Tyler, M. E., Farrar-Edwards, D., Caldera, K. E., Sattin, J. A., Williams, J. C., & Prabhakaran, V. (2015). DTI measures track and predict motor function outcomes in stroke rehabilitation utilizing BCI technology. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00195>

Stieger, J. R., Engel, S. A., & He, B. (2021). Continuous sensorimotor rhythm based brain computer interface learning in a large population. *Scientific Data*, 8(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-021-00883-1>

Stinear, C. M., Byblow, W. D., Ackerley, S. J., Smith, M.-C., Borges, V. M., & Barber, P. A. (2017a). Proportional Motor Recovery After Stroke. *Stroke*, 48(3), 795–798. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.016020>

Stinear, C. M., Byblow, W. D., Ackerley, S. J., Smith, M.-C., Borges, V. M., & Barber, P. A. (2017b). PREP2: A biomarker-based algorithm for predicting upper limb function after stroke. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*, 4(11), 811–820. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acn3.488>

Stinear, C. M., Byblow, W. D., Steyvers, M., Levin, O., & Swinnen, S. P. (2006). Kinesthetic, but not visual, motor imagery modulates corticomotor excitability. *Experimental Brain Research*, 168(1–2), 157–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-005-0078-y>

Stinear, C. M., Lang, C. E., Zeiler, S., & Byblow, W. D. (2020). Advances and challenges in stroke rehabilitation. *The Lancet Neurology*, 19(4), 348–360. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(19\)30415-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30415-6)

Formatted: German

- Tariq, M., Trivailo, P. M., & Simic, M. (2018). EEG-Based BCI Control Schemes for Lower-Limb Assistive-Robots. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *12*.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00312>
- Thibault, R. T., MacPherson, A., Lifshitz, M., Roth, R. R., & Raz, A. (2018). Neurofeedback with fMRI: A critical systematic review. *NeuroImage*, *172*, 786–807.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.12.071>
- Thompson, M. C. (2019). Critiquing the Concept of BCI Illiteracy. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *25*(4), 1217–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-018-0061-1>
- Umarova, R. M., Schumacher, L. V., Schmidt, C. S. M., Martin, M., Egger, K., Urbach, H., Hennig, J., Klöppel, S., & Kaller, C. P. (2021). Interaction between cognitive reserve and age moderates effect of lesion load on stroke outcome. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 4478. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-83927-1>
- Varkuti, B., Guan, C., Pan, Y., Phua, K. S., Ang, K. K., Kuah, C. W. K., Chua, K., Ang, B. T., Birbaumer, N., & Sitaram, R. (2013). Resting State Changes in Functional Connectivity Correlate With Movement Recovery for BCI and Robot-Assisted Upper-Extremity Training After Stroke. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*, *27*(1), 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1545968312445910>
- Veerbeek, J. M., Wegen, E. van, Peppen, R. van, Wees, P. J. van der, Hendriks, E., Rietberg, M., & Kwakkel, G. (2014). What Is the Evidence for Physical Therapy Poststroke? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *PLOS ONE*, *9*(2), e87987.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0087987>
- Vidaurre, C., & Blankertz, B. (2010). Towards a Cure for BCI Illiteracy. *Brain Topography*, *23*(2), 194–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10548-009-0121-6>
- Vuckovic, A., & Osuagwu, B. A. (2013). Using a motor imagery questionnaire to estimate the performance of a Brain–Computer Interface based on object oriented motor

imagery. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 124(8), 1586–1595.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2013.02.016>

Wierzgała, P., Zapala, D., Wojcik, G. M., & Masiak, J. (2018). Most Popular Signal Processing Methods in Motor-Imagery BCI: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2018.00078>

Wu, Q., Yue, Z., Ge, Y., Ma, D., Yin, H., Zhao, H., Liu, G., Wang, J., Dou, W., & Pan, Y. (2020). Brain Functional Networks Study of Subacute Stroke Patients With Upper Limb Dysfunction After Comprehensive Rehabilitation Including BCI Training. *Frontiers in Neurology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2019.01419>

Xing, Y., & Bai, Y. (2020). A Review of Exercise-Induced Neuroplasticity in Ischemic Stroke: Pathology and Mechanisms. *Molecular Neurobiology*, 57(10), 4218–4231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12035-020-02021-1>