



Introduction

Background:

The incorporation of Brain Computer Interface (BCI) systems into fields such as healthcare, education, and entertainment has been an area of interest across many academic circles in recent years. This platform of BCI decodes brainwave patterns during a sustained period of visual attention to a specified task. During a period of visual attention, electric potentials are created in response to synaptic activity across neurons. These potentials were collected as signals through the non-invasive technique of scalp ElectroEncephaloGrams (EEG).

Objective:

The goal of this project was to improve the prediction accuracy for a EEG signals using a deep neural network and signal processing techniques.





Figure 1: Raw EEG Signal and Channel Layout

Data Collection

- Data from 2 subjects was collected across 14 channels using the Emotiv Headset
- Each Subject produced 400 Image Trials containing signal data that was analyzed and processed within the model • Sub-Categories were used to ensure the participants gave
- visual attention to the category assigned

| Block Number | Task-Relevant Image | Task-Irrelevant Image | |
|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Indoor | Outdoor | |
| 2 | Male Female | | |
| 3 | Indoor Outdoor | | |
| 4 | Female | Male | |
| 5 | Outdoor | Indoor | |
| 6 | Male | Female | |
| 7 | Outdoor | Indoor | |
| 8 | Female | Male | |

Decoding EEG Waves for Visual Attention to Faces and Scenes

Students: Taylor Berger (UTK), Yiyao CHEN (CUHK) Mentors: Xiaopeng Zhao (UTK), Kwai Wong (UTK), Soheil Borhani (UTK)

Model

Pre-Processing and Feature Extraction:

- Raw EEG signals were filtered in the frequency domain to remove artifacts that distort the signal prior to feature extraction
- Features were extracted in 56 frequency bands with a range of 1 Hz

Lowpass Filter **Raw EEG Signa** at 60 Hz

Figure 3: Pre-Processing and Feature Extraction Method

Data Augmentation:

- Split and combination method was applied to increase the number of training examples (Figure 4)
- EEG signals were cut and randomly combined to produce 1600 training examples





Cross Validation and Random Seed:

- 10-Fold cross validation was used with a training-to-testing ratio of 0.9 (Figure 5)
- Random seeding was used to ensure reproducible results



Figure 5: K-Fold Cross Validation Method^[2]

Convolutional Neural Network



Figure 4: Split-and-Combination Method^[1]

Model Dimensions:

- our data type

Model Layer Structure:

| Layer | 1 CONV3D | 2 CONV3D | 3 CONV3D | 4 FC | 5 FC |
|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------|---------|
| Filter | (3,3,3) #1 = 6 | (2,2,2) #2 = 12 | (3,3,3) #3 = 24 | 56 | 1 |
| Activation | relu | relu | relu | relu | sigmiod |
| Pooling | NA | (2,2,2) | (2,2,2) | NA | NA |
| Loss: binary_crossentropy | | | Optimizor: Adam | | |



Pre-Processing:

- Test Continuous Wavelet Transform (CWT) • Optimize number of frequency bands on model accuracy
- Model:
- Optimize Dropout Rate and Optimizor function • Optimize CONV3D layers



This project was sponsored by the National Science Foundation through Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU) award, with additional support from the Joint Institute of Computational Sciences at University of Tennessee Knoxville. This project used allocations from the Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), which is supported by the National Science Foundation. In addition, the computing work was also performed on technical workstations donated by the BP High Performance Computing Team.





• 2D and 3D Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) were compared and 3D models proved to be more efficient for

• Each Image Trial dataset was reshaped to a 28*28 matrix

Results

• The number of epochs and model parameters such as early stopping was tested and evaluated using the average and standard deviation of the testing accuracy across 10 folds • Below are the best model parameters after current testing

| ing (Patience = 10) | Mean (std) = 74.38% (3.61%) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Max = 80.62 MIn = 66.88 |
| | Mean (std) = 74.56% (5.18%) |
| | Max = 84.38 MIn = 67.5 |

Future Work

Acknowledgements

References

[1] Lotte, F. (2015). Signal Processing Approaches to Minimize or Suppress calibration Time in Oscillatory Activity-Based Brain-Computer Interfaces. *Proceedings of IEEE*, 103(6). 871-890 [2] Kong, Q. (2017, February 12). Machine Learning 9 - More on Artificial Neural Networks. Retrieved from http://qingkaikong.blogspot.com/2017/02/machine-learning-9-more-one-artificial.html