

# Discriminating goal-directed from nongoal-directed movements and its potential impact for BCI control

J. Pereira<sup>1</sup>, P. Ofner<sup>1</sup>, A. Schwarz<sup>1</sup>, G. R. Müller-Putz<sup>1\*</sup>


<sup>1</sup>Institute of Neural Engineering, Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria

\*Stremayrgasse 16/IV, 8010 Graz, Austria. E-mail: [gernot.mueller@tugraz.at](mailto:gernot.mueller@tugraz.at)

**Introduction:** Differences in the electroencephalographic (EEG) recordings between the execution of goal-directed and nongoal-directed movements have been recently shown in [1]. Such differences can be of interest for brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) control, when combined with information on the kinematic level (e.g. velocity decoding), since this combination mirrors the hierarchic way one plans a movement. In this study, we show that the time-domain differences between these movements are discriminable in a single-trial classification.

**Material, Methods and Results:** Ten healthy, right-handed subjects participated in the experiment. Subjects were presented a small red ball on the monitor (*Goal*) or a red screen (*No-Goal*). After 2 seconds and only when the stimuli color changed from red to purple, subjects were instructed to reach-and-touch the ball (*Goal Movement*) or to decide on their own where to touch (*No-Goal Movement*). 72 trials per condition were recorded. EEG signals were recorded using 60 passive electrodes and sampled at 512 Hz.

Independent component analysis (ICA) was performed for artefact removal: components representing eye movements and muscle activity were rejected. To extract relevant low-frequency time-domain features, data were down sampled to 16 Hz, common average referenced and band-pass filtered from 0.3 to 3 Hz with a zero-phase 4<sup>th</sup> order Butterworth filter. Classification was done using a random forest binary classifier; accuracies were calculated for each time-point and validated using 10x5-fold cross-validation. To score significantly above the chance level, 64.7% had to be reached ( $p=0.01$ , Bonferroni corrected for multiple tests over the trial length). Fig. 1 shows the time-course of the classification accuracies when discriminating *Goal Movement* and *No-Goal Movement*. Accuracies rise above the chance level after both first and second cues. After the GO cue (second cue), the average accuracy peaks immediately after movement onset with 67%. Here, 4 out of 10 subjects show accuracies above 80%, and all subjects are above the chance level. Also interestingly, 3 of the subjects show high accuracies even 2 seconds after movement onset.



**Figure 1.** Classification accuracies when discriminating *Goal* and *No-Goal* Movements, time-locked at movement onset ( $t=0s$ ). The first 2 vertical lines correspond to the average time-points when the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> cue appeared, in respect to movement onset. The thick black line corresponds to the grand-average accuracy.

**Discussion:** Our results show that there are differences between goal-directed and nongoal-directed movements when time-locking at movement onset. Namely, the motor-related cortical potentials – after the second cue- show different amplitudes between conditions. These differences are discriminable in a single-trial classification. Future work will be to investigate whether similar results are obtained with neuroprostheses end-users and movement imagination (MI). If so, this information could be useful to establish activation thresholds, or even by instructing the subjects to imagine the kinesthetic MI associated with a target. We hypothesize that this instruction, combined with movement decoding at the kinematic level, could additionally improve classification accuracies.

**Significance:** The results contribute to the goal of our research: a naturally-controlled BCI neuroprostheses. Furthermore, we encourage the BCI community to explore the neural correlates behind goal-directed movements and how recent neurophysiological findings in action planning (e.g. [2]) can be of practical interest for BCIs.

**Acknowledgements:** This work is supported by the EU ICT Programme Project H2020-643955, “MoreGrasp” and the ERC Consolidator Grant “Feel Your Reach”.

## References

- [1] Pereira J, Ofner P, Muller-Putz G.R. Goal-directed or aimless? EEG differences during the preparation of a reach-and-touch task. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual International Conference of the IEEE/EMBS*, 1488-1491. IEEE, 2015.
- [2] Aflalo T, Kellis S, Klaes C, Lee B, Shi Y, Pejsa K, Shanfield K, Hayes-Jackson S, Aisen Heck C and Liu C. Decoding motor imagery from the posterior parietal cortex of a tetraplegic human. *Science*, 348(6237), pp.906-910, 2015.