

Progress in Brain Computer Interfaces: Challenges and Trends

Simanto Saha¹, Khondaker A. Mamun², Khawza Ahmed³, Raqibul Mostafa³, Ganesh R. Naik⁴, Ahsan Khandoker^{5,6}, Sam Darvishi¹, and Mathias Baumert¹

¹The School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, the University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia

²The Department of Computer Science and Engineering, United International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

³The Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, United International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

⁴The Marcs Institute for Brain, Behaviour and Development, Western Sydney University, Sydney, Australia

⁵The Department of Biomedical Engineering, Khalifa University of Science, Technology and Research, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

⁶The Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, the University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Corresponding author: Mathias Baumert (e-mail: mathias.baumert@adelaide.edu.au).

ABSTRACT Brain computer interfaces (BCI) provide a direct communication link between the brain and a computer or other external devices. They offer an extended degree of freedom either by strengthening or by substituting human peripheral working capacity and have potential applications in various fields such as rehabilitation, affective computing, robotics, gaming and artificial intelligence. Significant research efforts on a global scale have delivered common platforms for technology standardization and help tackle highly complex and nonlinear brain dynamics and related feature extraction and classification challenges. Psychoneurophysiological phenomena and their impact on brain signals impose another challenge for BCI researchers to transform the technology from laboratory experiments to plug-and-play daily life. This review summarizes progress in BCI field and highlights critical challenges.

INDEX TERMS brain computer interface (BCI), hybrid/multimodal BCI, neuroimaging techniques, neurosensors, electrical/hemodynamic brain signals, cognitive rehabilitation

I. INTRODUCTION

The brain computer interface (BCI) is a direct and sometimes a bidirectional communication tie-up between the brain and a computer or an external device, which involves no muscular stimulation, and has shown promise for rehabilitating subjects with motor impairments as well as for augmenting human working capacity either physically or cognitively. BCI was originally envisioned as a potential technology for augmenting/replacing existing neural rehabilitations or serving assistive devices controlled directly by the brain [1], [2]. The first systematic attempt to implement an electroencephalogram (EEG)-based BCI was made by J. J. Vidal in 1973, who recorded the evoked electrical activity of the cerebral cortex from the intact skull using EEG [1]. Another early endeavor to establish direct communication between the brain and the computer of people with severe motor impairments had utilized P300, an event related potential of the brain [3]. As an alternative to conventional therapeutic rehabilitation for motor impairments, BCI technology seeks to artificially augment or re-excite synaptic plasticity in affected neural circuits. By exploiting undamaged cognitive and emotional functions, BCI aims at re-establishing the link between the brain and an impaired peripheral site [4]. However, the research application of BCI technology has evolved over the years, including brain fingerprinting for lie detection [5], detecting drowsiness for improving human working performances [6], controlling virtual reality [7] and video games [8], and driving humanoid robots [9], [10], [11]. Figure 1 shows the increasing number of publications on BCI in various application fields over the years since its first appearance in a seminal article in 1979 [1].

According to the BNCI (Brain/Neural Computer Interaction) Horizon 2020 project, an initiative by the European Commission for coordinating BCI research community, six major application themes, i.e., restore (e.g., unlocking the completely locked-in), replace (e.g., BCI-controlled neuroprosthesis), enhance (e.g., enhanced user experience in computer games), supplement (e.g., augmented reality glasses), improve (e.g., upper limb rehabilitation after stroke) and research tool (e.g., decoding brain activity with real-time feedback) have been outlined as feasible and promising fields of BCI application [12].

A. CHARACTERIZATION OF BCI SYSTEMS

BCI systems can be categorized by the way they use the brain: Passive BCI decode unintentional affective/cognitive states of the brain [11], while active BCI directly involve the user's voluntary intention-induced brain activity. Reactive BCI use brain waves generated as reactions to external stimuli. Detecting driver's drowsiness to prevent road accidents is an example of passive BCI [13]. BCI systems driven by user's intentional motor imagery [14] and visually evoked P300 produced by external stimulation [3], [5] can be considered as active BCI and reactive BCI, respectively.

The modality of signal acquisition has been used to divide systems into invasive and noninvasive BCI [15], [16]. Noninvasive BCI exploiting EEG are most common, although more recently, functional near infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS) [17], magnetoencephalogram (MEG) [18] and functional transcranial Doppler ultrasonography [19] have been exploited. In contrast, invasive intracortical electrodes [20] and electrocorticogram (ECoG) [21] have been used, providing a superior signal-to-noise ratio and better localization of brain activity.

Recent advancements allow both the decoding of neural activities and the delivery of external signals into targeted brain areas to induce plasticity [22]. While most of the BCI systems translate brain signals as computer command, some systems utilize external stimulation modalities such as transcranial magnetic stimulation [23], [24] and transcranial direct current stimulation [25] to stimulate specific brain areas. The bidirectional framework of BCI comprises of either one brain with feedback modality or two brains. Transcranial direct current stimulation directed by motor imagery-related EEG signals alters the connectivity in the sensorimotor networks in healthy individuals [26]. Another possible application of bidirectional BCI framework is direct brain-to-brain communication [23], [24]. Figure 2 illustrates a typical bidirectional BCI framework. Moreover, some BCI applications require auxiliary modalities, i.e., proprioceptive feedback and functional electrical stimulation driven by brain signals as feedback for augmenting or regaining peripheral motor actions [27], [28].

B. FACTORS INFLUENCING BCI PERFORMANCE

For medical applications of BCI, three criteria are essential: (1) a comfortable and convenient signals acquisition device, (2) system validation and dissemination, and (3) reliability and potentiality of BCIs [29]. For the restoration of mobility in patients with motor impairments, invasive intracortical recordings show better BCI performance [30] than noninvasive methods such as EEG [31]. Invasive modalities are also suitable for locked-in patients, because the benefits (significantly improved quality-of-life) outweigh the risks associated with implantation [32]. A pilot study with a 1-year follow-up found no adverse effects pertaining to surgery or tissue reaction [33]. Invasive BCI should generally not be considered for neurologically intact subjects.

Many factors influence BCI performance; understanding the underlying neuronal mechanisms of cortical-subcortical networks is of crucial importance. For example, motor imagery-induced signals are recorded from premotor and motor areas, because premotor cortex, primary motor cortex and supplementary motor area along with basal ganglia and thalamus of the subcortical areas are the mostly activated areas during motor imagery [34].

Some issues can significantly impede BCI performance. Maintaining an acceptable signal-to-noise ratio in noninvasive long-term recordings is critical. Event-induced brain waves or oscillations are dynamic while being affected by unstable resting state networks (RSNs) [35]. Time-variant psychophysiological [36], [37], [38], neuroanatomical [39] factors and user's fundamental traits [40] cause unreliable estimates of RSNs, causing short and long-term signal variation within and across individuals. Due to these intrinsic signal variations, BCI systems require subject-specific training, in which subjects attend a calibration session that is tedious and often frustrating for the subject. To eliminate subject-specific training, the concept of inter-subject associativity, demonstrated in previous works in case of natural vision [41] and natural music listening [42], could be exploited toward inter-subject operable BCI. A recent study suggests that inter-subject operable BCI might become feasible with associate subjects [43]. Inter-subject BCI holds most promise for healthy subjects in applications like gaming, drowsiness and lie detection, because rehabilitative BCI must consider the characteristics and severity of individual impairment [44]. Another way to reduce the effects of session-to-session and subject-to-subject variabilities is transfer learning, in which algorithms are designed to test on datasets that are either not or minimally used to train the algorithms [45].

II. CHALLENGES

Table 1 and Figure 3 highlight the fundamental BCI challenges in psycho-neuro-physiological and technological domains.

A. PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGICAL AND NEUROLOGICAL CHALLENGES

Underlying emotional and mental processes, neurophysiology associated with cognition and neurological factors, i.e., functions, anatomy, play crucial roles in BCI performance and give rise to significant intra- and inter-individual variability. Psychological factors including attention, memory load, fatigue and competing cognitive processes [36], [46], [47] as well as users' basic

characteristics such as lifestyle, gender and age, [39] influence instantaneous brain dynamics. For example, individuals with lower empathy participate less emotionally in a P300-BCI paradigm and can produce higher amplitudes of P300 waves than subjects with greater empathetic involvement [48]. Motivation is also related to P300-BCI performances and, such BCI is only applicable for people with intact visual perceptions [49].

Besides psychological traits, resting state physiological parameters, for example, frequency domain features extracted from resting state heart rate variability analysis are associated with BCI performances [50]. In addition, the baselines of RSNs are dynamic and modify any cortical signature instantaneously [35]. Age alters RSNs and associated cognitive responses [51]. Adapting with such time-variant RSNs is more demanding when the effects of RSNs are prominent over event-related cortical responses [52]. Moreover, the inherent complexity and diversity in the formation of a human brain [53] that influence the functional neural networks [54], construct highly volatile neuronal connectivity over time and across subjects [55]. An efficient BCI system must be robust to such inherent physiological fluctuations over time courses and, BCI without subject-specific calibration can promote more generalized frameworks for comforting healthy users.

Experiments correlating BCI performance with neuroanatomical, neurophysiological and psychological parameters have provided fascinating results: gray matter volume in sensorimotor cortical areas is associated with BCI success [39]. Sensorimotor rhythm-based BCI has implicated that physiological predictors such as spectral entropy and power spectral density, derived from resting state EEG recordings are correlated with BCI performance [37], [38]. Psychological predictors such as attention and motivation, are also associated with sensorimotor rhythm-based BCI performance [56]. Complementing EEG-based and questionnaire-based psychological predictors, corticospinal excitability could be used as another reliable marker for BCI performance [57]. Taking head anatomy into consideration augments BCI performance [58].

Around 15-30% of individuals are inherently not able to produce brain signals robust enough to operate a BCI [59]. Considering neurophysiological phenomena may reduce BCI illiteracy. An adaptive machine learning approach incorporating neurophysiological and psychological traits has been proposed to reduce BCI illiteracy [60].

Other case-specific investigations on neuro-psycho-physiological parameters contributing to BCI performance are essential. For the rehabilitation of stroke survivors, affected neural circuits, i.e., lesions are to be identified carefully, because brain responses fluctuate according to the spatial location of the stroke lesion [44]. Although current neuroimaging methods are effective in capturing stroke lesion sites, a case-specific BCI design that incorporates residual brain function is required for rehabilitative interventions. Highly individualized design impedes wide dissemination of BCI-driven rehabilitation of neurological conditions.

B. TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

Event related potential (ERP) [61], steady-state visual evoked potential (SSVEP) [62], auditory evoked potential (AEP) [63], steady-state somatosensory evoked potential (SSSEP) [64] and motor imagery (MI) [14], have been proposed to detect cognitive signatures although none of the signatures performs well for all BCI applications. For example, ERPs and SSVEPs are target-specific and generated by external stimulation; however, if ERPs depend on visual stimuli, they cannot be used for rehabilitating locked-in patients with impaired visual processing. In that case, auditory-based ERP could be used if auditory processing remains intact. On the other hand, MI seems too slow for action control, thus they are not suitable for controlling virtual reality environments or videogames [65]. Recently proposed hybrid BCIs which utilize more than one waves, i.e., SSVEP/ERP [66], [67] and SSVEP/MI [68], seem to offer more robust features.

Intrinsic neurophysiological instability of the brain dynamics poses critical challenges for making BCI systems efficient. The major components of a BCI system are the signal acquisition, signal processing and effector device [69]. Various neuroimaging techniques have already been in use to explore cortical activities as forms of either electrical or hemodynamic signatures [16] and none of the methods shows any advantageous outcome for a lucrative BCI design complying four important criteria, i.e., cost efficiency, portability, easy maintenance and less or no involvement of invasive surgery. Invasive signal acquisitions are yet to be tested for long-term reliability for assessing whether the placed sensors could maintain the signal quality over a long period inside the brain [70].

EEG [71] provides relatively poor spatial resolution due to noninvasive scalp recordings compared to fMRI, but finer temporal resolution [32], [72]. Employing high density EEG mapping to increase spatial resolution results in high computational cost and efforts to maintain a reasonable signal-to-noise ratio across all channels [73]. Since EEG captures only the electrical field generated associated cognitive processes, concomitant assessment of blood-oxygen level-dependent (BOLD) activity may improve BCI performance. BOLD activity is typically captured with fMRI [74], which is not feasible for most BCI applications,

due to unmanageable size and cost of the device. fNIRS provides a safe, noninvasive, relatively inexpensive and portable neuroimaging alternative for recording BOLD activity [75], [17]. Integrating fNIRS with EEG can significantly enhance classification performances regardless of low information transfer rate caused by inherent delays in hemodynamics [76]. A recent study has suggested that fNIRS is unable to adequately offer acceptable performances on its own, but can be combined with EEG to boost the performances [77]. Probing cortical sources is another important issue for scalp-based sensors such as EEG, as they could be located subcortically. Reconstructing task-induced sources while resolving the so-called inverse problem imposes a significant challenge. A two-equivalent-dipole model was applied on EEG data to discern the anatomical nature of the MI induced sources and to aid the classification performances [78]. The neuronal signals attenuate through some layers of tissues having complex geometry and diverse electrical properties; however, the magnetic permeability in the cerebrospinal fluid, skull, and skin, is consistent [79]. Thus, MEG is more likely to capture signal with lesser distortion than EEG. Even MEG provides better spatiotemporal resolution as compared to EEG, although the use of this technology is limited by cost and portability [80].

The design of classifiers for BCI comprises two issues [81], [82], [83]. First, the dimensionality of the features set used for estimating the model parameters should be chosen for optimal performance based on the nature of the classifier. Second, the trade-off between bias and variance has to be considered and may involve regularizing the parameter estimation.

Covariate shift of class specific feature sets during training and testing a classifier model, following unlike probability distributions although their conditional distributions remain unchanged [84], is an important issue requiring the application of adaptive methods for compensating feature space transitions. The unsupervised subspace learning method enables session-to-session and subject-to-subject information transfers, augmenting BCI performance [85], [86], [44]. As a supervised method, common spatial pattern has been extensively used in EEG-based online and offline BCI settings [87]. However, a common problem with such a data-driven technique is over-fitting of the model parameters based on training sets, causing unreliable prediction on the test data [88].

III. NEURAL PLASTICITY, SENSORS, SIGNAL PROCESSING, MODELING AND APPLICATIONS

Exploiting neural plasticity, designing hi-fidelity and customized neural sensors, applying advanced signal processing, and machine learning techniques are the key aspects of BCI design. Table 2 summarizes a set of applications of BCI technology.

A. SYNAPTIC PLASTICITY AND COGNITIVE REHABILITATION

The time-variant behavior of synapses within complex neural networks underpins the plastic characteristics of the brain and was first illustrated by Donald O. Hebb in 1949 [89]. Closed-loop BCI with neurofeedback is assumed to contribute to the reorganization of cortical-subcortical neural networks and assist subjects in self-regulating specific brain rhythms; notwithstanding, the underlying mechanisms that alter neural substrates are still not well-understood [90]. For example, BCI-based covert visuomotor training modulates associated neural substrates [91], where the effects of modulated neural substrates are observed while performing that particular movement-related task. Substantial changes in overt movement-related task following BCI-driven training induced learning suggest a critical role of BCI in enhanced motor learning for proficiently controlling neuroprosthetics [92]. BCI may augment training-induced plasticity during therapeutic motor rehabilitation and, thus, re-excite corresponding neural substrates to regain control by means of neuroprosthetics or upper limb functions [93].

The extent of BCI-induced plasticity entails several factors, including (1) the selection of the signal acquisition modality, which plays important role in diagnosing neural states, (2) the design of feedback modality that has explicit association with the neural signal classification performance, (3) the consideration of application-specific feedback delays, and (4) the utilization of a suitable feedback modality [94]. Neural ensemble recordings using signal acquisition modalities such as EEG, MEG, fNIRS and fMRI has become dominant over single unit recordings. Behavioral activities are likely to be distributed across three-dimensional cortical-subcortical networks and that cannot be captured within single unit recordings [95].

Rehabilitative BCI can be designed either by attaching neural prostheses to the impaired body parts or by re-stimulating the damaged synaptic networks; in any of the cases, the idea is to exploit and promote neural plasticity [96]. In stroke patients with paretic muscles without residual finger movement, increased electromyogram activity post rehabilitation by BCI-driven orthoses exhibits increased neuromuscular coherence that is essential for restoring movement control [97]. Explicit application of functional electrical stimulation regulated by EEG-based movement-related signatures further suggests a role of BCI in rehabilitation [98]. Increased electromyogram activity in paretic muscles is indicative of plasticity induced by electrical stimulation [28]. For BCI-based rehabilitation in a real-life environment, differentiating between task-induced activities and resting state activities is a key factor for controlling the prosthesis or stimulation modality [99].

Externally stimulating the affected brain areas by electric or magnetic fields holds promise for stroke rehabilitation. A recent study demonstrated the induction of neural plasticity in white matter and cortical functions in chronic stroke patients by motor imagery-based BCI and transcranial direct current stimulation applied to targeted brain areas [100]. Magnetic stimulation of brain areas driven by BCI increases cortical activation in stroke patients [101]. Plasticity alteration post-rehabilitation varies across subjects and, thus, an individual-specific training session is necessary [102]. The usefulness of BCI-based motor rehabilitation is limited for locked-in patients because they are unable to interact with the system [103]. Other examples of BCI-driven rehabilitations include optimizing the parameters for deep brain stimulation applied into the subthalamic nucleus in patients with Parkinson's disease [104] and treating major depressive disorder patients by BCI-driven transcranial magnetic stimulation [105].

Either by providing direct control of assistive technologies or by neural rehabilitation, BCI can help patients who may suffer from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, cerebral palsy, brainstem stroke, spinal cord injuries, muscular dystrophies, or chronic peripheral neuropathies [106]. Providing auxiliary degrees of freedom improves quality of life significantly for people with disabilities. Brain signals can be translated to drive wheelchairs [107], [108]. Integration of BCI with a vision-guided autonomous system was shown to effectively perform the grasping task using a prosthetic arm in a Tetraplegia patient [109]. An implanted microelectrode array has been proposed to operate a three-dimensional neuroprosthetic device [110].

B. SIGNAL ACQUISITION, SIGNAL PROCESSING AND MODELING

Control signals exploiting either cognitive hemodynamics or electrical activities can be used to operate a BCI efficiently. A significant number of studies are now involved in combining multimodal signal acquisition modalities to augment current BCI systems. For example, simultaneous EEG and fMRI yield complementary features by exploiting good temporal resolution of EEG and good spatial resolution of fMRI [111]. Enhanced multiclass sensorimotor tasks classification performance using hybrid EEG and fNIRS signals implicates the importance of features extracted from both hemodynamic and electrical activities [112]. MEG is another potential tool to combine with EEG, as it captures radially/tangentially dipole sources in cortical-subcortical networks and adds complementary information to EEG signals [113]. Hence, different signal acquisition modalities could be combined together to improve the BCI efficiency.

The combination of signal processing and machine learning approaches plays critical role in translating any brain signal to a command for a computer or other external devices. Here, we only highlight signal processing and machine learning techniques for processing EEG, ECoG and fNIRS signals. Representing signals in the time-frequency-space is necessary to obtain physiological correlates of BCI outcomes [81]. Fourier transform (FT) and autoregressive models are examples of time domain representations while short time FT and wavelet transform allow for time-frequency representations of brain signals [114], [81]. In case of spatial filtering, the most popular filtering approaches are common spatial pattern, independent component analysis and the Laplacian filter. A diverse range of inverse models allow to discern the actual sources projected on three-dimensional cortical-subcortical networks. Extracted features can be translated using various linear and nonlinear classification algorithms. Examples of linear and nonlinear classifier models are linear discriminant analysis and nonlinear kernel-based support vector machines [82], [83].

Since the first publication in 2000, common spatial pattern is still one of the most popular methods to represent multichannel EEG signals by corresponding spatial contents [87]. As a data-driven method, it requires a significant number of training samples to model the filtering parameters. In case of small training trials, regularizing the covariance estimation works better than the traditional algorithm [115]. Other modifications in spatial filtering include projecting EEG by using sparse representation and filter bank spectral division of raw signals [116]. Generally, spatial filtering is applicable in subject-specific BCI development although a recent study has proposed estimating the filter coefficients from a subject and applied that filter to another subject, which contributed no training sample [43]. On the other hand, independent component analysis is a blind source separation method requiring no training. The estimation of independent components are based on statistical properties of the signals [117]. However, modeling the actual cortical sources as dipoles in the complex brain anatomy from the scalp EEG recordings seeks to solve the so called inverse problem [118], [119]. More recent source localization methods such as wavelet-based maximum entropy on the mean represent EEG/MEG signals as relevant time-frequency contents and finally transform them into spatial representations [120].

C. NEUROSENSORS: THE-STATE-OF-THE-ART

Deeper regions of the brain, e.g., subcortical and cerebellar regions, contribute to various neuronal activities [121], [122]. Interpreting the genesis of cortical sources from cellular to scalp levels and RSNs spanned throughout the three-dimensional

brain space can guide BCI development [123]. Sensors with customized design are developed to advance brain signal acquisition modalities. Neurosensors can be constructed in different forms like electrical, optical, chemical and biological [124]. Dry EEG electrodes are convenient, but provide inferior signal-to-noise ratio compared to conventional wet electrodes, which use conductive gel and require proper skin preparation minimizing the skin-electrode impedance [125]. However, a study on dry electrodes-based BCI suggested that dry electrode could be used to collect good quality signals by designing the circuits carefully [126]. While utilizing the advantages of both dry and wet electrodes, quasi-dry electrodes exploiting the mechanical properties of polymer can capture signals as comparable to commercial Ag/AgCl electrodes [127]. To increase the spatial resolution of EEG, Petrov et al. have proposed an ultra-dense sensor array of 700-800 electrodes [128]. The signal-to-noise ratio was twice as high as for high-density EEG that has up to 256 gold-coated electrodes. An auricle electrode with stretchable connector was proposed that not only can increase portability but also can offer a comfortable alternative for long term recordings [129]. The electrode is flexible with the alterations of electrical and mechanical properties of skin, thus it would be a comfortable option for long term recordings.

Invasive signal acquisition sensors must be biocompatible. A novel organic electrochemical transistor-based sensor enables to collect neural signals directly from the brain surface [130]. This sensor is biocompatible and mechanically flexible, and the transistor-based design amplifies captured signals locally, thus providing much better signal-to-noise ratio than conventional ECoG. To enhance the signal quality, carbon nanotube coating can decrease the electrode impedance and, thus, increase the charge transfer [131]. Another invasive biocompatible sensor, designed for recording previously inaccessible spectra of large neuron populations, includes data transmission for use in natural environments [132]. Oxley et al. have proposed stent-electrode array (stentode) that involves minimal invasiveness [133]. Using computer-guided catheter angiography, the stentode can be placed within arteries or veins located inside the brain anatomy. Capturing high-fidelity cortical signals, this technology will significantly reduce the risk factors of craniotomy. With the outstanding progression of nanotechnology, nanowire Field Effect Transistor and other p/n junction devices have potential for neuro-sensing modalities for intracellular recordings, even in the deep brain regions [134].

Besides large scale recording modalities like EEG and MEG, very small scale recordings of neuronal activities is crucial for understanding brain circuits' functions and intra- and inter-neuron interactions. Representation of any cognitive task as functions of both small scale and large scale neuronal interactions is crucial for the advancement of neuroengineering and BCI. In this regard, a high-density neurosensor array made from silicon probes combined with optogenetics enables single unit recordings [135]. Yang et al. proposed a novel multi-plane two-photon microscope that can be used to capture multi-layer neuronal structure and mechanism with cellular resolution [136]. Other potential imaging methods for investigating cell signaling include calcium imaging [137] and advanced microscope with chronically implanted lenses [138]. Designer receptor exclusively activated by designer drugs, provides a chemogenetic tool to understand cell-signaling including electrical activities in molecularly clustered cell groups [139], [140]. A new ultrasonic-based wireless system, called neural dust, enables the recording of electromyogram and electroneurogram on the millimeter scale [141].

D. MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATIONS

The applications of BCI are extremely diverse, specifically as an augmentative tool for healthy individuals. An EEG-based BCI-driven controller of mobile robot has demonstrated the possibility of this technology in robotics industry [142]. BCI can also be used for controlling humanoid robots remotely using EEG [9], [10], suitable in hazardous environments, for example by sending a robot in a coal mine for executing a task that is potentially unsafe for a human. In space, BCI can be used to monitor astronauts' working capacity [143] and to drive an exoskeleton [144]. In the absence of gravity, working becomes tedious and inconvenient. Furthermore, astronauts' working time is precious. BCI-driven systems could be practical for improving astronauts' functionality, efficiency and safety [145]. Other applications for healthy users consist of controlling virtual reality and video games [67], brain fingerprinting [5], [146], mood assessment [147], and brain painting [148].

More recently, brain-to-brain interface (BBI), involving decoding sender's cognitive intentions, translate them into commands for stimulating receiver's brain have been explored. In 2013, researchers implemented a direct BBI system in which one rat was able to share sensorimotor information to another rat [149]. Intracortical microstimulation was used to stimulate the receiver's target brain areas. An early attempt to develop sensorimotor rhythm-based BBI between two human subjects used noninvasive EEG and transcranial magnetic stimulation has been proposed by Rao et al. [23]. Other total noninvasive BBI experiments have proposed sharing pseudo-random binary streams encoding words between human subjects [24] and playing collaborative games [150].

IV. ETHICAL CONCERNS AND SOCIOECONOMIC CONTEXTS

Irrespective of the scientific breakthroughs in BCI field, there are key factors pertaining to safety, ethics, privacy protection and data confidentiality, community acceptance and socioeconomic aspects that should be considered with adequate precautions to maximize users' benefits and social impacts [151], [152], [153], [154].

Physical and mental safety of BCI users is important. Invasive procedures such as deep brain stimulation may cause postoperative psychological and neurological side effects [155], [156], [157]. Additionally, bleeding and infections are infrequent but do occur and may require removal or further maintenance of the implanted electrodes. Guidelines are required to safely advance neurotechnologies [158], because BCI devices can alter behavior and, thus introduce potential threats to one's emotions, personality and memories; more generally one's mind. For human brain-to-brain interface applications [23], [150], one may define an upper bound for research depths keeping in mind the necessity of ethical utilization of this technology. Because both sender and receiver play complicated roles, more specifically, sender's intentional manipulative control over neural signals might alter the anticipated outcome. Altering human cognitive and possibly moral capacity raise a serious ethical question and it is not predictable if the cognitive changes reversible and efficacious [159].

A user's expectations of achieving extended or auxiliary degree of freedom may not be fulfilled, and even the unfamiliar risk factors can diminish the accomplished advantage of using BCI [160], [161]. Creating broad awareness of BCI technology and its pros and cons would educate people, who fear unnecessary technological dependency [162].

It is critical to introduce a suitable act for lawful utilization of BCI and preservation of privacy and confidentiality of stored data. Necessary precursor initiatives should propose application-specific BCI frameworks, which can restrict unauthorized access to stored data or the system [163]. For example, illicit access to a wireless BCI-driven limb and manipulative reprogramming of a computer-guided neuro stimulation have demonstrated the importance of establishing resilient safeguards to BCI use [164]. Without evaluating socioeconomic, ethical and policy issues, the commercialization of BCI would hinder BCI progress [165].

By creating a common networking platform for BCI researchers worldwide, the immediate proposition of a comprehensive list of universal guidelines is key to sustainable advancements of the field [166]. Various alliance-based projects are running as common platforms for advancing the knowledge of neuroscience [167]. The European Union along with its partner universities have initiated The Human Brain Project (HBP). In addition, the Brain Initiative has been announced by the White House. A comprehensive set of social and ethical guidelines have been described by Rose [168]. Figure 4 highlights the present states and predicted future achievements of BCI technology.

V. CONCLUSION

Numerous groundbreaking advances in neurosensors and computational tools herald great promise for more sophisticated and user friendly BCI systems requiring no or little maintenance. In addition to hi-fidelity signal acquisition, significant progress in signal processing and machine learning tools, their complementary roles, and high computation power and increased mobility of computers have significantly contributed in the emergence of BCI technologies. The future of BCI technology will rely greatly on addressing the following key aspects:

- Elucidating the underlying psychophysiological and neurological factors that potentially influence BCI performance.
- Designing sensors with greater signal resolution, while considering portability, easy maintenance, minimal or no invasiveness and affordability.
- Estimating covariate shift for subject-specific feature spaces (i.e., training and testing feature sets) and modeling subject-to-subject information transfer for the proposition of more generalized BCI models with insignificant or no calibration requirement.
- Establishing broad consensus on ethical issues and beneficial socioeconomic application of this technology.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Prof. Moritz Grosse-Wentrup for providing his valuable feedback.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None declared.

REFERENCES

- [1] Vidal, J.J., 1973. Toward direct brain-computer communication. *Annual review of Biophysics and Bioengineering*, 2(1), pp.157-180.
- [2] Birbaumer, N., Ghanayim, N., Hinterberger, T., Iversen, I., Kotchoubey, B., Kübler, A., ... & Flor, H. (1999). A spelling device for the paralysed. *Nature*, 398(6725), 297.
- [3] Farwell, L.A. and Donchin, E., 1988. Talking off the top of your head: toward a mental prosthesis utilizing event-related brain potentials. *Electroencephalography and clinical Neurophysiology*, 70(6), pp.510-523.
- [4] Chaudhary, U., Xia, B., Silvoni, S., Cohen, L.G. and Birbaumer, N., 2017. Brain-computer interface-based communication in the completely locked-in state. *PLoS biology*, 15(1), p.e1002593.
- [5] Farwell, L.A., Richardson, D.C., Richardson, G.M. and Furedy, J.J., 2014. Brain fingerprinting classification concealed information test detects US Navy military medical information with P300. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 8, p.410.
- [6] Kohlmorgen, J., Dornhege, G., Braun, M., Blankertz, B., Müller, K.R., Curio, G., Hagemann, K., Bruns, A., Schrauf, M. and Kincses, W., 2007. Improving human performance in a real operating environment through real-time mental workload detection. *Toward Brain-Computer Interfacing*, pp.409-422.
- [7] Nakatsu, R., Rauterberg, M. and Ciancarini, P. eds., 2017. *Handbook of Digital Games and Entertainment Technologies*. Springer Singapore.
- [8] Loup-Escande, E., Lotte, F., Loup, G. and Lécuyer, A., 2017. User-centered BCI videogame design. *Handbook of digital games and entertainment technologies*, pp.225-250.
- [9] Bell, C.J., Shenoy, P., Chalodhorn, R. and Rao, R.P., 2008. Control of a humanoid robot by a noninvasive brain-computer interface in humans. *Journal of neural engineering*, 5(2), p.214.
- [10] Choi, B., & Jo, S. (2013). A low-cost EEG system-based hybrid brain-computer interface for humanoid robot navigation and recognition. *PloS one*, 8(9), e74583.
- [11] Zander, T. O., Kothe, C., Welke, S., & Rötting, M. (2009, July). Utilizing secondary input from passive brain-computer interfaces for enhancing human-machine interaction. In *International Conference on Foundations of Augmented Cognition* (pp. 759-771). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [12] Brunner, C., Birbaumer, N., Blankertz, B., Guger, C., Kübler, A., Mattia, D., Millán, J.D.R., Miralles, F., Nijholt, A., Opisso, E. and Ramsey, N., 2015. BNCI Horizon 2020: towards a roadmap for the BCI community. *Brain-computer interfaces*, 2(1), pp.1-10.
- [13] Lin, C.T., Chen, Y.C., Huang, T.Y., Chiu, T.T., Ko, L.W., Liang, S.F., Hsieh, H.Y., Hsu, S.H. and Duann, J.R., 2008. Development of wireless brain computer interface with embedded multitask scheduling and its application on real-time driver's drowsiness detection and warning. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 55(5), pp.1582-1591.
- [14] Marchesotti, S., Bassolino, M., Serino, A., Bleuler, H. and Blanke, O., 2016. Quantifying the role of motor imagery in brain-machine interfaces. *Scientific reports*, 6, p.24076.
- [15] Rosenfeld, J.V. and Wong, Y.T., 2017. Neurobionics and the brain-computer interface: Current applications and future horizons. *Med J Aust*, 206(8), pp.363-368.
- [16] Min, B.K., Marzelli, M.J. and Yoo, S.S., 2010. Neuroimaging-based approaches in the brain-computer interface. *Trends in biotechnology*, 28(11), pp.552-560.
- [17] Matthews, F., Pearlmutter, B.A., Wards, T.E., Soraghan, C. and Markham, C., 2008. Hemodynamics for brain-computer interfaces. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 25(1), pp.87-94.
- [18] Fukuma, R., Yanagisawa, T., Saitoh, Y., Hosomi, K., Kishima, H., Shimizu, T., Sugata, H., Yokoi, H., Hirata, M., Kamitani, Y. and Yoshimine, T., 2016. Real-time control of a neuroprosthetic hand by magnetoencephalographic signals from paralysed patients. *Scientific reports*, 6, p.21781.
- [19] Lu, J., Mamun, K.A. and Chau, T., 2015. Pattern classification to optimize the performance of Transcranial Doppler Ultrasonography-based brain machine interface. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 66, pp.135-143.
- [20] Pandarinath, C., Nuyujukian, P., Blabe, C.H., Sorice, B.L., Saab, J., Willett, F.R., Hochberg, L.R., Shenoy, K.V. and Henderson, J.M., 2017. High performance communication by people with paralysis using an intracortical brain-computer interface. *Elife*, 6.
- [21] Kaiju, T., Yokota, M., Watanabe, K., Inoue, M., Ando, H., Takahashi, K., Yoshida, F., Hirata, M. and Suzuki, T., 2017. High Spatiotemporal Resolution ECoG Recording of Somatosensory Evoked Potentials with Flexible Micro-Electrode Arrays. *Frontiers in neural circuits*, 11, p.20.
- [22] Lajoie, G., Krouchev, N.I., Kalaska, J.F., Fairhall, A.L. and Fetz, E.E., 2017. Correlation-based model of artificially induced plasticity in motor cortex by a bidirectional brain-computer interface. *PLoS computational biology*, 13(2), p.e1005343.
- [23] Rao, R.P., Stocco, A., Bryan, M., Sarma, D., Youngquist, T.M., Wu, J. and Prat, C.S., 2014. A direct brain-to-brain interface in humans. *PloS one*, 9(11), p.e111332.
- [24] Grau, C., Ginhoux, R., Riera, A., Nguyen, T.L., Chauvat, H., Berg, M., Amengual, J.L., Pascual-Leone, A. and Ruffini, G., 2014. Consensus brain-to-brain communication in humans using non-invasive technologies. *PLoS One*, 9(8), p.e105225.
- [25] Callan, D.E., Falcone, B., Wada, A. and Parasuraman, R., 2016. Simultaneous tDCS-fMRI identifies resting state networks correlated with visual search enhancement. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 10, p.72.
- [26] Baxter, B.S., Edelman, B.J., Sohrabpour, A. and He, B., 2017. Anodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation Increases Bilateral Directed Brain Connectivity during Motor-Imagery Based Brain-Computer Interface Control. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 11.

- [27] Darvishi, S., Gharabaghi, A., Boulay, C.B., Ridding, M.C., Abbott, D. and Baumert, M., 2017. Proprioceptive feedback facilitates motor imagery-related operant learning of sensorimotor β -band modulation. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 11, p.60.
- [28] De Marchis, C., Monteiro, T.S., Simon-Martinez, C., Conforto, S. and Gharabaghi, A., 2016. Multi-contact functional electrical stimulation for hand opening: electrophysiologically driven identification of the optimal stimulation site. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 13(1), p.22.
- [29] Shih, J.J., Krusienski, D.J. and Wolpaw, J.R., 2012, March. Brain-computer interfaces in medicine. In *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* (Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 268-279). Elsevier.
- [30] Hochberg, L.R., 2013. Intracortical Brain-Computer Interfaces for the Restoration of Communication and Mobility. *Biophysical Journal*, 104(2), p.376a.
- [31] Milan, J.D.R. and Carmena, J.M., 2010. Invasive or noninvasive: Understanding brain-machine interface technology [conversations in bme]. *IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Magazine*, 29(1), pp.16-22.
- [32] Gilja, V., Chestek, C.A., Diester, I., Henderson, J.M., Deisseroth, K. and Shenoy, K.V., 2011. Challenges and opportunities for next-generation intracortically based neural prostheses. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 58(7), pp.1891-1899.
- [33] Friehs, G., Penn, R.D., Park, M.C., Goldman, M., Zerris, V.A., Hochberg, L.R., Chen, D., Mukand, J. and Donoghue, J.D., 2006. Initial Surgical Experience with an Intracortical Microelectrode Array for Brain-computer Interface Applications 881. *Neurosurgery*, 59(2), p.481.
- [34] Marchesotti, S., Martuzzi, R., Schurger, A., Blefari, M.L., del Millán, J.R., Bleuler, H. and Blanke, O., 2017. Cortical and subcortical mechanisms of brain-machine interfaces. *Human brain mapping*, 38(6), pp.2971-2989.
- [35] Mantini, D., Perrucci, M.G., Del Gratta, C., Romani, G.L. and Corbetta, M., 2007. Electrophysiological signatures of resting state networks in the human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(32), pp.13170-13175.
- [36] Goncalves, S.I., De Munck, J.C., Pouwels, P.J.W., Schoonhoven, R., Kuijter, J.P.A., Maurits, N.M., Hoogduin, J.M., Van Someren, E.J.W., Heethaar, R.M. and Da Silva, F.L., 2006. Correlating the alpha rhythm to BOLD using simultaneous EEG/fMRI: inter-subject variability. *Neuroimage*, 30(1), pp.203-213.
- [37] Zhang, R., Xu, P., Chen, R., Li, F., Guo, L., Li, P., Zhang, T. and Yao, D., 2015. Predicting inter-session performance of SMR-based brain-computer interface using the spectral entropy of resting-state EEG. *Brain topography*, 28(5), pp.680-690.
- [38] Acqualagna, L., Botrel, L., Vidaurre, C., Kübler, A. and Blankertz, B., 2016. Large-scale assessment of a fully automatic co-adaptive motor imagery-based brain computer interface. *PloS one*, 11(2), p.e0148886.
- [39] Kasahara, K., DaSalla, C.S., Honda, M. and Hanakawa, T., 2015. Neuroanatomical correlates of brain-computer interface performance. *Neuroimage*, 110, pp.95-100.
- [40] Ahn, M. and Jun, S.C., 2015. Performance variation in motor imagery brain-computer interface: a brief review. *Journal of neuroscience methods*, 243, pp.103-110.
- [41] Hasson, U., Nir, Y., Levy, I., Fuhrmann, G. and Malach, R., 2004. Intersubject synchronization of cortical activity during natural vision. *science*, 303(5664), pp.1634-1640.
- [42] Abrams, D.A., Ryali, S., Chen, T., Chordia, P., Khouzam, A., Levitin, D.J. and Menon, V., 2013. Inter-subject synchronization of brain responses during natural music listening. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 37(9), pp.1458-1469.
- [43] Saha, S., Ahmed, K.I.U., Mostafa, R., Hadjileontiadis, L. and Khandoker, A., 2018. Evidence of Variabilities in EEG Dynamics During Motor Imagery-Based Multiclass Brain-Computer Interface. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 26(2), pp.371-382.
- [44] Jayaram, V., Alamgir, M., Altun, Y., Scholkopf, B., & Grosse-Wentrup, M. (2016). Transfer learning in brain-computer interfaces. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, 11(1), 20-31.
- [45] Park, W., Kwon, G.H., Kim, Y.H., Lee, J.H. and Kim, L., 2016. EEG response varies with lesion location in patients with chronic stroke. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 13(1), p.21.
- [46] Calhoun, V.D. and Adali, T., 2016. Time-Varying Brain Connectivity in fMRI Data: whole-brain data-driven approaches for capturing and characterizing dynamic states. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 33(3), pp.52-66.
- [47] Käthner, I., Wriessnegger, S.C., Müller-Putz, G.R., Kübler, A. and Halder, S., 2014. Effects of mental workload and fatigue on the P300, alpha and theta band power during operation of an ERP (P300) brain-computer interface. *Biological psychology*, 102, pp.118-129.
- [48] Kleih, S.C. and Kübler, A., 2013. Empathy, motivation, and P300 BCI performance. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 7, p.642.
- [49] Nijboer, F., Birbaumer, N. and Kübler, A., 2010. The influence of psychological state and motivation on brain-computer interface performance in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis—a longitudinal study. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 4, p.55.
- [50] Kaufmann, T., Vögele, C., Sütterlin, S., Lukito, S. and Kübler, A., 2012. Effects of resting heart rate variability on performance in the P300 brain-computer interface. *International journal of psychophysiology*, 83(3), pp.336-341.
- [51] Wang, H., McIntosh, A.R., Kovacevic, N., Karachalios, M. and Protzner, A.B., 2016. Age-related multiscale changes in brain signal variability in pre-task versus post-task resting-state EEG. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, 28(7), pp.971-984.
- [52] Jensen, O., Bahramisharif, A., Oostenveld, R., Klanke, S., Hadjipapas, A., Okazaki, Y.O. and van Gerven, M.A., 2011. Using brain-computer interfaces and brain-state dependent stimulation as tools in cognitive neuroscience. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2, p.100.
- [53] Sporns, O., 2013. Structure and function of complex brain networks. *Dialogues in clinical neuroscience*, 15(3), p.247.

- [54] Honey, C.J., Thivierge, J.P. and Sporns, O., 2010. Can structure predict function in the human brain?. *Neuroimage*, 52(3), pp.766-776.
- [55] Honey, C.J., Sporns, O., Cammoun, L., Gigandet, X., Thiran, J.P., Meuli, R. and Hagmann, P., 2009. Predicting human resting-state functional connectivity from structural connectivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(6), pp.2035-2040.
- [56] Hammer, E.M., Halder, S., Blankertz, B., Sannelli, C., Dickhaus, T., Kleih, S., Müller, K.R. and Kübler, A., 2012. Psychological predictors of SMR-BCI performance. *Biological psychology*, 89(1), pp.80-86.
- [57] Vasilyev, A., Liburkina, S., Yakovlev, L., Perepelkina, O. and Kaplan, A., 2017. Assessing motor imagery in brain-computer interface training: Psychological and neurophysiological correlates. *Neuropsychologia*, 97, pp.56-65.
- [58] Wronkiewicz, M., Larson, E. and Lee, A.K., 2015. Leveraging anatomical information to improve transfer learning in brain-computer interfaces. *Journal of neural engineering*, 12(4), p.046027.
- [59] Blankertz, B., Sannelli, C., Halder, S., Hammer, E.M., Kübler, A., Müller, K.R., Curio, G. and Dickhaus, T., 2009. Predicting BCI performance to study BCI illiteracy. *BMC Neuroscience*, 10(Suppl 1):P84.
- [60] Vidaurre, C. and Blankertz, B., 2010. Towards a cure for BCI illiteracy. *Brain topography*, 23(2), pp.194-198.
- [61] McCane, L.M., Heckman, S.M., McFarland, D.J., Townsend, G., Mak, J.N., Sellers, E.W., Zeitlin, D., Tenteromano, L.M., Wolpaw, J.R. and Vaughan, T.M., 2015. P300-based brain-computer interface (BCI) event-related potentials (ERPs): People with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) vs. age-matched controls. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 126(11), pp.2124-2131.
- [62] Abu-Alqumsan, M. and Peer, A., 2016. Advancing the detection of steady-state visual evoked potentials in brain-computer interfaces. *Journal of neural engineering*, 13(3), p.036005.
- [63] Schreuder, M., Blankertz, B. and Tangermann, M., 2010. A new auditory multi-class brain-computer interface paradigm: spatial hearing as an informative cue. *PloS one*, 5(4), p.e9813.
- [64] Muller-Putz, G.R., Scherer, R., Neuper, C. and Pfurtscheller, G., 2006. Steady-state somatosensory evoked potentials: suitable brain signals for brain-computer interfaces?. *IEEE transactions on neural systems and rehabilitation engineering*, 14(1), pp.30-37.
- [65] Lécuyer, A., Lotte, F., Reilly, R.B., Leeb, R., Hirose, M. and Slater, M., 2008. Brain-computer interfaces, virtual reality, and videogames. *Computer*, 41(10).
- [66] Yin, E., Zeyl, T., Saab, R., Chau, T., Hu, D. and Zhou, Z., 2015. A hybrid brain-computer interface based on the fusion of P300 and SSVEP scores. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 23(4), pp.693-701.
- [67] Combaz, A. and Van Hulle, M.M., 2015. Simultaneous detection of P300 and steady-state visually evoked potentials for hybrid brain-computer interface. *PLoS One*, 10(3), p.e0121481.
- [68] Ortiz-Rosario, A. and Adeli, H., 2013. Brain-computer interface technologies: from signal to action. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 24(5), pp.537-552.
- [69] Schwartz, A.B., Cui, X.T., Weber, D.J. and Moran, D.W., 2006. Brain-controlled interfaces: movement restoration with neural prosthetics. *Neuron*, 52(1), pp.205-220.
- [70] Allison, B.Z., Brunner, C., Kaiser, V., Müller-Putz, G.R., Neuper, C. and Pfurtscheller, G., 2010. Toward a hybrid brain-computer interface based on imagined movement and visual attention. *Journal of neural engineering*, 7(2), p.026007.
- [71] Birbaumer, N., 2006. Brain-computer-interface research: coming of age. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 117, pp. 479-483
- [72] He, B., Yang, L., Wilke, C. and Yuan, H., 2011. Electrophysiological imaging of brain activity and connectivity—challenges and opportunities. *IEEE transactions on biomedical engineering*, 58(7), pp.1918-1931.
- [73] Chen, X., Wang, Y., Nakanishi, M., Gao, X., Jung, T.P. and Gao, S., 2015. High-speed spelling with a noninvasive brain-computer interface. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 112(44), pp.E6058-E6067.
- [74] Sitaram, R., Weiskopf, N., Caria, A., Veit, R., Erb, M. and Birbaumer, N., 2008. fMRI brain-computer interfaces. *IEEE Signal processing magazine*, 25(1), pp.95-106.
- [75] Bunce, S.C., Izzetoglu, M., Izzetoglu, K., Onaral, B. and Pourrezaei, K., 2006. Functional near-infrared spectroscopy. *IEEE engineering in medicine and biology magazine*, 25(4), pp.54-62.
- [76] Fazli, S., Mehnert, J., Steinbrink, J., Curio, G., Villringer, A., Müller, K.R. and Blankertz, B., 2012. Enhanced performance by a hybrid NIRS-EEG brain computer interface. *Neuroimage*, 59(1), pp.519-529.
- [77] Ge, S., Yang, Q., Wang, R., Lin, P., Gao, J., Leng, Y., Yang, Y. and Wang, H., 2017. A brain-computer interface based on a few-channel EEG-fNIRS bimodal system. *IEEE Access*, 5, pp.208-218.
- [78] Kamousi, B., Liu, Z. and He, B., 2005. Classification of motor imagery tasks for brain-computer interface applications by means of two equivalent dipoles analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 13(2), pp.166-171.
- [79] da Silva, F.L., 2013. EEG and MEG: relevance to neuroscience. *Neuron*, 80(5), pp.1112-1128.
- [80] Mellinger, J., Schalk, G., Braun, C., Preissl, H., Rosenstiel, W., Birbaumer, N. and Kübler, A., 2007. An MEG-based brain-computer interface (BCI). *Neuroimage*, 36(3), pp.581-593.
- [81] Bashashati, A., Fatourechi, M., Ward, R.K. and Birch, G.E., 2007. A survey of signal processing algorithms in brain-computer interfaces based on electrical brain signals. *Journal of Neural engineering*, 4(2), p.R32.
- [82] Lotte, F., Congedo, M., Lécuyer, A., Lamarche, F. and Arnaldi, B., 2007. A review of classification algorithms for EEG-based brain-computer interfaces. *Journal of neural engineering*, 4(2), p.R1.
- [83] Lotte, F., Bougrain, L., Cichocki, A., Clerc, M., Congedo, M., Rakotomamonjy, A. and Yger, F., 2018. A review of classification algorithms for EEG-based brain-computer interfaces: a 10 year update. *Journal of neural engineering*, 15(3), p.031005.

- [84] Krusienski, D.J., Grosse-Wentrup, M., Galán, F., Coyle, D., Miller, K.J., Forney, E. and Anderson, C.W., 2011. Critical issues in state-of-the-art brain-computer interface signal processing. *Journal of neural engineering*, 8(2), p.025002.
- [85] Samek, W., Meinecke, F.C. and Müller, K.R., 2013. Transferring subspaces between subjects in brain-computer interfacing. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 60(8), pp.2289-2298.
- [86] Krauledat, M., Schröder, M., Blankertz, B. and Müller, K.R., 2007. Reducing calibration time for brain-computer interfaces: A clustering approach. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (pp. 753-760).
- [87] Ramoser, H., Müller-Gerking, J. and Pfurtscheller, G., 2000. Optimal spatial filtering of single trial EEG during imagined hand movement. *IEEE transactions on rehabilitation engineering*, 8(4), pp.441-446.
- [88] Sannelli, C., Vidaurre, C., Müller, K.R. and Blankertz, B., 2016. Ensembles of adaptive spatial filters increase BCI performance: an online evaluation. *Journal of neural engineering*, 13(4), p.046003.
- [89] Brown, R.E. and Milner, P.M., 2003. The legacy of Donald O. Hebb: more than the Hebb synapse. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 4(12), p.1013.
- [90] Sitaram, R., Ros, T., Stoeckel, L., Haller, S., Scharnowski, F., Lewis-Peacock, J., Weiskopf, N., Blefari, M.L., Rana, M., Oblak, E. and Birbaumer, N., 2017. Closed-loop brain training: the science of neurofeedback. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 18(2), p.86.
- [91] Vyas, S., Even-Chen, N., Stavisky, S.D., Ryu, S.I., Nuyujukian, P. and Shenoy, K.V., 2018. Neural population dynamics underlying motor learning transfer. *Neuron*, 97(5), pp.1177-1186.
- [92] Orsborn, A.L., Moorman, H.G., Overduin, S.A., Shanechi, M.M., Dimitrov, D.F. and Carmena, J.M., 2014. Closed-loop decoder adaptation shapes neural plasticity for skillful neuroprosthetic control. *Neuron*, 82(6), pp.1380-1393.
- [93] Dobkin, B.H., 2007. Brain-computer interface technology as a tool to augment plasticity and outcomes for neurological rehabilitation. *The Journal of physiology*, 579(3), pp.637-642.
- [94] Grosse-Wentrup, M., Mattia, D. and Oweiss, K., 2011. Using brain-computer interfaces to induce neural plasticity and restore function. *Journal of neural engineering*, 8(2), p.025004.
- [95] Nicolelis, M.A. and Lebedev, M.A., 2009. Principles of neural ensemble physiology underlying the operation of brain-machine interfaces. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 10(7), p.530.
- [96] Wang, W., Collinger, J.L., Perez, M.A., Tyler-Kabara, E.C., Cohen, L.G., Birbaumer, N., Brose, S.W., Schwartz, A.B., Boninger, M.L. and Weber, D.J., 2010. Neural interface technology for rehabilitation: exploiting and promoting neuroplasticity. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics*, 21(1), pp.157-178.
- [97] Ramos-Murguialday, A., Broetz, D., Rea, M., Läer, L., Yilmaz, Ö., Brasil, F.L., Liberati, G., Curado, M.R., Garcia-Cossio, E., Vyziotis, A. and Cho, W., 2013. Brain-machine interface in chronic stroke rehabilitation: a controlled study. *Annals of neurology*, 74(1), pp.100-108.
- [98] Zhao, X., Chu, Y., Han, J. and Zhang, Z., 2016. SSVEP-based brain-computer interface controlled functional electrical stimulation system for upper extremity rehabilitation. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 46(7), pp.947-956.
- [99] Pahwa, M., Kusner, M., Hacker, C.D., Bundy, D.T., Weinberger, K.Q. and Leuthardt, E.C., 2015. Optimizing the Detection of Wakeful and Sleep-Like States for Future Electroencephalographic Brain Computer Interface Applications. *PloS one*, 10(11), p.e0142947.
- [100] Hong, X., Lu, Z.K., Teh, I., Nasrallah, F.A., Teo, W.P., Ang, K.K., Phua, K.S., Guan, C., Chew, E. and 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), p.9222.
- [101] Johnson, N.N., Carey, J., Edelman, B.J., Doud, A., Grande, A., Lakshminarayan, K. and He, B., 2018. Combined rTMS and virtual reality brain-computer interface training for motor recovery after stroke. *Journal of neural engineering*, 15(1), p.016009.
- [102] Leamy, D.J., Kocijan, J., Domijan, K., Duffin, J., Roche, R.A., Commins, S., Collins, R. and Ward, T.E., 2014. An exploration of EEG features during recovery following stroke-implications for BCI-mediated neurorehabilitation therapy. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 11(1), p.9.
- [103] Birbaumer, N. and Cohen, L.G., 2007. Brain-computer interfaces: communication and restoration of movement in paralysis. *The Journal of physiology*, 579(3), pp.621-636.
- [104] Sand, D., Peremen, Z., Haor, D., Arkadir, D., Bergman, H. and Geva, A., 2017. Optimization of deep brain stimulation in STN among patients with Parkinson's disease using a novel EEG-based tool. *Brain Stimulation: Basic, Translational, and Clinical Research in Neuromodulation*, 10(2), p.510.
- [105] Ray, A.M., Sitaram, R., Rana, M., Pasqualotto, E., Buyukturkoglu, K., Guan, C., Ang, K.K., Tejos, C., Zamorano, F., Aboitiz, F. and Birbaumer, N., 2015. A subject-independent pattern-based Brain-Computer Interface. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience*, 9, p.269.
- [106] Mak, J.N. and Wolpaw, J.R., 2009. Clinical applications of brain-computer interfaces: current state and future prospects. *IEEE reviews in biomedical engineering*, 2, pp.187-199.
- [107] Galán, F., Nuttin, M., Lew, E., Ferrez, P.W., Vanacker, G., Philips, J. and Millán, J.D.R., 2008. A brain-actuated wheelchair: asynchronous and non-invasive brain-computer interfaces for continuous control of robots. *Clinical neurophysiology*, 119(9), pp.2159-2169.
- [108] Iturrate, I., Antelis, J.M., Kubler, A. and Minguez, J., 2009. A noninvasive brain-actuated wheelchair based on a P300 neurophysiological protocol and automated navigation. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 25(3), pp.614-627.

- [109] Downey, J.E., Weiss, J.M., Muelling, K., Venkatraman, A., Valois, J.S., Hebert, M., Bagnell, J.A., Schwartz, A.B. and Collinger, J.L., 2016. Blending of brain-machine interface and vision-guided autonomous robotics improves neuroprosthetic arm performance during grasping. *Journal of neuroengineering and rehabilitation*, 13(1), p.28.
- [110] Taylor, D.M., Tillery, S.I.H. and Schwartz, A.B., 2002. Direct cortical control of 3D neuroprosthetic devices. *Science*, 296(5574), pp.1829-1832.
- [111] Debener, S., Ullsperger, M., Siegel, M. and Engel, A.K., 2006. Single-trial EEG-fMRI reveals the dynamics of cognitive function. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 10(12), pp.558-563.
- [112] Buccino, A.P., Keles, H.O. and Omurtag, A., 2016. Hybrid EEG-fNIRS asynchronous brain-computer interface for multiple motor tasks. *PloS one*, 11(1), p.e0146610.
- [113] Kauhanen, L., Nykopp, T., Lehtonen, J., Jylanki, P., Heikkonen, J., Rantanen, P., Alaranta, H. and Sams, M., 2006. EEG and MEG brain-computer interface for tetraplegic patients. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 14(2), pp.190-193.
- [114] McFarland, D.J., Anderson, C.W., Muller, K.R., Schlogl, A. and Krusienski, D.J., 2006. BCI meeting 2005-workshop on BCI signal processing: feature extraction and translation. *IEEE transactions on neural systems and rehabilitation engineering*, 14(2), pp.135-138.
- [115] Lotte, F. and Guan, C., 2011. Regularizing common spatial patterns to improve BCI designs: unified theory and new algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 58(2), pp.355-362.
- [116] Arvaneh, M., Guan, C., Ang, K.K. and Quek, C., 2014. Mutual information-based optimization of sparse spatio-spectral filters in brain-computer interface. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 25(3-4), pp.625-634.
- [117] Bell, A.J. and Sejnowski, T.J., 1995. An information-maximization approach to blind separation and blind deconvolution. *Neural computation*, 7(6), pp.1129-1159.
- [118] Kamousi, B., Liu, Z. and He, B., 2005. Classification of motor imagery tasks for brain-computer interface applications by means of two equivalent dipoles analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 13(2), pp.166-171.
- [119] Qin, L., Ding, L. and He, B., 2004. Motor imagery classification by means of source analysis for brain-computer interface applications. *Journal of neural engineering*, 1(3), p.135.
- [120] Lina, J.M., Chowdhury, R., Lemay, E., Kobayashi, E. and Grova, C., 2014. Wavelet-based localization of oscillatory sources from magnetoencephalography data. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 61(8), pp.2350-2364.
- [121] Wardman, D.L., Gandevia, S.C. and Colebatch, J.G., 2014. Cerebral, subcortical, and cerebellar activation evoked by selective stimulation of muscle and cutaneous afferents: an fMRI study. *Physiological Reports*, 2(4).
- [122] Müller, J.L., Röder, C.H., Schuierer, G. and Klein, H., 2002. Motor-induced brain activation in cortical, subcortical and cerebellar regions in schizophrenic inpatients. A whole brain fMRI fingertapping study. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, 26(3), pp.421-426.
- [123] Donoghue, J.P., 2008. Bridging the brain to the world: a perspective on neural interface systems. *Neuron*, 60(3), pp.511-521.
- [124] Deisseroth, K. and Schnitzer, M.J., 2013. Engineering approaches to illuminating brain structure and dynamics. *Neuron*, 80(3), pp.568-577.
- [125] Liao, L.D., Lin, C.T., McDowell, K., Wickenden, A.E., Gramann, K., Jung, T.P., Ko, L.W. and Chang, J.Y., 2012. Biosensor technologies for augmented brain-computer interfaces in the next decades. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 100(Special Centennial Issue), pp.1553-1566.
- [126] Chi, Y.M., Wang, Y.T., Wang, Y., Maier, C., Jung, T.P. and Cauwenberghs, G., 2012. Dry and noncontact EEG sensors for mobile brain-computer interfaces. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*, 20(2), pp.228-235.
- [127] Mota, A.R., Duarte, L., Rodrigues, D., Martins, A.C., Machado, A.V., Vaz, F., Fiedler, P., Hauelsen, J., Nóbrega, J.M. and Fonseca, C., 2013. Development of a quasi-dry electrode for EEG recording. *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical*, 199, pp.310-317.
- [128] Petrov, Y., Nador, J., Hughes, C., Tran, S., Yavuzcetin, O. and Sridhar, S., 2014. Ultra-dense EEG sampling results in two-fold increase of functional brain information. *NeuroImage*, 90, pp.140-145.
- [129] Norton, J.J., Lee, D.S., Lee, J.W., Lee, W., Kwon, O., Won, P., Jung, S.Y., Cheng, H., Jeong, J.W., Akce, A. and Umunna, S., 2015. Soft, curved electrode systems capable of integration on the auricle as a persistent brain-computer interface. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(13), pp.3920-3925.
- [130] Khodagholy, D., Doublet, T., Quilichini, P., Gurfinkel, M., Leleux, P., Ghestem, A., Ismailova, E., Hervé, T., Sanaur, S., Bernard, C. and Malliaras, G.G., 2013. In vivo recordings of brain activity using organic transistors. *Nature communications*, 4, p.1575.
- [131] Keefer, E.W., Botterman, B.R., Romero, M.I., Rossi, A.F. and Gross, G.W., 2008. Carbon nanotube coating improves neuronal recordings. *Nature nanotechnology*, 3(7), p.434.
- [132] Yin, M., Borton, D.A., Komar, J., Agha, N., Lu, Y., Li, H., Laurens, J., Lang, Y., Li, Q., Bull, C. and Larson, L., 2014. Wireless neurosensor for full-spectrum electrophysiology recordings during free behavior. *Neuron*, 84(6), pp.1170-1182.
- [133] Oxley, T.J., Opie, N.L., John, S.E., Rind, G.S., Ronayne, S.M., Wheeler, T.L., Judy, J.W., McDonald, A.J., Dornom, A., Lovell, T.J. and Steward, C., 2016. Minimally invasive endovascular stent-electrode array for high-fidelity, chronic recordings of cortical neural activity. *Nature biotechnology*, 34(3), p.320.
- [134] Kruskal, P.B., Jiang, Z., Gao, T. and Lieber, C.M., 2015. Beyond the patch clamp: nanotechnologies for intracellular recording. *Neuron*, 86(1), pp.21-24.

- [135] Buzsáki, G., Stark, E., Berényi, A., Khodagholy, D., Kipke, D.R., Yoon, E. and Wise, K.D., 2015. Tools for probing local circuits: high-density silicon probes combined with optogenetics. *Neuron*, 86(1), pp.92-105.
- [136] Yang, W., Miller, J.E.K., Carrillo-Reid, L., Pnevmatikakis, E., Paninski, L., Yuste, R. and Peterka, D.S., 2016. Simultaneous multi-plane imaging of neural circuits. *Neuron*, 89(2), pp.269-284.
- [137] Grienberger, C. and Konnerth, A., 2012. Imaging calcium in neurons. *Neuron*, 73(5), pp.862-885.
- [138] Resendez, S.L., Jennings, J.H., Ung, R.L., Namboodiri, V.M.K., Zhou, Z.C., Otis, J.M., Nomura, H., McHenry, J.A., Kosyk, O. and Stuber, G.D., 2016. Visualization of cortical, subcortical and deep brain neural circuit dynamics during naturalistic mammalian behavior with head-mounted microscopes and chronically implanted lenses. *Nature protocols*, 11(3), p.566.
- [139] Sternson, S.M. and Roth, B.L., 2014. Chemogenetic tools to interrogate brain functions. *Annual review of neuroscience*, 37, pp.387-407.
- [140] Roth, B.L., 2016. DREADDs for neuroscientists. *Neuron*, 89(4), pp.683-694.
- [141] Seo, D., Neely, R. M., Shen, K., Singhal, U., Alon, E., Rabaey, J. M., ... & Maharbiz, M. M. (2016). Wireless recording in the peripheral nervous system with ultrasonic neural dust. *Neuron*, 91(3), 529-539.
- [142] Millán, J.R., Renkens, F., Mourino, J. and Gerstner, W., 2004. Noninvasive brain-actuated control of a mobile robot by human EEG. *IEEE Transactions on biomedical Engineering*, 51(6), pp.1026-1033.
- [143] Kirchner, E.A., Woehrle, H., Bergatt, C., Kim, S.K., Metzen, J.H., Feess, D. and Kirchner, F., 2010, September. Towards operator monitoring via brain reading—an EEG-based approach for space applications. In *Proceedings of the 10th international symposium on artificial intelligence, robotics and automation in space* (pp. 448-455).
- [144] Gancet, J., Ilzkovitz, M., Cheron, G., Ivanenko, Y., van der Kooij, H., van der Helm, F., Zanow, F. and Thorsteinsson, F., 2011. MINDWALKER: a brain controlled lower limbs exoskeleton for rehabilitation. Potential applications to space. In *11th Symposium on advanced space technologies in robotics and automation* (pp. 12-14).
- [145] Summerer, L., Izzo, D. and Rossini, L., 2009. Brain–Machine Interfaces for Space Applications—Research, Technological Development, and Opportunities. *International review of neurobiology*, 86, pp.213-223.
- [146] Wang, H., Chang, W. and Zhang, C., 2016. Functional brain network and multichannel analysis for the P300-based brain computer interface system of lying detection. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 53, pp.117-128.
- [147] Carreon, F.O., Serna, J.G.G., Rendon, A.M., Franco, N.G., Jimenez, A.M.P. and Gomez, J.H., 2016. Induction of emotional states in people with disabilities through film clips using brain computer interfaces. *IEEE Latin America Transactions*, 14(2), pp.563-568.
- [148] Botrel, L., Holz, E.M. and Kübler, A., 2015. Brain Painting V2: evaluation of P300-based brain-computer interface for creative expression by an end-user following the user-centered design. *Brain-Computer Interfaces*, 2(2-3), pp.135-149.
- [149] Pais-Vieira, M., Lebedev, M., Kunicki, C., Wang, J. and Nicolelis, M.A., 2013. A brain-to-brain interface for real-time sharing of sensorimotor information. *Scientific reports*, 3, p.1319.
- [150] Stocco, A., Prat, C.S., Losey, D.M., Cronin, J.A., Wu, J., Abernethy, J.A. and Rao, R.P., 2015. Playing 20 questions with the mind: collaborative problem solving by humans using a brain-to-brain interface. *PloS one*, 10(9), p.e0137303.
- [151] Illes, J. and Bird, S.J., 2006. Neuroethics: a modern context for ethics in neuroscience. *Trends in neurosciences*, 29(9), pp.511-517.
- [152] Bostrom, N. and Sandberg, A., 2009. Cognitive enhancement: methods, ethics, regulatory challenges. *Science and engineering ethics*, 15(3), pp.311-341.
- [153] Jebari, K., 2013. Brain machine interface and human enhancement—an ethical review. *Neuroethics*, 6(3), pp.617-625.
- [154] McCullagh, P., Lightbody, G., Zygierevicz, J. and Kernohan, W.G., 2014. Ethical challenges associated with the development and deployment of brain computer interface technology. *Neuroethics*, 7(2), pp.109-122.
- [155] Gilbert, F., 2015. Self-estrangement & deep brain stimulation: Ethical issues related to forced explantation. *Neuroethics*, 8(2), pp.107-114.
- [156] Jotterand, F. and Giordano, J., 2011. Transcranial magnetic stimulation, deep brain stimulation and personal identity: Ethical questions, and neuroethical approaches for medical practice. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 23, pp 476-485.
- [157] Maslen, H., Pugh, J. and Savulescu, J., 2015. The ethics of deep brain stimulation for the treatment of anorexia nervosa. *Neuroethics*, 8(3), pp.215-230.
- [158] Goering, S. and Yuste, R., 2016. On the necessity of ethical guidelines for novel Neurotechnologies. *Cell*, 167(4), pp.882-885.
- [159] Nakazawa, E., Yamamoto, K., Tachibana, K., Toda, S., Takimoto, Y. and Akabayashi, A., 2016. Ethics of decoded neurofeedback in clinical research, treatment, and moral enhancement. *AJOB Neuroscience*, 7(2), pp.110-117.
- [160] Clausen, J., 2011. Conceptual and ethical issues with brain–hardware interfaces. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 24(6), pp.495-501.
- [161] Schickntanz, S., Amelung, T. and Rieger, J.W., 2015. Qualitative assessment of patients’ attitudes and expectations toward BCIs and implications for future technology development. *Frontiers in systems neuroscience*, 9, p.64.
- [162] Hobson, E.V., Fazal, S., Shaw, P.J. and McDermott, C.J., 2017. “Anything that makes life’s journey better.” Exploring the use of digital technology by people living with motor neurone disease. *Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration*, 18(5-6), pp.378-387.
- [163] Ienca, M. and Haselager, P., 2016. Hacking the brain: brain–computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18(2), pp.117-129.

- [164] Denning, T., Matsuoka, Y. and Kohno, T., 2009. Neurosecurity: security and privacy for neural devices. *Neurosurgical Focus*, 27(1), p.E7.
- [165] Eaton, M.L. and Illes, J., 2007. Commercializing cognitive neurotechnology—the ethical terrain. *Nature biotechnology*, 25(4), p.393.
- [166] Vaadia, E. and Birbaumer, N., 2009. Grand challenges of brain computer interfaces in the years to come. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 3, p.15.
- [167] Grillner, S., Ip, N., Koch, C., Koroshetz, W., Okano, H., Polachek, M., Poo, M.M. and Sejnowski, T.J., 2016. Worldwide initiatives to advance brain research. *Nature neuroscience*, 19, pp. 1118–1122
- [168] Rose, N., 2014. The human brain project: social and ethical challenges. *Neuron*, 82(6), pp.1212-1215.

Figures and Tables

FIGURE 1.

The number of publications over the years: The statistics was based on a search on PubMed in which 'brain computer interface' was the search keyword. The publications those were listed until 17th May 2018 have been accounted only. A significant increase in the number of publications in this decade as compared to the last decade implicates the engagement of a greater community in this field and, thus the importance of BCI technology.




FIGURE 2.

Basic block diagram of communication between a brain and a computer: (a) a typical brain computer interface framework and its components, (b) a typical computer to brain interface framework and its components.




FIGURE 3.

The psychophysiological, technological and ethical challenges in brain computer interface development.




FIGURE 4.

The current states and future prediction of brain computer interface technologies: (a) predicted improvements in signal acquisition modalities and (b) predicted applications with extended degree of freedom. [Abbreviations: ECoG- electrocorticogram, EEG- electroencephalogram, fNIRS- functional near infrared spectroscopy; adopted from BNCI 2020 Roadmap].




Table 1

SUMMARY OF BCI CHALLENGES IN PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGICAL, NEUROLOGICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL DOMAINS

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Challenges</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
Psychological, Physiological and Neurological	Cognitive variability over time and across individuals	Attention, memory load, fatigue and spontaneous cognitive processes continuously alter over time and across individuals, while introducing diversity in the event induced cortical activities [36], [46], [47].
	Non-unique basic characteristics	Users' demographics such as gender and age, and way of living influence the nonstationary brain dynamics [40].
	Resting state network (RSN)	RSN characterizes the underlying cognitive processes of brain and influence the event related activities. The baseline of RSN is unstable over short and long time courses and non-unique [35].
	Neuroanatomical structure	Individuals possess diverse anatomical structure of the brain that is correlated with BCI performances [39], [58].
	Spatially locating region of interest	Example: identifying lesion location for stroke survivors [45].
Technological	Signal acquisition	None of the signal acquisition modalities is able to provide high resolution signals in spatial, spectral and temporal domains while maintaining the most important BCI features, i.e., efficiency, mobility, ease of use and safety, simultaneously [16].
	Signal preprocessing, feature extraction and classification	While capturing brain signals from the scalp by noninvasive means, dealing with inverse problem is critical. Furthermore, non-brain artifacts degrade signal quality. No generalized signal processing, feature extraction and pattern recognition methods have been found yet [81], [82], [83].
	Brain waves	Event related potential [63], steady-state visual evoked potential [64], auditory evoked potential [65] and steady-state somatosensory evoked potentials [66], are target specific and motor imagery [14] is a slow wave and, thus they not suitable for virtual reality and gaming applications [67].
	BCI illiteracy	About 15% to 30% of BCI users are unable to control the systems due to BCI Illiteracy [59].

Table 2

LIST OF POTENTIAL APPLICATION FIELDS FOR BCI TECHNOLOGY

<i>BCI application fields</i>	<i>Examples</i>
Neural rehabilitation	Inducing plasticity in paretic finger movement [97]
	3D cursor movement using Tetraplegia ECoG cortical signatures [168]
	Stimulating muscle by BCI-driven functional electrical stimulation while bypassing the central nervous system [28]
	Treating major depressive disorder patients [105]
Brain-to-brain interface	Transferring cognitive information regarding words [24], motor [25] and visual [150] stimuli between two human brains directly
Robotics and assistive technologies	First BCI-controlled robot [143]
	Vision guided prosthetic arm for Tetraplegia patients [110]
	Controlling humanoid robots [59]
	Driving wheelchairs [107], [108]
Space applications	Monitoring and augmenting astronauts' working capacity [143]
	Rehabilitating astronauts by BCI-driven exoskeleton [144]
	Enhancing astronauts' functionality, efficiency and safety [145]
Clinical applications	Treating amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, cerebral palsy, brainstem stroke, spinal cord injuries, muscular dystrophies, or chronic peripheral neuropathies [106]
Miscellaneous	Controlling virtual reality, video games [67], brain fingerprinting [5], mood assessment [146] and brain painting [147]