A novel transferability attention neural network model for EEG emotion recognition

Yang Li [a], Boxun Fu [a], Fu Li [a,*], Guangming Shi [a], Wenming Zheng [b]

[a] Key Laboratory of Intelligent Perception and Image Understanding of Ministry of Education, The School of Artificial Intelligence, Xidian University, Xi'an 710071, China
[b] Key Laboratory of Child Development and Learning Science (Ministry of Education), School of Biological Sciences and Medical Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210096, China

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The existed methods for electroencephalograph (EEG) emotion recognition always train the models based on all the EEG samples indistinguishably. However, some of the source (training) samples may lead to a negative influence because they are significant dissimilar with the target (test) samples. So it is necessary to give more attention to the EEG samples with strong transferability rather than forcefully training a classification model by all the samples. Furthermore, for an EEG sample, from the aspect of neuroscience, not all the brain regions of an EEG sample contain emotional information that can transferred to the test data effectively. Even some brain region data will make strong negative effect for learning the emotional classification model. Considering these two issues, in this paper, we propose a transferable attention neural network (TANN) for EEG emotion recognition, which learns the emotional discriminative information by highlighting the transferable EEG brain regions data and samples adaptively through local and global attention mechanism. This can be implemented by measuring the outputs of multiple brain-region-level discriminators and one single sample-level discriminator. Extensive experiments on EEG emotion recognition demonstrate that the proposed TANN is superior to those state-of-the-art methods.

© 2021 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Emotion plays an important role in human daily life. It influences our rational decision-making, perception and cognition, and is essential in interpersonal communication [1]. Thus, it is necessary to make machines to understand human emotions in the field of human–computer interaction (HCI). To this end, the technology of emotion recognition provides a possible way for computers to capture human emotions, which is the first step to improve and humanize the interaction between humans and machines.

Generally, emotion recognition measures the emotional states by analyzing the data of bodily reactions under emotional conditions [2]. These reactions, including speech, facial expression and gesture, can adequately express our emotions under most circumstances. Nevertheless, these methods are subjective and cannot guarantee the authenticity of emotion [3]. Except for the above external methods, the internal physiological variables tend to be much close to the real emotions. Human brain, as the source of all the reactions, can reflect the mental activities including the

emotion states. According to the studies of neurophysiology and psychology, EEG has the ability to record the brain neural activities, and can be used to decode the effective information of human emotional states [4,5]. Consequently, EEG emotion recognition has become an active topic in affective computing and human–computer interaction areas [6–8].

Most EEG emotion recognition methods focus on two major tasks, i.e., EEG feature extraction and classification. The first task aims at seeking the discriminative emotion-related information from the raw EEG signals. EEG emotional signal always has a low signal-to-noise ratio because it contains many neural processes and hence present a highly heterogeneous behavior [2]. Hence, it is necessary to extract the specific emotion-related information that contribute more to emotion recognition. For example, these information can be extracted from time, frequency and time–frequency domains. In [9], Jenke et al. summarized all the existing EEG features and evaluated them on a self-recorded EEG emotional dataset. The target of classification is modeling the correlation between the EEG emotional feature and the class labels, which leads to the interpretation of raw EEG emotional signals. Classification performance provides insight about how well a trained model can estimate the emotional state. Researchers have proposed many advanced classification algorithms over the years. For example,

* Corresponding author.
    E-mail address: fuli@mail.xidian.edu.cn (F. Li).

deep belief network (DBN) [7], recurrent neural network (RNN) [10] and graph convolutional network (GCN) [11] are adopted for classifying EEG emotional signals. These methods improve emotion recognition significantly. In [12], Alarcao and Fonseca summarized, reviewed and compared these works comprehensively.

Recently, many domain adaptation methods have been proposed to deal with EEG emotion recognition due to the large distribution gap between source (training) and target (test) data. These methods have significantly advanced the EEG emotion recognition task, especially in the subject-independent task. For example, Zheng and Lu [13] evaluated four different domain adaptation approaches including Transfer component analysis (TCA) [14], Kernel Principle Analysis (KPCA) [15], Transductive Support Vector Machine (T-SVM) [16] and Transductive Parameter Transfer (TPT) [17] on SEED dataset, and find that the accuracy can be improved by 20% compared with the generic classifier. Lan et al. [18] made a comparative study on several state-of-the-art domain adaptation techniques on two EEG emotional datasets and the experiment results show that using domain adaptation technique can improve the accuracy significantly by 7.25% and 13.40% compared with the baseline accuracy where no domain adaptation technique is used. In all the domain adaptation methods, the most well-established one is the domain adversarial neural network (DANN) [19], which constructs a two players mini-max game by using a domain discriminator that works adversarially with the feature extractor to generate the domain-invariable data representations. Li et al. adopted this setting and proposed a bi-hemisphere domain adversarial neural network (BiDANN) for EEG emotion recognition and achieved the state-of-the-art performance [10].

Nevertheless, we argue that there are two issues should be further considered in EEG emotion recognition tasks. The first one is how to identify the positive EEG samples that consist of more emotion-related information. EEG emotional signals usually consist of many neural processes and are much vulnerable to negative effect of irrelevant knowledge, which incurs that some training EEG samples are significantly dissimilar with the test ones. Exploring how to highlight the positive EEG emotional samples and weaken the effect of negative samples will contribute more to emotion recognition. The second issue is how to weight the variability of different brain regions for EEG emotion recognition. Some studies of neuroscience have shown that different brain regions have different contributions for emotion expression [20]. In an EEG emotional sample, it is obvious that not all the brain regions contain the knowledge of emotion that can be transferred to the test samples. Making a strategy to distinguish the transferable and nontransferable brain regions is helpful to improve EEG emotion recognition.

To this end, in this paper, we propose a transferable attention neural network (TANN) to deal with the above tranferability learning problem for EEG emotion recognition. This transferability of data can be measured by calculating from the outputs of domain discriminators. Specifically, for the domain adversarial neural network [19], the output of domain discriminator is the probability of input data belongs to source or target domain. When the probability approaches 0, it represents the input data belongs to source domain, while approaching 1 indicates that it belongs to the target domain. Therefore, TANN takes advantages of the domain discriminator to measure the transferability from the training data to test data. Concretely, the framework of TANN includes the following three major modules:

- **Feature extractor.** The goal of feature extractor is to extract the high-level discriminatisve deep feature from raw EEG data for classification. Considering the internal dependence between emotion and brain regions, the intrinsic structural information of electrodes will be helpful for classification. Hence, by adopt-

ing two directional recurrent neural networks (RNN) that traverse all the electrodes from horizontal and vertical directions, TANN keeps this relationship information meanwhile generate discriminative deep features for all the EEG electrodes.
- **Attention module.** The attention module aims to weight the input training data according to the level of transferability. For EEG emotional data, there is a large distribution gap between training and test data, resulting that some training EEG data are significantly dissimilar with the test. Moreover, from the aspect of neuroscience, not all the brain regions of an EEG sample contains emotional information that can transferred to the test data effectively. Therefore, TANN employs multiple brain-region-level and one sample-level discriminators to assess the transferability of EEG sample and the inside brain region data, then strengthen or weaken the contributions of these brain regions and samples for emotion classification.
- **Classifier.** Like most supervised learning methods, we introduce a classifier to predict the emotion class label based on the deep features obtained by the feature extractor. It will guide the feature extracting process towards generate more discriminative EEG features for emotion classification.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to exploit the global and local transferability of EEG signals for emotion recognition. The experimental results verify the proposed TANN method can achieve the state-of-the-art performance on three public datasets.

2. Preliminary

In this section, we briefly overview the preliminary of transferable attention and then address how we can apply it to EEG emotion recognition.

Most attention based methods focus on how to highlight or weaken different parts in an image according to their contribution for classification but neglect the evaluation for each training sample [21]. It is known that not all the training samples are similar with the test. It will be a negative influence in the learning process if we feed the model with all the training samples forcefully. Transferable attention (TA) is designed to deal with this problem [22]. When a training sample is much easier to be transferred to the test, it will be rewarded with more attention due to the high similarity with the test data, which is called transferable attention. Inspired by adversarial learning methods, this attention can be realized by calculating the outputs of the discriminator, which can reflect the similarity between training and test data.

Since in the task of EEG emotion recognition, not all the training EEG data are useful in the process of learning a model, exploring the transferability of EEG data will be helpful for EEG emotion recognition.

3. The proposed model for EEG emotion recognition

To specify the proposed method clearly, we illustrate the framework of the proposed TANN model in Fig. 1. TANN aims to distinguish which training samples are easy or hard to be transferred to test samples. Through penalizing these training samples, it can further improve EEG emotion recognition. Besides, considering not all the brain regions have the equal transferability, as well as measuring the similarity across EEG samples, TANN also focuses on the brain regions with high transferability. To achieve this goal, we adopt local and global attentions to the EEG emotion sample and its inside brain regions' data, respectively. These attention weights can be obtained from the outputs of multiple local and one global

Fig. 1. The proposed TANN framework. TANN consists of three major modules, i.e., feature extractor, attention layers, and classifier. Herein, the attention layers include local and global attentions, which can make the model focus on the brain regions and samples with higher transferability. Moreover, here the notations $G_d^{N_i}, N_i = 1, \cdots, N$ and G_d^g are defined as the discriminators on brain-region-level and sample-level..

domain discriminators. Concretely, TANN consists of three major modules, i.e., feature extractor, attention layers, and classifier. In the following, we illustrate these parts detailedly.

3.1. Feature extractor

The process of feature extraction is depicted in Fig. 2, and the goal is to represent the EEG emotional data in a more discriminative feature space so as to improve the EEG classification performance. To avoid losing the intrinsic structural relationship of electrodes, we adopt two directional RNN modules that determined with respect to two predefined pathways. These two RNN modules traverse the spatial regions horizontally and vertically to construct a complete relationship of electrodes' locations. By doing this, the high-level features are obtained for each EEG electrode meanwhile it facilitates to construct the brain regions' features.

Concretely, for an EEG sample $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{x}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, where d and n are the dimension and number of EEG electrode, the above process can be formulated as

$$\mathbf{s}_i^h = \sigma(\mathbf{U}^h \mathbf{x}_i^h + \sum_{j=1}^n e_{ij}^h \mathbf{V}^h \mathbf{h}_j^h + \mathbf{b}^h) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f},$$
$$e_{ij}^h = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad \mathbf{x}_j^h \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i^h), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbf{s}_i^v = \sigma(\mathbf{U}^v \mathbf{x}_i^v + \sum_{j=1}^n e_{ij}^v \mathbf{V}^v \mathbf{h}_j^v + \mathbf{b}^v) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f},$$
$$e_{ij}^v = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad \mathbf{x}_j^v \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i^v), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{s}_i$ is the hidden unit of the RNN module as well as the data representation for the electrode $\mathbf{x}_i$, and d_f is its dimension; $\{\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f \times d}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f \times d_f}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f \times 1}\}$ are the learnable transformation matrices; $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the nonlinear operation; and $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ denotes the set of neighbors of node $\mathbf{x}_i$.

Due to that TANN consists of horizontal and vertical directional RNNs to represent EEG electrode, we can obtain the data representations that not only contain the information of the electrodes itself but also the nearby relationship. Specifically, it can be expressed as $\mathbf{S}^h = \{\mathbf{s}_i^h\}$ that contains the information from left and right electrodes, and $\mathbf{S}^v = \{\mathbf{s}_i^v\}$ that includes the information from up and down electrodes. To integrate these spatial information into a overall representation, we arrange the order of the columns of $\mathbf{S}^h$ and $\mathbf{S}^v$, and use two transformation matrices $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ which are learnable to obtain the deep features $\mathbf{H} = \{\mathbf{h}_k\}$ for all the electrodes, in which

$$\mathbf{h}_i = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{s}_i^h + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{s}_i^v + \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{f'}}, \quad i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}. \quad (3)$$

Here $\mathbf{h}_i$ is the deep feature of electrode $\mathbf{x}_i$, and $d_{f'}$ is the dimension.

Fig. 2. The process of feature extraction. We first extract the deep feature for each electrode, and then rearrange them to form the data representation of brain regions.

3.2. Attention layers

For EEG emotion samples, there is a large distribution gap between training and test data. Some training samples are very dissimilar with the test ones. Therefore, to avoid training a model with all the source samples indiscriminately, TANN measures the transferability of all the training samples and then strengthen or weaken them in the learning process of the model. Besides, as we know, for emotion recognition, not all the brain regions of an EEG sample contains emotional information that can transferred to the test data effectively. Some brain regions are more transferable than the others. Due to this, TANN not only employs a global attention layer to weight the sample-level transferability but also a local attention layer as a complement to focus on the brain-region-level transferability. Specifically, the transferability is quantified by the entropy of the outputs of domain discriminator. The domain discriminator can generate the probability of confusion between source (training) and target (test) data. When the probability approaches 0.5, it indicates that the input has good ability to confuse the domain discriminator, which nicely meet our need to highlight the data with positive transferability. In the following, we will demonstrate how to achieve the local and global attentions by transferability learning.

3.2.1. Local transferable attention on brain-region-level

After obtaining the data representation $\mathbf{h}_i$ of each electrode of $\mathbf{X}$, TANN employs local attention to highlight the brain regions with high transferability. Here we first group the electrodes into several clusters according to the associated brain region locations, which can be formulated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{brain region 1}: \quad \mathbf{H}^1 = [\mathbf{h}_1^1, \mathbf{h}_2^1, \cdots, \mathbf{h}_{n_1}^1], \\
&\cdots \qquad\qquad\qquad \cdots \\
&\text{brain region N}: \quad \mathbf{H}^N = [\mathbf{h}_1^N, \mathbf{h}_2^N, \cdots, \mathbf{h}_{n_N}^N],
\end{aligned} \tag{4}
$$

where N is the number of brain regions, n_c denotes the number of electrodes in the c-th brain region, $n_1 + \cdots + n_N = n$. In this case, the reordered deep feature can be expressed as

$$
\hat{\mathbf{H}} = [\mathbf{H}^1, \cdots, \mathbf{H}^N]. \tag{5}
$$

Based on the above process, we can obtain the deep features of all the brain regions from source and target EEG samples, which can be denoted as $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_S = [\mathbf{H}_S^1, \cdots, \mathbf{H}_S^N]$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_T = [\mathbf{H}_T^1, \cdots, \mathbf{H}_T^N]$. Then they are fed to N local discriminators to calculate the transferability. Concretely, let $\mathbf{d}^{N_i} = \{d_s^{N_i}, d_t^{N_i}\}$ denote the output probability of one discriminator $G_d^{N_i}$ for brain region N_i, where $d_s^{N_i}$ and $d_t^{N_i}$ are the probabilities that the input belongs to the source and target data, respectively. Then we can quantity the transferability of this brain region through the entropy function in information theory [22], which is defined as

$$
H(\mathbf{d}^{N_i}) = -d_s^{N_i} \cdot \log(d_s^{N_i}) - d_t^{N_i} \cdot \log(d_t^{N_i}). \tag{6}
$$

Then the higher transferability of a brain region has, the more attention value is.

However, for an EEG signal, the emotion information is the most difficult component to be transferred. Due to this, we reverse the attention values for the brain regions to make the model pay attention on the difficult transferred brain regions. Thus the attention value for brain region N_i is defined as

$$
w^{N_i} = 1 - H(\mathbf{d}^{N_i}). \tag{7}
$$

Besides, to mitigate the negative effect of wrong attentions, we adopt the residual attention mechanism to make the model more robust. Thus, after local attention layer, the data representations for EEG sample $\mathbf{X}$ can be formulated as

$$
\hat{\mathbf{H}}' = [(1 + w^1)\mathbf{H}^1, \cdots, (1 + w^N)\mathbf{H}^N] \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{f'} \times n}. \tag{8}
$$

Here the loss function of the local discriminators for all the brain regions can be formulated as

$$
L_d^l = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{N_i=1}^N L_d^{l_{N_i}}(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T | \theta_d^{l_{N_i}}), \tag{9}
$$

where

$$
L_d^{l_{N_i}} = -\sum_{t=1}^{M_1} \log p(0|\mathbf{X}_t^{S_{N_i}}) - \sum_{t'=1}^{M_2} \log p(1|\mathbf{X}_{t'}^{T_{N_i}}) \tag{10}
$$

denote the loss of the local discriminator for brain region N_i; $p(0|\mathbf{X}_t^{S_{N_i}})$ and $p(1|\mathbf{X}_{t'}^{T_{N_i}})$ are the probabilities of the input data belongs to source and target domains respectively; $\theta_d^{l_{N_i}}$ is the parameter of the local attention network; $\mathbf{X}_t^{S_{N_i}}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{t'}^{T_{N_i}}$ represent the N_i brain region data of the t-th and t'-th source and target sample, respectively; M_1 and M_2 are the number of the source and target data.

3.2.2. Global transferable attention on sample-level

Although the above local attention for all the brain regions can make a fine-grained transfer learning between the source and target domain data, there is a possible that the local domain discriminator find fewer brain regions to transfer. Meanwhile, due to the distribution difference, there are some negative samples in the source data that are very dissimilar with the target data. It will weak the efficiency If we force training the model with these negative samples equaling with the other positive samples. Hence, after weighting the transferability of brain regions with local attention, we adopt the global transferable attention on the sample-level to transfer the knowledge from source to target domain.

Concretely, after local attention module, the input feature can be expressed as

$$
\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}'\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{f'} \times n'}, \tag{11}
$$

where $\mathbf{S}$ is a learnable transformation matrix. Then it is sent to a global discriminator G_d^g to highlight the EEG samples with higher transferability. Here the loss function of the global discriminator G_d^g can be formulated as

$$
L_d^g(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T | \theta_d^g) = -\sum_{t=1}^{M_1} \log p(0|\mathbf{X}_t^S) - \sum_{t'=1}^{M_2} \log p(1|\mathbf{X}_{t'}^T), \tag{12}
$$

where θ_d^g is the parameter of the global attention network. Concretely, let $\mathbf{d} = \{d_s, d_t\}$ denote the output probability of the global discriminator, where d_s and d_t are the probabilities that the input belongs to the source and target data respectively. The global attention value w can be calculated as

$$
w = 1 + H(\mathbf{d}), \tag{13}
$$

$$
H(\mathbf{d}) = -d_s \cdot \log(d_s) - d_t \cdot \log(d_t). \tag{14}
$$

Here we also adopt the residual mechanism to avoid the wrong attention. In this case, we obtain that the more transferability is, the larger attention value w is.

Inspired by Long et al. [23], the entropy minimization principle can refine the classifier adaptation, which can increase the confidence of the classifier prediction. Thus, we utilize the global domain discriminator to generate the global attention values acting on the label entropy to enhance the certainty of the source samples that are more similar with the target samples. Then w is embedded into the label entropy loss to achieve the function for global attention. Hence the loss function of the label entropy, which is called attentive entropy loss, can be written as

$$
L_e(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T | \theta_e) = \sum_{k=1}^{M_1+M_2} \sum_{c=1}^C -w\_k \cdot p(c|\mathbf{X}_k) \cdot \log p(c|\mathbf{X}_k), \tag{15}
$$

where $\mathbf{X}_k$ is the k-th sample in $\{\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T\}$; w_k is the global attention value for EEG sample $\mathbf{X}_k$; and C is the number of emotion classes.

3.3. Classifier

To enhance the discriminative ability of the model, we add the classifier to TANN model and employ the cross entropy as the loss function, which can be formulated as

$$L_c(\mathbf{X}^S|\theta_c) = \sum_{t=1}^{M_1}\sum_{c=1}^{C} - \tau(l,c) \cdot \log p(c|\mathbf{X}_t),$$
$$\tau(l,c) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } l = c, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$
(16)

where θ_c denotes the parameter of the classifier.

Concretely, based on the final feature vector $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ in Eq. (11), we first arrange the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ into a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$, and then use the simple linear transform approach to predict the class label, which can be formulated as

$$\mathbf{O} = \mathbf{G}\tilde{\mathbf{h}} + \mathbf{b}_c = [o_1, \cdots, o_C],$$
(17)

where $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{b}^c$ are the transformation matrices. Then the label $\tilde{l}$ of the input $\mathbf{X}_t$ can be predicted by softmax function as

$$\tilde{l} = \underset{c}{\arg\max} p(c|\mathbf{X}_t),$$
(18)

$$p(c|\mathbf{X}_t) = \exp(o_c) / \sum_{i=1}^{C} \exp(o_i).$$
(19)

3.4. The optimization

In summary, the overall loss function includes four parts, i.e., local and global discriminator losses, classifier loss and the attentive entropy loss. Concretely, the loss function of the proposed TANN method can be formulated as

$$L(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\theta_c, \theta_e, \theta_d^l, \theta_d^g) = L_c(\mathbf{X}^S|\theta_c) + \alpha L_e(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\theta_e)$$
$$- \beta\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{N_i=1}^{N} L_d^{l_{N_i}}(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\theta_d^{l_{N_i}}) + L_d^g(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\theta_d^g)\right),$$
(20)

where α and β are the hyper-parameters, $L_d^{l_{N_i}}$ and L_d^g represent the losses of local and global attention discriminators. Then we iteratively optimize the classifier, attentive entropy, local and global attention discriminators. Concretely, the parameters can be found through minimizing and maximizing

$$(\hat{\theta}_f, \hat{\theta}_c) = \underset{\theta_f, \theta_c}{\arg\min} L_c(\mathbf{X}^S|\theta_f, \theta_c, \theta_e, \hat{\theta}_d^l, \hat{\theta}_d^g),$$
(21)

$$\hat{\theta}_e = \underset{\theta_e}{\arg\min} L_e(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\hat{\theta}_f, \hat{\theta}_c, \theta_e, \hat{\theta}_d^l, \hat{\theta}_d^g),$$
(22)

$$\hat{\theta}_d^{l_{N_i}} = \underset{\theta_d^{l_{N_i}}}{\arg\max} L_d^{l_{N_i}}(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\hat{\theta}_f, \hat{\theta}_c, \hat{\theta}_e, \theta_d^{l_{N_i}}, \hat{\theta}_d^g),$$
(23)

$$\hat{\theta}_d^g = \underset{\theta_d^g}{\arg\max} L_d^g(\mathbf{X}^S, \mathbf{X}^T|\hat{\theta}_f, \hat{\theta}_c, \hat{\theta}_e, \hat{\theta}_d^l, \theta_d^g).$$
(24)

To solve the maximization problems of Eq. (23) and (24), we adopt a gradient reversal layer (GRL) [19] before the discriminator to transfer them to minimization problems. GRL layer will act as an identity transform in the forward-propagation but reverse the gradient sign while performing the back-propagation operation. Then we can use the stochastic gradient decent (SGD) algorithm to solve the parameter optimization process easily. Specifically, the parameters can be updated by the rules below

$$\theta_c \leftarrow \theta_c - \frac{\partial L_c}{\partial \theta_c}, \quad \theta_e \leftarrow \theta_e - \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial L_e}{\partial \theta_e},$$
(25)

$$\theta_d^{l_{N_i}} \leftarrow \theta_d^{l_{N_i}} - \beta \cdot \frac{\partial L_d^{l_{N_i}}}{\partial \theta_d^{l_{N_i}}}, \quad \theta_d^g \leftarrow \theta_d^g - \beta \cdot \frac{\partial L_d^g}{\partial \theta_d^g},$$
(26)

$$\theta_f \leftarrow \theta_f - \left(\frac{\partial L_c}{\partial \theta_f} + \alpha \cdot \frac{\partial L_e}{\partial \theta_f} - \beta \cdot \frac{\partial L_d^{l_{N_i}}}{\partial \theta_f} - \beta \cdot \frac{\partial L_d^g}{\partial \theta_f}\right).$$
(27)

4. Experiments

4.1. Experiment setup

4.1.1. Datasets and protocols

To evaluate the proposed TANN method adequately, we conduct the experiments on three public EEG emotion datasets, namely,

(1) **SEED** [7] dataset is a standard benchmark for EEG emotion recognition. It contains three types of emotions, i.e., *happy*, *neutral* and *sad*, from 15 subjects' EEG emotional signals.
(2) **SEED-IV** [24] dataset includes four types of emotions from 15 subjects. Compared with SEED, it contains an extra emotion *fear*.
(3) **MPED** [11] is a refined EEG emotional dataset that contains seven types of emotions collected from 30 subjects. Except for *neutral*, *sad*, *fear*, which are same with SEED-IV, other emotions include *joy*, *funny*, *disgust* and *anger*.

On these datasets, we design two kinds of EEG emotion recognition experiments including the subject-dependent and subject-independent ones. Table 1 summarizes the number of training and test samples, and the experimental protocols used in the experiments. The concrete protocols include: (1) subject-dependent experiment, in which the training and test data come from the same subject but different trials; (2) subject-independent experiment, in which the training and test data come from different subjects, which is a harder task than the above subject-dependent one but more conductive to practical applications. The mean accuracy (ACC) and standard deviation (STD) are used as the evaluation results in all the experiment.

4.1.2. Preprocessing

Generally, for EEG signal, the emotion-related information are always under 50 Hz in frequency. Therefore, after removing EOG and artifacts, the raw EEG signals are filtered and decomposed into five frequency bands for extracting handcraft features. These bands consists of delta (1–3 Hz), theta (4–7 Hz), alpha (8–13 Hz), beta (14–30 Hz) and gamma (31–50 Hz), which is better for distinguishing different emotions. For SEED and SEED-IV datasets, differential entropy (DE) feature is extracted, which is equivalent to the logarithm energy spectrum in a certain frequency band. And for MPED dataset, the short-time Fourier transform (STFT) feature is extracted.

4.1.3. Implementation details

In the experiment, we respectively set the dimension d_f and d_f' of the feature extractor to 32; the number of brain region N to 16[1]; the dimension n' of the input for the global attention layer to 6; the hyper-parameters α and β are both set to 0.1 throughout the exper-

---

[1] Concretely, these brain regions include Pre-Frontal, Frontal, Left Frontal, Right Frontal, Left Temporal, Right Temporal, Frontal Central, Central, Central Parietal, Left Parietal, Right Parietal, Parietal, Left Parietal Occipital, Right Parietal Occipital, Parietal Occipital, and Occipital lobes.

Table 1
The number of training and test samples, and the experimental protocols used in the experiment.

		The subject-dependent experiment	
Dataset		Training/test	Protocol
SEED		2010/1384	Zheng and Lu [7]
SEED-IV	Session 1	561/290	Zheng et al. [24]
	Session 2	550/282	
	Session 3	576/246	
MPED		2520/840	Song et al. [25]
		The subject-independent experiment	
Dataset		Training/Test	Protocol
SEED		47516/3394	Zheng et al. [13]
SEED-IV	Session 1	11914/851	LOSO*
	Session 2	11648/832	
	Session 3	11508/822	
MPED		97440/3360	LOSO*

*LOSO denotes the leave-one-subject-out strategy.

iment. Besides, we run TANN model on one Nvidia 1080Ti GPU with a learning rate of 0.003, and the batch size is set to 200.

4.2. Experiment results

4.2.1. The classification accuracy on three public EEG emotional datasets

The performance of our TANN is summarized in Table 2 and 3. For comparison, we also conduct the same experiment by other existed methods. Note that in the experiment of subject-independent task, the domain gap is large. Thus the domain adaptation methods can achieve better results. Then we train these

models by labeled training data and unlabeled test data. From these tables, we have three observations:

(1) The proposed TANN model outperforms all the comparable methods on all the three datasets. Especially on SEED-IV dataset, the mean improvement is about 3.4% and 2.5% over the state-of-the-art methods A-LSTM and BiDANN. It verifies the learned transferable data representation are useful for EEG emotion recognition.
(2) The proposed TANN is superior to the recent domain adaptation methods. TANN has an improvement of 1.0%, 3.7% and 2.1% for subject-dependent task in Table 2, and 1.2%, 2.4% and 2.5% for subject-independent task in Table 3 than the

Table 2
The classification accuracy (%) for subject-dependent EEG emotion recognition task on three public datasets.

	Method	SVM [26]	RF [27]	CCA [28]	GSCCA [29]	DBN [7]	GRSLR [30]	GCNN [31]
Accuracy	SEED	83.99/09.72	78.46/11.77	77.63/13.21	82.96/09.95	86.08/08.34	87.39/08.64	87.40/09.20
	SEED-IV	56.61/20.05	50.97/16.22	54.47/18.48	69.08/16.66	66.77/07.38	69.32/19.57	68.34/15.42
	MPED	32.39/09.53	23.83/06.82	29.08/07.96	36.78/07.76	35.07/11.25	34.58/08.41	33.26/06.44
	Method	DGCNN [11]	DANN [19]	BiDANN [32]	EmotionMeter [24]	A-LSTM [25]	TANN	
Accuracy	SEED	90.40/08.49	91.36/08.30	92.38/07.04	–	88.61/10.16	**93.34/06.64**	
	SEED-IV	69.88/16.29	63.07/12.66	70.29/12.63	70.59/17.01	69.50/15.65	**73.94/13.65**	
	MPED	32.37/06.08	35.04/06.52	37.71/06.04	–	38.99/07.53	**39.82/07.98**	

–Indicates the experiment results are not reported on that dataset.

Table 3
The classification accuracy (%) for subject-independent EEG emotion recognition task on three public datasets.

	Method	KLIEP [33]	ULSIF [34]	STM [35]	SVM [26]	TCA [14]	SA [36]	GFK [37]
Accuracy	SEED	45.71/17.76	51.18/13.57	51.23/14.82	56.73/16.29	63.64/14.88	69.00/10.89	71.31/14.09
	SEED-IV	31.46/09.20	32.99/11.05	39.39/12.40	37.99/12.52	56.56/13.77	64.44/09.46	64.38/11.41
	MPED	18.92/04.54	19.63/03.81	20.89/03.62	19.66/03.96	19.50/03.61	20.74/04.17	20.27/04.34
	Method	A-LSTM [25]	DANN [19]	DGCNN [11]	DAN [38]	BiDANN [32]	TANN	
Accuracy	SEED	72.18/10.85	75.08/11.18	79.95/09.02	83.81/08.56	83.28/09.60	**84.41/08.75**	
	SEED-IV	55.03/09.28	47.59/10.01	52.82/09.23	58.87/08.13	65.59/10.39	**68.00/08.35**	
	MPED	24.06/04.58	22.36/04.37	25.12/04.20	–	25.86/04.92	**28.32/05.11**	

BiDANN method, which also adopts domain adversarial learning strategy to train the model. This reveals that the local and global attention structures are helpful to learn the discriminative information for emotion recognition.

(3) Even under the same classification models, the performance of the subject-independent tasks are quite lower than the subject-dependent ones. It is clear to see the gaps on three datasets are about 13%, 5% and 12%, respectively. This reveals that the individual difference is a negative influence on EEG emotion recognition, and should be mitigated in the subject-independent task.

Besides, we can also see that the standard deviation of the proposed TANN is much lower or close to the state-of-the-art methods A-LSTM (06.64 vs. 10.16, 13.65 vs 15.65, 07.98 vs 07.53) in subject-dependent task and BiDANN (08.75 vs. 09.60, 08.35 vs. 10.39, 05.11 vs. 04.92) in subject-independent task. This indicates that TANN is much more stable compared with the other two methods.

4.2.2. The confusion matrices based on the results of TANN model

To better understand the confusion of TANN in recognizing different emotions, the confusion matrices of subject-dependent and subject-independent EEG emotion recognition experiments are depicted in Fig. 3 and 4, respectively, from which we have the following observations:

(1) In Fig. 3, for SEED, the classification accuracies for three emotions are about 90%, and the happy and neutral emotions are easier to be recognized than the sad emotion; for SEED-IV, which consists of four emotions, we can see the negative emotions, i.e., sad and fear, are confused by the classifier with higher possibility; and for MPED, the confusion is more complex because it has more emotions than the other two datasets. It is obvious to see that the funny emotion is the easiest to be recognized and has 16% more than the neutral emotion on the second place. Except this, we can find that the funny and joy are easier to be confused maybe because both of them are positive emotions.

(2) From the results of subject-independent EEG emotion recognition experiment in Fig. 4, we can observe that, for SEED, which has three types of emotions, the happy emotion is much easier to be recognized than neutral and sad; for


Fig. 4. The confusion matrices of TANN in subject-independent experiment.

SEED-IV, the neutral and sad emotions are much easier to be recognized; for MPED, which is a hard seven classification problem, the accuracies of funny, neutral and anger emotions overpass that of the other emotions, and this reveals that we should focus on the joy, sad, fear and disgust emotion data in the task of classifying seven emotions.

4.2.3. The transferability of different brain regions

To investigate the transferability of different brain regions for EEG emotion recognition, we visualize all the brain regions by mapping the local attention values w in Eq. (7) into the corresponding electrodes. The obtained results are shown in Fig. 5, from which we have two observations:

(1) The left and right temporal lobes make more important contribution for emotion recognition in all the three datasets, which coincides with the previous EEG emotion studies [6,7]. This also reveals that, as well as the proposed model can adaptively give attention to different brain regions, it is still effective to capture the most important ones.

(2) The activation areas are slightly different across datasets. For example, there is a broader activation to the temporal lobes for SEED-IV compared with SEED. And for MPED, which consists of more types of emotions, the occipital lobe, as well as the temporal lobe, contributes more for emotion expression.

4.2.4. Ablation study

To see the importance of each module of TANN for EEG emotion recognition, we conduct an ablation study by removing the local and global attention layers both and separately. These reduced models are depicted in Fig. 6, which includes.


Fig. 3. The confusion matrices of TANN in subject-dependent experiment.

Fig. 5. The transferability of different EEG brain regions.

(a) TANN-R1

(b) TANN-R2

(c) TANN-R3

Fig. 6. The frameworks of the reduced models of TANN: (a) TANN-R1, (b) TANN-R2, (c) TANN-R3.

- TANN-R1, which removes both the local and global attention modules;
- TANN-R2, which neglects the global transferability for EEG samples;
- TANN-R3, which employs the same structure of TANN model except the local attention layer.

The experimental results are shown in Table 4, from which we can have three observations:

(1) It is effective for the structure of the feature extractor in TANN. From the results of TANN-R1, we can see it achieves comparable performance on three datasets. This verifies the obtained deep data representation by two directional recurrent neural networks is discriminative for emotion recognition.
(2) Either the local or global transferable attention modules can enhance emotion recognition. In contrast to TANN-R1, TANN-R2 and TANN-R3 improve the accuracy, on average, by 1.8% and 1.5% on three datasets, respectively.
(3) By assembling the feature extractor, local and global attention modules, TANN achieves the best performance. We can see TANN has a further improvement of 3% compared with TANN-R2 and TANN-R3.

The above results verify the effectiveness of the three important modules in TANN.

Table 4
The comparison of EEG emotion recognition results among four methods: (1) TANN-R1, (2) TANN-R2, (3) TANN-R3; (4) TANN.

Method	Accuracy (%)		
	SEED	SEED-IV	MPED
TANN-R1	87.06/09.45	68.28/14.28	37.92/07.80
TANN-R2	89.73/07.53	**70.82/14.65**	**38.10/07.98**
TANN-R3	**91.03/07.63**	68.72/13.30	38.06/08.21
TANN	**93.34/06.64**	**73.94/13.65**	**39.82/07.98**

4.2.5. The process of training and testing of TANN

To show more details about training and testing process of TANN, we depict the curves of training loss and test accuracy w. r.t the iteration number on MPED dataset in Fig. 7. Here we choose the first three subjects in MPED dataset as examples. From the results of training loss in Fig. 7, i.e., (a), (c) and (e), it is easy to see our TANN fast converges to a local minimum after a few iterations. While from the results of test accuracy, i.e., (b), (d) and (f) in Fig. 7, we can see that the classification accuracy can fast reach a stable value after 50–100 iterations.

(a)

(b)

(1) Subject #1

(c)

(d)

(2) Subject #2

(e)

(f)

(3) Subject #3

Fig. 7. The training loss and test accuracy w.r.t the iteration number on MPED dataset.

Table 5
The comparison of calculation amount between TANN and two state-of-the-art methods.

Method	TANN	BiDANN	A-LSTM
FLOPs	0.9G	4.6G	6.3G

4.2.6. The calculation amount of TANN

To show the calculation advantage of TANN, we compute the number of FLOPs of TANN and two compared methods A-LSTM and BiDANN for an EEG data. The results are shown in Table 5. We can see that our TANN only needs 0.9G FLOPs to process an EEG data, which is 80% and 86% less than BiDANN and A-LSTM, respectively. This shows that TANN can achieve better results even with less calculation amount.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a transferable attention neural network (TANN) to deal with EEG emotion recognition problem, which is motivated by the finding that not all the training samples have the equal contribution for emotion recognition, which also happens for the importance of different brain regions in this sample. TANN has the ability to learn the positive and negative information from the sample-level and brain-region-level, which can improve EEG emotion recognition. The extensive experiments demonstrated that the proposed TANN method achieves the state-of-the-art performance. Besides, based on TANN, we also investigate the transferability of different brain regions in EEG emotion recognition and find that the temporal lobe and occipital lobe contribute more for emotion expression. In the future work, we will further focus on more operations for learning the transferability information to explore the potential meaning of transferable attention for EEG emotion recognition.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Yang Li: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Boxun Fu:** Data curation, Investigation. **Fu Li:** Supervision, Conceptualization. **Guangming Shi:** Writing - review & editing. **Wenming Zheng:** Writing - review & editing.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] R.W. Picard, Affective Computing, MIT press, 2000.

[2] B. García-Martínez, A. Martinez-Rodrigo, R. Alcaraz, A. Fernández-Caballero, A review on nonlinear methods using electroencephalographic recordings for emotion recognition, IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput. (2019).

[3] J. Chen, P. Zhang, Z. Mao, Y. Huang, D. Jiang, and Y. Zhang, Accurate eeg-based emotion recognition on combined features using deep convolutional neural networks, IEEE Access 7 (2019) 44 317–44 328. .

[4] D. Sammler, M. Grigutsch, T. Fritz, S. Koelsch, Music and emotion: electrophysiological correlates of the processing of pleasant and unpleasant music, Psychophysiology 44 (2) (2007) 293–304.

[5] D. Mathersul, L.M. Williams, P.J. Hopkinson, A.H. Kemp, Investigating models of affect: relationships among eeg alpha asymmetry, depression, and anxiety, Emotion 8 (4) (2008) 560–572.

[6] Y.-P. Lin, C.-H. Wang, T.-P. Jung, T.-L. Wu, S.-K. Jeng, J.-R. Duann, J.-H. Chen, Eeg-based emotion recognition in music listening, IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng. 57 (7) (2010) 1798–1806.

[7] W.-L. Zheng, B.-L. Lu, Investigating critical frequency bands and channels for eeg-based emotion recognition with deep neural networks, IEEE Trans. Auton. Ment. Dev. 7 (3) (2015) 162–175.

[8] P. Li, H. Liu, Y. Si, C. Li, F. Li, X. Zhu, X. Huang, Y. Zeng, D. Yao, Y. Zhang, et al., Eeg based emotion recognition by combining functional connectivity network and local activations, IEEE Trans. Biomed. Eng. (2019).

[9] R. Jenke, A. Peer, M. Buss, Feature extraction and selection for emotion recognition from eeg, IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput. 5 (3) (2014) 327–339.

[10] Y. Li, W. Zheng, Y. Zong, Z. Cui, T. Zhang, X. Zhou, A bi-hemisphere domain adversarial neural network model for eeg emotion recognition, IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput. (2018).

[11] T. Song, W. Zheng, P. Song, Z. Cui, Eeg emotion recognition using dynamical graph convolutional neural networks, IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput. (2018).

[12] S.M. Alarcao, M.J. Fonseca, Emotions recognition using eeg signals: a survey, IEEE Trans. Affect. Comput. (2017).

[13] W.-L. Zheng, B.-L. Lu, Personalizing eeg-based affective models with transfer learning, in: International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI), AAAI Press, 2016, pp. 2732–2738. .

[14] S.J. Pan, I.W. Tsang, J.T. Kwok, Q. Yang, Domain adaptation via transfer component analysis, IEEE Trans. Neural Networks 22 (2) (2011) 199–210.

[15] B. Schölkopf, A. Smola, K.-R. Müller, Nonlinear component analysis as a kernel eigenvalue problem, Neural Comput. 10 (5) (1998) 1299–1319.

[16] R. Collobert, F. Sinz, J. Weston, L. Bottou, Large scale transductive svms, J. Mach. Learn. Res. 7 (2006) 1687–1712. .

[17] E. Sanguineto, G. Zen, E. Ricci, N. Sebe, We are not all equal: personalizing models for facial expression analysis with transductive parameter transfer, in: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM). ACM, 2014, pp. 357–366..

[18] Z. Lan, O. Sourina, L. Wang, R. Scherer, G.R. Müller-Putz, Domain adaptation techniques for eeg-based emotion recognition: a comparative study on two public datasets, IEEE Trans. Cogn. Dev. Syst. 11 (1) (2018) 85–94.

[19] Y. Ganin, E. Ustinova, H. Ajakan, P. Germain, H. Larochelle, F. Laviolette, M. Marchand, V. Lempitsky, Domain-adversarial training of neural networks, J. Mach. Learn. Res. 17 (59) (2016) 1–35.

[20] P.A. Kragel, K.S. Labar, Decoding the nature of emotion in the brain, Trends Cogn. Sci. 20 (6) (2016) 444–455.

[21] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A.N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin, Attention is all you need, 2017, pp. 5998–6008. .

[22] X. Wang, L. Li, W. Ye, M. Long, J. Wang, Transferable attention for domain adaptation, 2019. .

[23] M. Long, H. Zhu, J. Wang, M.I. Jordan, Unsupervised domain adaptation with residual transfer networks, Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (2016) 136–144.

[24] W.-L. Zheng, W. Liu, Y. Lu, B.-L. Lu, A. Cichocki, Emotionmeter: a multimodal framework for recognizing human emotions, IEEE Trans. Cybern. 49 (2019) 1110–1122.

[25] T. Song, W. Zheng, C. Lu, Y. Zong, X. Zhang, Z. Cui, Mped: a multi-modal physiological emotion database for discrete emotion recognition, IEEE Access 7 (2019) 12 177–12 191. .

[26] J.A. Suykens, J. Vandewalle, Least squares support vector machine classifiers, Neural Process. Lett. 9 (3) (1999) 293–300.

[27] L. Breiman, Random forests, Mach. Learn. 45 (1) (2001) 5–32.

[28] B. Thompson, Canonical correlation analysis, Encycl. Stat. Behav. Sci. (2005). .

[29] W. Zheng, Multichannel eeg-based emotion recognition via group sparse canonical correlation analysis, IEEE Trans. Cogn. Dev. Syst. 9 (3) (2017) 281–290.

[30] Y. Li, W. Zheng, Z. Cui, Y. Zong, S. Ge, Eeg emotion recognition based on graph regularized sparse linear regression, Neural Process. Lett. (2018) 1–17. .

[31] M. Defferrard, X. Bresson, P. Vandergheynst, Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS), 2016, pp. 3844–3852.

[32] Y. Li, W. Zheng, Z. Cui, T. Zhang, Y. Zong, A novel neural network model based on cerebral hemispheric asymmetry for eeg emotion recognition, in: International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI), 2018, pp. 1561–1567.

[33] M. Sugiyama, S. Nakajima, H. Kashima, P.V. Buenau, M. Kawanabe, Direct importance estimation with model selection and its application to covariate shift adaptation, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) (2008) 1433–1440.

[34] T. Kanamori, S. Hido, M. Sugiyama, A least-squares approach to direct importance estimation, J. Mach. Learn. Res. 10 (2009) 1391–1445.

[35] W.-S. Chu, F. De la Torre, J.F. Cohn, Selective transfer machine for personalized facial expression analysis, IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell. 39 (3) (2017) 529–545.

[36] B. Fernando, A. Habrard, M. Sebban, T. Tuytelaars, Unsupervised visual domain adaptation using subspace alignment, in: IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), IEEE, 2013, pp. 2960–2967. .

[37] B. Gong, Y. Shi, F. Sha, K. Grauman, Geodesic flow kernel for unsupervised domain adaptation, in: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). IEEE, 2012, pp. 2066–2073. .

[38] H. Li, Y.-M. Jin, W.-L. Zheng, B.-L. Lu, Cross-subject emotion recognition using deep adaptation networks, in: International Conference on Neural Information Processing, Springer, 2018, pp. 403–413. .

Yang Li received the B.S. degree in electronic information and science technology from School of Physics and Electronics, Shandong Normal University, China, in 2012, the M.S. degree in electronic and communication engineering from School of Electronic Engineering, Xidian University, China, in 2015, the Ph.D. degree from the School of Information Science and Engineering, Southeast University, China, in 2020. He was also a visiting student at University of Wollongong from August 2018 to August 2019. His researches focus on affective computing, pattern recognition and computer vision.

Boxun Fu received the B.S. degree in electronic engineering from Xidian University, Xi'an, China, in 2016, where he is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree with the School of Artificial Intelligence. His research interests include brain computer interface, affective computing, computer vision, and machine learning.

Fu Li is a Professor in the School of Artificial Intelligence at Xidian University, Xi'an, China. He is the head of Xidian-Xilinx Embedded Digital Integrated System Joint Laboratory. He received his B.S. degree in Electronic Engineering from Xidian University in 2004, and Ph.D. degree in Electrical & Electronic Engineering from the Xidian University in 2010. He has published more than 30 papers international and national journals, and international conferences. His research interests are brain-computer interface, deep learning, small target detection, 3D imaging, embedded deep learning, image and video compression processing, VLSI circuit design, target tracking, neural net- work acceleration and Implementation of intelligent signal processing algorithms (DSP & FPGA).

Guangming Shi received the B.S. degree in Automatic Control in 1985, the M.S. degree in Computer Control and Ph.D. degree in Electronic Information Technology, all from Xidian University in 1988 and 2002, respectively. He joined the School of Electronic Engineering, Xidian University, in 1988. From 1994 to 1996, as a Research Assis- tant, he cooperated with the Department of Electronic Engineering at the University of Hong Kong. Since 2003, he has been a Professor in the School of Electronic Engineering at Xidian University, and in 2004 the head of National Instruction Base of Electrician & Electronic (NIBEE). From June to December in 2004, he had studied in the Department of Electronic Engineering at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). Presently, he is the Deputy Director of the School of Electronic Engineering, Xidian University, and the academic leader in the subject of Circuits & Systems. His research interests include compressed sensing, theory and design of multirate filter banks, image denoising, low-bit-rate image/ video coding and implementation of algorithms for intelligent signal processing (DSP&FPGA).

Wenming Zheng (SM'18) received the B.S. degree in computer science from Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, China, in 1997, the M.S. degree in computer science from Huaqiao University, Quanzhou, China, in 2001, and the Ph.D. degree in signal processing from Southeast University, Nanjing, China, in 2004. Since 2004, he has been with the Research Center for Learning Science, Southeast University, where he is currently a Professor with the School of Biological Science and Medical Engineering and the Key Laboratory of Child Development and Learning Science of the Ministry of Education. His current research interests include affective computing, pattern recognition, machine learning, and computer vision. Dr. Zheng served as an Associate Editor of several peer-reviewed journals, such as the IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing, Neurocomputing, and Visual Computer.