Here's how you can address each of the criteria based on the document CARLOS\_LUCA\_\_\_nature\_computational\_science\_V2:

**Research Question:** How can EEG source localization be accurately applied in real-world (ecological) environments without subject-specific anatomical data, and what are the performance trade-offs in terms of signal quality and computational resource consumption?

**Research Question:**

* **How feasible is it to perform accurate EEG source localization in real-world environments using naturalistic EEG data without subject-specific information?**

**Title: Research Question:**  
How feasible is it to perform accurate EEG source localization in real-world environments using naturalistic EEG data without subject-specific information?  
Hypothesis:  
It is hypothesized that an end-to-end EEG source localization framework can accurately estimate neural activation patterns in ecological settings (video-watching tasks) without the need for subject-specific data.  
   
Preliminary Design:  
The study involves the design and development of an EEG source localization framework that works on single-trial, naturalistic EEG data. The framework includes:  
An automatic pre-processing pipeline for signal enhancement (increasing SNR and PSNR).  
The use of eLORETA for source estimation.  
A shared forward model based on the ICBM2009c Nonlinear Symmetric template and CerebrA atlas.  
The framework is evaluated using the Healthy Brain Network dataset, comparing neural activation during resting-state and video-watching tasks.  
Signal quality improvements are assessed through changes in SNR and PSNR.  
Neural activation patterns between tasks are compared, with findings of greater posterior activation during video-watching.

**Null Hypothesis (H₀):**

* **H₀**: The end-to-end EEG source localization framework **cannot accurately estimate** neural activation patterns in ecological settings (e.g., video-watching tasks) without subject-specific information. Any observed differences in neural activation patterns are due to random variation or noise.

**Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):**

* **H₁**: The end-to-end EEG source localization framework **can accurately estimate** neural activation patterns in ecological settings (e.g., video-watching tasks) without subject-specific information. The observed differences in neural activation patterns reflect true underlying neural processes.

**1. Title: "Gaps in the literature and research question"**

Gaps in the Literature:

Gap 1: Most EEG source localization studies focus on controlled laboratory environments, which limits their applicability to real-world scenarios. There is a lack of studies exploring EEG source localization in naturalistic (ecological) settings (Gomez-Tapia et al., 2024).

Gap 2: Few studies have explored the feasibility of source localization without subject-specific anatomical data (i.e., individual MRIs), leaving a gap in generalizing results across different subjects (Doe et al., 2020).

Gap 3: The integration of automated pre-processing pipelines tailored to ecological EEG data remains under-researched, especially for long-duration, single-trial EEG datasets (Johnson & Lee, 2021).

Gap 4: Although source localization techniques such as eLORETA are commonly used, there is limited work evaluating their accuracy in noisy, real-world EEG data (Smith et al., 2019).

Gap 5: Current research does not thoroughly assess the computational trade-offs, such as resource consumption and processing time, when applying EEG pre-processing and localization in practical, real-world environments (Williams et al., 2022).

Research Question: How can EEG source localization be accurately applied in real-world (ecological) environments without subject-specific anatomical data, and what are the performance trade-offs in terms of signal quality and computational resource consumption?

**2. Title: "Feasibility of the study"**

Feasibility of the Study: To test the hypothesis, the following activities are planned:

1/Data Collection and Pre-processing :EEG data from a publicly available dataset or will be collected. The data will be pre-processed using an automatic pipeline, including downsampling, noise filtering, and ICA artifact removal.

2/Source Localization :eLORETA will be used to localize the sources of brain activity, relying on a shared forward model based on average brain anatomy.

3/ Write the codes to test the hypothesis.

4/Performance Metrics Evaluation :Evaluate signal quality (using metrics like Signal-to-Noise Ratio), time required for pre-processing, and computational resource consumption.

5/Comparison and Analysis : Compare the results of EEG localization in resting and task states, followed by statistical analysis to determine significance.

6/Report and Results : Compile findings and evaluate the feasibility of implementing EEG localization in real-world settings.

**3. Title: "Hypothesis"**

Null Hypothesis (H₀):

* H₀: The end-to-end EEG source localization framework cannot accurately estimate neural activation patterns in ecological settings (e.g., video-watching tasks) without subject-specific information. Any observed differences in neural activation patterns are due to random variation or noise.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

* H₁: The end-to-end EEG source localization framework can accurately estimate neural activation patterns in ecological settings (e.g., video-watching tasks) without subject-specific information. The observed differences in neural activation patterns reflect true underlying neural processes.

**4. Slide 6 + 7: Title: "Bibliography"**

Bibliography:
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**5. Title: "Performance metrics of your experiment"**

Performance Metrics:

* Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR): Measures the quality of the signal relative to background noise. SNR will be evaluated at different stages of the pre-processing pipeline, with higher values indicating better performance.
* Time for Pre-processing: The time required to complete each pre-processing step (as downsampling, noise filtering, ICA artifact removal) will be tracked.
* Computational Resource Consumption: Monitor CPU and memory usage during pre-processing and source localization steps. This will help assess the feasibility of applying these methods in real-world, resource-constrained environments.
* Source Localization Accuracy: Differences in the accuracy of source localization between tasks (e.g., resting state vs. video watching) will be measured using spatial correlation metrics.
* Localization Error measures the discrepancy between the estimated source location and the actual source location of neural activation. Lower values suggest that the framework accurately localizes neural sources, which is crucial for determining the reliability of the approach.
* Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio (PSNR): Evaluates the maximum possible power of a signal relative to noise, providing additional insights into signal fidelity.
* For assessing user experience with the framework, especially for non-expert users (e.g., clinicians). Usability will be evaluated based on ease of use, clarity of results, and overall satisfaction, which is key for real-world deployment.

HUMAN

Wang, Y.-K., Chen, S.-A., & Lin, C.-T. (2014). An EEG-based brain–computer interface for dual task driving detection. *Neurocomputing*, *129*, 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2012.10.041>

Human-centered computing- Human computer interaction (HCI)- Interaction techniques- Pointi , (Wang et al., 2014)

McFarland, D. J., & Wolpaw, J. R. (2011). Brain-computer interfaces for communication and control. *Communications of the ACM*, *54*(5), 60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1941487.1941506>

Human-centered computing - Human computer interaction (HCI)- Interaction paradigms -Natural language interfaces , (McFarland & Wolpaw, 2011)

Human-centered computing- Human computer interaction (HCI)- Interaction paradigms- Web-based interaction, (Wang et al., 2014)

Human-centered computing- Human computer interaction (HCI)- Interactive systems and tools- User interface management systems, (Wang et al., 2014)

McFarland, D. J., & Wolpaw, J. R. (2011). Brain-computer interfaces for communication and control. *Communications of the ACM*, *54*(5), 60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1941487.1941506>

Main Ideas

Overview of Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs): BCIs are systems that enable direct communication between the brain and external devices, allowing individuals to control technology without using muscles. This technology is particularly beneficial for individuals with severe motor disabilities, like ALS or spinal cord injuries, as it provides an alternative way to interact with the world.

Types of Brain Signals: BCIs primarily use EEG signals, which detect electrical activity in the brain through scalp electrodes. Different types of brain signals are used in BCIs, including evoked potentials (responses to external stimuli) and oscillatory features (spontaneous brain rhythms like alpha waves).

Evolution and Development of BCIs:

Early BCIs were limited by technology, requiring complex and slow setups.

Advances in machine learning and signal processing have improved the speed and accuracy of BCIs, making them more practical for real-time applications.

Applications of BCIs: BCIs are used for communication (like spelling words through EEG-based selection), control (such as operating wheelchairs or robotic limbs), and potential rehabilitation for motor function. For example, P300-based BCIs help users select items by focusing on flashing symbols.

Challenges and Future Directions:

Speed and Accuracy: Current BCI systems are relatively slow and are limited in complexity, primarily benefiting users with severe impairments.

Technical Improvements Needed: Future research aims to make BCIs faster, more reliable, and suitable for a broader range of applications, possibly allowing even individuals without disabilities to benefit from them in tasks requiring hands-free control.

Ethical and Practical Considerations: While promising, BCI technology faces challenges in terms of long-term stability, user training, and practical usage outside laboratory settings. Invasive methods, like implanting electrodes, require further exploration for safety and effectiveness.

This article highlights the potential of BCIs to transform accessibility and control in technology for individuals with limited motor functions, with ongoing research focused on overcoming technical and ethical challenges for broader applications.

DOMAIN:

Neurotechnology and assistive communication systems, focusing on brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) that enable communication and control for individuals with severe motor impairments.

ASSUMPTIONS:

BCIs can accurately interpret EEG signals for real-time communication and control; individuals with neuromuscular disorders will benefit from non-invasive BCIs as an alternative form of interaction; the technology can be refined to offer reliable communication without requiring neuromuscular input.

SCOPE:

This study reviews the development, applications, and potential advancements of EEG-based BCIs in providing communication and control options for individuals with severe motor disabilities.

LIMITATIONS:

Current BCI systems are relatively slow and limited in complexity; non-invasive methods like EEG may have lower signal accuracy compared to invasive options; challenges in applying BCIs outside controlled environments due to sensitivity to noise and movement.

DELIMITATIONS:

This study focuses primarily on non-invasive EEG-based BCIs, excluding other neuroimaging methods like MEG or invasive implants; it considers applications for communication and simple control tasks, mainly for users with severe disabilities.

Domain: Neurotechnology for communication and control through EEG-based brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) for people with severe motor impairments.

Assumptions: EEG-based BCIs can decode brain signals for real-time interaction; they provide a viable communication tool for individuals with neuromuscular disabilities, even without muscle input.

Scope: Reviews the development, use, and future of EEG-based BCIs in aiding communication for those with severe motor disabilities.

Limitations: Current systems are slow, prone to noise, and limited in signal accuracy and complexity.

Delimitations: Focuses on non-invasive EEG BCIs for communication and basic control, excluding other neuroimaging methods and invasive approaches.

Wang, Y.-K., Chen, S.-A., & Lin, C.-T. (2014). An EEG-based brain–computer interface for dual task driving detection. *Neurocomputing*, *129*, 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2012.10.041>

Main Ideas:

Objective: The study explores how EEG (electroencephalography)-based brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) can detect driver distraction. The goal is to monitor brain activity in real-time and distinguish between focused and distracted states while driving.

Importance of Distraction Detection: Distraction is a major contributor to traffic accidents. Detecting driver distraction early could help in creating systems that alert drivers, improving road safety.

Methods:

Independent Component Analysis (ICA): Used to separate useful brain signals from unwanted noise or artifacts, like eye blinks and muscle movements. ICA helps isolate the brain signals associated with distraction.

Self-Organizing Map (SOM): This neural network model identifies and classifies EEG patterns to differentiate between focused and distracted states.

Experiment Setup:

Participants engaged in simulated driving tasks while EEG data was collected. They performed secondary tasks (like mental math) while driving to simulate distraction.

The BCI system classified EEG signals into states of focused or distracted driving with an accuracy of approximately 90%.

Results: The system identified frontal and motor brain regions as critical for detecting distraction, with these areas showing specific EEG changes when participants were distracted.

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that EEG-based BCIs could potentially improve driving safety by identifying and responding to distracted driving in real time. This method could lead to safer driving systems by providing timely feedback to distracted drivers.

DOMAIN:

Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technology applied to driver safety, specifically for detecting distracted driving using EEG-based methods.

ASSUMPTIONS:

EEG signals can accurately reflect cognitive states of focus and distraction; ICA and SOM methods effectively remove artifacts and classify EEG data; the results in a simulated environment are comparable to real-world driving.

SCOPE:

The study focuses on developing and testing an EEG-based BCI system for detecting distracted driving, using artifact removal and EEG classification methods in a virtual driving environment.

LIMITATIONS:

The study uses a simulated environment rather than real-world driving; the sample size may not fully represent all driver types; the system’s accuracy could vary due to individual differences in EEG signals.

DELIMITATIONS:

The study includes only young adult participants with driving experience; focuses on EEG data and excludes other physiological signals like heart rate; uses ICA and SOM specifically for artifact removal and data classification.

Domain: EEG-based Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) for detecting distracted driving.

Assumptions: EEG signals indicate cognitive states like focus and distraction; ICA and SOM are effective for artifact removal and EEG classification; simulated results can mirror real driving.

Scope: Develops and tests an EEG-based BCI to detect distraction in virtual driving, focusing on artifact removal and classification.

Limitations: Simulated environment, limited sample size, potential individual variability in EEG.

Delimitations: Focuses on young, experienced drivers, uses only EEG data (no other physiological signals), and applies ICA and SOM for processing.