Frist, it doesn’t read clearly.  There are a ton of typos and wording problems, especially in the last section. It’s often hard to see exactly what you mean.   I’m assuming that Mike or your colleagues will work closely with you in clearing that up.

One of my main points at your defense still holds in this draft.  This isn’t by any means approaching any kind of careful systematic study that, for example, the assistive or even the CHI community would do.  It’s not a scientific thesis, and shouldn’t pretend to be that.  What it seems to be is a bunch of design probes that you quickly tried out on people.  I’ll drill into a few examples of that below.  So you should say that up front - e.g., ‘that this is a series of design studies rather than systematic studies into the different implementations’ or something like this, so expectations are properly set.

Going further, you use strong words in this thesis like ‘prove’.  To be honest, you haven’t proven anything here, as I can find a zillion ways any one of your tests is flawed of falls short or istn’t exactly sure what you’re measuring.  So I’d not use the word ‘prove’ or ‘proven’ or even ‘have shown’ anywhere.  I’d say instead that you ‘see indication of’ or ‘our data hints at’ etc.  I also would be careful at calling anything ‘successful’ - your rate over chance isn’t very high for most of your rigs.  You have indications here - call it what it is.  They just aren’t great ‘senses' to rely on.

People doing this kind of work for real live with these systems.  They have people keep them on for days or longer, to really look at how the brain adapts to and assimilates the information - we talked about this at your defense.  You don’t do any of this - you have people try something for some minutes or an hour or so - no time to really explore what kind of adaptation or improvement you get with these new ‘senses’.  You should say this up front too - say that you’re not exploring long term adaptation with any of these rigs - just getting first impressions of fresh users.  It’s more of an HCI approach than a sensory approach.  You say this somewhere in the text, but it should be up front too.