

# MEG Chicken: Interactive Artifact Detection Training for MEG and EEG data

Kirsten Petras<sup>1\*</sup>, Yue Kong<sup>1\*</sup>, Hayley Yingxuan Wu<sup>1\*</sup>, and Laura Dugué<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université Paris Cité, INCC UMR 8002, CNRS, F-75006 Paris, France <sup>2</sup> Institut Universitaire de France (IUF), Paris, France \* These authors contributed equally.

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

## Software

- [Review](#)
- [Repository](#)
- [Archive](#)

Editor: [Open Journals](#)

## Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

## License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

## Statement of Need

Detecting and processing signal artifacts is crucial for analyzing neural time-series data from magnetoencephalography (MEG) or electroencephalography (EEG) recordings (Luck & Kappenman, 2017). While numerous automated and semi-automated artifact detection algorithms exist (e.g., (Jas et al., 2017)), visual inspection and manual labeling remain the most widely used methods for identifying components contaminated by eye movements, muscle activity, or electrical noise. Despite excellent resources describing common physiological and electrical artifacts in MEG and EEG data (Burgess, 2020; Uriguen & Garcia-Zapirain, 2015), decisions about segment or component rejection are ultimately subjective. This subjectivity often results in inconsistencies, particularly when training new lab members.

Implicit or procedural learning refers to the acquisition of skills and knowledge through repeated exposure and practice, without explicit instruction. A well established example of implicit rule learning is chicken sexing, where workers learn to distinguish the sex of day-old chicks based on subtle visual cues. Despite often not being able to articulate which exact features distinguish between male and female chicks, experienced chicken sexers can classify chicks accurately and reliably through extensive experience and feedback (Horsey, n.d.).

MEG Chicken uses the principle of implicit learning through immediate feedback to streamline and standardize the process of learning to detect artifacts in electrophysiology data. The open source software tool presents trainees with data containing various types of artifacts and provides immediate feedback on their decisions, enabling consistent rejection criteria to be learned implicitly. Labs can customize the training with their own annotated datasets to ensure alignment with lab-specific standards.

## Functionality

MEG Chicken is built on the MNE-Python library and employs MNE's user-friendly graphical interface for visualizing time-series data and sensor topographies. The software includes labeled example datasets available for download via Zenodo, and labs can import or create their own labeled datasets through the interactive interface.

The training program includes modules for:

1. Bad Channel Rejection
2. ICA Component Selection
3. Labeled Data Import
4. Label Creator

Participants complete the training at their own pace, progressing until they consistently make

40 correct decisions over a predefined number of trials. The full visualization capabilities of MNE  
41 are available in both modules, augmented with information slides.

42 Immediate feedback after each decision supports implicit learning in the absense of explicit  
43 rules.

## 44 Evaluation and Performance

45 Testing on 5 observes, naive to MEG and EEG artefacts, showed: - Participants required an  
46 average of xx minutes to achieve xx% accuracy in bad channel selection. - Participants required  
47 an average of xx minutes to achieve xx% accuracy in ICA component selection. - Performance  
48 remained consistent in follow-up tests conducted several days later.

### 49 Table:

Task	Average Time to Mastery	Final Accuracy	Retest Accuracy
Bad Channel Rejection	xx minutes	xx%	xx%
ICA Component Selection	xx minutes	xx%	xx%

## 50 Funding

51 This project received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European  
52 Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 852139 - Laura  
53 Dugué).

## 54 Acknowledgments

55 We thank Laetitia Grabot for providing the example dataset, and Coline Haro for contributions  
56 to an earlier version.

## 57 Toolbox Dependencies

- 58 ▪ os
- 59 ▪ time
- 60 ▪ random
- 61 ▪ json
- 62 ▪ numpy
- 63 ▪ mne
- 64 ▪ tkinter
- 65 ▪ pickle
- 66 ▪ csv
- 67 ▪ matplotlib
- 68 ▪ warnings
- 69 ▪ scipy
- 70 ▪ PIL
- 71 ▪ playsound
- 72 ▪ copy

## 73 References

74 Burgess, R. C. (2020). Recognizing and correcting MEG artifacts. *Journal of Clinical*  
75 *Neurophysiology*, 37(6), 508–517.

- 76 Horsey, R. (n.d.). *The art of chicken sexing*. [https://web-archive.southampton.ac.uk/cogprints.](https://web-archive.southampton.ac.uk/cogprints.org/3255/1/chicken.pdf)  
77 [org/3255/1/chicken.pdf](https://web-archive.southampton.ac.uk/cogprints.org/3255/1/chicken.pdf)
- 78 Jas, M., Engemann, D. A., Bekhti, Y., Raimondo, F., & Gramfort, A. (2017). Autoreject:  
79 Automated artifact rejection for MEG and EEG data. *NeuroImage*, 159, 417–429.
- 80 Luck, S. J., & Kappenman, E. S. (2017). *Electroencephalography and event-related brain*  
81 *potentials*.
- 82 Urigüen, J. A., & Garcia-Zapirain, B. (2015). EEG artifact removal—state-of-the-art and  
83 guidelines. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, 12(3), 031001.

DRAFT