Towards a Neural Co-Processor Which Restores Movement After Stroke: Modeling a Proof-of-Concept

Matthew J Bryan[1], Linxing Preston Jiang[1], Rajesh P N Rao[1]

[1] Neural Systems Laboratory, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Washington, Box 352350, Seattle, WA 98105, USA

E-mail: `matthew.bryan@dell.com`

September 2021

Abstract. *Objective* Brain co-processors[1] are devices which use artificial intelligence (AI) and closed-loop neurostimulation to shape neural activity and to bridge injured neural circuits for targeted repair and rehabilitation. The co-processor framework offers a flexible approach to learning stimulation policies that optimize for (a) specific regimes of neural activities, or (b) external task performance. For example, it may seek to learn a complex stimulation policy, to aid a stroke victim in reaching to grasp an object. Through the use of artificial neural networks (ANNs) and deep learning, the co-processor co-adapts with the neural circuit, allowing it to seek optimal stimulation policies, and adapt them as the neural circuit changes. The results presented here demonstrate a neural co-processor for the first time through the use of a simulation, and explore some of the core algorithms that may allow them to succeed. *Approach* We provide the first proof-of-concept of a neural co-processor, through the use of a simulated neural circuit, based on (ANNs). The simulated circuit performs a reach-to-grasp task, based on visual input which is designed to closely resemble a similar circuit in a primate brain [2]. We simulate a variety of lesions by altering the model, and then demonstrate a co-processor's ability to restore lost function through "stimulation" of that model. We further test the ability of a co-processor to adapt its stimulation as the simulated brain undergoes changes. *Main results* Our simulated co-processor successfully co-adapts with the neural circuit to accomplish the external reaching task. The co-processor framework demonstrated here adapts to a variety of lesion types, and to ongoing changes in the simulated brain. *Significance* The proof-of-concept here outlines a co-processor model, as well as our approach to training it, leading to insights on how such a model may be developed for *in vivo* use. We believe this co-processor design will allow for learning complex stimulation policies that help restore function to a stroke victim. This initial proof-of-concept lays the foundation for a future demonstration *in vivo*.

Keywords: brain-computer interface, neural co-processor, ai, machine learning, stimulation

1. Introduction

* Introduce the notion of a co-processor

* BCIs: a single direction * Increasingly sophisticated ML techniques applied to decoding ** See 2019Raj * Encoding models, stimulation models (cite)

* Bi-directional BCIs (BBCIs) ** Closed loop control

- [3] Inception Loops: driving brain states
- [4] "Closed loop" here refers to when to apply stimulation, always of the same type and at the same site, based on memory performance.
- [5] ACLS

Need for more complex stimulation policies, and need for optimizing task performance.

Demonstration by way of simulation.

Simulation:

- [6] Simulation of spiking neural network, learning stimulation regime

2. Method

* Overview of test bed ** Michaels model ** Lesion designs ** Stimulation design

* EN architecture * CPN architecture

3. Results

* Task performance improves drastically * Fine tuning takes a long time * Object classes separate * Can co-adapt with the brain, as it changes

* White noise and noised params ** Learning instability ** Predictive power isn't enough

4. Discussion

* Training efficiency * Spectrum from simple low dimensional stimulation vectors today to higher dimensional future * Toward in vivo application

5. Conclusion

asdf

6. Acknowledgements

Ganguly, Priya, Anca, Justin, Luciano

7. Ethical Statement

asdf

8. References

[1] RPN R 2019 *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* **55** 142–151
[2] Michaels J A, Schaffelhofer S, Agudelo-Toro A and Scherberger H 2020 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117** 32124–32135 ISSN 0027-8424 (*Preprint* `https://www.pnas.org/content/117/50/32124.full.pdf`) URL `https://www.pnas.org/content/117/50/32124`
[3] Walker E e a 2019 *Nature Neuroscience* **22**(12) 2060–2065 URL `https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-019-0517-x`
[4] Kahana M J e a 2021 *medRxiv* (*Preprint* `https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/05/22/2021.05.18.2125698` URL `https://www.medrxiv.org/content/early/2021/05/22/2021.05.18.21256980`
[5] Tafazoli S, MacDowell C J, Che Z, Letai K C, Steinhardt C R and Buschman T J 2020 *Journal of Neural Engineering* **17** 056007 URL `https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/abb860`
[6] Dura-Bernal S, Li K, Neymotin S, Francis J, Principe J and Lytton W 2016 *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **10** 28 ISSN 1662-453X URL `https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2016.00028`