Brain-Controlled Cursor using EEG: Foundations, Neurophysiology, and Engineering Challenges in Motor Imagery Systems

The Evolution and Formalization of Brain-Computer Interfaces

The conceptualization of the Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) represents one of the most significant shifts in the history of human-machine interaction, moving from the physical manipulation of transducers to the direct translation of neural intent into digital action. A BCI, often referred to in literature as a Brain-Machine Interface (BMI), is fundamentally a communication link that establishes an immediate pathway between the electrical activity of the brain and an external device, such as a computer cursor or a robotic limb.[1] This technology is distinct from traditional human-computer interaction (HCI) in its fundamental architecture, as it deliberately bypasses the standard intermediary of the peripheral nervous system and the muscular apparatus.[1]

Formal Definition and Taxonomic Boundaries

The formal definition of a BCI has been refined over several decades of research. Initially, in the 1970s, Jacques Vidal used the term broadly to describe any computer-based system capable of generating detailed information regarding brain function.[4] However, the modern academic consensus, solidified by Wolpaw and colleagues, defines a BCI as a system that records Central Nervous System (CNS) activity and translates it into an artificial output that serves to replace, restore, enhance, supplement, or improve natural CNS outputs.[4] This definition establishes the BCI not merely as a passive monitoring tool, but as an active, real-time control system that modifies the ongoing interactions between the CNS and its environment.[4]

To be classified as a true BCI under contemporary standards, a system must satisfy six essential components: the user (the brain), signal acquisition (sensors), signal preprocessing (artifact removal), feature extraction (identifying intent-related patterns), translation (the algorithm or classifier), and the application output (the controlled device).[4] A critical criterion for a BCI is the existence of a real-time feedback loop. A system that records neural data for offline analysis is a neuroimaging study; a BCI, conversely, provides the user with the results of the analysis in real-time, allowing for a closed-loop interaction where the user can adapt their brain signals based on the observed output.[5]

The Paradigm Shift: BCI vs. Traditional HCI

The architectural difference between BCI and traditional HCI is rooted in the "output channel." In traditional HCI, the brain's intent is executed through the somatic motor system. For instance, moving a cursor with a mouse requires the brain to send signals through the spinal cord to the peripheral nerves, which then trigger muscular contractions in the hand. The BCI paradigm explicitly skips this "peripheral nerve and muscle" stage.[2]

Interaction Feature	Traditional HCI	Brain-Computer Interface (BCI)
Output Path	Motor nerves and muscles	Direct neural signals (e.g., EEG)
Information Transducer	Physical device (keyboard, mouse)	Neural sensors (electrodes)
User Requirement	Intact motor control	Purely cognitive/mental intent
System Adaptation	Static hardware, user learns	Dual-adaptive (user and system learn)
Primary Limitation	Ergonomics and physical speed	Signal-to-noise ratio and brain state

In the BCI context, the system is viewed as a "new output" for the CNS, one that is neither neuromuscular nor hormonal.[4] This necessitates a unique interaction model described as a "dual-adaptive controller" system. In this model, both the user and the system must acquire a skill: the user must learn to produce specific brain signals that encode their intent, and the BCI must learn to measure these features and translate them accurately into commands.[3]

Inherent Challenges in BCI Engineering

Despite the intuitive appeal of "mind control" over devices, BCIs are notoriously difficult to implement due to the nature of the biological signals involved. The primary challenge is the non-stationarity and low Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) of brain signals.[7] Neural activity is constantly fluctuating due to internal factors such as fatigue, emotion, and distraction, which means the "signature" of a specific intent today may look different tomorrow.[7]

Furthermore, BCIs must contend with the "Inverse Problem"—the mathematical difficulty of locating the source of a signal inside a three-dimensional volume (the brain) based on two-dimensional measurements on the surface (the scalp).[11] The skull acts as a massive electrical resistor and a spatial low-pass filter, which blurs the signals from million of neurons into a single, faint voltage fluctuation at the electrode.[8] This blurriness leads to poor spatial resolution, making it difficult to distinguish between intentions that originate in physically adjacent areas of the brain.[13]

Biophysical and Technological Rationales for EEG in BCI

For a project focused on a brain-controlled cursor, the selection of the recording modality is the most consequential design decision. Electroencephalography (EEG) has emerged as the most prevalent technique in BCI research due to its balance of temporal fidelity and practical accessibility.[6]

Foundations of EEG Signal Generation

EEG records the summation of postsynaptic potentials from large populations of neurons, specifically the pyramidal cells in the cortex.[6] When a neuron receives a synaptic input, it creates a small electrical dipole. If thousands of these neurons are oriented in parallel and fire in synchrony, their combined dipoles create a measurable potential on the scalp.[8]

A useful analogy for computer scientists is the "Football Stadium" metaphor. If the brain is a stadium, an invasive electrode is a microphone placed on a single fan's seat, capturing their individual voice. EEG, by contrast, is a microphone placed outside the stadium walls.[8] It cannot hear what an individual is saying, but it can detect when the entire crowd cheers or groans in unison. In BCI terms, these "collective cheers" are the neural oscillations or rhythms—such as the mu and beta bands—that we use to track motor intent.[8]

Comparison with Other Neural Recording Techniques

The landscape of neural recording can be divided based on invasiveness and resolution. While invasive techniques like intracortical microelectrodes or Electrocorticography (ECoG) provide superior signal quality, they require surgery and carry risks of infection and tissue scarring.[5]

Modality	Invasiveness	Spatial Resolution	Temporal Resolution	Mechanism

EEG	Non-invasive	Low (~10 cm^2)	High (~1-10 ms)	Electrical (Scalp)
fMRI	Non-invasive	High (~1-3 mm)	Low (~1-5 s)	Hemodynamic (BOLD)
MEG	Non-invasive	Medium	High (~1-10 ms)	Magnetic Field
ECoG	Invasive	High (~1-2 mm)	High (~1-10 ms)	Electrical (Cortex)
Intracortical	Highly Invasive	Very High (Microns)	Very High (<1 ms)	Action Potentials

EEG is favored for cursor control because cursor movement requires immediate feedback. The high temporal resolution of EEG—capturing changes in milliseconds—allows for near-real-time cursor updates.[3] Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), while spatially precise, measures the Blood Oxygen Level Dependent (BOLD) signal, which reflects blood flow changes that lag several seconds behind neural activity.[15] This delay makes fMRI unsuitable for tasks requiring tight sensorimotor coordination, such as guiding a cursor to a target.[19]

Advantages and Limitations of the EEG Modality

The primary advantages of EEG are its relative low cost, portability, and safety.[6] Modern wireless EEG headsets allow for experiments outside of shielded rooms, which is essential for translating BCI into assistive technology for the home.[8] However, these benefits are countered by significant drawbacks. EEG signals are incredibly faint, typically between 10 and $100\mu V$, making them susceptible to "noise" from the environment (e.g., $60Hz$ power lines) and the body (e.g., muscle activity).[7]

Limitation Category	**Description**	**Engineering Consequence**
Spatial Resolution	Signal blurred by the skull and volume conduction	Difficulty distinguishing adjacent brain regions

Signal-to-Noise	Brain signals are 10-100x weaker than muscle artifacts	Requires robust artifact removal (ICA, Filtering)
Non-stationarity	Signal changes over time and across sessions	Requires frequent recalibration of classifiers
Setup Overhead	Needs conductive gel and precise electrode placement	Limits user acceptance and "plug-and-play" use

Neurophysiological Foundations of Motor Imagery and Cortical Modulation

The operational paradigm for most brain-controlled cursors is Motor Imagery (MI). This is a mental process where a user rehearsals a movement—such as opening and closing a hand—without actually performing the action.[21] This task is powerful for BCI because it activates the same cortical regions and networks used during actual motor execution.[21]

The Motor Homunculus and Contralateral Representation

The primary motor cortex is organized according to a topographical map known as the Motor Homunculus.[25] In this arrangement, specific areas of the cortex are dedicated to controlling specific body parts. Crucially, the size of the cortical representation is proportional to the complexity of the motor control, not the physical size of the limb. The hands have a massive cortical footprint compared to the legs, providing a larger "target" for EEG sensors.[25]

Additionally, the motor system exhibits contralateral organization: the right hemisphere of the brain controls the left side of the body, and vice versa.[25] When a user imagines moving their right hand, the activity increases in the left hemisphere's motor area. This lateralization is the biological foundation for the "left vs. right" BCI paradigm, as it allows for a simple spatial comparison between electrodes on the left (e.g., C3) and right (e.g., C4) sides of the scalp.[16]

Oscillatory Dynamics: Mu and Beta Rhythms

The BCI system detects motor imagery by monitoring changes in the power of specific frequency bands. The two most important are the mu rhythm ($8 - 13Hz$) and the beta rhythm ($13 - 30Hz$).[16]

- **Mu Rhythm ($8 - 13Hz$):** Also known as the "rolandic mu rhythm," it is most prominent over the sensorimotor cortex when the person is at rest.[16] It is distinct from the visual alpha rhythm found in the back of the head.
- **Beta Rhythm ($13 - 30Hz$):** These are higher frequency oscillations, some of which are harmonics of the mu rhythm. They are closely linked to motor planning and the "resetting" of the motor system after a movement.[17]

Mechanism of ERD and ERS

When a user performs motor imagery, the synchronized oscillations of the resting brain are disrupted. This phenomenon is known as Event-Related Desynchronization (ERD).[16]

1. **Resting State:** Large groups of neurons in the motor cortex fire in a slow, rhythmic, synchronized fashion (the mu rhythm), producing a high-amplitude EEG signal.[16]
2. **Imagery Task:** As the user imagines a movement, the neurons begin to work independently to process the "imaginary" motor command. This desynchronization leads to a decrease in the power of the mu/beta rhythms—this is ERD.[16]
3. **Post-Task:** Once the imagery stops, the neurons re-synchronize, often leading to a temporary increase in rhythm power above baseline, known as Event-Related Synchronization (ERS) or "beta rebound".[16]

Quantifying ERD involves measuring the percentage change in power relative to a baseline:

$$ERD\% = \frac{\text{Power}_{task} - \text{Power}_{baseline}}{\text{Power}_{baseline}} \times 100$$

A negative percentage represents a power drop (ERD), which the BCI algorithm translates as an "active" command.[16]

Rationale for Left vs. Right Hand Paradigms

Left and right hand imagery is the "gold standard" for 1D and 2D cursor control for several reasons. First, the spatial separability is maximized, as the signals originate in different brain hemispheres.[2] Second, the task is intuitive for the user; imagining a left-hand movement to move a cursor left is a natural mapping.[2] Finally, the hand representations in the homunculus are highly "responsive," meaning they produce robust ERD patterns that can be detected even through the resistive barrier of the skull.[26]

Strategic Motivations for Brain-Controlled Cursor Systems

The development of a brain-controlled cursor is more than a technical exercise; it is a critical benchmark in assistive technology and human-machine interaction.

Assistive Technology and Digital Inclusion

For individuals with severe physical impairments, such as "locked-in syndrome" resulting from ALS or high-level spinal cord injuries, the ability to control a cursor is synonymous with the ability to communicate.[4] In a 1D system, a user might move a cursor toward "Yes" or "No" targets. In a 2D system, the cursor can be used to select letters on a virtual keyboard or navigate the internet, effectively restoring digital agency.[5]

Research Benchmarking and Algorithmic Validation

The cursor control task provides a standardized environment for testing the efficiency of new signal processing techniques. Because the goal is clear (reach the target) and the output is continuous, it allows researchers to measure performance in terms of Information Transfer Rate (ITR), accuracy, and path efficiency.[29] It has served as the testbed for seminal papers by Wolpaw and McFarland, who demonstrated that users could learn to control the amplitudes of their mu and beta rhythms to navigate a screen with high precision.[20]

Human-Machine Interaction (HMI) Dynamics

Unlike a mouse, which is a passive tool, a BCI is an active partner. The BCI must adapt to the user's changing brain patterns, while the user must adapt to the BCI's interpretation of their thoughts.[5] This "co-adaptation" is a unique field of study in HMI. The brain-controlled cursor allows researchers to investigate how feedback—such as the visual movement of the cursor—helps the user "fine-tune" their neural activity to achieve better control.[3]

Persistent Barriers and Contemporary Research Relevance

Despite over 30 years of research, the problem of EEG-based cursor control remains "open" due to several fundamental limitations that prevent widespread clinical use.

The Information Bottleneck and Shannon Capacity

The performance of any communication system is governed by the Shannon-Hartley theorem, which establishes the maximum information rate (Capacity C) for a channel with bandwidth B and signal-to-noise ratio S/N:

$$C = B \log_2(1 + S/N)$$

In the context of EEG, the S/N is extremely low because the "signal" of interest is buried under layers of background brain activity and environmental noise.[32] This creates a "bottleneck" where the rate of information flow is far slower than traditional input devices.[32] Improving S/N through better filtering and sensor design is a major focus of current research.[9]

Inter-Subject and Intra-Subject Variability

A major hurdle is that BCI models do not generalize well. A classifier trained on one person rarely works for another because of physical and physiological differences.[7]

Variability Type	Physical/Physiological Cause	Effect on BCI Performance
Inter-Subject	Skull thickness ($5.97 \pm$), age, gender	Alters conductivity and signal projection [34]
Inter-Subject	Brain morphology and cortical folding	Changes the orientation of neural dipoles [11]
Intra-Subject	Fatigue, circadian rhythms, level of attention	Causes "drift" in the signal over a single session [10]
Intra-Subject	Learning and neuroplasticity	The brain changes as the user masters the BCI [13]

Research has shown a significant negative correlation between age and skull conductivity ($\rho = -0.5$), meaning that as users age, the EEG signal becomes more attenuated and harder to decode.[34] Furthermore, the brain-to-skull conductivity ratio (BSCR) can range from 8 to 80 among healthy adults, making universal head models highly inaccurate.[11]

The Phenomenon of BCI Inefficiency

The most daunting challenge is "BCI Inefficiency" (formerly "BCI Illiteracy"). Estimates suggest that 15% to 30% of users cannot control a BCI even after extensive training.[10] These users often exhibit low baseline sensorimotor rhythm (SMR) amplitudes, making their ERD responses too faint to be distinguished from background noise.[10]

This inefficiency has prompted a move toward "user-centered" design, where paradigms are adapted to the individual rather than forcing a "one-size-fits-all" approach.[3] New techniques, such as hybrid BCIs that combine MI with eye-tracking or overt spatial attention (OSA), are being explored to help "inefficient" users gain control.[37]

Future Directions in Adaptive and Hybrid Neural Interfaces

To overcome the limitations of standard MI-based systems, researchers are increasingly turning toward more complex and integrative approaches.

Imagined Body Kinematics (IBK) vs. Motor Imagery

A recent alternative to MI is Imagined Body Kinematics (IBK). While MI focuses on the "feeling" of movement to produce frequency-band power changes, IBK focuses on the continuous trajectory of the imagined movement.[20] IBK typically relies on low-frequency signals (typically $< 1Hz$) and can potentially reduce the training time required for cursor control, as it maps the imagined velocity directly to the cursor velocity.[20]

Deep Learning and Transfer Learning

The advent of Deep Learning (DL) has provided new tools for handling the complexity of EEG. Architectures such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks can learn spatial and temporal features automatically, potentially reducing the impact of inter-subject variability.[7] Furthermore, "transfer learning" allows a model trained on a large group of subjects to be "fine-tuned" for a new user with minimal data, addressing the calibration bottleneck.[7]

Hybrid Paradigms and Multi-Modal Inputs

Integrating MI with other paradigms is another promising avenue. For example, combining MI with Overt Spatial Attention (OSA) has been shown to improve 2D cursor control.[37] In this hybrid setup, MI might control the horizontal axis while OSA controls the vertical axis, or they might both contribute to the same movement to increase overall accuracy.[37] By diversifying the neural sources used for control, researchers can create more robust systems that work for a wider range of the population.

Conclusion

The pursuit of a brain-controlled cursor via EEG and Motor Imagery remains a cornerstone of modern neuroengineering. By bridging the gap between the internal world of neural dynamics and the external world of digital execution, these systems offer a unique window into the brain's capacity for adaptation and control. While challenges such as signal noise, inter-subject variability, and BCI inefficiency remain significant, the ongoing integration of advanced biophysical modeling and machine learning continues to push the boundaries of what is possible. For the user with severe motor impairments, the brain-controlled cursor is more than a research project—it is a pathway toward social inclusion and the restoration of autonomy in an increasingly digital age. The success of this introduction lies in its recognition that a BCI is not just a piece of software, but a living, breathing interaction between a human brain and an adaptive machine.

Works cited

1. Brain–computer interface - Wikipedia, accessed January 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brain%E2%80%93computer_interface
2. Brain-computer interface paradigms and neural coding - Frontiers, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2023.1345961/full
3. Motor Imagery–Based Brain–Computer Interfaces: Challenges, Methods, and Future Directions - IEEE Xplore, accessed January 23, 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/11059654/
4. Considerations and discussions on the clear definition and definite scope of brain-computer interfaces - PubMed Central, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11330831/
5. Brain-computer interfaces, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.neurotechcenter.org/sites/default/files/misc/Brain-computer%20interfaces.%20.pdf
6. Past, Present, and Future of EEG-Based BCI Applications - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9101004/
7. Motor Imagery–Based Brain–Computer Interfaces: Challenges, Methods, and Future Directions | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/393341043_Motor_Imagery-Based_Brain-Computer_Interfaces_Challenges_Methods_and_Future_Directions
8. Five Levels of Explanation (Part I): How Brain-Computer Interfaces Work | BCI Guide [2025] | Arctop Deep Dives, accessed January 23, 2026, https://arctop.com/deep-dives/how-bci-works-part-1
9. Decoding Silent Reading EEG Signals Using Adaptive Feature Graph Convolutional Network | IEEE Signal Processing Society, accessed January 23, 2026, https://signalprocessingsociety.org/publications-resources/ieee-signal-processing-letters/2024/01/decoding-silent-reading-eeg-signals
10. Functional Connectivity Analysis in Motor-Imagery Brain Computer ..., accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8555469/
11. Simultaneous head tissue conductivity and EEG source location estimation -

PMC, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4651780/
12. Patient specific conductivity models: characterization of the skull bones. - ResearchGate, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321835656_Patient_specific_conductivity_models_characterization_of_the_skull_bones
13. EEGSym: Overcoming Inter-subject Variability in Motor Imagery Based BCIs with Deep Learning - SciSpace, accessed January 23, 2026, https://scispace.com/pdf/eegsym-overcoming-inter-subject-variability-in-motor-imagery-t149tq8w.pdf
14. Using Brain Computer Interfaces & EEG Signals to Classify Emotions, accessed January 23, 2026, https://towardsdatascience.com/using-brain-computer-interfaces-eeg-signals-to-classify-emotions-ca3e81096a5b/
15. Quantitative Analyses Help in Choosing Between Simultaneous vs. Separate EEG and fMRI, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2018.01009/full
16. Mu rhythm (de)synchronization and EEG single-trial classification of different motor imagery tasks, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pub.ista.ac.at/~schloegl/publications/pfurtscheller2006.pdf
17. Classification of Motor Imagery BCI Using Multivariate Empirical Mode Decomposition - IEEE Xplore, accessed January 23, 2026, https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/iel5/7333/4359219/06362235.pdf
18. Measurement of the Mapping between Intracranial EEG and fMRI Recordings in the Human Brain - MDPI, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/2306-5354/11/3/224
19. A multivariate comparison of electroencephalogram and functional magnetic resonance imaging to electrocorticogram using visual object representations in humans - Frontiers, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2022.983602/full
20. A Usability Study of Low-cost Wireless Brain-Computer Interface for Cursor Control Using Online Linear Model - NIH, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7990128/
21. Effects of Motor Imagery Tasks on Brain Functional Networks Based ..., accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8870302/
22. Mu and Beta Rhythm Topographies During Motor Imagery and Actual Movements | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/12525054_Mu_and_Beta_Rhythm_Topographies_During_Motor_Imagery_and_Actual_Movements
23. Motor Imagery vs Motor Execution and Right Hand vs Left Hand with OpenBCI 32bit board, accessed January 23, 2026, https://openbci.com/community/motor-imagery-vs-motor-execution-and-right-hand-vs-left-hand-with-openbci-32bit-board/

24. Classification of Right/Left Hand Motor Imagery by Effective Connectivity Based on Transfer Entropy in Electroencephalogram Signal - PubMed Central, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10719976/
25. Homunculus Sensory and Motor Cortex - EBM Consult, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.ebmconsult.com/articles/homunculus-sensory-motor-cortex
26. The Sensory Homunculus - Brain Maps - BrainFacts, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.brainfacts.org/~/media/brainfacts/article%20multimedia/educator%20section/olson%20handout.ashx
27. A Motor Imagery Signals Classification Method via the Difference of EEG Signals Between Left and Right Hemispheric Electrodes - Frontiers, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2022.865594/full
28. Motor Imagery Classification Using Mu and Beta Rhythms of EEG with Strong Uncorrelating Transform Based Complex Common Spatial Patterns - PubMed Central, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5066028/
29. An EEG-based brain-computer interface for cursor control. - Semantic Scholar, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/An-EEG-based-brain-computer-interface-for-cursor-Wolpaw-McFarland/0ffa8f925c3f1ddee1da4380524759c9fd40dd6b
30. A Noninvasive BCI System for 2D Cursor Control Using a ... - Frontiers, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computational-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fncom.2022.799019/full
31. Brain-computer interfaces for 1-D and 2-D cursor control: designs using volitional control of the EEG spectrum or steady-state visual evoked potentials - ResearchGate, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/203918374_Brain-computer_interfaces_for_1-D_and_2-D_cursor_control_designs_using_volitional_control_of_the_EEG_spectrum_or_steady-state_visual_evoked_potentials
32. Shannon–Hartley theorem - Wikipedia, accessed January 23, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shannon%E2%80%93Hartley_theorem
33. Shannon Capacity - GeeksforGeeks, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/electronics-engineering/shannon-capacity/
34. Inter-Subject Variability of Skull Conductivity and Thickness in Calibrated Realistic Head Models - PubMed, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32919058/
35. Discrepancy between inter- and intra-subject variability in EEG-based motor imagery brain-computer interface: Evidence from multiple perspectives - Frontiers, accessed January 23, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2023.1122661/full
36. A novel method to reduce the motor imagery BCI illiteracy | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed January 23, 2026,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355568500_A_novel_method_to_reduce_the_motor_imagery_BCI_illiteracy
37. Integrating simultaneous motor imagery and spatial attention for EEG-BCI control - PMC, accessed January 23, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10803074/