

1 The Impact of Distractions on Intracortical Brain-Computer Interface Control of a Robotic Arm

2 Michael D. Guthrie, MD^{1,2}, Angelica J. Herrera, BS^{1,3,4}, John E. Downey, PhD^{1,3,5}, Lucas J. Brane, MD^{1,2},
3 Michael L. Boninger, MD PhD^{1,2,3,6}, Jennifer L. Collinger, PhD^{1,2,3,4,6}

4 ¹Rehab Neural Engineering Labs, ²Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, ³Department of
5 Bioengineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, ⁴Center for the Neural Basis of Cognition,
6 Pittsburgh, PA, USA, ⁵ Department of Organismal Biology and Anatomy, University of Chicago, Chicago,
7 IL, USA, ⁶ Human Engineering Research Laboratories, VA Center of Excellence, Department of Veterans
8 Affairs, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.

9 Corresponding author: Jennifer L. Collinger, collinger@pitt.edu, 1-412-383-1274

10 University of Pittsburgh, 3520 5th Avenue, Suite 300, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213

11 Clinical trial registration numbers: NCT01364480 and NCT01894802

12 *Abstract*

13 This was an investigational device observational trial with the objective to evaluate the impact of
14 distractions on intracortical brain-computer interface (BCI) performance. Two individuals with
15 tetraplegia had microelectrode arrays implanted into their motor cortex for trials of intracortical BCI
16 safety and performance. The primary task was moving a robotic arm between two targets as quickly as
17 possible, performed alone and with various secondary distraction conditions. Primary outcomes
18 included targets acquired, path efficiency, and subjective difficulty. There was no difference in the
19 number of targets acquired for either subject with or without distractions. Median path efficiency was
20 similar across all conditions (range: 0.766-0.846) except the motor distraction for Subject P2, where the
21 median path efficiency dropped to 0.675 ($p = 0.033$, Mann-Whitney U test). Both subjects rated the
22 overall difficulty of the task with and without distractions as low. Overall, intracortical BCI performance
23 was robust to various distractions.

24 *Key Words*

25 Brain-computer interfaces, Brain-machine interface, Tetraplegia, Motor Cortex, Spinal Cord Injuries

26

27 Abbreviations: Brain-computer interface (BCI), electroencephalography (EEG), root-mean-square voltage

28 (RMS), optimal linear estimation (OLE), virtual reality (VR), interquartile range (IQR)

29

30

31 *Introduction*

32 Many medical conditions, including spinal cord injuries, can lead to a devastating loss of upper limb
33 function resulting in significant disability. Restoring hand and arm function is a priority for people with
34 tetraplegia due to cervical spinal cord injury^{1, 2}. Rehabilitation aims to restore movement capabilities and
35 functional abilities; however, motor deficits often persist³. When recovery has plateaued, assistive
36 technologies can be used to augment or replace function. Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) are one type
37 of assistive device that use intact brain activity to control an end effector such as a robotic arm or
38 computer cursor^{4, 5}. Intracortical BCIs use microelectrode arrays to record activity from 10s-100s of
39 neurons, commonly from the motor cortex where the firing rate patterns of these neurons provides
40 detailed information about movement intention^{6, 7}. People with tetraplegia have been able to use
41 intracortical BCIs to interact with a computer^{8, 9}, to control robotic devices that replace reaching and
42 grasping function^{10, 11}, and to restore grasping function of their own hand using functional electrical
43 stimulation^{12, 13}. Surveys of populations of potential BCI users, including those with spinal cord injuries,
44 suggest that ease of use and reliable device performance are important design features^{2, 14, 15}. Therefore,
45 an ideal BCI would be simple to use and capable of restoring functional abilities in a consistent and
46 reliable manner. To date, the majority of intracortical BCI research has occurred in a controlled,
47 laboratory setting. However, an important step towards clinical translation is to demonstrate robust
48 performance in real world environments where distractions may be present.

49 Everyday use of a BCI would require the system to output reliable, continuous control in the face of
50 external stimuli such as environmental disturbances or fluctuations in mental states. Previous studies on
51 attention and distraction in BCIs have focused primarily on electroencephalography (EEG)-based
52 interfaces that record neural activity through electrodes placed on the scalp. EEG BCIs typically rely on
53 motor imagery (e.g. imagining moving your right hand to move a cursor to the right) or sensory evoked

54 potentials to operate the interface^{4, 16}. Research on attention in EEG-based BCI performance suggests
55 that in able-bodied individuals, there is an optimal level of attention and cognitive activity that results in
56 more accurate BCI performance^{17, 18}. Additional experiments have sought to characterize the influence
57 of specific types of distractions, such as simple visual and auditory distractions on performance and have
58 found that these types of distractions do not significantly impair EEG-based BCI systems¹⁹⁻²¹. However,
59 various studies have demonstrated that distractions with increasing cognitive demand led to detectable
60 impairments in performance of EEG-based BCIs^{22, 23}. A proposed mechanism of these performance
61 impairments is that attentional shifts during distraction attenuate the activity recorded from motor
62 cortex that is used to control the BCI²⁴. Ideally, BCI users will be able to successfully use a system while
63 engaged in other activities. Evidence of impaired performance in EEG-based BCI in the presence of
64 distractions poses a significant barrier to the practical application of BCIs as an assistive technology.

65 Another barrier to the successful translation of BCI use into real-world environments is that some
66 individuals may require significant training and learning to achieve optimal performance²⁵. Others may
67 not be able to learn how to operate a BCI at all, which is termed BCI illiteracy²⁶. However, in many cases
68 intracortical BCIs have enabled high performance control with minimal training or learning²⁷⁻²⁹. Despite
69 the potential for practical and functional use of intracortical BCIs, the impact of distractions on
70 intracortical BCI performance has not been studied directly and it is unclear if intracortical BCI would be
71 more robust to cognitive distractions than EEG-based systems. One recent study demonstrated that
72 intracortical BCI control of a computer cursor was not impaired when the user was simultaneously
73 speaking³⁰. This is particularly significant because neural activity in the hand knob area of motor cortex
74 recorded with the BCI was modulated during stand-alone speech; however, during BCI control, the
75 patterns of neural activity associated with speech did not overlap with those used for BCI control. To
76 inform the design and functional use of intracortical BCI systems it will be important to further
77 characterize precisely which types of distraction may disrupt the typical performance of the system. For

78 example, given that single neurons in motor cortex can be modulated by many types of movements³¹, it
79 is possible that the performance of simultaneous movement-based tasks may interfere with BCI control.
80 The aim of the current study is to characterize the impact of multiple types of distractions on
81 intracortical BCI performance during robotic arm control. We hypothesize that BCI performance will be
82 robust to simple auditory distractions, tasks designed to increase cognitive load, and speech-related
83 activities, while simultaneous movement-based tasks will lead to reduced performance.

84 *Materials and Methods*

85 Participants

86 Two participants completed this study as a part of a clinical trial conducted under Investigational Device
87 Exemptions granted by the United States Food and Drug Administration and registered at
88 clinicaltrials.gov (NCT01364480 and NCT01894802). Informed consent was obtained from both
89 participants prior to the completion of any study-related procedures. All procedures followed protocol
90 and accord with the ethical standards the Space and Naval Warfare System Center Pacific. Ethical
91 approval was granted by the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board.

92 Subject P1 was woman in her 50's with spinocerebellar degeneration resulting in motor complete
93 tetraplegia at the C4 level with some preserved sensation³². Two 96-channel intracortical microelectrode
94 arrays^a were implanted in the hand and arm region of her left motor (M1) cortex. Data were collected
95 over 5 study sessions, occurring between 595- and 609-days post-implant. Subject P2 was a male in his
96 20's with tetraplegia due to a C5 AIS B spinal cord injury³³. Subject P2 had two 88-channel intracortical
97 microelectrode arrays^a implanted in the hand and arm region of his left motor (M1) cortex. He
98 participated in 4 study sessions, occurring between 606- and 626-days post-implant. Subject P2 also had
99 arrays implanted into somatosensory cortex for experiments regarding restoring sensation³⁴ though

100 those were not used for the experiments presented here. Both participants completed a variety of BCI
101 tasks, including robotic arm control, prior to these experiments and had demonstrated skilled reach and
102 grasp control using the BCI without distractions³⁵. Study visits were typically completed 3 days per week
103 for 3-4 hours per day for the duration of the implant.

104 Neural recording and BCI decoder calibration


105 Neural data was collected using the Neuroport Neural Signal Processor^a. A threshold for all recorded
106 channels was set at -5.25 times root-mean-square voltage (RMS) for Subject P1 and -4.5 times RMS for
107 Subject P2 at the beginning of each test session. Spike counts, identified by threshold crossings, were
108 binned for each channel every 30ms (33 Hz update rate) for Subject P1 and every 20ms (50 Hz update
109 rate) for Subject P2. Binned spike counts were low-pass filtered using an exponential smoothing function
110 with a 450ms and 440ms window for Subjects P1 and P2, respectively, and were square-root
111 transformed.

112 Both subjects utilized a modular prosthetic limb^b throughout the experimental sessions. To provide the
113 participants with BCI control of the robotic arm, a decoder was trained to transform neural firing rates
114 into three-dimensional endpoint translation velocity commands. As presented in our previous studies,
115 an indirect optimal linear estimation (OLE) decoder was trained in virtual reality (VR) using a two-step
116 calibration method⁷. In the first step, the participants were instructed to attempt to move a VR robotic
117 arm to a specified target location while the computer controlled the kinematics of the VR arm. After 36-
118 60 trials, an OLE decoder was created to predict three-dimensional endpoint velocity (v_x , v_y , v_z) of the
119 robotic hand from the recorded neural firing rates^{36, 37}. Using this decoder, the participants then
120 performed the same VR task with assisted BCI control, where the computer attenuated command
121 signals orthogonal to the target direction³⁸. After another 36-60 trials, a new decoder was trained using

122 the neural and kinematic data collected during assisted BCI use. This decoder was used to enable BCI
123 control of the robotic arm for the remainder of the testing session.

124 BCI performance during distractions

125 At the beginning of each trial, the robotic arm was placed in the center of the workspace between two
126 foam targets that were 0.4m apart (Figure 1). The participants were instructed to use the BCI to move
127 the robotic arm as quickly as possible to alternate between the two targets. The primary task was to
128 acquire as many targets as possible in 60 seconds. A target was deemed to be acquired when the robotic
129 hand made contact with the intended physical target on the appropriate end of the workspace. If
130 contact was made with the same target twice in a row, it was considered only a single target acquisition.



131
132 Figure 1 Experimental setup. The robotic arm was placed in between two foam targets (blue). The participants
133 were seated to the left of the robotic prosthesis while using the BCI to control the endpoint velocity of the hand.
134

135 During an experimental session, two 60-second trials were collected for each condition. The six task
136 conditions were: No Distraction (Video 1 -
137 <https://drive.google.com/file/d/19n4lombhCrq7rklhU8mrijcco-IN7xCD/view?usp=sharing>), Background
138 Noise (Video 2 -
139 <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RXJkaIXGWL1vkXqdk1nHHyaVRbBFqt8V/view?usp=sharing>), Counting
140 Tones (Video 3 -
141 <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zJrz55KsNupGQBTMWmBrCf5j29FTNlju/view?usp=sharing>), Counting
142 Back by Three's (Video 4 -
143 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FjzH1A92dp1F9Pa1h_pOaDxbEGwBkY2H/view?usp=sharing), Casual
144 Conversation (Video 5 -
145 <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1x4LxXBsYLmJRMes8KkNhw2zeLXTxOoei/view?usp=sharing>), and a
146 Motor task (Video 6 - [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BCMDuhalmNr2vLe-](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BCMDuhalmNr2vLe-D9Q0iMt9duVaTsyR/view?usp=sharing)
147 [D9Q0iMt9duVaTsyR/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BCMDuhalmNr2vLe-D9Q0iMt9duVaTsyR/view?usp=sharing)). The No Distraction condition was used as a basis of
148 comparison for the distraction conditions. Further details of each distraction condition are provided in
149 Table 1. Trial order was randomized for each session. The background noise condition was designed to
150 mimic the auditory conditions of a noisy environment outside of the laboratory, specifically a restaurant.
151 Prior research in psychology and BCI performance has made use of distractions with high cognitive load,
152 or internal thought processes that require the use of working memory^{39, 40}. We included a tone counting
153 task, which is a variant of an auditory n-back test^{41, 42}, as well as a counting back task⁴³ to assess how
154 cognitive distraction may impact BCI performance. Casual conversation included the cognitive effort of
155 listening to and responding to conversational questions as well as the motor task of speaking. Finally,
156 each subject performed an overt movement task that was compatible with their specific injury level and
157 was distinct from the BCI task. Subject P2 was limited to a single trial for each condition during one
158 testing day due to time constraints. Subject P2 also attempted to manipulate a wheelchair joystick with

159 his hand as a motor distraction task, however had significant shoulder pain related to the movement. It
 160 is unclear if the movement itself or the associated pain caused large changes in neural firing rates, but
 161 this prevented him from completing the primary task and this data was not included in the analysis.
 162 Instead, we selected a movement with a smaller range of motion that he would commonly do, swiping
 163 across a tablet with his right hand. This was introduced in later sessions, so he completed fewer overall
 164 trials of the motor task.

165 Table 1 Distraction conditions. Explanation of the various conditions including auditory, cognitive, and motor
 166 distractions.

Condition	Description	
No Distraction	The primary task was completed without any secondary distractions.	
Background Noise	Subjects listened to an audio track with background restaurant noise at a constant volume.	
Counting Tones	Beeps with low, middle, and high-frequency tones were presented randomly and at variable time intervals to the subjects. The subjects were instructed to add the number of high beeps, subtract the number of low beeps, and count the value out loud throughout the trial.	
Counting Back by Three's	The researcher generated a random three-digit number and the subjects were instructed to count backward by three's out loud starting from the generated number.	
Casual Conversation	The subjects were asked questions (which were never repeated) in order to mimic normal conversation. Example questions included: <i>How was your weekend?</i> <i>Did you watch any movies yesterday?</i>	
Motor Task	Subject P1, Wheelchair operation: The subject's power wheelchair was turned off during the trials. The subject received an auditory cue every 10 seconds to change the direction of force she was applying to the chin joystick. She applied force throughout the entire trial. The direction moved clockwise from a random starting direction (up, down, left, or right).	Subject P2, Tablet swiping: The subject was instructed to replicate the motion of swiping a tablet with his right hand in response to a tone every 10 seconds throughout the duration of the trial.


167

168 Performance measures included the total number of targets acquired per 60-second trial during back-
169 and-forth movements of the robotic arm, the three-dimensional path efficiency of the robotic arm
170 between targets, and the user-reported subjective difficulty of each trial (on a 10-point scale where 1 =
171 very easy and 10 = very difficult). Path efficiency was calculated as the ratio of the ideal path length to
172 actual path length so that a direct movement towards a target would have a path efficiency of 1.0. The
173 actual path length was calculated as the three-dimensional distance traveled between each successful
174 acquisition of the right and left targets (defined as the point of direction change between reaches) based
175 on the robotic arm endpoint position feedback. Since successful target acquisition was achieved by
176 touching any location on the physical target (Figure 1), we calculated the ideal path length for each trial
177 by finding the average location each target was acquired by the robotic hand and determining the
178 distance between these two points. The kinematic data from four trials (3 for Subject P1, including
179 Background Noise, Counting Back by Three's, and Casual Conversation trials and 1 for Subject P2, No
180 Distraction trial) was not recorded properly. This occurred in rare cases where one of the robotic fingers
181 became displaced preventing position feedback from being saved, although the commanded velocities
182 of the arm and online control were not impacted. These trials were omitted from the kinematic analysis
183 but included for the number of targets acquired and subjective difficulty ratings. The performance
184 metrics were tested for normality using the Lillefors test⁴⁴ and we determined that non-parametric tests
185 would be appropriate for all outcome measures. Statistical analyses were completed separately for each
186 subject. We evaluated whether performance during each of the independent distraction conditions was
187 significantly different than the No Distraction condition using the Mann-Whitney U test. A significance
188 level of 0.05 was used, and we did not include an adjustment for multiple comparisons, as Type 1 errors
189 were acceptable given that we were looking for any small impairments in BCI performance.

190

191 *Results*


192 Both participants were able to use the BCI to control the robotic arm to complete the primary target
193 acquisition task, which involved active control of the trajectory of the arm with frequent direction
194 changes. Subject P1 acquired a median of 20 targets (interquartile range (IQR): 16.5 – 21) per 60 second
195 trial across all conditions and Subject P2 acquired a median of 23 targets (IQR: 18 – 26) across all
196 conditions. There were no significant differences in the number of targets acquired during the
197 distraction conditions as compared to the No Distraction condition for either subject (Mann-Whitney U
198 tests, Figure 2).



199 Figure 2 Targets Acquired for each Distraction Condition. The number of targets acquired for each 60-second trial
200 is displayed for Subject P1 (left, red dots) and Subject P2 (right, blue dots) for each condition. Boxes represent the
201 25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile. Dashed lines extend to values that are outside the interquartile range
202 and are not outliers. Neither subject demonstrated a significant difference in the number of targets acquired
203 during any of the distractions as compared to the No Distraction condition.
204

205
206 In addition to acquiring the targets in a timely manner, a BCI should enable precise control of the robotic
207 arm position during the movements, which would be reflected as a high path efficiency (i.e., closer to
208 1.0). Both subjects had similar median path efficiencies and ranges across all trials, 0.814 (IQR: 0.772 –


209 0.847) for Subject P1 and 0.819 (IQR: 0.762– 0.856) for Subject P2 (Figure 3). The only significant drop in
210 performance was in the motor distraction condition for Subject P2 ($p = 0.033$, Mann Whitney U test).



212 Figure 3 Path Efficiency for each Distraction Condition. Path efficiencies, calculated as the average of all lateral
213 movements in a single trial, are displayed for each trial condition for Subject P1 (left, red dots) and Subject P2
214 (right, blue dots). Boxes outline the 25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile. Dashed vertical lines extend to
215 values that are outside the interquartile range and are not outliers. The dashed horizontal line indicates the lowest
216 path efficiency for the No Distraction condition for each Subject. *Indicates statistically significant difference
217 between the distraction condition and No Distraction for Subject P2 (Mann-Whitney U test)

218

219 There were 8 distraction trials for Subject P1 and 7 distraction trials for Subject P2 where the path
220 efficiency dropped below that of the lowest No Distraction trial. This was chosen as a threshold for an
221 impaired trial because it reflected the lower limit of performance for the BCI system without distraction.
222 The lowest path efficiency for both Subject P1 and Subject P2 in the No Distraction condition was
223 approximately 0.745. Notably, 7 out of 8 impaired trials occurred on the same testing day for Subject P1.
224 Three out of the 4 impaired trials for Subject P2 were motor distraction trials, and these were spread
225 across multiple testing sessions. Representative kinematic tracings of the path of the robotic arm for
226 Subject P1 are displayed in Figure 4 for three different trial cases: a typical No Distraction trial, a typical
227 Counting Back by Three's trial, and an impaired Counting Back by Three's trial.




228

229 Figure 4 Kinematic Trajectories. The kinematic tracings of the path of the robotic arm in the vertical and horizontal
230 plane are demonstrated for Subject P1 completing a trial with No Distraction (A, path efficiency = 0.868), Counting
231 Back by Three's with good path efficiency (B, path efficiency = 0.851), and Counting Back by Three's with poor path
232 efficiency (C, path efficiency = 0.581). The blue rectangles indicate the average position of the acquired target on
233 either side.

234

235 Subjective difficulty ratings were collected to characterize the user perspective on how challenging it
236 was to operate the BCI system across the various conditions (Figure 5). Subject P1 reported a median
237 subjective difficulty of 3 (IQR: 3 - 4) for the No Distraction condition and 3 (IQR: 3 - 5) across all

238 distraction tasks. Subject P2 rated the No Distraction condition as 1 in difficulty for all trials, compared
239 to a median rating of 2 across all distraction conditions (IQR: 1- 3). Subject P2 did report a significantly
240 higher median difficulty rating for the Counting Tones ($p = 0.009$), Counting Back by Three's ($p < 0.001$),
241 Casual Conversation ($p = 0.008$), and Motor distraction ($p = 0.002$) tasks when compared to the No
242 Distraction condition (Mann-Whitney U test). Overall, both subjects considered the task difficulty to be
243 very low.



244 Figure 5 Subjective Difficulty Ratings for each Distraction Condition. The difficulty ratings on a 10-point scale (1 =
245 very easy, 10 = very difficult) for Subject P1 (left, red dots) and Subject P2 (right, blue dots) are displayed for each
246 trial. Boxes represent the 25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile. Dashed lines extend to values that are
247 outside the interquartile range and are not outliers. *Indicates statistically significant difference between the
248 distraction condition and No Distraction for Subject P2 ($p < 0.05$, Mann-Whitney U test)
249

250

251 Discussion

252 Overall performance

253 The purpose of the study was to determine the influence of various types of distraction on intracortical
254 BCI performance. Both subjects demonstrated the ability to complete a primary BCI-controlled task in
255 the presence of distractions. Consistent with our hypothesis, distractions overall did not significantly

256 impair intracortical BCI performance in two subjects as determined by the number of targets acquired.
257 Similarly, median path efficiency was unaffected with one exception; it was reduced during the Motor
258 task in Subject P2. Median difficulty ratings were low for both subjects for all distraction conditions,
259 although for Subject P2 this was at times significantly higher than for BCI control without distraction.

260 Distractions with Increasing Cognitive Load

261 As expected, listening to background noise did not impair performance or subjectively increase the level
262 of difficulty for either subject. This is consistent with findings from a previous EEG-based BCI study
263 where there was no change in performance observed when subjects simply listened to a recording of
264 counting numbers²¹. While listening to background noise alone is a passive activity, a BCI user may
265 desire to maintain control of the system while actively attending to other cognitive tasks. As portable
266 intracortical BCI systems are emerging as a potential assistive technology⁴⁵, it will be important for
267 individuals to be able to use their BCI in environments outside of a controlled laboratory setting. To
268 evaluate the impact of distractions that would require cognitive effort we used two tasks, Tone Counting
269 and Counting Back by Three's, that have previously been shown to impair performance in a virtual hand
270 grasping task⁴¹ and standing balance in older adults⁴³. There was no impairment in performance
271 measures for either subject in these two tasks, and the increase in subjective difficulty reported by
272 Subject P2 for the cognitive tasks was modest and likely does not reflect a clinically significant barrier to
273 the use of the system. This is opposed to previous work in EEG-based BCI, which demonstrated impaired
274 performance in the presence of distractions with high cognitive load²². In some of the EEG-based
275 studies, there were identifiable changes in the neural activity recorded during distraction conditions
276 which impacted the resulting performance of the BCI^{23, 24}. The obvious difference between the different
277 types of BCIs is that intracortical interfaces decode neural signals from very small populations of
278 neurons in contrast to EEG-based interfaces that record signals from the scalp surface, leading to lower
279 spatial resolution and generally noisier signals. A simple explanation for the robustness of intracortical

280 BCIs is that the motor neurons being recorded by the implanted array are less affected by cognitive
281 distraction conditions, which require attention from distinct cortical areas such as the prefrontal
282 cortex⁴⁶. The current findings suggest that intracortical BCIs will function predictably during the intended
283 task even in the presence of distractions requiring cognitive effort.

284 Casual Conversation

285 Speech involves both cognitive processes as well as the execution of specific motor movements that
286 may impair motor cortical activity used for BCI control. Indeed, a previous EEG-BCI study demonstrated
287 that simultaneous speech during control of a virtual prosthetic arm impaired performance²². Single unit
288 studies have demonstrated broad activity patterns related to movements of all four limbs and the face
289 in the hand knob area of motor cortex³¹. In addition, prior intracortical neural research demonstrated
290 that specific primary motor neurons were active when participants simply read a verb or imagined doing
291 an action⁴⁷. Despite concerns that speech may invoke cognitive or motor activity that would disrupt
292 consistent control of a BCI, our results indicate that intracortical BCI control is not impaired by speech-
293 related activities as both subjects were able to perform the primary task while holding a casual
294 conversation with good performance and ease of use. A previous intracortical BCI study demonstrated
295 that speech modulated neural activity in areas thought to be specific to the hand/arm area of motor
296 cortex. However, despite the speech-related neural activity, the authors found that these signals did not
297 impair BCI performance during cursor control while the participant was speaking. Neural data
298 demonstrated that speech-related activity in the motor cortex region of interest was attenuated during
299 BCI control enabling robust decoding of movement-related activity³⁰. This explanation is also consistent
300 with our findings.

301

302 Motor-related Distractions

303 Finally, we wanted to test whether intracortical BCI performance would be maintained while performing
304 a simultaneous movement-based task. As Subject P1 had 0/5 muscle strength in all four extremities³²,
305 but regularly operated her wheelchair via chin movements to control a joystick, we chose this
306 movement to be her motor distraction. Subject P2 had trace 1/5 strength movements of right wrist
307 extension which he would commonly use for swiping a tablet, thus this was used as a motor distraction
308 for him. Similar to the speech condition, it would be expected that the neural activity generated to
309 enable chin movement would be independent from that used for BCI control of a robotic arm and hand.
310 Indeed, Subject P1 was not significantly impaired during her motor distraction. In contrast, hand
311 movements generated by Subject P2 during tablet swiping did indeed impair performance as most path
312 efficiencies during the motor task trial were lower than the efficiencies observed in the No Distraction
313 trial. Observation of his motor trials does indeed reveal that fluctuations in the trajectory of the robotic
314 prosthetic arm occurred immediately after he swiped his right hand (Video 7 -
315 https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-KQhcEPlmux_A-fYErKzb3Z7IFsABF1/view?usp=sharing). This implies
316 that the neural activity used for BCI control was disrupted when he executed movement of his
317 contralateral hand. This is consistent with results from non-human primate work that showed that BCI
318 control was more impaired when the primate was required to decouple neural activity used for BCI
319 control from that used to generate wrist movement of the contralateral limb⁴⁸. These findings and
320 results from our motor distraction trials suggest that while some motor movements may not influence
321 intracortical BCI performance, certain specific movements may indeed disrupt the system in a
322 predictable way. This extends our understanding of the limitations of motor cortical activity used for
323 intracortical BCIs and informs the design of functional devices.

324

325 Reliability and Clinical Relevance

326 It is intuitively expected that distractions will impair task performance. For example, use of a cell phone
327 while driving is clearly linked to an increased risk of automobile accidents⁴⁹. A survey of individuals with
328 spinal cord injuries found that a majority of respondents preferred BCIs that would consistently perform
329 with at least 80% accuracy¹⁵. To identify small changes in performance of the BCI system related to
330 distraction, we used a relatively strict threshold for inaccuracy defined as any path efficiency lower than
331 observed during the No Distraction condition. Subject P1 completed 42/50 distraction trials (84%) and
332 Subject P2 completed 26/33 distraction trials (78.8%) with a path efficiency at least as high as the lowest
333 No Distraction trial. It should be noted the trials with lower path efficiency were not impaired in terms
334 of the total number of targets acquired. Also, despite occasionally higher difficulty ratings, neither
335 subject consistently rated the task as difficult to complete with any of the distractions. Nonetheless, the
336 inefficient trials should be addressed as they may put the technology at risk for abandonment⁵⁰ and
337 raise concern regarding the use of a BCI-controlled prosthetic for tasks that require significant reliability,
338 such as picking up a glass of water. Interestingly, all but one of the impaired trials for Subject P1
339 occurred during the same session (the first day of testing), which generally had a lower number of
340 targets acquired and higher difficulty ratings than the other days. The lack of any obvious technical or
341 internal factors unique to this session may suggest a rapid learning effect for this subject. Our study
342 helps to identify which specific types of distractions are the most challenging, and perhaps which
343 distractions would be amenable to early detection and augmentation of the system for safe operation,
344 similar to existing automatic safety mechanisms in the automobile industry to avoid collisions^{51, 52}.

345 Future directions of intracortical BCI research should aim to characterize the neural activity that occurs
346 during distraction to develop methods that are robust to these changes, thus improving overall safety
347 and reliability. While our results support that the intracortical BCI system was easy to use and
348 performed well even in the presence of distractions, we also identified a need to detect occasional
349 impairments in performance that may occur.

350 Study Limitations

351 A limitation of our study is that we only conducted the experiments with two subjects due to the
352 inherent nature of the research and interventions involving an implanted BCI. These participants were
353 experienced with using a BCI, so our findings do not generalize to novice BCI users who may be more
354 susceptible to distractions. Additionally, the primary task of repetitively moving a prosthetic arm back
355 and forth between targets is relatively simple. BCI tasks that require more cognitive effort or working
356 memory may also be more susceptible to distractions^{39, 40}. Furthermore, we did not use an objective
357 measure of cognitive load or distraction, but rather subjective difficulty ratings to gauge the user's
358 perspective. User reported limitations and functionality should be assessed more completely in future
359 trials. This may include testing primary functional tasks with the BCI system that the user personally
360 hopes to perform as well as specific conditions he or she may face in their daily use of a BCI.

361 Conclusions

362 Two subjects with intracortical electrodes were able to successfully control a robotic prosthetic arm to
363 complete a motor task with consistent performance in the presence of various distractions. This
364 supports the practical use of an intracortical BCI in patients with tetraplegia to restore upper extremity
365 function in a realistic setting. These findings are in contrast to previous EEG-based BCI distraction studies
366 in which BCI classification accuracy and movement trajectory were impaired by distractions. Despite
367 generally good performance, there were occasional trials where the BCI system performed below the
368 baseline level expected for each subject. This highlights a need to detect occasional changes in neural
369 activity and BCI performance to ensure safe and reliable BCI performance.

370

371 *Acknowledgements*

372 We would like to acknowledge the study participants and their families for their cooperation and effort
373 throughout the duration of the study. We would also like to extend a special thanks to Gina McKernan
374 for her assistance with statistical analyses and Lynne Yash for photo editing.

375 *Declaration of Interest*

376 This material was presented as a poster at the AAPM&R Annual Assembly in San Antonio, Texas to
377 conference attendees in November 2019. This work was supported by the Defense Advanced Research
378 Projects Agency (DARPA) and Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Pacific (SSC Pacific) under
379 Contract No. N66001-16-C-4051 and the Revolutionizing Prosthetics program under Contract No.
380 N66001-10-C-4056. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this
381 material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of DARPA, SSC Pacific or the
382 United States Government. The material and effort contributed by AH is based upon work supported by
383 the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. 1747452. Any
384 opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the
385 authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the National Science Foundation. There are no other
386 relevant financial conflicts of interest to report outside the current work.

387 *References*

- 388 1. Anderson KD. Targeting Recovery: Priorities of the Spinal Cord-Injured Population. *Journal of*
389 *Neurotrauma* 2004;21(10):1371-83.
- 390 2. Collinger JL, Boninger ML, Bruns TM, Curley K, Wang W, Weber DJ. Functional priorities, assistive
391 technology, and brain-computer interfaces after spinal cord injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev* 2013;50(2):145-60.
- 392 3. van Middendorp JJ, Goss B, Urquhart S, Atresh S, Williams RP, Schuetz M. Diagnosis and
393 prognosis of traumatic spinal cord injury. *Global Spine J* 2011;1(1):1-8.
- 394 4. Jonathan R. Wolpaw NB, Dennis J McFarland, Gert Pfurtscheller, Theresa M Vaughan. Brain-
395 computer interfaces for communication and control. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2002;113:767-91.
- 396 5. Schwartz AB, Cui XT, Weber DJ, Moran DW. Brain-controlled interfaces: movement restoration
397 with neural prosthetics. *Neuron* 2006;52(1):205-20.
- 398 6. David M. Brandman SSC, Leigh R. Hochberg. Review Human intracortical recording and neural
399 decoding for brain computer interfaces. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng* 2018;25(10):1687-96.


- 400 7. Collinger JL, Gaunt RA, Schwartz AB. Progress towards restoring upper limb movement and
401 sensation through intracortical brain-computer interfaces. *Current Opinion in Biomedical Engineering*
402 2018;8:84-92.
- 403 8. Pandarinath C, Nuyujukian P, Blabe CH, Sorice BL, Saab J, Willett FR et al. High performance
404 communication by people with paralysis using an intracortical brain-computer interface. *Elife* 2017;6.
- 405 9. Hochberg LR, Serruya MD, Friehs GM, Mukand JA, Saleh M, Caplan AH et al. Neuronal ensemble
406 control of prosthetic devices by a human with tetraplegia. *Nature* 2006;442(7099):164-71.
- 407 10. Hochberg LR, Bacher D, Jarosiewicz B, Masse NY, Simeral JD, Vogel J et al. Reach and grasp by
408 people with tetraplegia using a neurally controlled robotic arm. *Nature* 2012;485(7398):372-5.
- 409 11. Collinger JL, Wodlinger B, Downey JE, Wang W, Tyler-Kabara EC, Weber DJ et al. High-
410 performance neuroprosthetic control by an individual with tetraplegia. *The Lancet* 2013;381(9866):557-
411 64.
- 412 12. Ajiboye AB, Willett FR, Young DR, Memberg WD, Murphy BA, Miller JP et al. Restoration of
413 reaching and grasping movements through brain-controlled muscle stimulation in a person with
414 tetraplegia: a proof-of-concept demonstration. *The Lancet* 2017;389(10081):1821-30.
- 415 13. Bouton CE, Shaikhouni A, Annetta NV, Bockbrader MA, Friedenberg DA, Nielson DM et al.
416 Restoring cortical control of functional movement in a human with quadriplegia. *Nature*
417 2016;533(7602):247-50.
- 418 14. Blabe CH, Gilja V, Chestek CA, Shenoy KV, Anderson KD, Henderson JM. Assessment of brain-
419 machine interfaces from the perspective of people with paralysis. *J Neural Eng* 2015;12(4):043002.
- 420 15. Huggins JE, Moinuddin AA, Chiodo AE, Wren PA. What would brain-computer interface users
421 want: opinions and priorities of potential users with spinal cord injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2015;96(3
422 Suppl):S38-45 e1-5.
- 423 16. Lazarou I, Nikolopoulos S, Petrantonakis PC, Kompatsiaris I, Tsolaki M. EEG-Based Brain-
424 Computer Interfaces for Communication and Rehabilitation of People with Motor Impairment: A Novel
425 Approach of the 21 (st) Century. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2018;12:14.
- 426 17. Myrden A, Chau T. Effects of user mental state on EEG-BCI performance. *Front Hum Neurosci*
427 2015;9:308.
- 428 18. Berry DR. Manipulating Paradigm and Attention via a Mindfulness Meditation Training Program
429 Improves P300-Based BCI. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations - East Tennessee State University* 2011.
- 430 19. Edelman BJ, Meng J, Gulachek N, Cline CC, He B. Exploring Cognitive Flexibility With a
431 Noninvasive BCI Using Simultaneous Steady-State Visual Evoked Potentials and Sensorimotor Rhythms.
432 *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng* 2018;26(5):936-47.
- 433 20. Emami Z, Chau T. Investigating the effects of visual distractors on the performance of a motor
434 imagery brain-computer interface. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2018;129(6):1268-75.
- 435 21. Iscan Z, Nikulin VV. Steady state visual evoked potential (SSVEP) based brain-computer interface
436 (BCI) performance under different perturbations. *PLoS One* 2018;13(1):e0191673.
- 437 22. Stephen T Foldes DMT. Speaking and Cognitive distractions during EEG-based brain control of a
438 virtual neuroprosthesis-arm. *Journal of Neuroengineering and Rehabilitation* 2013.
- 439 23. Emami Z, Chau T. The effects of visual distractors on cognitive load in a motor imagery brain-
440 computer interface. *Behav Brain Res* 2020;378:112240.
- 441 24. Aliakbaryhosseinabadi S, Kamavuako EN, Jiang N, Farina D, Mrachacz-Kersting N. Influence of
442 dual-tasking with different levels of attention diversion on characteristics of the movement-related
443 cortical potential. *Brain Res* 2017;1674:10-9.
- 444 25. Curran E. Learning to control brain activity: A review of the production and control of EEG
445 components for driving brain-computer interface (BCI) systems. *Brain and Cognition* 2003;51(3):326-36.
- 446 26. Allison BZ, Neuper C. Could Anyone Use a BCI? *Brain-Computer Interfaces*. 2010. p 35-54.

- 447 27. Shenoy KV, Carmena JM. Combining decoder design and neural adaptation in brain-machine
448 interfaces. *Neuron* 2014;84(4):665-80.
- 449 28. Brandman DM, Hosman T, Saab J, Burkhart MC, Shanahan BE, Ciancibello JG et al. Rapid
450 calibration of an intracortical brain-computer interface for people with tetraplegia. *J Neural Eng*
451 2018;15(2):026007.
- 452 29. Jennifer L Collinger BW, John E Downey, Wei Wang, Elizabeth C. Tyler-Kabara, Douglas J Weber,
453 Angus JC McMorland. 7 degree-of-freedom control neuroprosthetic control by an individual with
454 tetraplegia. *Lancet* 2013.
- 455 30. Stavisky SD, Willett FR, Avansino DT, Hochberg LR, Shenoy KV, Henderson JM. Speech-related
456 dorsal motor cortex activity does not interfere with iBCI cursor control. *J Neural Eng* 2020;17(1):016049.
- 457 31. Willett FR, Deo DR, Avansino DT, Rezaii P, Hochberg LR, Henderson JM et al. Hand Knob Area of
458 Premotor Cortex Represents the Whole Body in a Compositional Way. *Cell* 2020;181(2):396-409 e26.
- 459 32. Boninger M, Mitchell G, Tyler-Kabara E, Collinger J, Schwartz AB. Neuroprosthetic control and
460 tetraplegia – Authors'reply. *The Lancet* 2013;381(9881):1900-1.
- 461 33. Kirshblum SC, Waring W, Biering-Sorensen F, Burns SP, Johansen M, Schmidt-Read M et al.
462 Reference for the 2011 revision of the International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal
463 Cord Injury. *J Spinal Cord Med* 2011;34(6):547-54.
- 464 34. Sharlene N. Flesher JLC, Stephen T. Foldes, Jeffrey M. Weiss, John E. Downey, Elizabeth C. Tyler-
465 Kabara, Sliman J. Bensmaia, Andrew B. Schwartz, Michael L. Boninger, Robert A. Gaunt. Intracortical
466 microstimulation of human somatosensory cortex. *Science Translational Medicine* 2016;8(361).
- 467 35. Downey JE, Brane L, Gaunt RA, Tyler-Kabara EC, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. Motor cortical activity
468 changes during neuroprosthetic-controlled object interaction. *Sci Rep* 2017;7(1):16947.
- 469 36. Wang W, Chan SS, Heldman DA, Moran DW. Motor cortical representation of position and
470 velocity during reaching. *J Neurophysiol* 2007;97(6):4258-70.
- 471 37. Marquardt DM. Generalized Inverses, Ridge Regression, Biased Linear Estimation, and Nonlinear
472 Estimation. *Technometrics* 1970;12(3):591-612.
- 473 38. Velliste M, Perel S, Spalding MC, Whitford AS, Schwartz AB. Cortical control of a prosthetic arm
474 for self-feeding. *Nature* 2008;453(7198):1098-101.
- 475 39. Lavie N. Attention, Distraction, and Cognitive Control Under Load. *Current Directions in*
476 *Psychological Science* 2010;19(3):143-8.
- 477 40. Lavie N, Hirst A, de Fockert JW, Viding E. Load theory of selective attention and cognitive
478 control. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 2004;133(3):339-54.
- 479 41. Witteveen HJ, de Rond L, Rietman JS, Veltink PH. Hand-opening feedback for myoelectric
480 forearm prostheses: performance in virtual grasping tasks influenced by different levels of distraction. *J*
481 *Rehabil Res Dev* 2012;49(10):1517-26.
- 482 42. Owen AM, McMillan KM, Laird AR, Bullmore E. N-back working memory paradigm: a meta-
483 analysis of normative functional neuroimaging studies. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2005;25(1):46-59.
- 484 43. Pallecchia GL. Postural sway increases with attentional demands of concurrent cognitive task. *Gait & Posture*
485 2003;18(1):29-34.
- 486 44. Lilliefors HW. On the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality with Mean and Variance
487 Unknown. *The Journal of the American Statistical Association*;62(318):399-402.
- 488 45. Weiss JM, Gaunt RA, Franklin R, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. Demonstration of a portable
489 intracortical brain-computer interface. *Brain-Computer Interfaces* 2020.
- 490 46. Mark D'Esposito, Bradley R. Postle, Rypma B. Prefrontal cortical contributions to working
491 memory: evidence from event-related fMRI studies. *Executive Control and the Frontal Lobe: Current*
492 *Issues* 2000:pp 3 - 11.
- 493 47. Yang Y, Dickey MW, Fiez J, Murphy B, Mitchell T, Collinger J et al. Sensorimotor experience and
494 verb-category mapping in human sensory, motor and parietal neurons. *Cortex* 2017;92:304-19.

495 48. Milovanovic I, Robinson R, Fetz EE, Moritz CT. Simultaneous and independent control of a brain-
496 computer interface and contralateral limb movement. *Brain Comput Interfaces* (Abingdon)
497 2015;2(4):174-85.
498 49. Klauer SG, Guo F, Simons-Morton BG, Ouimet MC, Lee SE, Dingus TA. Distracted driving and risk
499 of road crashes among novice and experienced drivers. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370(1):54-9.
500 50. Phillips B, Zhao H. Predictors of assistive technology abandonment. *Assist Technol* 1993;5(1):36-
501 45.
502 51. Nazan Aksan LS, Benjamin Lester, Sarah Hacker, Jeffrey Dawson, Steven W Anderson, and
503 Matthew Rizzo. Effectiveness of a heads-up adaptive lane deviation warning system for middle-aged &
504 older adults. *Proc Int Driv Symp Hum Factors Driv Assess Train Veh* 2015:422-8.
505 52. Erik Coelingh AEaMB. Collision warning with full auto brake and pedestrian detection. 2010 13th
506 International IEEE Annual Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems. Madeira Island, Portugal;
507 2010. p 155-60.
508


509 *Suppliers*

- 510 a. NeuroPort intracortical microelectrode arrays and Neural Signal Processor:
511 Blackrock Microsystems LLC
512 630 Komas Drive, Suite 200
513 Salt Lake City, UT 84108-1229
514 b. Modular Prosthetic Limb:
515 Johns Hopkins Applied Physics Laboratory
516 11100 Johns Hopkins Road
517 Laurel, Maryland 20723




Targets Acquired

Subject P1




Subject P2



Path Efficiency

Subject P1



Subject P2

