

# SELF-SUPERVISED ENHANCEMENT OF STIMULUS-EVOKED BRAIN RESPONSE DATA

Bernd Accou<sup>\*†</sup>      Hugo Van hamme<sup>†</sup>      Tom Francart<sup>\*</sup>

<sup>\*</sup> ExpORL, Department of Neuroscience, KU Leuven

<sup>†</sup> PSI, Department of Electrical Engineering, KU Leuven

## ABSTRACT

Stimulus-evoked brain response data has a notoriously low signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and high inter-subject variability. Multiple techniques have been proposed to alleviate this problem, such as averaging, denoising source separation (DSS) and (multiway) canonical correlation analysis ((M)CCA), but all these methods have significant limitations. We propose a novel paradigm for the self-supervised enhancement of stimulus-related brain response data. Different time-aligned stimulus-evoked brain responses to the same stimulus are randomly shifted in time and independently enhanced. Both enhanced brain responses are compared using a model that predicts the shift in time between the brain responses. Using a model based on a multi-view convolutional neural network as an enhancement module, we show the efficacy of our method for a downstream task of decoding the speech envelope from auditory EEG. A significant relative improvement of 32% ( $p < 0.001$ ) was found when using the enhanced EEG versus normal EEG. While the shown example concerns EEG in response to auditory stimulation, conceptually, our method applies to other modalities (such as MEG) and other tasks (such as visual stimulus-response modelling).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Recorded brain responses to natural stimuli pose significant challenges in analysis due to the relatively low SNR (due to noise from neural processes unrelated to the stimulus, environmental noise, etc.) and high inter-subject variability (due to differences in anatomy, shifts in sensor locations, etc.). A solution is to present a stimulus multiple times and average the responses, but this does not leverage the availability of multiple sensors. Methods like denoising source separation (DSS) [1, 2] with extensions such as time delayed denoising source separation (TDSS) [3] and specific implementations such as joint decorrelation [4] have been proposed to combine the spatial distribution of sensors to construct spatial filters

that can disentangle noise sources from target signal sources. These techniques require the definition of a bias function, which in EEG/MEG is often defined as the stimulus-evoked response after averaging over epochs [2–4]. Both averaging and DSS methods require that multiple epochs of stimulus-evoked response are recorded for a specific subject with a specific sensor setup, which is in practice often not the case. Canonical correlation analysis (CCA) [5–8] can define a set of spatial filters for stimulus-evoked brain response data for a single repetition of a stimulus. CCA (and variations such as correlated component analysis) has been used to compare brain responses intra- and inter-subject to study engagement [9], stimulus preference [10] and speech intelligibility [11]. CCA is, however, limited to 2 inputs. Multi-way canonical correlation analysis (MCCA) [12] extends CCA to work with multiple recordings of the same stimulus-evoked response. The downsides of MCCA are that it has to be retrained when new subjects are included, and a careful selection of shared components is necessary to obtain optimal results.

CCA can also relate a brain response directly to the stimulus [6, 7], creating stimulus-aware spatial filters. Other methods, such as generalized eigenvalue decomposition (GEVD) [13, 14], can combine dimensionality reduction with stimulus-aware spatial filtering. Like the methods discussed previously, this is a linear method with limited modelling capability.

Recently, self-supervised pre-training of neural networks on pretext tasks has become a popular way to leverage unlabeled data for better downstream task performance in machine vision [15] and natural language processing [16]. In contrastive learning, the similarity of positive examples (created with data-augmentation techniques from the anchor sample) with the anchor sample is maximized, while the similarity between anchor samples and negative samples is minimized. Applied to stimulus-evoked brain responses for natural stimuli, the positive and negative labelling becomes conceptually more difficult (e.g. if natural running speech is the stimulus, negative examples may overlap in acoustics/linguistics/semantics, making them unsuitable as a negative example. This is also known as sampling bias [17]), and finding computationally feasible and biologically relevant augmentations to create good positive examples is hard.

---

The research conducted in this paper is funded by KU Leuven Special Research Fund C24/18/099 (C2 project to Tom Francart and Hugo Van hamme), by a PhD grant (1S89620N) of the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) and from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 637424, ERC Starting Grant to Tom Francart)

Stimulus-evoked brain responses have been used for multiple modalities and tasks, such as visual, motor, auditory, etc. For auditory tasks involving speech stimuli, the encoding/decoding approach has been most frequently used [18–20]. In this paradigm, speech features are decoded from the brain response, used to predict the brain response (encoding), or transformed into a feature space where their similarity is maximized (the hybrid approach, e.g. CCA [6, 7]). For decoding/encoding, linear models are mostly used, as they are efficient and interpretable.

In this work, we propose a shift-detection paradigm to enhance stimulus-evoked brain responses in a self-supervised paradigm without the need to identify explicit negative samples. The resulting enhancement module can be used across different subjects and stimuli. In this paradigm, brain responses to the same stimulus are shifted in time, enhanced and compared in the time dimension to identify the correct shift. To correctly classify this time shift for stimulus-evoked tasks, the enhancement module has to represent the stimulus responses in the brain in a time-aligned fashion. Our method is evaluated on an auditory EEG dataset using a subject-independent linear decoder to demonstrate the benefit of using the enhanced brain response data for downstream tasks. While an example is shown for EEG responses to natural speech stimuli, the same paradigm can be used for other stimulus-evoked brain response tasks such as visual, motor or BCI-related tasks.

## 2. METHODS

### 2.1. Models

Code for the models and model weights can be found at [https://github.com/exporl/shift\\_detection\\_icassp2023](https://github.com/exporl/shift_detection_icassp2023).

#### 2.1.1. Shift detection model

The general paradigm is displayed in figure 1. In this general paradigm, the input consists of two time-aligned segments of brain response data evoked by the same stimulus (but from different repetitions, sessions or subjects). Firstly, the second brain response is randomly shifted in time by one of  $S$  possible values. Both responses are supplied separately to the enhancement module, which independently enhances the brain response data. This enhanced brain response is passed to the comparison model, which classifies how much the second brain response segment was shifted in time with regard to the first brain response segment. As the shared information between both brain response segments is the stimulus, the enhancement should produce a representation that contains time-aligned information of the stimulus (response).

In our specific implementation, we chose a model architecture based on the multi-view convolutional neural network

(MVCNN) [21] as the enhancement module, as shown in figure 2. The first two layers of the MVCNN are fully connected, consisting of 128 nodes. Next, nine parallel paths are constructed consisting of 1D temporal convolutions with 64 filters and varying kernel sizes (i.e.  $K=[4, 8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64]$ ). Zero padding is applied at the end of each output of the convolutional layers to ensure they have the same length. After zero padding, a fully connected layer of dimension 64 is used. Finally, all resulting tensors are concatenated and passed to two fully connected layers with 512 and 64 nodes to obtain the output. After each dense and convolutional layer except the final dense layer, both layer normalization [22] and a LeakyReLU activation function [23] are applied. The output of the MVCNN will represent the enhanced brain response, which is used in section 3 for a downstream task.

The comparison model/classifier computes the cosine similarity between all combinations of filters of the enhanced brain response data and passes the flattened result to a fully connected layer with  $S$  nodes and a softmax activation function.

#### 2.1.2. Subject-independent linear decoder


To evaluate whether the enhanced brain responses can be used to obtain higher performance of downstream tasks, we use a linear decoder to decode the stimulus speech envelope from EEG. The linear decoder reconstructs the speech envelope by linearly transforming an integration window of 500 ms of (enhanced) EEG response across all channels, accounting for the delay in neural response [18]. This linear decoder is trained across subjects (subject-independently) using negative Pearson correlation as the loss function with the Adam optimizer [24].

### 2.2. Dataset


The auditory EEG dataset contains 80 native Flemish speakers (between 18-30 years old) who listened to 2-8 (on average 6) single-speaker stories narrated in Dutch while their EEG was recorded. A (subset) of this dataset has been used and is described in more detail by [25–27]. Each story is approximately 15 minutes in duration. All participants gave informed consent for this study, approved by the Medical Ethics Committee UZ KU Leuven/Research (KU Leuven, Belgium) with reference S57102. In screening, a questionnaire was used to confirm that participants had no neurological diagnoses or hearing-related issues. Furthermore, participants’ hearing was tested using a pure-tone audiogram and Flemish MATRIX test [28]. Participants with hearing thresholds  $> 30\text{dBHL}$  for 125-8000Hz were excluded.

To encourage the participants to listen carefully, they were informed that a question would be asked about the content after each stimulus presentation.

Each EEG recording and corresponding stimulus recording was split into 80% training, 10% validation and 10% test



**Fig. 1.** The shift detection paradigm. Two brain response segments evoked by the same, time-aligned stimulus are shifted in time relative to each other (out of  $S = 13$  possible shifts in our experiment, see 3). The enhancement module enhances each segment independently. The comparison model predicts how much the second brain response segment was shifted in time with regard to the first brain response segment based on the output of the enhancement module. The specific implementation of the enhancement module for the experiment in section 3 is shown in figure 2



**Fig. 2.** Model based on the multi-view CNN [21] acting as enhancement module in figure 1. Layer normalization and a LeakyReLU activation function are applied after each Dense (fully connected layer) and Conv1D (1D convolutional) layer.

set. The validation and test set were extracted from the middle of the recording to avoid artefacts and attention deficits of the participant that may occur at the beginning and end of the story.

### 2.3. Preprocessing

EEG data was high-pass filtered (non-causally) to correct for sensor drift with a 4th-order Butterworth filter with a cut-off frequency of 0.5Hz. After anti-alias filtering, the data were downsampled from 8192Hz to 1024Hz. A multi-channel Wiener filter was used to remove eyeblink artefacts [29]. EEG channels were re-referenced to a common average reference. Finally, EEG was downsampled from 1024Hz to 64Hz. The speech envelope of the stimulus was extracted using a gammatone filterbank using 28 ERB-spaced filters ranging from 50 to 5000Hz [30, 31]. The absolute value of each sample in the filters was exponentiated by 0.6. All filters were averaged to obtain the speech envelope. The envelope was then downsampled to 1024Hz and finally to 64Hz.

The EEG and speech envelopes were normalized per recording by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation (both computed on the training set of the recording) for the training, validation and test set.

## 3. EXPERIMENT


To showcase the effectiveness of the proposed paradigm, we train a shift detection model (as described in section 2.1.1) on the data described in section 2.2 and use the enhancement module to enhance the EEG for speech envelope decoding as a downstream task. For this experiment,  $S=13$  equally spaced shifts were chosen (-600 ms, -500 ms, ..., no shift, ..., 500 ms, 600 ms), yielding a classification chance level of 7.69%. As multiple subjects listened to multiple stories, all pairwise combinations of EEG recordings evoked by the same stimulus but recorded from different subjects were sampled during training. Windows of 10 seconds without overlap were extracted and presented to the model. The shift detection model was trained end-to-end using the Adam optimizer

with a learning rate of  $10^{-4}$  and a batch size of 128. Early stopping was applied with a patience factor of 5.

For the downstream task, a linear decoder (as described in section 2.1.2) was trained and evaluated on EEG and enhanced EEG using segments of 5 seconds with 80% overlap. Early stopping was applied with a patience factor of 5 and a minimum delta of  $10^{-4}$ . Reconstruction scores for EEG and enhanced EEG were compared using a Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

## 4. RESULTS

As shown in figure 3, the linear decoder trained and evaluated on enhanced EEG significantly outperforms the linear decoder trained and evaluated on normal EEG (from 0.13 to 0.16 median Pearson correlation, a relative increase of 32% in median performance,  $p < 0.001$ ). For 77 of the 80 subjects, an improvement in reconstruction score was found.



**Fig. 3.** Comparison between a linear decoder trained and evaluated on raw EEG of the single-speaker dataset and a linear decoder trained and evaluated on enhanced EEG. Each point in the violin plot is the reconstruction score for one subject on the test set, averaged across recordings. The lines connect points belonging to the same subjects in both violin plots (green means an increase in reconstruction score when training/evaluating on enhanced EEG), and red a decrease. The linear decoder trained on feature-extracted EEG significantly outperforms the linear decoder trained/evaluated on raw EEG ( $p < 0.001$ ).

## 5. DISCUSSION

In this work, we show a new general framework for EEG enhancement using the time alignment of the stimulus across

recordings and apply it to a downstream task: decoding the speech envelope from EEG.

We have shown that the enhanced EEG produced by our enhancement module can be successfully used to obtain higher reconstruction scores in the speech decoding paradigm. While this shows promise, as the speech envelope representations in the enhanced EEG seem to be improved for 77 of the 80 subjects, further investigation is necessary to identify the nature of the information encoded in this enhanced EEG (just acoustic processing or linguistic processing, semantic processing, etc.). While our experiments here are limited to decoding the speech envelope from EEG for subjects that listen to natural running speech, this method is conceptually applicable to all stimulus-evoked brain responses, as long as correct time alignment is provided. However, the efficacy of this method should be validated for specific downstream tasks in future work.

The proposed framework has conceptual advantages over the current state-of-the-art methods of brain response denoising/enhancing: Compared to averaging and DSS, no repetitions of the same stimulus for each subject are necessary. Compared to (M)CCA, this method imposes no explicit need for re-training for unseen subjects and/or stimuli, and the applied transformations can be non-linear. Compared to contrastive learning approaches, no explicit labelling of negative examples has to be done, removing the possibility of sampling bias [17]. Also, the time alignment of stimuli can be leveraged to do the classification task without requiring a positive surrogate distribution through (computationally expensive and/or biologically implausible) augmentations.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Jaakko Särelä and Harri Valpola, “Denoising Source Separation,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 233–272, 2005.
- [2] Alain de Cheveigné and Jonathan Z. Simon, “Denoising based on spatial filtering,” *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, vol. 171, no. 2, pp. 331–339, June 2008.
- [3] Alain de Cheveigné, “Time-shift denoising source separation,” *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, vol. 189, no. 1, pp. 113–120, May 2010.
- [4] Alain de Cheveigné and Lucas C. Parra, “Joint decorrelation, a versatile tool for multichannel data analysis,” *NeuroImage*, vol. 98, pp. 487–505, Sept. 2014, Publisher: Academic Press.
- [5] Harold Hotelling, “Relations Between Two Sets of Variates,” in *Breakthroughs in Statistics: Methodology and Distribution*, Samuel Kotz and Norman L. Johnson, Eds., Springer Series in Statistics, pp. 162–190. Springer, New York, NY, 1992.
- [6] Alain de Cheveigné, Daniel D. E. Wong, Giovanni M. Di Liberto, Jens Hjørtkjær, Malcolm Slaney, and Edmund Lalor, “Decoding the auditory brain with canonical component analysis,” *NeuroImage*, vol. 172, pp. 206–216, May 2018.

- [7] Jacek P. Dmochowski, Jason J. Ki, Paul DeGuzman, Paul Sajda, and Lucas C. Parra, "Extracting multidimensional stimulus-response correlations using hybrid encoding-decoding of neural activity," *NeuroImage*, vol. 180, pp. 134–146, Oct. 2018.
- [8] Alain de Cheveigné, Malcolm Slaney, Søren A. Fuglsang, and Jens Hjortkjaer, "Auditory stimulus-response modeling with a match-mismatch task," *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 046040, May 2021, Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [9] Jacek Dmochowski, Paul Sajda, Joao Dias, and Lucas Parra, "Correlated Components of Ongoing EEG Point to Emotionally Laden Attention – A Possible Marker of Engagement?," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 6, 2012.
- [10] Jacek P. Dmochowski, Matthew A. Bezdek, Brian P. Abelson, John S. Johnson, Eric H. Schumacher, and Lucas C. Parra, "Audience preferences are predicted by temporal reliability of neural processing," *Nature Communications*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 4567, July 2014, Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [11] Ivan Iotzov and Lucas C. Parra, "EEG can predict speech intelligibility," *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 036008, Mar. 2019, Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [12] Alain de Cheveigné, Giovanni M. Di Liberto, Dorothée Arzounian, Daniel D. E. Wong, Jens Hjortkjaer, Søren Fuglsang, and Lucas C. Parra, "Multiway canonical correlation analysis of brain data," *NeuroImage*, vol. 186, pp. 728–740, Feb. 2019.
- [13] D. Lesenfants, J. Vanthornhout, E. Verschuere, and T. Francart, "Data-driven spatial filtering for improved measurement of cortical tracking of multiple representations of speech," *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 066017, Oct. 2019, Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [14] Neetha Das, Jonas Vanthornhout, Tom Francart, and Alexander Bertrand, "Stimulus-aware spatial filtering for single-trial neural response and temporal response function estimation in high-density EEG with applications in auditory research," *NeuroImage*, vol. 204, pp. 116211, Jan. 2020.
- [15] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals, "Representation Learning with Contrastive Predictive Coding," Jan. 2019, arXiv:1807.03748 [cs, stat].
- [16] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, "BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding," May 2019, arXiv:1810.04805 [cs].
- [17] Ching-Yao Chuang, Joshua Robinson, Yen-Chen Lin, Antonio Torralba, and Stefanie Jegelka, "Debiased Contrastive Learning," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2020, vol. 33, pp. 8765–8775, Curran Associates, Inc.
- [18] Michael J. Crosse, Giovanni M. Di Liberto, Adam Bednar, and Edmund C. Lalor, "The Multivariate Temporal Response Function (mTRF) Toolbox: A MATLAB Toolbox for Relating Neural Signals to Continuous Stimuli," *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, vol. 10, 2016.
- [19] Jonas Vanthornhout, Lien Decruy, Jan Wouters, Jonathan Z. Simon, and Tom Francart, "Speech Intelligibility Predicted from Neural Entrainment of the Speech Envelope," *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 181–191, Apr. 2018.
- [20] Giovanni M. Di Liberto, James A. O'Sullivan, and Edmund C. Lalor, "Low-Frequency Cortical Entrainment to Speech Reflects Phoneme-Level Processing," *Current Biology*, vol. 25, no. 19, pp. 2457–2465, Oct. 2015.
- [21] Hang Su, Subhansu Maji, Evangelos Kalogerakis, and Erik Learned-Miller, "Multi-View Convolutional Neural Networks for 3D Shape Recognition," 2015, pp. 945–953.
- [22] Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton, "Layer Normalization," July 2016, arXiv:1607.06450 [cs, stat].
- [23] Djork-Arné Clevert, Thomas Unterthiner, and Sepp Hochreiter, "Fast and Accurate Deep Network Learning by Exponential Linear Units (ELUs)," in *ICLR*, Feb. 2016, arXiv:1511.07289 [cs].
- [24] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba, "Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization," in *ICLR*, 2015.
- [25] Mohammad Jalilpour Monesi, Bernd Accou, Tom Francart, and Hugo Van hamme, "Extracting different levels of speech information from EEG using an LSTM-based model," in *Proceedings Interspeech 2021*. Aug. 2021, pp. 526–530, ISCA.
- [26] Bernd Accou, Mohammad Jalilpour Monesi, Hugo Van hamme, and Tom Francart, "Predicting speech intelligibility from EEG in a non-linear classification paradigm," *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 066008, Nov. 2021, Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [27] Lies Bollens, Tom Francart, and Hugo Van Hamme, "Learning Subject-Invariant Representations from Speech-Evoked EEG Using Variational Autoencoders," in *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, May 2022, pp. 1256–1260, ISSN: 2379-190X.
- [28] Heleen Luts, Sofie Jansen, Wouter Dreschler, and Jan Wouters, "Development and normative data for the Flemish/Dutch Matrix test," 2014.
- [29] Ben Somers, Tom Francart, and Alexander Bertrand, "A generic EEG artifact removal algorithm based on the multi-channel Wiener filter," *Journal of Neural Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 036007, Feb. 2018, Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [30] P. L. Søndergaard and P. Majdak, "The Auditory Modeling Toolbox," in *The Technology of Binaural Listening*, Jens Blauert, Ed., Modern Acoustics and Signal Processing, pp. 33–56. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [31] Peter L. Søndergaard, Bruno Torr sani, and Peter Balazs, "The linear time frequency analysis toolbox," *International Journal of Wavelets, Multiresolution and Information Processing*, vol. 10, no. 04, pp. 1250032, July 2012, Publisher: World Scientific Publishing Co.