

## **Outcome measures in implantable brain-computer interface research: a systematic review**

### **Authors:**

Esmee Dohle MA MB BChir<sup>1</sup>; Eleanor Swanson MSc.<sup>2</sup>; Suraya Yusuf MA MB BChir<sup>3</sup>, Luka Jovanovic MA MB BChir<sup>4</sup>; Lucy Thompson MA BMBCh<sup>5</sup>; Hugo Layard Horsfall MSc MBBS<sup>6</sup>; William R Muirhead PhD BMBS<sup>6,7</sup>, Luke Bashford, PhD<sup>8,9</sup>; Jamie Brannigan, MA MB BChir<sup>1</sup>

### **Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> University of Oxford, Medical Sciences Division, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK

<sup>2</sup> Queen Square Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK

<sup>3</sup> John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Oxford, UK

<sup>4</sup> East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust, Lister Hospital, Stevenage, UK

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK

<sup>6</sup> Department of Neurosurgery, National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, London, UK

<sup>7</sup> Wellcome / EPSRC Centre for Interventional and Surgical Sciences, University College London, London, United Kingdom

<sup>8</sup> Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

<sup>9</sup> Department of Neurosurgery, University of Colorado, Denver, CO, USA

Corresponding author:

Jamie Brannigan

University of Oxford, Medical Sciences Division, Oxford OX3 9DU

[jamie.brannigan@medsci.ox.ac.uk](mailto:jamie.brannigan@medsci.ox.ac.uk)

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## **One Sentence Summary:**

Implantable brain-computer interface studies primarily evaluate engineering-related outcome measures over clinical outcome measures.

## **Abstract:**

Implantable brain-computer interfaces (iBCIs) aim to restore function in patients with severe motor impairments by translating neural signals into motor outputs. As iBCI technology advances toward clinical application, assessing iBCI performance with robust and clinically relevant outcome measures becomes crucial. This systematic review analysed 77 studies, with 63.6% reporting outcome measures prospectively. Decoding outcomes were most frequently assessed (67.5%), followed by task performance (63.6%). Only 22.1% of studies reported a clinical outcome measure, often related to prosthetic limb function or activities of daily living. Successful iBCI translation and regulatory approval requires clinical outcomes developed collaboratively with individuals with motor impairments.

## INTRODUCTION

Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) are systems which record neural signals and translate these into commands to control external devices, thereby bypassing dysfunctional or damaged pathways from brain to muscles. [1,2] The aim of motor BCIs is to restore functional independence for individuals with severe motor impairments, for instance due to amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), spinal cord injury (SCI), or stroke.

Following the first human microelectrode array implantation in 2004, [3] implantable BCIs (iBCIs) have enabled the control of computer cursors, digital clicks [4] and robotic prosthetic limbs. [5] More recently, implantable BCIs have been used to decode attempted handwriting [6] and attempted speech [7,8] in patients with paralysis. Alongside these advances in decoding and performance, fully implanted BCI systems have been developed, requiring substantially reduced setup burden and enabling independent use at home. [4,9–11]

Despite advances in investigational clinical studies, no iBCI technology has yet received a full regulatory approval, or been adopted as a standard of care. A major challenge in the clinical translation of iBCI devices is an absence of consensus for clinically meaningful performance metrics that can be used when evaluating device efficacy in clinical trials.

[12,13] In the USA, the Food and Drug Administration has highlighted the absence of an appropriate outcome measure, [14] and government funding has been awarded to investigate this. [15]

In this systematic review, we aim to assess the outcome measures reported in all iBCI publications. We aim to determine if any consensus can be identified from existing literature and to inform the future selection of iBCI clinical endpoints.

## RESULTS


### *Search results*

Our search identified a total of 4279 records across three databases (1652 in MEDLINE, 2197 in Embase and 430 in CINAHL). Following deduplication, 2711 records remained, of which 341 were selected for full-text screening. A total of 77 studies were included in the final analysis. A full Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) flowchart is shown in Figure 1.

### *Study characteristics and participant demographics*

The review included 77 studies published between 2000-2023. The majority (79%, n = 62) of studies were conducted in the United States. An overview of study characteristics is shown in Table 1. As some research participants were included in multiple publications, all publications were cross-referenced to identify 53 unique participants. The majority (77%, n = 41) of participants were male, with an average age of 46.2 years. A total of 45 patients (85%) suffered from amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), spinal cord injury (SCI) or stroke. An overview of participant demographics is shown in Table 2. Details of all included studies are shown in Supplementary Materials C. Most of the included studies, 62.8% (n = 49), reported their outcome measures prospectively.

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for updated systematic reviews which included searches of databases, registers and other sources



From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.

Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart

*Table 1: Overview of study characteristics*


<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>
Publication year (range)	2000-2023
Study design	
Single-participant	51 (66%)
Multi-participant	26 (34%)
Country	
USA	62
France	4
Netherlands	3
China	2
Switzerland	2
Australia	2
Canada	2

*Table 2: Overview of participant demographics*

<b>Total participants</b>	<b>53</b>
Gender	
Male	41 (77%)
Female	12 (23%)
Average age (earliest reported)	46.2
Pathology	
Spinal cord injury (SCI)	21 (40%)
Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS)	16 (30%)
Stroke	8 (15%)
Other	8 (15%)

### *Types of outcome measures reported*

Among the different categories of outcome measures, decoding-related outcomes such as decoding accuracy were the most frequently reported, in 67.5% of the publications (52 publications). Task-related outcomes, such as successful task completion or target accuracy, were also reported most publications (63.6%,  $n = 49$ ). Clinical outcomes were more rarely used, with only 22.1% (17 publications) reporting a clinical outcome. This is shown in Figure 2.



*Figure 2: Percentage of publications reporting decoding-related, task-related and clinical outcome measures*


### *Clinical outcome measures*

The clinical outcome measures used varied widely, with 20 different clinical outcomes reported across 17 publications. Nearly half (47%,  $n = 8$ ) of the studies reporting a clinical outcome were published after 2020.

Clinical outcome measures most commonly related to upper limb functioning, such as the Action Research Arm Test (ARAT) or the Graded and Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension (GRASSP), used by 13 publications. The second most commonly assessed type of clinical outcome were activities of daily living (ADLs), such as communication, online banking and shopping, with 6 publications assessing completion of at least one ADL. Other outcome measures relate to assistive device functioning, such as the Psychosocial Impact of Assistive Devices (PIADS) scale, adverse events and quality of life (QOL). This is shown in Figure 3.



**A**



**B**




Figure 3: (A) Number of publications reporting different clinical outcome measures, grouped by category. (B) Number of publications reporting different individual clinical outcome measures. ARAT = Action Research Arm Test. BBS = Berg Balance Scale. BBT = Box and Block Test. EQ-5d-5l = EuroQOL-5d-5l. FMMIS = Fugl-Meyer Motor Impairment Score.

*GRASSP = Graded and Redefined Assessment of Strength Sensibility and Prehension. GRT = Grasp Release Test. HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. ISNCSCI = International Standards for Neurological Classification of Spinal Cord Injury. MOS SF-36 = Medical Outcomes Study Short Form-36. PIADS = Psychosocial Impact of Assistive Devices Scales. QIF-SF = Quadriplegia Index of Function - Short Form. QUEST 2.0 = Quebec User Evaluation of Satisfaction with Assistive Technology version 2.0. SCIM = Spinal Cord Independence Measure.*

### *Decoding- and task-related outcome measures*

The most commonly reported engineering outcome measure was accuracy, with 76% of of the included studies (59 publications) reporting this as an outcome. Task accuracy was most commonly reported, e.g. task success rate or accuracy (47%,  $n = 36$ ) followed by model accuracy, e.g. decoding or classification accuracy (44%,  $n = 34$ ).

Several studies involved iBCIs developed for the purpose of assisting communication, e.g. via cursor-based typing or speech/phoneme decoding. Out of 78 total studies, 14 studies reported a communication-speed outcome measure such as correct characters per minute (CCPM) or words per minute (WPM). Of these studies, the majority (8 publications) used character-based metrics such as CCPM or CPM, although more recent studies (6 publications) tend to use word-based metrics such as WPM.

Another metric of speed, the information transfer rate (ITR) and its derivatives, was reported in 8 studies (10% of all publications). Combined, a total of 18 studies (23%) reported a speed-related metric such as CPM or ITR.

## DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review of outcome measures used to assess iBCI devices. We identified a total population of 53 participants with iBCIs evaluated across 77 studies. Most studies assessed iBCI outcomes using measures of engineering performance, such as decoder or task performance. Only 22.1% (n = 17) studies reported a clinical outcome measure, most of which evaluated robotic prosthetic upper limb function (n = 13). The proportion of studies evaluating clinical iBCI outcomes has increased in recent years, however clinical measures were heterogenous and often specific to the types of tasks being performed.

### *Clinical iBCI outcome measures are increasingly utilised, but highly heterogenous*

Of the 18 studies we identified utilising clinical outcome measures, nearly half (47%, n = 8) were published since 2020, and this represents a higher proportion of the outcome assessments being used to assess iBCI devices. Despite increasing interest in evaluating the clinical benefit of iBCI devices, there is substantial variability in the assessments being used. This has included quality of life (QoL) metrics, specific measures of upper limb function, and assessments of satisfaction in the use of assistive devices.

In most cases, assessments were specific to a single task or function being restored, most notably in the case of restored upper limb function. Whilst these measures may be useful in a specific context, such measures are neither agnostic to task nor device, precluding use as a generalised measure of iBCI outcomes. Moreover, assessments of physical function are less immediately relevant, as ongoing iBCI studies are primarily aiming to restore control of digital devices and/or communication (e.g. BrainGate2 (NCT00912041), Neuralink PRIME (NCT06429735), Synchron COMMAND (NCT05035823), BRAVO (NCT03698149)). This suggests outcome measures which can capture the clinical benefits of restored digital functional

independence are most appropriate for the first wave of iBCI devices approaching clinical translation.

The single most commonly captured clinical outcome was the performance of activities of daily living. However, this typically comprised assessment of individual activities rather than using an existing standardised measure. To our knowledge, no ADL currently exists which captures restored digital functional independence. The development of a ‘digital activities of daily living’ instrument has previously been proposed by Fry et al., and the US Food and Drug Administration. [12,13].

The quality of life (QoL) measures identified in our review, such as the EuroQol-5D-5L, are existing measures which are agnostic to both device type and the function being restored. QoL assessments measure an individual's perception of their overall well-being, which includes feelings about health status and the nonmedical aspects of one’s life. However, QoL assessments are typically used only as supplementary measures when evaluating therapeutic interventions due to inherent limitations. They are confounded by a wide range of variables, such as socioeconomic status and psychological wellbeing, leading to temporal fluctuations and a high degree of inter-subject variability. If constricted to health-related QoL, this is still confounded by comorbidities. Moreover, a study of patient perceptions in ALS, a population involved in current BCI studies, has demonstrated persistently elevated QoL, despite progressive paralysis of all four limbs and the resulting dependence upon carers. [16] This suggests an effective psychological adaptation to new deficits, which would skew the assessment of any intervention to restore bodily functions. Whilst it is necessary to capture patient reported outcomes in randomised studies of interventions, [17] and a QoL measure

may be the most such appropriate assessment, these challenges may limit the potential for QoL assessments as a primary measure of clinical benefit with iBCI devices.

Given the inherent heterogeneity in device types, desired outputs, patient selection, and baseline motor impairments, it is unlikely that one single comprehensive measure will be developed to evaluate overall iBCI clinical benefit. To this end, Fry *et al.* (2022) suggest that BCI clinical outcome measures should address three dimensions: how a patient ‘feels’ (e.g. quality of life scores), how a patient ‘functions’ (e.g. activities of daily living scale) and how a patient ‘survives’ (i.e. health-related outcomes, including device safety). [12]

*Engineering performance measures have been selected with greater consistency*

Engineering measures of decoder and task performance were more commonly and consistently used in the included studies. Accuracy was measured in 76% of studies (n=59). Performance measures related to speed, e.g. characters per minute or bit rate, were utilised in only 23% of studies (n = 18). The preference for measuring device accuracy as an engineering metric is aligned with patient preference literature, which demonstrates patients prioritise high accuracy over other aspects of iBCI performance, such as speed. Whilst commonly used and preferred by patients as a performance characteristic, accuracy is a one dimensional measure and does not give information on the task difficulty or complexity, e.g. the degrees of freedom, cognitive load being used, or training burden. Moreover, isolated measurement of accuracy does not account for the environmental context in which a task can be performed. Therefore, such engineering measures do not account for how an individual feels and functions in their daily life, [18] and the US Food and Drug Administration have referred to these assessments as ‘lab-tests’, rather than assessments of real world function. [13] Inclusion of engineering metrics, such as accuracy, may still be useful to evaluate performance of the BCI device, however additional assessments of real world function will be necessary to determine clinical benefits.

Accuracy was most commonly defined at the task level, i.e., number of successful trials/total number of trials, with assessment in 36 studies (47%). This definition at the task level is most appropriate for application across different iBCI studies, as it is a standardised accuracy measure for discrete, continuous, and hybrid discrete/continuous iBCI applications. Other definitions, such as classification accuracy, are specific to the nature of the paradigm employed when decoding motor intentions.

Whilst information transfer rate or characters per minute of language output have also been referenced as measures of BCI function, [13] these assessments were overrepresented by benchmark studies of iBCI performance, and less commonly used in the literature overall. However, it may be the case that these measures are only reported if successful in demonstrating a new breakthrough, as there is less frequent reporting on low or failed outcome measures across the academic literature.

#### *Towards a standardised and clinically meaningful iBCI outcome measures*

Current iBCI research primarily utilises engineering-related outcome measures, quantifying device performance in terms of decoding accuracy or subsequent performance at tasks. This focus is understandable, given the considerable ongoing and addressed technical challenges in developing iBCI systems. Furthermore, device-related outcomes will remain important in the context of fundamental science research, iBCI quality control, and development of next generation devices. However, to develop and validate devices for clinical translation, an increased focus on clinically meaningful, patient-centred concepts of interest is essential. [13,18] This may include evaluations of functional independence, patient quality of life, or direct assessments of restored bodily functions.

The selection and development of appropriate clinical outcome assessments must involve multi-stakeholder consensus, [13] including input from individuals with lived experience of

severe motor impairment. This is critical to ensure future device outcomes match a user's priorities and expectations. Moreover, given the emergence of multiple companies working to translate iBCI devices at scale, this work must also ensure collaboration across different commercial actors. In the USA, the creation of the iBCI collaborative community (iBCI-CC) is an important step to enable this work ([ibci-cc.org](http://ibci-cc.org)), along with organisation of multiple workshops by regulators to discuss iBCI clinical outcome assessments. [13,14]



## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

This systematic review was conducted in line with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines. A PRISMA checklist is attached in Supplementary Materials A. The review was prospectively registered on Open Science Framework (OSF) (<https://osf.io/ky5g4>).

### *Search strategy*

Search strategies were developed for three databases (MEDLINE, Embase and CINAHL) which combined synonyms for brain-computer interfaces, intracortical and patient. A senior medical librarian was consulted throughout the process. The search was carried out using Ovid (Wolters Kluwer, Netherlands) and EBSCO, and run from inception to 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023. An example search strategy is included in Supplementary Materials B. Further studies were identified through reference lists of included records.

### *Eligibility criteria*

Screening was performed in accordance with the criteria shown in Table 3. The scope of this review was limited to implantable BCI devices, defined as an intracranial device which records neural activity and decodes this into an output signal to control an external effector. Non-invasive BCI devices and cochlear implants have previously been discussed in detail. [19–23] Additionally, studies were excluded where transient implantation was carried out for the primary purpose of peri-operative care, e.g. seizure localization in epilepsy patients.

*Table 3: Exclusion criteria.*

**Exclusion criteria**

- 1 No use of implantable BCI devices
- 2 No discussion of BCI recalibration
- 3 Not a full text, independent publication
- 4 Not a primary study
- 5 Text not available in English
- 6 Full text not available
- 7 Non-human subjects

*Study selection*

Included records were screened by two independent reviewers (ED, ES). An initial pilot screen of 50 records was carried out to ensure concordance, following which reviewers were blinded to each other's decisions using Rayyan (Rayyan Systems Inc, Cambridge, MA, USA). Disagreements were resolved by consensus or discussion with a third reviewer (JB). Full-text screening was carried out by the same reviewers (ED, ES).

*Data management, extraction, and appraisal*

Data extraction was carried out using a piloted proforma in Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA). Risk of bias assessment was carried out in duplicate by two reviewers (ES, ED) using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) checklist. Zotero (Zotero, Vienna, VA, USA) was used for reference management.

*Data synthesis*

Analysis was carried out in R (R Core Team, 2019). Plots were produced using the ggplot2 package. [24] Figures were edited using Inkscape (Inkscape Project, 2020).

As protocol papers were rarely published prior to publication of the included manuscripts, outcome measures were considered to be prospectively reported if they were clearly defined in the methods section.

During data extraction, outcome measures were divided into three categories: 1. evaluation of decoder performance (e.g. classifier accuracy), 2. evaluation of task performance (e.g. successful target acquisition), or 3. assessment of clinical outcome (e.g. Graded Redefined Assessment of Strength, Sensibility and Prehension, GRASSP scale).

## **List of Supplementary Materials**

Supplementary Materials A: PRISMA checklist

Supplementary Materials B: Example search strategy as applied to MEDLINE

Supplementary Materials C: Table of included studies



## References and Notes

1. Kawala-Sterniuk A, Browarska N, Al-Bakri A, Pelc M, Zygarlicki J, Sidikova M, et al. Summary of over Fifty Years with Brain-Computer Interfaces—A Review. *Brain Sci.* 2021 Jan 3;11(1):43.
2. Chaudhary U, Birbaumer N, Ramos-Murguialday A. Brain-computer interfaces for communication and rehabilitation. *Nat Rev Neurol.* 2016 Sep;12(9):513–25.
3. Hochberg LR, Serruya MD, Friehs GM, Mukand JA, Saleh M, Caplan AH, et al. Neuronal ensemble control of prosthetic devices by a human with tetraplegia. *Nature.* 2006 Jul;442(7099):164–71.
4. Mitchell P, Lee SCM, Yoo PE, Morokoff A, Sharma RP, Williams DL, et al. Assessment of Safety of a Fully Implanted Endovascular Brain-Computer Interface for Severe Paralysis in 4 Patients: The Stentrode With Thought-Controlled Digital Switch (SWITCH) Study. *JAMA Neurol.* 2023 Mar 1;80(3):270.
5. Wang W, Collinger JL, Degenhart AD, Tyler-Kabara EC, Schwartz AB, Moran DW, et al. An Electrocorticographic Brain Interface in an Individual with Tetraplegia. *PLoS ONE.* 2013 Feb 6;8(2):e55344.
6. Willett FR, Avansino DT, Hochberg LR, Henderson JM, Shenoy KV. High-performance brain-to-text communication via handwriting. *Nature.* 2021 May;593(7858):249–54.
7. Moses DA, Metzger SL, Liu JR, Anumanchipalli GK, Makin JG, Sun PF, et al. Neuroprosthesis for Decoding Speech in a Paralyzed Person with Anarthria. *N Engl J Med.* 2021 Jul 14;385(3):217–27.
8. Metzger SL, Littlejohn KT, Silva AB, Moses DA, Seaton MP, Wang R, et al. A high-performance neuroprosthesis for speech decoding and avatar control. *Nature.* 2023 Aug;620(7976):1037–46.
9. Vansteensel MJ, Pels EGM, Bleichner MG, Branco MP, Denison T, Freudenburg ZV, et al. Fully Implanted Brain-Computer Interface in a Locked-In Patient with ALS. *N Engl J Med.* 2016 Nov 24;375(21):2060–6.
10. Neuralink. PRIME Study Progress Update — User Experience [Internet]. Neuralink Blog. 2024 [cited 2024 Sep 6]. Available from: <https://neuralink.com/blog/prime-study-progress-update-user-experience/>
11. Paradromics Accepted to FDA Regulatory Accelerator Program and Announces New Patient Registry [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 18]. Available from: <https://www.paradromics.com/news/paradromics-accepted-to-fda-regulatory-accelerator-program-and-announces-new-patient-registry>
12. Fry A, Chan HW, Harel NY, Spielman LA, Escalon MX, Putrino DF. Evaluating the clinical benefit of brain-computer interfaces for control of a personal computer. *J Neural Eng.* 2022 Apr;19(2):021001.
13. Sawyer A, Chetty N, McMullen DP, Dean H, Eisler J, Fried-Oken M, et al. Building consensus on clinical outcome assessments for BCI devices. A summary of the 10th BCI society meeting 2023 workshop. *J Neural Eng* [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Sep 21]; Available from: <http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1741-2552/ad7bec>
14. Public Workshop – Food and Drug Administration/National Institutes of Health Joint Workshop: Developing Implanted Brain-Computer Interface Clinical Outcome Assessments to Demonstrate Benefit, September 19 and 20, 2024 - 09/19/2024 [Internet]. FDA. 2024 [cited 2024 Aug 14]. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/fda-meetings-conferences-and-workshops/public-workshop-food-and-drug-administrationnational-institutes-health-joint-workshop-developing>
15. RFA-FD-23-030: Systematic Review of Clinical Outcome Assessments (COAs) for Communication Brain-Computer Interface Devices (cBCIs) in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS) (UH2/UH3) Clinical Trials Not Allowed [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 11]. Available from: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-FD-23-030.html>

16. Simmons Z. Patient-Perceived Outcomes and Quality of Life in ALS. *Neurother J Am Soc Exp Neurother*. 2015 Apr;12(2):394–402.
17. Calvert M, Blazeby J, Altman DG, Revicki DA, Moher D, Brundage MD, et al. Reporting of Patient-Reported Outcomes in Randomized Trials: The CONSORT PRO Extension. *JAMA*. 2013 Feb 27;309(8):814–22.
18. Research C for DE and. Patient-Focused Drug Development: Selecting, Developing, or Modifying Fit-for-Purpose Clinical Outcome Assessments [Internet]. FDA; 2024 [cited 2024 Sep 25]. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/patient-focused-drug-development-selecting-developing-or-modifying-fit-purpose-clinical-outcome>
19. Liu B, Gao H, Jiang Y, Wu J. A review of research on non-invasive brain-computer interface technology. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 4th International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence for Medicine Science* [Internet]. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2024 [cited 2024 May 31]. p. 887–91. (ISAIMS '23). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3644116.3644268>
20. Maslova O, Komarova Y, Shusharina N, Kolsanov A, Zakharov A, Garina E, et al. Non-invasive EEG-based BCI spellers from the beginning to today: a mini-review. *Front Hum Neurosci* [Internet]. 2023 Aug 23 [cited 2024 May 31];17. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2023.1216648>
21. Kalagi S, Machado J, Carvalho V, Soares F, Matos D. Brain computer interface systems using non-invasive electroencephalogram signal: A literature review. In: *2017 International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC)* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2024 May 31]. p. 1578–83. Available from: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8280071>
22. Gaylor JM, Raman G, Chung M, Lee J, Rao M, Lau J, et al. Cochlear implantation in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Otolaryngol-- Head Neck Surg*. 2013 Mar;139(3):265–72.
23. Forli F, Arslan E, Bellelli S, Burdo S, Mancini P, Martini A, et al. Systematic review of the literature on the clinical effectiveness of the cochlear implant procedure in paediatric patients. *Acta Otorhinolaryngol Ital*. 2011 Oct;31(5):281–98.
24. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis* [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer; 2009 [cited 2024 May 31]. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-0-387-98141-3>
25. Aflalo T, Kellis S, Klaes C, Lee B, Shi Y, Pejsa K, et al. Decoding motor imagery from the posterior parietal cortex of a tetraplegic human. *Science*. 2015 May 22;348(6237):906–10.
26. Ajiboye AB, Willett FR, Young DR, Memberg WD, Murphy BA, Miller JP, et al. Restoration of reaching and grasping in a person with tetraplegia through brain-controlled muscle stimulation: a proof-of-concept demonstration. *Lancet Lond Engl*. 2017 May 5;389(10081):1821.
27. Bacher D, Jarosiewicz B, Masse NY, Stavisky SD, Simeral JD, Newell K, et al. Neural Point-and-Click Communication by a Person With Incomplete Locked-In Syndrome. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2015 Jun;29(5):462–71.
28. Benabid AL, Costecalde T, Eliseyev A, Charvet G, Verney A, Karakas S, et al. An exoskeleton controlled by an epidural wireless brain-machine interface in a tetraplegic patient: a proof-of-concept demonstration. *Lancet Neurol*. 2019 Dec 1;18(12):1112–22.
29. Bockbrader M, Annetta N, Friedenber D, Schwemmer M, Skomrock N, Colachis S, et al. Clinically Significant Gains in Skillful Grasp Coordination by an Individual With Tetraplegia Using an Implanted Brain-Computer Interface With Forearm Transcutaneous Muscle Stimulation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2019 Jul 1;100(7):1201–17.
30. Bouton CE, Shaikhouni A, Annetta NV, Bockbrader MA, Friedenber DA, Nielson DM, et al. Restoring cortical control of functional movement in a human with quadriplegia. *Nature*. 2016 May;533(7602):247–50.

31. Brandman DM, Burkhart MC, Kelemen J, Franco B, Harrison MT, Hochberg LR. Robust Closed-Loop Control of a Cursor in a Person with Tetraplegia using Gaussian Process Regression. *Neural Comput.* 2018 Sep 14;1–23.
32. Brandman DM, Hosman T, Saab J, Burkhart MC, Shanahan BE, Ciancibello JG, et al. Rapid calibration of an intracortical brain computer interface for people with tetraplegia. *J Neural Eng.* 2018 Apr 1;15(2):026007.
33. Cajigas I, Davis KC, Meschede-Krasa B, Prins NW, Gallo S, Naeem JA, et al. Implantable brain–computer interface for neuroprosthetic-enabled volitional hand grasp restoration in spinal cord injury. *Brain Commun.* 2021 Oct 21;3(4):fcab248.
34. Cajigas I, Davis KC, Prins NW, Gallo S, Naeem JA, Fisher L, et al. Brain-Computer interface control of stepping from invasive electrocorticography upper-limb motor imagery in a patient with quadriplegia. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 2023 Jan 9;16:1077416.
35. Chadwick EK, Blana D, Simeral JD, Lambrecht J, Kim SP, Cornwell AS, et al. Continuous neuronal ensemble control of simulated arm reaching by a human with tetraplegia. *J Neural Eng.* 2011 Jun;8(3):034003.
36. Collinger JL, Wodlinger B, Downey JE, Wang W, Tyler-Kabara EC, Weber DJ, et al. High-performance neuroprosthetic control by an individual with tetraplegia. *The Lancet.* 2013 Feb 16;381(9866):557–64.
37. Davis KC, Meschede-Krasa B, Cajigas I, Prins NW, Alver C, Gallo S, et al. Design-development of an at-home modular brain–computer interface (BCI) platform in a case study of cervical spinal cord injury. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2022 Jun 3;19:53.
38. Degenhart AD, Hiremath SV, Yang Y, Foldes S, Collinger JL, Boninger M, et al. Remapping cortical modulation for electrocorticographic brain–computer interfaces: a somatotopy-based approach in individuals with upper-limb paralysis. *J Neural Eng.* 2018 Apr 1;15(2):026021.
39. Dekleva BM, Weiss JM, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. Generalizable cursor click decoding using grasp-related neural transients. *J Neural Eng.* 2021 Aug 31;18(4):10.1088/1741-2552/ac16b2.
40. Downey JE, Weiss JM, Muelling K, Venkatraman A, Valois JS, Hebert M, et al. Blending of brain-machine interface and vision-guided autonomous robotics improves neuroprosthetic arm performance during grasping. *J NeuroEngineering Rehabil.* 2016 Mar 18;13(1):28.
41. Downey JE, Weiss JM, Flesher SN, Thumser ZC, Marasco PD, Boninger ML, et al. Implicit Grasp Force Representation in Human Motor Cortical Recordings. *Front Neurosci.* 2018 Oct 31;12:801.
42. Feng Z, Sun Y, Qian L, Qi Y, Wang Y, Guan C, et al. Design a Novel BCI for Neurorehabilitation Using Concurrent LFP and EEG Features: A Case Study. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng.* 2022 May;69(5):1554–63.
43. Friedenber DA, Schwemmer MA, Landgraf AJ, Annetta NV, Bockbrader MA, Bouton CE, et al. Neuroprosthetic-enabled control of graded arm muscle contraction in a paralyzed human. *Sci Rep.* 2017 Aug 21;7(1):8386.
44. Gilja V, Pandarinath C, Blabe CH, Nuyujukian P, Simeral JD, Sarma AA, et al. Clinical translation of a high-performance neural prosthesis. *Nat Med.* 2015 Oct;21(10):1142–5.
45. Guan C, Aflalo T, Kadlec K, Gámez de Leon J, Rosario ER, Bari A, et al. Decoding and geometry of ten finger movements in human posterior parietal cortex and motor cortex. *J Neural Eng.* 2023 Jun 1;20(3):036020.
46. Guan C, Aflalo T, Zhang CY, Amoroso E, Rosario ER, Pouratian N, et al. Stability of motor representations after paralysis. *Diedrichsen J, Baker CI, Diedrichsen J, editors. eLife.* 2022 Sep 20;11:e74478.



47. Guenther FH, Brumberg JS, Wright EJ, Nieto-Castanon A, Tourville JA, Panko M, et al. A Wireless Brain-Machine Interface for Real-Time Speech Synthesis. *PLoS ONE*. 2009 Dec 9;4(12):e8218.
48. Guthrie MD, Herrera AJ, Downey JE, Brane LJ, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. The impact of distractions on intracortical brain-computer interface control of a robotic arm. *Brain-Comput Interfaces*. 2022 Jan 2;9(1):23–35.
49. Handelman DA, Osborn LE, Thomas TM, Badger AR, Thompson M, Nickl RW, et al. Shared Control of Bimanual Robotic Limbs With a Brain-Machine Interface for Self-Feeding. *Front Neurobotics* [Internet]. 2022 Jun 28 [cited 2024 May 23];16. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnbot.2022.918001>
50. Hochberg LR, Bacher D, Jarosiewicz B, Masse NY, Simeral JD, Vogel J, et al. Reach and grasp by people with tetraplegia using a neurally controlled robotic arm. *Nature*. 2012 May;485(7398):372–5.
51. Jarosiewicz B, Sarma AA, Bacher D, Masse NY, Simeral JD, Sorice B, et al. Virtual typing by people with tetraplegia using a self-calibrating intracortical brain-computer interface. *Sci Transl Med*. 2015 Nov 11;7(313):313ra179.
52. Jarosiewicz B, Sarma AA, Saab J, Franco B, Cash SS, Eskandar EN, et al. Retrospectively supervised click decoder calibration for self-calibrating point-and-click brain-computer interfaces. *J Physiol Paris*. 2016 Nov;110(4 Pt A):382–91.
53. Jiang H, Wang R, Zheng Z, Zhu J, Qi Y, Xu K, et al. Short report: surgery for implantable brain-computer interface assisted by robotic navigation system. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)*. 2022 Sep 1;164(9):2299–302.
54. Jorge A, Royston DA, Tyler-Kabara EC, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. Classification of Individual Finger Movements Using Intracortical Recordings in Human Motor Cortex. *Neurosurgery*. 2020 Oct;87(4):630.
55. Kennedy PR, Kirby MT, Moore MM, King B, Mallory A. Computer control using human intracortical local field potentials. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2004 Sep;12(3):339–44.
56. Kennedy PR, Bakay RAE, Moore MM, Adams K, Goldwithe J. Direct control of a computer from the human central nervous system. *IEEE Trans Rehabil Eng*. 2000 Jun;8(2):198–202.
57. Kennedy P, Andreasen D, Bartels J, Ehirim P, Mao H, Velliste M, et al. Making the lifetime connection between brain and machine for restoring and enhancing function. *Prog Brain Res*. 2011;194:1–25.
58. Kim SP, Simeral JD, Hochberg LR, Donoghue JP, Friehs GM, Black MJ. Point-and-Click Cursor Control With an Intracortical Neural Interface System by Humans With Tetraplegia. *Ieee Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2011 Apr;19(2):193–203.
59. Kim SP, Simeral JD, Hochberg LR, Donoghue JP, Black MJ. Neural control of computer cursor velocity by decoding motor cortical spiking activity in humans with tetraplegia. *J Neural Eng*. 2008 Dec;5(4):455–76.
60. Kryger M, Wester B, Pohlmeier EA, Rich M, John B, Beaty J, et al. Flight simulation using a Brain-Computer Interface: A pilot, pilot study. *Exp Neurol*. 2017 Jan 1;287:473–8.
61. Leinders S, Vansteensel MJ, Branco MP, Freudenburg ZV, Pels EGM, Van der Vijgh B, et al. Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex-based control with an implanted brain-computer interface. *Sci Rep*. 2020 Sep 22;10(1):15448.
62. Lorach H, Galvez A, Spagnolo V, Martel F, Karakas S, Intering N, et al. Walking naturally after spinal cord injury using a brain-spine interface. *Nature*. 2023 Jun;618(7963):126–33.
63. Luo S, Angrick M, Coogan C, Candrea DN, Wyse-Sookoo K, Shah S, et al. Stable Decoding from a Speech BCI Enables Control for an Individual with ALS without Recalibration for 3 Months. *Adv Sci*. 2023;10(35):2304853.

64. Márquez-Chin C, Popovic MR, Sanin E, Chen R, Lozano AM. Real-time two-dimensional asynchronous control of a computer cursor with a single subdural electrode. *J Spinal Cord Med*. 2012 Sep;35(5):382–91.
65. Masse NY, Jarosiewicz B, Simeral JD, Bacher D, Stavisky SD, Cash SS, et al. Non-causal spike filtering improves decoding of movement intention for intracortical BCIs. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2014 Oct 30;236:58–67.
66. Metzger SL, Liu JR, Moses DA, Dougherty ME, Seaton MP, Littlejohn KT, et al. Generalizable spelling using a speech neuroprosthesis in an individual with severe limb and vocal paralysis. *Nat Commun*. 2022 Nov 8;13(1):6510.
67. Moly A, Costecalde T, Martel F, Martin M, Larzabal C, Karakas S, et al. An adaptive closed-loop ECoG decoder for long-term and stable bimanual control of an exoskeleton by a tetraplegic. *J Neural Eng*. 2022 Apr 1;19(2):026021.
68. Nuyujukian P, Albites Sanabria J, Saab J, Pandarinath C, Jarosiewicz B, Blabe CH, et al. Cortical control of a tablet computer by people with paralysis. *PLoS ONE*. 2018 Nov 21;13(11):e0204566.
69. Oxley TJ, Yoo PE, Rind GS, Ronayne SM, Lee CMS, Bird C, et al. Motor neuroprosthesis implanted with neurointerventional surgery improves capacity for activities of daily living tasks in severe paralysis: first in-human experience. *J Neurointerventional Surg*. 2021 Feb;13(2):102–8.
70. Pandarinath C, Nuyujukian P, Blabe CH, Sorice BL, Saab J, Willett FR, et al. High performance communication by people with paralysis using an intracortical brain-computer interface. Kastner S, editor. *eLife*. 2017 Feb 21;6:e18554.
71. Pels EGM, Aarnoutse EJ, Leinders S, Freudenburg ZV, Branco MP, van der Vijgh BH, et al. Stability of a chronic implanted brain-computer interface in late-stage amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2019 Oct;130(10):1798–803.
72. Perge JA, Homer ML, Malik WQ, Cash S, Eskandar E, Friehs G, et al. Intra-day signal instabilities affect decoding performance in an intracortical neural interface system. *J Neural Eng*. 2013 Jun;10(3):036004.
73. Perge JA, Zhang S, Malik WQ, Homer ML, Cash S, Friehs G, et al. Reliability of directional information in unsorted spikes and local field potentials recorded in human motor cortex. *J Neural Eng*. 2014 Aug;11(4):046007.
74. Rizzoglio F, Altan E, Ma X, Bodkin KL, Dekleva BM, Solla SA, et al. From monkeys to humans: observation-based EMG brain-computer interface decoders for humans with paralysis. *J Neural Eng*. 2023 Oct 1;20(5):056040.
75. Rouanne V, Costecalde T, Benabid AL, Aksenova T. Unsupervised adaptation of an ECoG based brain-computer interface using neural correlates of task performance. *Sci Rep*. 2022 Dec 9;12(1):21316.
76. Rubin DB, Ajiboye AB, Barefoot L, Bowker M, Cash SS, Chen D, et al. Interim Safety Profile From the Feasibility Study of the BrainGate Neural Interface System. *Neurology*. 2023 Mar 14;100(11):e1177–92.
77. Rubin DB, Hosman T, Kelemen JN, Kapitonava A, Willett FR, Coughlin BF, et al. Learned Motor Patterns Are Replayed in Human Motor Cortex during Sleep. *J Neurosci*. 2022 Jun 22;42(25):5007–20.
78. Sakellaridi S, Christopoulos VN, Aflalo T, Pejsa KW, Rosario ER, Ouellette D, et al. Intrinsic variable learning for brain-machine interface control by human anterior intraparietal cortex. *Neuron*. 2019 May 8;102(3):694-705.e3.
79. Serino A, Bockbrader M, Bertoni T, Colachis IV S, Solcà M, Dunlap C, et al. Sense of agency for intracortical brain-machine interfaces. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2022 Apr;6(4):565–78.
80. Serruya MD, Napoli A, Satterthwaite N, Kardine J, McCoy J, Grampurohit N, et al. Neuromotor prosthetic to treat stroke-related paresis: N-of-1 trial. *Commun Med*. 2022 Apr 7;2(1):1–14.

81. Shah NP, Willsey MS, Hahn N, Kamdar F, Avansino DT, Hochberg LR, et al. A brain-computer typing interface using finger movements. *Int IEEEEMBS Conf Neural Eng Proc Int IEEE EMBS Conf Neural Eng*. 2023 Apr;2023:10.1109/ner52421.2023.10123912.
82. Shaikhouni A, Donoghue JP, Hochberg LR. Somatosensory responses in a human motor cortex. *J Neurophysiol*. 2013 Apr 15;109(8):2192–204.
83. Silversmith DB, Abiri R, Hardy NF, Natraj N, Tu-Chan A, Chang EF, et al. Plug-and-play control of a brain–computer interface through neural map stabilization. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2021 Mar;39(3):326–35.
84. Simeral JD, Kim SP, Black MJ, Donoghue JP, Hochberg LR. Neural control of cursor trajectory and click by a human with tetraplegia 1000 days after implant of an intracortical microelectrode array. *J Neural Eng*. 2011 Apr;8(2):025027.
85. Simeral JD, Hosman T, Saab J, Flesher SN, Vilela M, Franco B, et al. Home Use of a Percutaneous Wireless Intracortical Brain–Computer Interface by Individuals With Tetraplegia. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng*. 2021 Jul;68(7):2313–25.
86. Śliwowski M, Martin M, Souloumiac A, Blanchart P, Aksenova T. Decoding ECoG signal into 3D hand translation using deep learning. *J Neural Eng*. 2022 Mar;19(2):026023.
87. Talakoub O, Marquez-Chin C, Popovic MR, Navarro J, Fonoff ET, Hamani C, et al. Reconstruction of reaching movement trajectories using electrocorticographic signals in humans. *PLoS ONE*. 2017 Sep 20;12(9):e0182542.
88. Truccolo W, Friehs GM, Donoghue JP, Hochberg LR. Primary Motor Cortex Tuning to Intended Movement Kinematics in Humans with Tetraplegia. *J Neurosci*. 2008 Jan 30;28(5):1163–78.
89. Vansteensel MJ, Pels EGM, Bleichner MG, Branco MP, Denison T, Freudenburg ZV, et al. Fully Implanted Brain–Computer Interface in a Locked-In Patient with ALS. *N Engl J Med*. 2016 Nov 24;375(21):2060–6.
90. Weiss JM, Gaunt RA, Franklin R, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. Demonstration of a portable intracortical brain-computer interface. *Brain-Comput Interfaces*. 2019 Oct 2;6(4):106–17.
91. Willett FR, Young DR, Murphy BA, Memberg WD, Blabe CH, Pandarinath C, et al. Principled BCI Decoder Design and Parameter Selection Using a Feedback Control Model. *Sci Rep*. 2019 Jun 20;9:8881.
92. Willett FR, Kunz EM, Fan C, Avansino DT, Wilson GH, Choi EY, et al. A high-performance speech neuroprosthesis. *Nature*. 2023 Aug;620(7976):1031–6.
93. Wodlinger B, Downey JE, Tyler-Kabara EC, Schwartz AB, Boninger ML, Collinger JL. Ten-dimensional anthropomorphic arm control in a human brain–machine interface: difficulties, solutions, and limitations. *J Neural Eng*. 2014 Dec;12(1):016011.
94. YOUNG D, WILLETT F, MEMBERG WD, MURPHY B, WALTER B, SWEET J, et al. Signal processing methods for reducing artifacts in microelectrode brain recordings caused by functional electrical stimulation. *J Neural Eng*. 2018 Apr 1;15(2):026014.
95. Zhang CY, Aflalo T, Revechkis B, Rosario E, Ouellette D, Pouratian N, et al. Preservation of Partially Mixed Selectivity in Human Posterior Parietal Cortex across Changes in Task Context. *eNeuro*. 2020 Mar 4;7(2):ENEURO.0222-19.2019.

**Acknowledgments:** N/A

**Funding:** N/A

**Author contributions:**

Conceptualization: JB, LB, ED, ES

Methodology: ED, ES, JB, LB

Visualization: ED, JB, LJ

Data extraction: ED, ES, SY, LJ, LT

Writing – original draft: ED, ES, HLH, LB, JB

Writing – review & editing: ED, ES, HLH, LB, JB, LJ, SY, LT

**Competing interests:** JB reports consulting fees from Synchron Inc., and the UK Advanced Research and Invention Agency (ARIA).

**Data and materials availability:** Data are available on reasonable request.