

Introducing the Use of Thermal Neurofeedback

François Le Jeune^{1,*}, E. Savalle^{1,*}, A. Lécuyer², M. J.-M. Macé¹, P. Maurel³,

L. Pillette¹

¹Univ. Rennes, Inria, CNRS, IRISA, Rennes, France ²Inria, Univ. Rennes, IRISA, CNRS, Rennes, France ³Univ. Rennes, Inria, CNRS, Inserm, Empenn ERL U1228, Rennes

rtFIN 2024 – 04/11/2024 – Heidelberg, Germany

Introduction: Neurofeedback modalities



Introduction: rationale for thermal feedback

TEC1-03108

 ✓ Activates sensorimotor areas [5,6] and overall lager areas than tactile or mechanical stimulation [7,8]

✓ Benefits post-stroke sensorimotor recovery [9,10]

Convenient: Peltier cells



[10] Wu, et al. (2010)



Affordable & easy to use

Introduction: rationale for thermal feedback

 ✓ Activates sensorimotor areas [5,6] and overall lager areas than tactile or mechanical stimulation [7,8]

✓ Be



Objective: investigate the impact of thermal modality on neurofeedback performance





Mental task Kinesthetic Motor Imagery (KMI)





Neurofeedback runs 1 run: 20 trials 1 trial: 5 s rest, 10 s task FB: online ERD Laplacian on C3 [8 Hz - 20 Hz] **Stimulation** run

No KMI

Stimulation only (replay of feedback generated during 2nd NFB run)

Materials and Methods

	Modality		
Task	Visual	Thermal	Visuothermal
Neurofeedback	2x3 Repeated-Measures ANOVA		
Stimulation			

Variables

- ERSP computed **off**line: **ERSP** ______ includes **both** ERD & ERS

Results on *ERSP* 1/3: main effect of Modality



Better performance with V and VT feedback compared to T

 $\square \neq$ intuitiveness

 $\square \neq$ stimulation delay

Richer information in V (vs T)

Similar performance between V and VT feedback

Possible to combine T modality to V without impairing V performance

Results on *ERSP* 2/3: main effect of *Task*



Neurofeedback brings about greater desynchronization than Stimulation.

Stimulation can generate ERDs on its own.

Results on ERSP 3/3: no interaction



 $[\]triangle$ No interaction. For information only.

Similar effect of *Modality* on ERSP for Neurofeedback and Stimulation

It seems visual Stimulation (moving hand) causes desynchronization on its own.

Probable presence of an Action Observation(AO) effect with V and VT modalities [11]

Results on **ERD**_{on}

No main effect of *Modality* on *ERD*_{on}

Probably due to setting ERS to 0 during online processing.







Take-home messages

Computing feedback only based on ERD might not be an ideal practice. Information loss, variable less reliable. No training of ERS minimization.

From *ERSP* investigation, it seems possible to combine Thermal modality to Visual modality (VT) without impairing performance of Visual modality.

Probable Action Observation effect of the Visual feedback, complementary with KMI-induced ERDs.

Visuo-thermal relevant for therapeutical applications. Combines MI-NFB, AO [11] (ERDs) and clinical benefits of thermal stimulation [9, 10].

Upcoming work and Perspective

Additional analyses:

Spatial & spectral investigation of brain activity

Neural correlates of modalities and tasks

Improving thermal modality:

☞ Use also **cold** temperatures (two directions) [12]

☞ Increase intensity & variation speed (easier detection) [12]

Perspective:

Clinically test VT neurofeedback as therapeutical application.



Thank you for your attention !





Emile Savalle PhD Student

Marc Macé CNRS Researcher



Pierre Maurel Rennes Univ. Professor



Director



Anatole Lécuyer Léa Pillette Inria Research CNRS Researcher







PEPERONI