

1 Review

2 **Brain-Computer Interface Robotics for Hand Rehabilitation**

3 **After Stroke: A Systematic Review**

4 Paul Dominick E Baniqued¹, Emily C Stanyer², Muhammad Awais², Ali Alazmani¹, Andrew
5 E Jackson¹, Mark A Mon-Williams², Faisal Mushtaq*², Raymond J Holt¹

6

7 1 School of Mechanical Engineering, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT Leeds, United Kingdom

8 2 School of Psychology, University of Leeds, LS2 9JZ Leeds, United Kingdom

9

10 *Correspondence: f.mushtaq@leeds.ac.uk

11

12 Keywords: brain-computer interface, electroencephalography, motor imagery, action

13 observation, robot-assisted rehabilitation, hand, wrist, stroke, therapy

14 **Abstract**

15 **Background:** Hand rehabilitation is core to helping stroke survivors regain activities of daily
16 living. Recent studies have suggested that the use of electroencephalography-based brain-
17 computer interfaces (BCI) can promote this process. Here, we report the first systematic
18 examination of the literature on the use of BCI-robot systems for the rehabilitation of fine
19 motor skills associated with hand movement and profile these systems from a technical and
20 clinical perspective.

21 **Methods:** A search for January 2010-October 2019 articles using Ovid MEDLINE, Embase,
22 PEDro, PsycINFO, IEEE Xplore and Cochrane Library databases was performed. The
23 selection criteria included BCI-hand robotic systems for rehabilitation at different stages of
24 development involving tests on healthy participants or people who have had a stroke. Data
25 fields include those related to study design, participant characteristics, technical
26 specifications of the system, and clinical outcome measures.

27 **Results:** 30 studies were identified as eligible for qualitative review and among these, 11
28 studies involved testing a BCI-hand robot on chronic and subacute stroke patients.
29 Statistically significant improvements in motor assessment scores relative to controls were
30 observed for three BCI-hand robot interventions. The degree of robot control for the majority
31 of studies was limited to triggering the device to perform grasping or pinching movements
32 using motor imagery. Most employed a combination of kinaesthetic and visual response via
33 the robotic device and display screen, respectively, to match feedback to motor imagery.

34 **Conclusion:** 19 out of 30 studies on BCI-robotic systems for hand rehabilitation report
35 systems at prototype or pre-clinical stages of development. Three studies report statistically
36 significant improvements in functional recovery after stroke, but there is a need to develop a
37 standard protocol for assessing technical and clinical outcomes so that the necessary evidence
38 base on efficiency and efficacy can be developed.

39 **Background**

40 There is growing interest in the use of robotics within the field of rehabilitation. This interest
41 is driven by the increasing number of people requiring rehabilitation following problems such
42 as stroke (with an ageing population), and the global phenomenon of insufficient numbers of
43 therapists able to deliver rehabilitation exercises to patients [1,2]. Robotic systems allow a
44 therapist to prescribe exercises that can then be guided by the robot rather than the therapist.

45 An important principle within the use of such systems is that the robots assist the patient to
46 actively undertake a prescribed movement rather than the patient's limb being moved
47 passively. This means that it is necessary for the system to sense when the patient is trying to
48 generate the required movement (given that, by definition, the patient normally struggles with
49 the action). One potential solution to this issue is to use force sensors that can detect when the
50 patient is starting to generate the movement (at which point the robot's motors can provide
51 assistive forces). It is also possible to use measures of muscle activation (EMGs) to detect the
52 intent to move [3]. In the last two decades there has been a concerted effort by groups of
53 clinicians, neuroscientists and engineers to integrate robotic systems with brain signals
54 correlated with a patient trying to actively generate a movement, or imagine a motor action to
55 enhance the efficacy and effectiveness of stroke rehabilitation. These systems, referred to as
56 Brain Computer Interfaces, or BCIs, are motivated by idea that the rehabilitation process can
57 be enhanced by particular types of brain activity related to imagining the movement [4] .

58

59 BCIs allow brain state-dependent control of robotic devices to aid stroke patients during
60 upper limb therapy. While BCIs in their general form have been in development for almost
61 50 years [5] and theoretically made possible since the discovery of the scalp-recorded human
62 electroencephalogram (EEG) in the 1920s [6], their application to rehabilitation is more
63 recent [7–9]. Graimann et al. [10] defined a BCI as an artificial system that provides direct

64 communication between the brain and a device based on the user's intent; bypassing the
65 normal efferent pathways of the body's peripheral nervous system. A BCI recognises user
66 intent by measuring brain activity and translating it into executable commands usually
67 performed by a computer, hence the term "brain-computer interface".

68

69 Most robotic devices used in upper limb rehabilitation exist in the form of exoskeletons or
70 end-effectors. Robotic exoskeletons (i.e., powered orthoses, braces) are wearable devices
71 where the actuators are biomechanically aligned with the wearer's joints and linkages;
72 allowing the additional torque to provide assistance, augmentation and even resistance during
73 training [11]. In comparison, end-effector systems generate movement through applying
74 forces to the most distal segment of the extremity via handles and attachments [11].

75 Rehabilitation robots are classified as Class II-B medical devices (i.e., a therapeutic device
76 that administers the exchange of energy, mechanically, to a patient) and safety considerations
77 are important during development [12,13]. Most commercial robots are focused on arms and
78 legs, each offering a unique therapy methodology. There is also a category of device that
79 target the hand and finger. While often less studied than the proximal areas of the upper limb,
80 hand and finger rehabilitation are core component in regaining activities of daily living
81 (ADL) [14]. Many ADLs require dexterous and fine motor movements (e.g. grasping and
82 pinching) and there is evidence that even patients with minimal proximal shoulder and elbow
83 control can regain some hand capacity long-term following stroke [15].

84

85 The strategy of BCI-robot systems (i.e. systems that integrate BCI and robots into one unified
86 system) in rehabilitation is to recognise the patient's intention to move or perform a task via a
87 neural or physiological signal, and then use a robotic device to provide assistive forces in a
88 manner that mimics the actions of a therapist during standard therapy sessions [16]. The

89 resulting feedback is patient-driven and is designed to aid in closing the neural loop from
90 intention to execution. This process is said to promote use-dependent neuroplasticity within
91 intact brain regions and relies on the repeated experience of initiating and achieving a
92 specified target [17,18]; making the active participation of the patient in performing the
93 therapy exercises an integral part of the motor re-learning process [19,20].

94

95 The aforementioned scalp-recorded EEG signal is a commonly used instrument for data
96 acquisition in BCI systems because it is non-invasive, easy to use and can detect relevant
97 brain activity with high temporal resolution [21,22]. In principle, the recognition of motor
98 imagery (MI), the imagination of movement without execution, via EEG can allow the
99 control of a device independent of muscle activity [10]. It has been shown that MI-based BCI
100 can discriminate motor intent by detecting event-related spectral perturbations (ERSP)
101 [23,24] and/or event-related desynchronisation/synchronisation (ERD/ERS) patterns in the μ
102 (9-11 Hz) and β (14-30 Hz) sensorimotor rhythm of EEG signals [24]. However, EEG also
103 brings with it some challenges. These neural markers are often concealed by various artifact
104 and may be difficult to recognise through the raw EEG signal alone. Thus, signal processing
105 (including feature extraction and classification) is a vital part of obtaining a good MI signal
106 for robotic control. A general pipeline for EEG data processing involves several steps. First,
107 the data undergo a series of pre-processing routines (e.g., filtering and artifact removal)
108 before feature extraction and classification for use as a control signal for the robotic hand.
109 There are variety of methods to remove artifact from EEG and these choices depend on the
110 overall scope of the work [25]. For instance, Independent Component Analysis (ICA) and
111 Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) can support real-time applications but are dependent
112 on manual input. In contrast, regression and wavelet methods are automated but support
113 offline applications. There also exist automated and real-time applications such as adaptive

114 filtering or using blind source separation (BSS) based methods. Recently, the research
115 community has been pushing real-time artifact rejection by reducing computational
116 complexity e.g. Enhanced Automatic Wavelet-ICA (EAWICA) [26], hybrid ICA - Wavelet
117 transform technique (ICA-W) [27] or by developing new approaches such as adaptive de-
118 noising frameworks [28] and Artifact Subspace Reconstruction (ASR) [29]. Feature
119 extraction involves recognising useful information (e.g., spectral power, time epochs, spatial
120 filtering) for better discriminability among mental states. For example, the common spatial
121 patterns (CSP) algorithm is a type of spatial filter that learns and maximises the variance of
122 band pass-filtered EEG from one class to discriminate it to the other [30]. Finally,
123 classification (which can range from linear and simple algorithms such as Linear
124 Discriminant Analysis (LDA), Linear Support Vector Machine (L-SVM) up to more complex
125 techniques in deep learning such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) and Recurrent
126 Neural Networks (RNN) [31,32] involves the translation of these signals of intent to an action
127 that provides the user feedback and closes the loop of the motor intent-to-action circuit.

128

129 The potential of MI-based BCIs has gained considerable attraction because the neural activity
130 involved in the control of the robotic device may be a key component in the rehabilitation
131 itself. For example, MI of movement is thought to activate some of the neural networks
132 involved in movement execution (ME) [33–36]. The resulting rationale is that encouraging
133 the use of MI could increase the capacity of the motor cortex to control major muscle
134 movements and decrease the necessity to use neural circuits damaged post-stroke. The
135 scientific justification for this approach was first provided by Jeannerod [36] who suggested
136 that the neural substrates of MI are part of a shared network that is also activated during the
137 simulation of action by the observation of action (AO) [36]. These ‘mirror neuron’ systems
138 are thought to be an important component of motor control and learning [36] - hence the

139 belief that activating these systems could aid rehabilitation. The use of a MI-BCI to control a
140 robot in comparison to traditional MI and physical practice provides a number of benefits to
141 its user and the practitioner. These advantages include the fact that the former can provide a
142 more streamlined approach such as sensing physiological states, automating visual and/or
143 kinaesthetic feedback and enriching the task and increasing user motivation through
144 gamification. There are also general concerns around the utility of motor imagery without
145 physical movement (and the corresponding muscle development that comes from these m)
146 and it is possible that these issues could be overcome through a control strategy that
147 progressively reduces the amount of support provided by the MI-BCI system and encourages
148 active motor control [37,38].

149

150 A recent meta-analysis of the neural correlates of action (MI, AO and ME) quantified
151 ‘conjunct’ and ‘contrast’ networks in the cortical and subcortical regions [33]. This analysis,
152 which took advantage of open-source historical data from fMRI studies, reported consistent
153 activation in the premotor, parietal and somatosensory areas for MI, AO and ME. Predicated
154 on such data, researchers have reasoned that performing MI should cause activation of the
155 neural substrates that are also involved in controlling movement and there have been a
156 number of research projects that have used AO in combination with MI in neurorehabilitation
157 [39–41] and motor learning studies [42,43] over the last decade.

158

159 One implication of using MI and AO to justify the use of BCI approaches is that great care
160 must be taken with regard to the quality of the environment in which the rehabilitation takes
161 place. While people can learn to modulate their brain rhythms without using motor imagery
162 and there is variability across individuals in their ability to imagine motor actions, MI-driven
163 BCI systems require (by design at least) for patient to imagine a movement. Likewise, AO

164 requires the patients to clearly see the action. This suggests that the richness and vividness of
165 the visual cues provided is an essential part of an effective BCI system. It is also reasonable
166 to assume that feedback is important within these processes and thus the quality of feedback
167 should be considered as essential. Afterall, MI and AO are just tools to modulate brain states
168 [40] and the effectiveness of these tools vary from one stroke patient to another [44]. Finally,
169 motivation is known to play an important role in promoting active participation during
170 therapy [20,45]. Thus, a good BCI system should incorporate an approach (such as gaming
171 and positive reward) that increases motivation. Recent advances in technology make it far
172 easier to create a rehabilitation environment that provides rich vivid cues, gives salient
173 feedback and is motivating. For example, the rise of immersive technologies, including
174 virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) platforms [46,45,47], allows for the creation
175 of engaging visual experiences that have the potential to improve a patient's self-efficacy [48]
176 and thereby encourage the patient to maintain the rehabilitation regime. One specific example
177 of this is visually amplifying the movement made by a patient when the movement is of
178 limited extent so that the patient can see their efforts are producing results [49].

179

180 In this review we set out to examine the literature to achieve a better understanding of the
181 current value and potential of BCI-based robotic therapy with three specific objectives:

182 (1) Identify how BCI technologies are being utilised in controlling robotic devices for
183 hand rehabilitation. Our focus was on the study design and the tasks that are
184 employed in setting up a BCI-hand robot therapy protocol.

185 (2) Document the readiness of BCI systems. Because BCI for rehabilitation is still an
186 emerging field of research, we expected that most studies would be in their proof-of-
187 concept or clinical testing stages of development. Our purpose was to determine the

188 limits of this technology in terms of: (a) resolution of hand MI detection and (b) the
189 degree of which we can have robotic control.

190 (3) Evaluate the clinical significance of BCI-hand robot systems by looking at the
191 outcome measures in motor recovery and determine if a standard protocol exists for
192 these interventions.

193

194 It is important to note that there have been several recent reviews exploring BCI for stroke
195 rehabilitation. For example, Monge-Pereira et al. [50] compiled EEG-based BCI studies for
196 upper limb stroke rehabilitation. Their systematic review (involving 13 clinical studies on
197 stroke and hemiplegic patients) reported on research methodological quality and
198 improvements in the motor abilities of stroke patients. Cervera et al. [51] performed a meta-
199 analysis on the clinical effectiveness of BCI-based stroke therapy among 9 randomised
200 clinical trials (RCT). McConnell et al. [52] undertook a narrative review of 110 robotic
201 devices with brain-machine interfaces for hand rehabilitation post-stroke. These reviews, in
202 general, have reported that such systems provide improvements in both functional and
203 clinical outcomes in pilot studies or trials involving small sample sizes. Thus, the literature
204 indicates that EEG-based BCI are a promising general approach for rehabilitation post-stroke.
205 The current work complements these previous reports by providing the first systematic
206 examination on the use of BCI-robot systems for the rehabilitation of fine motor skills
207 associated with hand movement and profiling these systems from a technical and clinical
208 perspective.

209 **Methods**

210 **Protocol Registration**

211 Details of the protocol for this systematic review were registered on the International
212 Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) and can be accessed at
213 www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO (ID: CRD42018112107).

214

215 **Search Strategy and Eligibility**

216 An in-depth search of articles from January 2010 to October 2019 was performed on Ovid
217 MEDLINE, Embase, PEDro, PsycINFO, IEEE Xplore and Cochrane Library. Only full-text
218 articles published in English were selected for this review. Table 1 shows the combination of
219 keywords used in the literature searching.

220

221 **Table 1. Keyword Combinations**

Set 1 (OR)	Set 2 (OR)	Set 3 (OR)
Brain-computer interface/BCI	Stroke (rehabilitation/	Robotic (exoskeleton/
Electroencephalography/EEG	therapy/treatment/recovery)	orthosis)
Brain-machine interface/BMI	Motor (rehabilitation,	Powered (exoskeleton/
Neural control interface	AND therapy/treatment/recovery)	AND orthosis)
Mind-machine interface	Neurorehabilitation	Robot
	Neurotherapy	Device
	Hand (rehabilitation/therapy/ recovery/exercises/movement)	

222

223 The inclusion criteria for the articles were: (1) publications that reported the development of
224 an EEG-based BCI; (2) studies targeted towards the rehabilitation of the hand after stroke; (3)
225 studies that involved the use of BCI and a robotic device (e.g., exoskeleton, end-effector type,
226 platform-types, etc.); (4) studies that performed a pilot test on healthy participants or a
227 clinical trial with people who have had a stroke. The articles were also screened for the

228 following exclusion criteria: (1) studies that targeted neurological diseases other than stroke;
229 (2) studies that used other intention sensing mechanisms (electromyography/EMG,
230 electrooculography/EOG, non-paretic hand, other body parts, etc.).

231

232 Two authors performed independent screenings of titles and abstracts based on the inclusion
233 and exclusion criteria. The use of a third reviewer was planned a priori in cases where a lack
234 of consensus existed around eligibility. However, consensus was achieved from the first two
235 authors during this stage. Full-text articles were then obtained, and a second screening was
236 performed until a final list of studies was agreed to be included for data extraction.

237

238 **Data Extraction**

239 The general characteristics of the study and their corresponding results were extracted from
240 the full-text articles by the reviewers following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
241 Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) checklist. Data fields included those related to study
242 design, participant characteristics, technical specifications of the system, and technical and
243 experimental results. For studies involving stroke patients, clinical outcomes were obtained
244 based on muscle improvement measures such as Fugl-Meyer Motor Assessment Upper
245 Extremity (FMA-UE) scores [53], Action Research Arm Test (ARAT) scores [54], United
246 Kingdom Medical Research Council (UK-MRC) muscle grade [55], Grip Strength (GS) Test
247 and Pinch Strength (PS) Test scores (i.e., kilogram force collected using an electronic hand
248 dynamometer) among others.

249 **Quality Assessment**

250 *Technological Readiness*

251 We first assessed the development stages of the systems used in the studies extracted. By
252 performing a Technological Readiness Assessment (TRA), we were able to determine the
253 maturity of the systems via a Technology Readiness Level (TRL) scale of 1-9 and quantify its
254 implementation in a research or clinical setting [56]. Since a BCI-robot for rehabilitation can
255 be categorised as a Class II-B medical device we have adapted a customised TRL scale to
256 account for these requirements [56]. The customised TRL accounts for prototype
257 development and pilot testing in human participants (TRL 3), safety testing (TRL 4-5), and
258 small scale (TRL 6) to large scale (TRL 7-8) clinical trials. Performing a TRA on each device
259 should allow us to map out where the technology is in terms of adoption and perceived
260 usefulness. For example, if most of the studies have used devices that have TRL below the
261 clinical trials stage (TRL 6-8), then we can have some confidence that said BCI-robot system
262 is not yet widely accepted in the clinical community. In this way we can focus on questions
263 that improve our understanding on the factors that impede its use as a viable therapy option
264 for stroke survivors.

265

266 *Clinical Use*

267 A methodological quality assessment was also performed for clinical studies based on the
268 Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) Scale [57]. This scale evaluates studies with a
269 checklist of 11 items based on experts' consensus criteria in physiotherapy practice. The
270 complete details of the criteria can be found online [58]. A higher score in the PEDro scale (6
271 and above) implied better methodological quality but are not used as a measure of validity in
272 terms of clinical outcomes. Pre-defined scores from this scale were already present in studies
273 appearing in the PEDro search. However, studies without PEDro scores or are not present in


274 the PEDro database at all had to be manually evaluated by the authors against the 11-item
275 checklist (five of seven studies).

276 Results

277 Search Results

278 Figure 1 shows the study selection process and the number of articles obtained at each stage.

279



280

281 **Figure 1. Study Selection Flowchart**

282

283 A total of 590 studies were initially identified. After deduplication, 330 studies underwent
284 title and abstract screening. Forty six studies passed this stage and among these, 16 were
285 removed after full-text screening due to the following reasons: insufficient EEG and robotic
286 data [59–65], the study was out of scope [66–68], the study design was not for hand/finger
287 movement [69–72], no robot or mechatronic device was involved in the study [73,74]. A final
288 sample of 30 studies were included in the qualitative review. Among the 30 studies, 11 [75–
289 85] were involved in testing the BCI-hand robot system on chronic and subacute stroke

290 patients ([75,80] are RCTs) while the rest involved testing on healthy participants [86–104].

291 Table 2 shows a summary of the relevant data fields extracted from these studies.

292

293 **[Table 2 Around Here]**


294

295 **Technology Evaluation**

296 *EEG Acquisition*

297 The EEG acquisition systems involved in the studies ranged from low-cost devices having few
298 electrode channels (2-15 gel or saline-soaked silver/silver chloride [Ag/AgCl] electrodes) to
299 standard EEG caps that had higher spatial resolution (16-256 gel or saline-soaked Ag/AgCl
300 electrodes). The placement of EEG channels was accounted for by studies involving MI
301 (N=21). This allowed us to determine the usage frequency among electrodes and is presented
302 in Figure 2 as a heat map generated in R Studio (using the packages: “akima”, “ggplot2” and
303 “reshape2”) against the 10-20 international electrode placement system.

304



305

306 **Figure 2. EEG Channel Usage across Motor Imagery Studies (N=21)**

307

308 It can be seen that the EEG channels used for MI studies are concentrated towards electrodes
309 along the central sulcus (C) region and the frontal lobe (F) region of the placement system
310 where the motor cortex strip lies. Among these, C3 (N=17) and F3 (N=14) were mostly used,
311 presumably because a majority of the participants were right-handed. The next most frequent
312 were C4 (N=13) and the electrodes F4, Cz and CP3 (N=10).

313

314 *Signal Processing: Feature Extraction and Classification*

315 In the EEG-based BCI studies examined, it was found that the feature extraction and
316 classification techniques were variable between systems. Table 3 provides a summary of pre-

317 processing, feature extraction and classification techniques across the studies. There was a
 318 wide variation in the implemented signal processing strategies, but a unifying theme across
 319 studies was the attempt to: (i) discriminate mental states recorded in EEG across different
 320 manual tasks; (ii) classify the different states to produce a viable signal.

321

322

Table 3. BCI Feature Extraction and Classification

Study	Pre-Processing	Feature Extraction	Classification	Hand Task
Ang et al. [75]	Band-pass (0.05-40 Hz)	Filter Bank Common Spatial Pattern (FBCSP) algorithm [105]	Calibration model (unspecified)	MI vs rest
Barsotti et al. [76]	Band-pass (8-24 Hz)	ERD (β and μ - decrease), CSP	SVM with linear kernel	MI vs rest
Bauer et al. [97]	Band-pass (6-16 Hz using zero- phase lag FIR	ERD (β -decrease)	Linear autoregressive model based on Burg Algorithm	MI vs rest
Bundy et al. [77]	Unspecified	ERD (β and μ - decrease)	Linear autoregressive model	MI (affected, unaffected) vs rest
Chowdhury et al. [78]	Band-pass (0.1 Hz-100 Hz), Notch (50 Hz)	CSP Covariance- based, ERD/ERS (β and μ -change)	SVM with linear kernel, Covariate Shift Detection (CSD)-based Adaptive Classifier	left vs right MI
Coffey et al. [92]	Band-pass (0.5 Hz-30 Hz), Notch (50 Hz)	CSP Covariance- based	Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) classifier	MI vs rest
Diab et al. [103]	Unspecified	Time epochs (unspecified)	Artificial Neural Network (ANN)-based Feed Forward Back Propagation	Non-MI open vs closed
Frolov al. [80]	Band-pass (5-30 Hz), FIR (order 101), IIR notch Chebyshev type I filter (50 Hz)	Time epochs (10 s)	Bayesian-based EEG covariance classifier [106]	MI (affected, unaffected) vs rest

Ono et al. [81]	Band-pass (0.5-30 Hz), notch (50 or 60 Hz)	Time epochs (700 ms), ERD (μ -decrease)	Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) classifier	MI vs rest
Ramos-Murguialday et al. [95]	Unspecified	Time epochs (5 s), Spatial filter, ERD/ERS (β and μ -change)	Linear autoregressive model	MI vs rest
Vukelic and Gharabaghi [99]	High-pass (unspecified)	ERD (β -decrease)	Linear autoregressive model based on Burg Algorithm	MI vs rest
Witkowski et al. [101]	Band-pass (0.4-70 Hz), Laplacian filter	ERD/ERS (β and μ -change)	Linear autoregressive model based on Yule-Walker algorithm	MI vs rest

323

324 SVM = Support Vector Machines, FIR = Finite Impulse Response, IIR = Infinite Impulse Response

325

326 *Robot-Assisted Rehabilitation*

327 Robotic hand rehabilitation systems provide kinaesthetic feedback to the user during BCI trials.

328 Most of these devices are powered by either DC motors, servomotors or pneumatic actuators

329 that transmit energy via rigid links or Bowden cables in a tendon-like fashion. The studies in

330 this review included single-finger [84–86], multi-finger [82] (including EMOHEX [78,79,87]),

331 full hand gloves [88,89] (including mano: Hand Exoskeleton [90] and Gloreha [91]) and full

332 arm exoskeletons with isolated finger actuation (BRAVO-Hand [76]). Nine of the studies

333 [77,87,88,90,92–96] presented their novel design of a hand rehabilitation device within the

334 article while some reported on devices reported elsewhere (i.e., in a previous study of the group

335 or a research collaborator). Two commercially-available devices were also used: AMADEO

336 (Tyromotion, Austria) is an end-effector device used in 3 studies [97–99], and Gloreha

337 (Idrogenet, Italy) is a full robotic hand glove used by Tacchino et al. [91]. AMADEO and


338 Gloreha are both rehabilitation devices that have passed regulatory standards in their respective

339 regions. AMADEO remains the gold standard for hand rehabilitation devices as it has passed

340 safety and risk assessments and provided favourable rehabilitation outcomes. The International

341 Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) provides three specific domains that
342 can be used to assess an intervention of this kind: improving impairments, supporting
343 performance of activities and promoting participation [107,108]. In this case, a gold standard
344 device not only prioritises user safety (established early in the development process) but also
345 delivers favourable outcomes in scales against these domains. Figure 3 shows the main types
346 of robotic hand rehabilitation devices.

347



348

349 **Figure 3. Robotic hand rehabilitation devices: a) An end-effector device (Haptic Knob)**
350 **used in one of the extracted studies [75,109], b) a wearable hand exoskeleton/orthosis**
351

352 *Quality Assessment*

353 A Technology Readiness Assessment (TRA) [56] was performed for each study and the
354 Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) are presented in Table 4. While some of the system
355 components (especially among robotic devices) were commercially available (having TRL
356 9+), we performed a TRA on the whole system (the interaction between BCI and robotics) to
357 provide an evaluation of its maturity and state-of-the-art development with regard to
358 rehabilitation medicine. We further assessed the TRL of each system at the time of the
359 publication and its subsequent development.

360

361 **Table 4. Technology Readiness Assessment of the BCI-Hand Robot Systems**

Levels	Description	Studies
TRL 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest level of technological readiness • Literature reviews and initial market surveys • Scientific application to defined problems 	
TRL 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generation of hypotheses • Development of research plans and/or protocols 	
TRL 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing of hypotheses – basic research, data collection and analysis • Testing of design/prototype – verification and critical component specifications • Initial proof-of-concept in limited amount of laboratory/animal models 	Most studies from the prototype group (N=18) [86–100,102–104]
TRL 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proof-of-concept of device/system in defined laboratory/animal models • Safety testing – problems, adverse events and potential side effects 	Witkowski et al., 2014 [101]
TRL 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of device/system to other existing modalities or equivalent devices/systems • Further development – testing through simulation (tissue or organ models), animal testing • Drafting of Product Development Plan 	Barsotti et al., 2015 [76], Ono et al., 2016 [81], Chowdhury et al., 2018-b [78], Tsuchimoto et al., 2019 [84]
TRL 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale clinical trials (Phase 1) – under carefully controlled and intensely monitored clinical conditions 	Carino-Escobar et al., 2019 [85], Chowdhury et al., 2018-c [79], Norman et al., 2018 [82], Wang et al., 2018 [83]
TRL 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical trials (Phase 2) – safety and effectiveness integration in operational environment 	Ang et al., 2014 [75], Frolov et al., 2017 [80]
TRL 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical trials (Phase 3) – evaluation of overall risk-benefit of device/system use 	

- Confirmation of QSR compliance
- Awarding of PMA for device/system by CDRH or equivalent agency

TRL 9

- The device/system may be distributed/marketed

362

363 QSR = Quality System Requirements, PMA = Premarket Approval, CDRH = Center for Devices and Radiological Health

364

365 **Clinical Evaluation**

366 *Studies with Stroke Patients (Clinical Group)*

367 A total of 208 stroke patients (with sample size varying 3-74) were involved in the 11 clinical
368 studies. One study [75] reported a 3-armed RCT with control groups as device-only and SAT
369 while another study [80] was a multi-centre RCT with sham as the control group. Five studies
370 were uncontrolled – where the aims were either to study classification accuracies during
371 sessions [76], to monitor clinical outcomes improvement from Day 0 until the end of the
372 programme [77,85] or both [79,82]. Two studies [83,84] compared effects of the intervention
373 against SHAM feedback. Another study [78] compared the classification accuracies of
374 healthy and hemiplegic stroke patients against two BCI classifiers while the remaining study
375 [81] compared classification accuracies from stroke patients who receive congruent or
376 incongruent visual and kinaesthetic feedback.

377

378 Most of the studies adopted FMA-UE, ARAT and GS measurements to assess clinical
379 outcomes. Six studies [75,77,79,80,83,85] reported patient improvement in these measures
380 when subjected to BCI-hand robot interventions; in contrast with their respective controls or
381 as recorded through time in the programme. For Ang et al. [75], FMA-UE Distal scores were
382 reported in weeks 3, 6, 12 and 24 and the BCI-device group (N=6) yielded the highest
383 improvement in scores across all time points as compared to the device only (N=8) and SAT
384 (N=7) groups. Bundy et al. [77] reported an average of 6.20 ± 3.81 improvement in the ARAT

385 scores of its participants (N=10) in the span of 12 weeks while Chowdhury et al. [79] reported
386 a group mean difference of +6.38 kg (p=0.06) and +5.66 (p<0.05) in GS and ARAT scores,
387 respectively (N=4). Frolov et al.'s [80] multi-centre RCT reported a higher improvement in
388 the FMA-UE Distal, ARAT Grasp and ARAT Pinch scores of the BCI-device group (N=55)
389 when compared to the control/SHAM group (N=19), but not in the ARAT Grip scores where
390 the values are both equal to 1.0 with p<0.01 for the BCI-device group and p=0.045 for the
391 control.

392

393 *Studies with Healthy Participants (Prototype Group)*

394 The studies which involved pilot testing on healthy human participants had a combined total
395 of 207 individuals (sample size ranging from 1-32) who had no history of stroke or other
396 neurological diseases. Right-handed individuals made up 44.24% of the combined population
397 while the other 55.76% were unreported. These studies aimed to report the successful
398 implementation of a BCI-robot system for hand rehabilitation and were more heterogeneous
399 in terms of study and task designs than those studies that involved clinical testing. The most
400 common approach was to design and implement a hand orthosis controlled by MI which
401 accounted for 9 out of the 19 studies and were measured based on classification accuracy
402 during the calibration/training period and online testing. Li et al. [88] and Stan et al. [94] also
403 aimed to trigger a hand orthosis but instead of MI, the triggers used by Li et al. is based on an
404 attention threshold while Stan et al. used a vision-based P300 speller BCI. Bauer et al. [97]
405 compared MI against ME using a BCI-device while Ono et al. [100] studied the
406 implementation of an action observation strategy with a combined visual and kinaesthetic
407 feedback or auditory feedback. Five more studies [91,95,96,98,99] focused on varying the
408 feedback while two more [89,101] assessed the performance and safety of a hybrid BCI with
409 EMG, EOG or both.

410

411 For the studies that had a clinical testing component, a methodological quality assessment by
 412 the PEDro Scale was performed. Two studies which appeared on the PEDro search [75,80]
 413 had predetermined scores in the scale and were extracted for this part while the rest were
 414 manually evaluated by the authors. Table 5 shows the results of the methodological quality
 415 assessment against the scale. Note that in the PEDro Scale, the presence of an eligibility
 416 criteria is not included in the final score.

417

418 **Table 5. Methodological Quality of Clinical Studies based on PEDro Scale**

Criteria		Ang et al.	Barsotti et al.	Bundy et al.	Carino-Escobar et al.	Chowdhury-b	Chowdhury-c	Frolov et al.	Norman et al.	Ono et al.	Tsuchimoto et al.	Wang et al.
1	Eligibility criteria*	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1
2	Random allocation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
3	Concealed allocation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
4	Baseline comparability	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
5	Blind subjects	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
6	Blind therapists	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
7	Blind assessors	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
8	Adequate follow-up	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
9	Intention-to-treat analysis	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
10	Between-group comparisons	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
11	Point estimates and variability	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
Total		6	2	4	4	5	3	5	4	3	7	7

419

420

*Not included in the final score

421 **Discussion**

422 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic examination of BCI-driven robotic
423 systems specific for hand rehabilitation. Through undertaking this review we found several
424 limitations present from the studies identified and we examine these in more detail here and
425 provide recommendations for future work in this area.

426

427 To provide clarity on the state of the current development of BCI-hand robot systems, we
428 looked into the maturity of technology used in each study as determined by its readiness level
429 (TRL). All but one in the prototype group was rated as having TRL 3 while the clinical group
430 was more varied in their TRL (ranging from 5-7). The system used by Witkowski et al. [101],
431 a prototype study, was rated TRL 4 due to the study being performed on the basis of
432 improving and assessing its safety features. It is also worth noting that while a formal safety
433 assessment was not performed for the TRL 3 prototypes of Stan et al. [94], Randazzo et al.
434 [90] and Tacchino et al. [91], safety considerations and/or implementations were made; a
435 criterion to be satisfied before proceeding to TRL 4. The system used by Chowdhury et al. is
436 a good example of improving a TRL from 5 to 6 with a pilot clinical study published within
437 the same year [78,79]. The two systems used in the RCT studies by Ang et al. [75] and Frolov
438 et al. [80] achieved the highest score (TRL 7) among all of the studies which also meant that
439 no BCI-hand robot system for stroke rehabilitation has ever been registered and
440 commercially-released to date. This suggests that such systems lack the strong evidence that
441 would propel commercialisation and technology adoption.

442

443 Heterogeneity in the study designs was apparent in both the clinical and prototype groups.
444 The lack of control groups and random allocation in clinical studies (e.g., only 2 out of 7
445 studies are in the huge sample size RCT stage) made us unable to perform a meta-analysis of

446 effects and continue the study by Cervera et al [51] with a focus on BCI-hand robot
447 interventions. Results from the methodological quality assessment showed that only two
448 studies [83,84] had a score of 7 in the PEDro scale. Although non-conclusive, these results
449 support the notion that most of the studies are not aligned with the criteria of high-quality
450 evidence-based interventions.

451

452 Almost all the clinical studies (except for Carino-Escobar et al. [85] and Frolov et al. [80])
453 limited their recruitment to chronic stroke patients. The reason may be due to the highly
454 variable rates of recovery in patients at different stages in their disease [110]. Baseline
455 treatments were also not reported among the clinical studies. Instead, the BCI-robot
456 interventions were compared to control groups using standard arm therapy; an example of
457 this was done by Ang et al. [75]. The heterogeneity of experimental designs reported in this
458 review raises the need to develop clearly defined protocols when conducting BCI-hand robot
459 studies on stroke patients. Until new systems have been assessed on this standard, it will be
460 difficult to generate strong evidence supporting the effectiveness of BCI-robotic devices for
461 hand rehabilitation.

462

463 In the development of any BCI-robotic device there are several design and feature
464 considerations that need to be made to ensure that the systems are both fit for purpose and
465 acceptable to the end-user. These design considerations must go beyond the scope of
466 understanding the anatomy of the hand and the physiology of motor recovery in response to
467 therapy. Feedback from stroke patients should also be an essential part of this design process.
468 Among the extracted studies, we surveyed the extent of end-user involvement in the initial
469 stages of development (i.e., through consultations, interviews and therapy observations) and
470 we found that there were no explicit statements about these in the reports. We recommend, as

471 good practice, for future work in this area to report the type and degree of patient and/or
472 physician involvement in device development to allow reviewers and readers to more readily
473 gauge the potential usability of the system.

474

475 We were able to profile the BCI-hand robot systems regarding their technical specifications
476 and design features. In hardware terms, a BCI-hand robot system involves three major
477 components: (1) An EEG data acquisition system with several electrodes connected to a
478 signal amplifier; (2) A computer where raw EEG data is received then processed by filters
479 and classifiers and where most of the cues and feedback during training is presented via a
480 visual display; (3) a robotic hand rehabilitation system for providing the physical therapy
481 back to the user.

482

483 The majority of the studies (N=19) used a BCI solely based on EEG while the rest were
484 combined with other sensors: EEG with EMG [75,78,87,91,95–98], EEG with force sensors
485 [79] and an EEG-EMG-EOG hybrid system [89,101]. The purpose of this integration is mainly
486 to improve signal quality by accounting for artifact or to provide added modalities. Action
487 potentials such as those caused by ocular, muscular and facial movements interfere with
488 nearby electrodes and the presence of an added electrophysiological sensor accounting for
489 these would enable the technician to perform noise cancellation techniques as a first step in
490 signal processing.

491

492 The choice of EEG system as well as the type of electrodes provides a technical trade-off and
493 affects the session both in terms of subjective experiences (i.e., ease-of-use, preparation time,
494 cleaning, comfortability) and data performance. Due to the presence of a conducting
495 gel/solution, standard “wet” electrodes provide a degree of confidence in preventing signal

496 disruption within a short duration usually enough for a standard stroke therapy session.
497 However, this also makes the setup, use and cleaning in the experiment more challenging, non-
498 ambulatory and reliant on a specialised laboratory setup [10]. Conversely, dry electrodes offer
499 an accessible, user-friendly and portable alternative by using dry metal pins or coatings that
500 comb through hair and come in contact directly with the scalp. The signal fidelity of dry
501 electrodes is still a matter of debate in the BCI community. A systematic comparison between
502 dry passively-amplified and wet actively-amplified electrodes reported similar performance in
503 the detection of event-related potentials (ERP) [111]. However, for a study involving dry active
504 electrodes [112], high inter-electrode impedance resulted in increased single-trial and average
505 noise levels as compared to both active and passive wet electrodes. In classifying MI,
506 movement-related artifacts adversely affect active dry electrodes, but these can be addressed
507 through a hybrid system of other physiological sensors to separate sources [113].

508
509 Almost all of the studies included used a standard EEG system with “wet” electrodes (e.g.,
510 g.USBamp by g.tec and BrainAmp by Brain Products) while three used Emotiv EPOC+, a
511 semi-dry EEG system that uses sponge conductors infused with saline solution. While the use
512 of dry electrodes has been observed in pilot and prototype studies of BCI-hand robot systems
513 [67,64,93,102] and other motor imagery experiments [114–117], no dry EEG system was used
514 in the final 30 studies that tested healthy or stroke participants. It is expected that as dry EEG
515 systems continue to improve, their use in clinical studies of BCI will also become increasingly
516 prominent.

517
518 The degree of BCI-robotic control for the majority of the studies (N=26) was limited to
519 triggering the device to perform grasping (opening and closing of hand) and pinching (a
520 thumb-index finger pinch or a 3-point thumb-index-middle finger pinch) movements using

521 MI and other techniques. A triggered assistance strategy provides the minimum amount of
522 active participation from the patient in a BCI-robot setup [37]. The main advantages of this is
523 that it is easy to implement; requiring less computational complexity in signal processing.
524 However, a higher spatial or temporal volitional control over the therapeutic device increases
525 its functionality and can be used to develop more engaging tasks for the stroke therapy.
526 Among the studies, no robotic control setup was able to perform digit-specific MI which
527 corresponds to the spatial aspects of volitional control. This is a limitation caused by the non-
528 invasive setup of EEG and is due to the low spatial resolution brought by the distances
529 between electrodes [118]. The homunculus model, a representation of the human body in the
530 motor strip, maps the areas of the brain where activations have been reported to occur for
531 motor processes. The challenge of decoding each finger digit MI in one hand is that they only
532 tend to occupy a small area in this strip. Hence even the highest resolution electrode
533 placement system (i.e., the five percent or 10-5 system – up to 345 electrodes) would have
534 difficulties accounting for digit-specific MI for BCI. In contrast to EEG, electrocorticography
535 (ECoG) have been used to detect digit-specific MI. The electrodes of ECoG come in contact
536 directly with the motor cortex and is an invasive procedure; making it non-ideal for use in
537 BCI therapy [119].

538
539 It is worth noting however that some studies were successful in implementing continuous
540 control based on ERD/ERS patterns. A continuous control strategy increases the temporal
541 volitional control over the robot as opposed to triggered assistance where a threshold is
542 applied, and the robot finishes the movement for the participant. Bundy et al. [77] and
543 Norman et al. [82] were both able to apply continuous control of a 3-DOF pinch-grip
544 exoskeleton based on spectral power while Bauer et al. [97] provided ERD-dependent control
545 of finger extension for an end-effector robot. These continuous control strategies have been

546 shown to be very useful in BCI-hand robots for assistive applications (i.e., partial or full
547 device dependence for performing ADL tasks [120]). Whether this type of control can
548 significantly improve stroke recovery is still in question as the strategy of robots for stroke
549 rehabilitation can be more classified as a therapeutic “exercise” device.

550

551 Signal processing and machine learning play a vital role in the development of any EEG-
552 based BCI. The pre-processing techniques (e.g., filtering, artifact removal), types of features
553 computed from EEG, and the classifier used in machine learning can significantly affect the
554 performance of the robotic system in classifying the user’s intent via MI [121]. False
555 classification, especially during feedback, could be detrimental to the therapy regime as it
556 relates to the reward and punishment mechanisms that are important in motor relearning
557 [122]. For example, false negatives hinder the reward strategy that is essential to motivate the
558 patient while false positives would also reward the action with the wrong intent. In this
559 review, a critical appraisal of the signal processing techniques was done on each system to
560 recognise the best practices involved. The current list of studies has revealed that approaches
561 to develop MI-based EEG signal processing are highly diverse in nature, which makes it
562 difficult to compare across the systems and hinders the development of new BCI systems
563 informed by the strengths and weaknesses of existing state-of-the-art systems. The diversity
564 in the design process can be beneficial to develop complex MI EEG-based BCI systems to
565 achieve high efficiency and efficacy. However, such newly developed systems should be
566 open sourced and easily reproducible by the research community to provide valid
567 performance comparisons and drive forward the domain of robotic-assisted rehabilitation.

568


569 In addition to MI, other strategies for robotic control were reported. Diab et al. [103] and
570 King et al. [104] both facilitated the movements of their respective orthoses by physical

571 practice while Stan et al. [94] utilised a P-300 evoked potential speller BCI, where the user
572 visually focused on a single alphanumeric character situated in a grid. The chosen character
573 then corresponded to a command for the hand orthosis thereby producing the desired stimulus
574 for the patient. While the latter study reported 100% accuracy rate in terms of intention and
575 execution, the EEG channels were situated in the visual cortex rather than the motor strip
576 which deviates from the goal of activating the desired brain region for plasticity. This
577 highlights a broader issue on the intent behind a BCI-robotic system. Given that any potential
578 signal that can be reliably modulated by a patient can be used to trigger a robot, and that such
579 an approach would be antithetical to the goal of many MI-based systems, engineers may
580 consider how they can tailor their systems to ensure that the appropriate control strategy (and
581 corresponding neural networks) are implemented by a user (e.g. by taking a hybrid approach
582 that includes EMG and force sensors).

583

584 In order to facilitate hand MI and account for significant time-points in the EEG data, all the
585 studies employed a cue-feedback strategy during their trials. 19 of the studies presented a
586 form of visual cue while the rest, except for two unspecified [84,102], involved cues in
587 auditory (“bleep”) [91,95–98], textual [93,94,104] or verbal [103] forms. As for the provision
588 of a matching sensory feedback, 16 studies presented a combination of kinaesthetic and
589 visual feedback with some also providing auditory feedback during successful movement
590 attempts. All the studies provided kinaesthetic feedback through their robotic devices. Some
591 systems with visual feedback, such as Wang et al. [83], Li et al. [88], Chowdhury et al. in both
592 of their clinical studies [78,79] and Ono et al. in their clinical [81] and pilot testing
593 experiments [100], used a video of an actual hand performing the desired action. Ang et al.
594 [75] and Stan et al. [94], in a different strategy, provided visual feedback through photo
595 manipulation and textual display, respectively. While the latter two studies reported

596 promising results (with Ang et al. in RCT stage and Stan et al. having 100% classification
597 accuracy), it should also be considered that such cue and feedback types (including Graz
598 visualisations and auditory forms) are non-representative of hand movement and may not
599 provide the same stimuli as a geometrical representation of a hand moving its desired course.
600 This may be essential when we base principles of stroke recovery in alignment with how MI
601 correlates with AO – an underlying theme of the motor simulation theory proposed by
602 Jeannerod [36]. Figure 4 shows how different kinds of visual cue and feedback can be
603 presented to participants to help facilitate MI.
604



606 **Figure 4. Visual cue and feedback during MI trials in different conditions. (a) Graz MI**
607 **visualisations, (b) video recordings of hand movement and (c) virtual hand**
608 **representation through VR/AR**

609 **Future Directions**

610 There is clearly great potential for the use of BCI-hand robots in the rehabilitation of an
611 affected hand following stroke. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that there is
612 currently insufficient evidence to support the use of such systems within clinical settings.
613 Moreover, the purported benefits of these systems rest on conjectures that require empirical
614 evidence. In other words, there are grounds for supposing that MI could be useful within
615 these rehabilitation settings but no supporting evidence. This systematic review has also
616 revealed that there are a number of technological limitations to existing BCI-hand robotic
617 systems. We stress an urgent need to address these limitations to ensure that the systems meet
618 the minimum required levels of product specification (in measuring brain activity, processing
619 signals, delivering forces to the hand and providing rich feedback and motivating settings).
620 We question the ethics or usefulness of conducting clinical trials with such systems until they
621 can demonstrate minimum levels of technological capability. We consider below what
622 standards these systems should obtain before subjecting them to a clinical trial and discuss
623 might constitute an acceptable standard for a clinical trial.

624

625 **Ideal Setup for a BCI-hand Robot**

626 We summarise the information revealed via the systematic review about what constitutes an
627 acceptable setup for a BCI-hand robot for stroke rehabilitation. We focus on improving
628 individual components in data acquisition, data processing, the hand rehabilitation robot, and
629 the visual cue and feedback environment. Table 6 presents the features and specifications of a
630 fully integrated acceptable system.

631 **Table 6. Exemplary Features and Specifications of Future BCI-Hand Robot Systems**

632

Component	Features and Specifications
Data Acquisition System and Software	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry EEG system with 8-16 channels, comfortable and easy to use • Inclusion of other bio-signal sensors such as EMG, EOG, force, accelerometers to remove artifacts and improve classification • Robust and reliable signal processing software: machine learning-based algorithms that discriminate brain states such as MI or evoked potentials and have lower calibration times
Hand Robot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe, comfortable and aligned with the hand's range of motion • Effective in providing kinaesthetic feedback • Use of back-drivable or soft actuators that effectively assist movement without additional injury • Multiple levels of safety and emergency features (mechanical, electronic, software), clear and obvious operation
Visual Cue and Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide rich visual cue and feedback to intended tasks, geometric representation of the hand (video or simulated environment), can be in multiple platforms such as display monitors or VR/AR on a head-mounted device • Gamification of therapy exercises to provide an engaging regime to stroke patients

633

634

635 The implementation of these features in an ideal BCI-robot setup needs to be weighed against
636 socioeconomic factors in healthcare delivery for it to be considered market ready. An ideal
637 BCI system should provide above chance-level classification after the first session on the first
638 day of therapy. Ideally, the classification algorithm should also translate to following sessions
639 or days; reducing the number of training sessions and focusing on the main therapy tasks. An
640 alternative approach is to focus on making the setup an engaging experience. In other words,
641 the delivery of intervention can be started immediately when the patient wears the EEG cap
642 and runs the BCI system. For the hand robot system, more straightforward criteria can be

643 followed with the existence of the numerous design protocols, regulation standards and
644 assessment matrices mentioned in this review. Nevertheless, end-user involvement in the
645 design with the prioritisation of safety while allowing the most natural hand movement and
646 ROM as possible is the recommended goal.

647

648 **Ideal Setup for Clinical Trials**

649 We also propose a set of specialised criteria for BCI-hand robot systems in addition to the
650 standard motor improvement scores (e.g. ARAT, FMA-UE) evaluated during clinical trials.
651 Firstly, classification accuracies between intended and interpreted actions from the data
652 acquisition and software component should always be accounted to track the effectiveness of
653 BCI in executing the clinical task. In addition to this, system calibration and training
654 procedures, especially its duration, should be detailed in the protocol to document the
655 reliability of the classification algorithm. There is not much to consider in the use of robotic
656 devices as they are most likely to be mature (if not yet commercially available) before being
657 used as the hardware component in the study. However, the devices' functionality (i.e., task
658 to be performed, degree of control and motion, actuation and power transmission etc.) should
659 always be stated as they contribute to the evaluation of interactions between other
660 components in the system. Lastly, controls for the clinical study must always be included,
661 even with small-scale patient studies. As discussed in this article, these controls may be in the
662 form of sham, standard arm therapy (SAT), standard robotic therapy, congruency feedback
663 and quality of stimuli among others. Having regarded and implemented these criteria would
664 help homogenise the clinical data for future meta-analyses, strengthen evidence-based results
665 and provide a reliable way of documentation for individual and/or interacting components.

666 **Proposed roadmap**

667 We suggest that the immediate focus for BCI-controlled robotic device research should be
668 around the engineering challenges. It is only when these challenges have been met that it is
669 useful and ethical to subject the systems to clinical trials. We recommend that the challenges
670 be broken down into the following elements: (1) data acquisition; (2) signal processing and
671 classification; (3) robotic device; (4) priming and feedback environment; (5) integration of
672 these four elements. The nature of these challenges means that a multidisciplinary approach is
673 required (e.g. the inclusion of psychologists, cognitive neuroscientists and physiologists to
674 drive the adoption of reliable neural data acquisition). It seems probable that progress will be
675 made by different laboratories tackling some or all of these elements and coordinating
676 information sharing and technology improvements. Once the challenges have been met (i.e.
677 there is a system that is able to take neural signals and use these to help drive a robotic
678 system capable of providing appropriate forces to the hand within a motivating environment)
679 then robust clinical trials can be conducted to ensure that the promise of this approach does
680 translate into solid empirical evidence supporting the use of these systems within clinical
681 settings.

682 **Declarations**

683 **Funding**

684 This work was supported by a Newton Fund PhD grant, ID 331486777, under the Newton-
685 Agham partnership. The grant is funded by the UK Department for Business, Energy and
686 Industrial Strategy and the Philippine Commission on Higher Education and delivered by the
687 British Council. For further information, please visit www.newtonfund.ac.uk. Authors F.M
688 and M.M-W were supported by Fellowships from the Alan Turing Institute and a Research
689 Grant from the EPSRC (EP/R031193/1).

690 **Availability of Data and Materials**

691 A full database of selected studies including those extracted during the search and selection
692 process is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

693

694 **Authors' Contributions**

695 PDEB and ECS performed the initial search and screening of the studies. MA performed the
696 analysis of signal processing techniques. AA, AEJ and RJH made contribution to the
697 robotics, design and other engineering aspects of the current work. FM provided analysis
698 related to EEG and BCI. MMW contributed to the clinical and overall direction of the review.
699 PDEB, FM and MMW were the major contributors to the writing of the manuscript. All
700 authors read and approved the final manuscript.

701

702 **Competing Interests**

703 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

704

705 **Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**

706 Not applicable.

707

708 **Consent for Publication**

709 Not applicable.

710

711 **Acknowledgements**

712 Not applicable.

713 **References**

- 714 1. McHugh G, Swain ID. A comparison between reported therapy staffing levels and the department
715 of health therapy staffing guidelines for stroke rehabilitation: a national survey. *BMC Health Services*
716 *Research*. 2014;14:216.
- 717 2. Ntsiea MV. Current stroke rehabilitation services and physiotherapy research in South Africa. *S Afr*
718 *J Physiother*. 2019;75:475–475.
- 719 3. Manguerra MV, Baniqued PDE, Abad AC, Baldovino RG, Dungao JR, Bugtai NT. Active motor
720 control for an upper extremity exoskeleton. *Advanced Science Letters*. 2018;24:9937–8840.
- 721 4. Wolpaw JR, Wolpaw EW. *Brain-Computer Interfaces, principles and practise*. Oxford University
722 Press USA; 2012.
- 723 5. Vidal JJ. Toward direct brain-computer communication. *Annual review of biophysics and*
724 *bioengineering*. 2:157–80.
- 725 6. Berger H. Über das Elektrenkephalogramm des Menschen. *Archiv für Psychiatrie und*
726 *Nervenkrankheiten*. 1929;527–70.
- 727 7. Hochberg LR, Serruya MD, Friehs GM, Mukand JA, Saleh M, Caplan AH, et al. Neuronal
728 ensemble control of prosthetic devices by a human with tetraplegia. *Nature*. 2006;442:164.
- 729 8. Silvoni S, Ramos-Murguialday A, Cavinato M, Volpato C, Cisotto G, Turolla A, et al. Brain-
730 computer interface in stroke: a review of progress. *Clin EEG Neurosci*. 2011;42:245–52.
- 731 9. Birbaumer N, Ghanayim N, Hinterberger T, Iversen I, Kotchoubey B, Kubler A, et al. A spelling
732 device for the paralysed. *Nature*. 1999;398:297–8.
- 733 10. Graitmann B, Allison B, Pfurtscheller G. Brain–computer interfaces: a gentle introduction. In:
734 Graitmann B, Pfurtscheller G, Allison B, editors. *Brain-Computer Interfaces: Revolutionizing Human-*
735 *Computer Interaction [Internet]*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2010. p. 1–27.
736 Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02091-9_1
- 737 11. Molteni F, Gasperini G, Cannaviello G, Guanzioli E. Exoskeleton and end-effector robots for
738 upper and lower limbs rehabilitation: narrative review. *PM&R*. 2018;10:S174–88.
- 739 12. European Commission. *Medical devices: guidance document - classification of medical devices*
740 *[Internet]*. United Kingdom Medicines and Healthcare products Regulation Agency; 2016 [cited 2018
741 Dec 10]. Available from: <http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/medical-devices/guidance/>
- 742 13. Guiochet J, Hoang QAD, Kaaniche M, Powell DJ. Applying existing standards to a medical
743 rehabilitation robot: Limits and challenges. *IROS*. 2012.
- 744 14. Yue Z, Zhang X, Wang J. Hand rehabilitation robotics on poststroke motor recovery. *Hindawi*
745 *Behavioural Neurology*. 2017;
- 746 15. Houwink A, Nijland RH, Geurts AC, Kwakkel G. Functional recovery of the paretic upper limb
747 after stroke: Who regains hand capacity? *Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation*.
748 2013;94:839–44.
- 749 16. Takahashi K, Domen K, Sakamoto T, Toshima M, Otaka Y, Seto M, et al. Efficacy of upper
750 extremity robotic therapy in subacute poststroke hemiplegia: an exploratory randomized trial. *Stroke*.
751 2016;47:1385–8.

- 752 17. Fregni F, Pascual-Leone A. Hand motor recovery after stroke: tuning the orchestra to improve
753 hand motor function. *Cogn Behav Neurol*. 2006;19:21–33.
- 754 18. Hallett M. Plasticity of the human motor cortex and recovery from stroke. *Brain Res Brain Res*
755 *Rev*. 2001;36:169–74.
- 756 19. Zeiler SR, Krakauer JW. The interaction between training and plasticity in the poststroke brain.
757 *Curr Opin Neurol*. 2013;26:609–16.
- 758 20. Mawase F, Uehara S, Bastian AJ, Celnik P. Motor learning enhances use-dependent plasticity. *J*
759 *Neurosci*. 2017;37:2673–85.
- 760 21. Teplan M. Fundamentals of EEG measurement. *Measurement Science Review*. 2002;2.
- 761 22. Cohen MX. *Analyzing Neural Time Series Data: Theory and Practice* [Internet]. Cambridge;
762 2014. Available from: <http://lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug01:002161004>
- 763 23. Li M, Xu G, Xie J, Chen C. A review: motor rehabilitation after stroke with control based on
764 human intent. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H*. 2018;232:344–60.
- 765 24. Pfurtscheller G, Lopes da Silva FH. Event-related EEG/MEG synchronization and
766 desynchronization: basic principles. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 1999;110:1842–57.
- 767 25. Jiang X, Bian GB, Tian Z. Removal of artifacts from EEG signals: A review. *Sensors*. 2019;19.
- 768 26. Mammone N, Morabito FC. Enhanced automatic wavelet independent component analysis for
769 electroencephalographic artifact removal. *Entropy*. 2014;16:6553–72.
- 770 27. Val-Calvo M, Alvarez-Sanchez JR, Ferrandez-Vicente JM, Fernandez E. Optimization of real-
771 time EEG artifact removal and emotion estimation for human-robot interaction applications. *Frontiers*
772 *in Computational Neuroscience*. 2019;
- 773 28. Kilicarslan A, Vidal JLC. Characterization and real-time removal of motion artifacts from EEG
774 signals. *Journal of Neural Engineering*. 2019;16.
- 775 29. Chang CY, Hsu SH, Pion-Tonachini L, Jung TP. Evaluation of artifact subspace reconstruction for
776 automatic artifact components removal in multi-channel EEG recordings. *IEEE Transactions on*
777 *Biomedical Engineering*. 2019;
- 778 30. Lotte F, Guan C. Regularizing common spatial patterns to improve BCI designs: unified theory
779 and new algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*. 2011;58:355–62.
- 780 31. Roy Y, Banville H, Albuquerque I, Gramfort A, Falk TH, Faubert J. Deep learning-based
781 electroencephalography analysis: a systematic review. *Journal of Neural Engineering*. 2019;16.
- 782 32. Schirrneister RB, Springenberg JT, Fiederer LDJ, Glasstetter M, Eggenberger K, Tangermann
783 M, et al. Deep learning with convolutional neural networks for EEG decoding and visualization.
784 *Human Brain Mapping*. 2017;38:5391–420.
- 785 33. Hardwick RM, Caspers S, Eickhoff SB, Swinnen SP. Neural correlates of action: comparing meta-
786 analyses of imagery, observation, and execution. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2018;31–
787 44.
- 788 34. Xu L, Zhang H, Hui M, Long Z, Jin Z, Liu Y, et al. Motor execution and motor imagery: a
789 comparison of functional connectivity patterns based on graph theory. *Neuroscience*. 2014;261:184–
790 94.

- 791 35. Sharma N, Baron JC. Does motor imagery share neural networks with executed movement: a
792 multivariate fMRI analysis. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013;7:564–564.
- 793 36. Jeannerod M. Neural simulation of action: A unifying mechanism for motor cognition.
794 *NeuroImage*. 2001;14:S103–9.
- 795 37. Marchal-Crespo L, Reinkensmeyer DJ. Review of control strategies for robotic movement training
796 after neurologic injury. *Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation*. 2009;6.
- 797 38. Brookes J, Mushtaq F, Jamieson E, Fath AJ, Bingham G, Culmer P, et al. Exploring disturbance
798 as a force for good in motor learning. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15.
- 799 39. Mulder T. Motor imagery and action observation: cognitive tools for rehabilitation. *J Neural*
800 *Transm (Vienna)*. 2007;114:1265–78.
- 801 40. Vogt S, Di Rienzo F, Collet C, Collins A, Guillot A. Multiple roles of motor imagery during
802 action observation. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 2013;7:807.
- 803 41. Friesen CL, Bardouille T, Neyedli HF, Boe SG. Combined Action Observation and Motor
804 Imagery Neurofeedback for Modulation of Brain Activity. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*.
805 2017;10:692.
- 806 42. Eaves DL, Riach M, Holmes PS, Wright DJ. Motor imagery during action observation: A brief
807 review of evidence, theory and future research opportunities. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. 2016;10:514.
- 808 43. Kim T, Frank C, Schack T. A systematic investigation of the effect of action observation training
809 and motor imagery training on the development of mental representation structure and skill
810 performance. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. 2017;11:499.
- 811 44. Nakano H, Kodama T. Motor imagery and action observation as effective tools for physical
812 therapy. *Neurological Physical Therapy*. IntechOpen; 2017.
- 813 45. Laver KE, Lange B, George S, Deutsch JE, Saposnik G, Crotty M. Virtual reality for stroke
814 rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;11:CD008349–CD008349.
- 815 46. Brookes J, Warburton M, Alghadier M, Mon-Williams M, Mushtaq F. Studying human behavior
816 with virtual reality: The Unity Experiment Framework. *Behavior Research Methods [Internet]*. 2019;
817 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01242-0>
- 818 47. Vourvopoulos A, Cardona JEM, Badia SB i. Optimizing motor imagery neurofeedback through
819 the use of multimodal immersive virtual reality and motor priming. 2015 International Conference on
820 Virtual Rehabilitation (ICVR). 2015. p. 228–34.
- 821 48. Johnston M, Bonetti D, Joice S, Pollard B, Morrison V, Francis JJ, et al. Recovery from disability
822 after stroke as a target for a behavioural intervention: Results of a randomized controlled trial.
823 *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2007;29:1117–27.
- 824 49. Hülsmann F, Frank C, Senna I, Ernst MO, Schack T, Botsch M. Superimposed Skilled
825 Performance in a Virtual Mirror Improves Motor Performance and Cognitive Representation of a Full
826 Body Motor Action. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*. 2019;6:43.
- 827 50. Monge-Pereira E, Ibanez-Pereda J, Alguacil-Diego IM, Serrano JI, Spottorno-Rubio MP, Molina-
828 Rueda F. Use of electroencephalography brain-computer interface systems as a rehabilitative
829 approach for upper limb function after a stroke: a systematic review. *PM R*. 2017;9:918–32.

- 830 51. Cervera MA, Soekadar SR, Ushiba J, Millan J d. R, Liu M, Birbaumer N, et al. Brain-computer
831 interfaces for post-stroke motor rehabilitation: a meta-analysis. bioRxiv [Internet]. 2017; Available
832 from: <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2017/11/24/224618.abstract>
- 833 52. McConnell AC, Moioli RC, Brasil FL, Vallejo M, Corne DW, Vargas PA, et al. Robotic devices
834 and brain-machine interfaces for hand rehabilitation post-stroke. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*.
835 2017;49:449–60.
- 836 53. Fugl-Meyer AR, Jaasko L, Leyman I, Olsson S, Steglind S. The post-stroke hemiplegic patient. 1.
837 a method for evaluation of physical performance. *Scand J Rehabil Med*. 1975;7:13–31.
- 838 54. Lyle RC. A performance test for assessment of upper limb function in physical rehabilitation
839 treatment and research. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research* [Internet]. 1981;4. Available
840 from:
841 [https://journals.lww.com/intjrehabilres/Fulltext/1981/12000/A_performance_test_for_assessment_of_](https://journals.lww.com/intjrehabilres/Fulltext/1981/12000/A_performance_test_for_assessment_of_upper_limb.1.aspx)
842 [upper_limb.1.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/intjrehabilres/Fulltext/1981/12000/A_performance_test_for_assessment_of_upper_limb.1.aspx)
- 843 55. Matthews WB. Aids to the examination of the peripheral nervous system. *Journal of the*
844 *Neurological Sciences*. 1977;33:299.
- 845 56. Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering Washington DC. Technology
846 Readiness Assessment (TRA) Deskbook [Internet]. Fort Belvoir, VA, USA: Defense Technical
847 Information Center; 2009 Jul. Report No.: ADA524200. Available from:
848 <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a524200.pdf>
- 849 57. Maher CG, Sherrington C, Herbert RD, Moseley AM, Elkins M. Reliability of the PEDro scale for
850 rating quality of randomized controlled trials. *Physical Therapy*. 2003;83:713–21.
- 851 58. PEDro Scale [Internet]. 1999 [cited 2018 Nov 30]. Available from:
852 www.pedro.org.au/english/downloads/pedro-scale/
- 853 59. Belardinelli P, Laer L, Ortiz E, Braun C, Gharabaghi A. Plasticity of premotor cortico-muscular
854 coherence in severely impaired stroke patients with hand paralysis. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2017;14:726–
855 33.
- 856 60. Bergamasco M, Frisoli A, Fontana M, Loconsole C, Leonardis D, Troncossi M, et al. Preliminary
857 results of BRAVO project: brain computer interfaces for Robotic enhanced Action in Visuo-motOr
858 tasks. *IEEE Int Conf Rehabil Robot*. 2011;2011:5975377.
- 859 61. Broetz D, Braun C, Weber C, Soekadar SR, Caria A, Birbaumer N. Combination of brain-
860 computer interface training and goal-directed physical therapy in chronic stroke: a case report.
861 *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2010;24:674–9.
- 862 62. Cincotti F, Pichiorri F, Arico P, Aloise F, Leotta F, de Vico Fallani F, et al. EEG-based brain-
863 computer interface to support post-stroke motor rehabilitation of the upper limb. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng*
864 *Med Biol Soc*. 2012;2012:4112–5.
- 865 63. George K, Iniguez A, Donze H, Kizhakkumthala S. Design, implementation and evaluation of a
866 brain-computer interface controlled mechanical arm for rehabilitation. 2014 IEEE International
867 Instrumentation and Measurement Technology Conference (I2MTC) Proceedings. 2014. p. 1326–8.
- 868 64. Ushiba J, Morishita A, Maeda T. A task-oriented brain-computer interface rehabilitation system
869 for patients with stroke hemiplegia. 2014 4th International Conference on Wireless Communications,
870 Vehicular Technology, Information Theory and Aerospace & Electronic Systems (VITAE). 2014. p.
871 1–3.

- 872 65. Rathee D, Chowdhury A, Meena YK, Dutta A, McDonough S, Prasad G. Brain-machine
873 interface-driven post-stroke upper-limb functional recovery correlates with beta-band mediated
874 cortical networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation Engineering*.
875 2019;27:1020–31.
- 876 66. Naros G, Gharabaghi A. Physiological and behavioral effects of beta-tACS on brain self-
877 regulation in chronic stroke. *Brain Stimul*. 2017;10:251–9.
- 878 67. Norman S. Brain computer interface design for robot assisted neurorehabilitation [Internet].
879 University of California, Irvine; 2017. Available from: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4v18v0d3>
- 880 68. Pellegrino G, Tomasevic L, Tombini M, Assenza G, Bravi M, Sterzi S, et al. Inter-hemispheric
881 coupling changes associate with motor improvements after robotic stroke rehabilitation. *Restor*
882 *Neurol Neurosci*. 2012;30:497–510.
- 883 69. Bousseta R, El Ouakouak I, Gharbi M, Rezagui F. EEG based brain computer interface for
884 controlling a robot arm movement through thought. *IRBM*. 2018;39:129–35.
- 885 70. Formaggio E, Storti SF, Boscolo Galazzo I, Gandolfi M, Geroi C, Smania N, et al. Modulation of
886 event-related desynchronization in robot-assisted hand performance: brain oscillatory changes in
887 active, passive and imagined movements. *J Neuroeng Rehabil*. 2013;10:24.
- 888 71. Sarasola-Sanz A, Irastorza-Landa N, Lopez-Larraz E, Bibian C, Helmhold F, Broetz D, et al. A
889 hybrid brain-machine interface based on EEG and EMG activity for the motor rehabilitation of stroke
890 patients. *IEEE Int Conf Rehabil Robot*. 2017;2017:895–900.
- 891 72. Shiman F, Irastorza-Landa N, Sarasola-Sanz A, Spuler M, Birbaumer N, Ramos-Murguialday A.
892 Towards decoding of functional movements from the same limb using EEG. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng*
893 *Med Biol Soc*. 2015;2015:1922–5.
- 894 73. Muralidharan A, Chae J, Taylor DM. Extracting attempted hand movements from EEGs in people
895 with complete hand paralysis following stroke. *Front Neurosci*. 2011;5:39.
- 896 74. Ono T, Mukaino M, Ushiba J. Functional recovery in upper limb function in stroke survivors by
897 using brain-computer interface: a single case A-B-A-B design. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*.
898 2013;2013:265–8.
- 899 75. Ang KK, Guan C, Phua KS, Wang C, Zhou L, Tang KY, et al. Brain-computer interface-based
900 robotic end effector system for wrist and hand rehabilitation: results of a three-armed randomized
901 controlled trial for chronic stroke. *Frontiers in Neuroengineering*. 2014;7:30–30.
- 902 76. Barsotti M, Leonardis D, Loconsole C, Solazzi M, Sotgiu E, Procopio C, et al. A full upper limb
903 robotic exoskeleton for reaching and grasping rehabilitation triggered by MI-BCI. 2015 *IEEE*
904 *International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics (ICORR)*. 2015. p. 49–54.
- 905 77. Bundy DT, Souders L, Baranyai K, Leonard L, Schalk G, Coker R, et al. Contralesional brain-
906 computer interface control of a powered exoskeleton for motor recovery in chronic stroke survivors.
907 *Stroke*. 2017;48:1908–15.
- 908 78. Chowdhury A, Raza H, Meena YK, Dutta A, Prasad G. Online covariate shift detection based
909 adaptive brain-computer interface to trigger hand exoskeleton feedback for neuro-rehabilitation. *IEEE*
910 *Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*. 2018;1–1.

- 911 79. Chowdhury A, Meena YK, Raza H, Bhushan B, Uttam AK, Pandey N, et al. Active physical
912 practice followed by mental practice using BCI-driven hand exoskeleton: a pilot trial for clinical
913 effectiveness and usability. *IEEE J Biomed Health Inform.* 2018;22:1786–95.
- 914 80. Frolov AA, Mokienko O, Lyukmanov R, Biryukova E, Kotov S, Turbina L, et al. Post-stroke
915 rehabilitation training with a motor-imagery-based brain-computer interface (BCI)-controlled hand
916 exoskeleton: a randomized controlled multicenter trial. *Frontiers in Neuroscience.* 2017;11:400–400.
- 917 81. Ono Y, Tominaga T, Murata T. Digital mirror box: an interactive hand-motor BMI rehabilitation
918 tool for stroke patients. 2016 Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual
919 Summit and Conference (APSIPA). 2016. p. 1–7.
- 920 82. Norman SL, McFarland DJ, Miner A, Cramer SC, Wolbrecht ET, Wolpaw JR, et al. Controlling
921 pre-movement sensorimotor rhythm can improve finger extension after stroke. *Journal of Neural
922 Engineering.* 2018;15:056026.
- 923 83. Wang X, Wong W, Sun R, Chu WC, Tong KY. Differentiated effects of robot hand training with
924 and without neural guidance on neuroplasticity patterns in chronic stroke. *Frontiers in Neurology.*
925 2018;9:810.
- 926 84. Tsuchimoto S, Shindo K, Hotta F, Hanakawa T, Liu M, Ushiba J. Sensorimotor connectivity after
927 motor exercise with neurofeedback in post-stroke patients with hemiplegia. *Neuroscience.*
928 2019;416:109–25.
- 929 85. Carino-Escobar RI, Carillo-Mora P, Valdes-Cristerna R, Rodriguez-Barragan MA, Hernandez-
930 Arenas C, Quinzaños-Fresnedo J, et al. Longitudinal analysis of stroke patient’ brain rhythms during
931 an interview with a brain-computer interface. *Neural Plasticity.* 2019;2019:11.
- 932 86. Cantillo-Negrete J, Carino-Escobar RI, Elias-Vinas D, Gutierrez-Martinez J. Control signal for a
933 mechatronic hand orthosis aimed for neurorehabilitation. 2015 Pan American Health Care Exchanges
934 (PAHCE). 2015. p. 1–4.
- 935 87. Chowdhury A, Raza H, Dutta A, Nishad SS, Saxena A, Prasad G. A study on cortico-muscular
936 coupling in finger motions for exoskeleton assisted neuro-rehabilitation. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med
937 Biol Soc.* 2015;2015:4610–4.
- 938 88. Li M, He B, Liang Z, Zhao CG, Chen J, Zhuo Y, et al. An attention-controlled hand exoskeleton
939 for the rehabilitation of finger extension and flexion using a rigid-soft combined mechanism. *Frontiers
940 in Neurorobotics.* 2019;13:34.
- 941 89. Zhang J, Wang B, Zhang C, Xiao Y, Wang MY. An EEG/EMG/EOG-based multimodal human-
942 machine interface to real-time control of a soft robot hand. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics.* 2019;13:7.
- 943 90. Randazzo L, Iturrate I, Perdakis S, Millán J d. R. mano: a wearable hand exoskeleton for activities
944 of daily living and neurorehabilitation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters.* 2018;3:500–7.
- 945 91. Tacchino G, Gandolla M, Coelli S, Barbieri R, Pedrocchi A, Bianchi AM. EEG analysis during
946 active and assisted repetitive movements: evidence for differences in neural engagement. *IEEE Trans
947 Neural Syst Rehabil Eng.* 2017;25:761–71.
- 948 92. Coffey AL, Leamy DJ, Ward TE. A novel BCI-controlled pneumatic glove system for home-
949 based neurorehabilitation. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc.* 2014;2014:3622–5.

- 950 93. Holmes CD, Wronkiewicz M, Somers T, Liu J, Russell E, Kim D, et al. IpsiHand Bravo: an
951 improved EEG-based brain-computer interface for hand motor control rehabilitation. *Conf Proc IEEE*
952 *Eng Med Biol Soc.* 2012;2012:1749–52.
- 953 94. Stan A, Irimia DC, Botezatu NA, Lupu RG. Controlling a hand orthosis by means of P300-based
954 brain computer interface. *2015 E-Health and Bioengineering Conference (EHB).* 2015. p. 1–4.
- 955 95. Ramos-Murguialday A, Schürholz M, Caggiano V, Wildgruber M, Caria A, Hammer EM, et al.
956 Proprioceptive feedback and brain computer interface (BCI) based neuroprostheses. *PLOS ONE.*
957 2012;7:e47048.
- 958 96. Ramos-Murguialday A, Birbaumer N. Brain oscillatory signatures of motor tasks. *J Neurophysiol.*
959 2015;113:3663–82.
- 960 97. Bauer R, Fels M, Vukelic M, Ziemann U, Gharabaghi A. Bridging the gap between motor
961 imagery and motor execution with a brain-robot interface. *Neuroimage.* 2015;108:319–27.
- 962 98. Naros G, Naros I, Grimm F, Ziemann U, Gharabaghi A. Reinforcement learning of self-regulated
963 sensorimotor beta-oscillations improves motor performance. *Neuroimage.* 2016;134:142–52.
- 964 99. Vukelic M, Gharabaghi A. Oscillatory entrainment of the motor cortical network during motor
965 imagery is modulated by the feedback modality. *Neuroimage.* 2015;111:1–11.
- 966 100. Ono Y, Wada K, Kurata M, Seki N. Enhancement of motor-imagery ability via combined action
967 observation and motor-imagery training with proprioceptive neurofeedback. *Neuropsychologia.*
968 2018;114:134–42.
- 969 101. Witkowski M, Cortese M, Cempini M, Mellinger J, Vitiello N, Soekadar S. Enhancing brain-
970 machine interface (BMI) control of a hand exoskeleton using electrooculography (EOG). *Journal of*
971 *NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation.* 2014;11:165.
- 972 102. Fok S, Schwartz R, Wronkiewicz M, Holmes C, Zhang J, Somers T, et al. An EEG-based brain
973 computer interface for rehabilitation and restoration of hand control following stroke using ipsilateral
974 cortical physiology. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc.* 2011;2011:6277–80.
- 975 103. Diab MS, Hussain Z, Mahmoud S. Restoring function in paralyzed limbs using EEG. *2016 IEEE*
976 *59th International Midwest Symposium on Circuits and Systems (MWSCAS).* 2016. p. 1–4.
- 977 104. King CE, Wang PT, Mizuta M, Reinkensmeyer DJ, Do AH, Moromugi S, et al. Noninvasive
978 brain-computer interface driven hand orthosis. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc.* 2011;2011:5786–
979 9.
- 980 105. Ang KK, Chin ZY, Wang C, Guan C, Zhang H. Filter bank common spatial pattern algorithm on
981 BCI competition IV datasets 2a and 2b. *Frontiers in neuroscience.* 2012;6:39–39.
- 982 106. Bobrov PD, Korshakov AV, Roshchin VI, Frolov AA. Bayesian classifier for brain-computer
983 interface based on mental representation of movements. *Zh Vyssh Nerv Deiat Im I P Pavlova.*
984 2012;62:89–99.
- 985 107. Oña ED, Cano-de la Cuerda R, Sanchez-Herrera P, Balaguer C, Jardon A. A review of robotics
986 in neurorehabilitation: Towards an automated process for upper limb. *J Healthc Eng.* 2018;
- 987 108. Kersten P. Principles of physiotherapy assessment and outcome measures. *Physical Management*
988 *in Neurological Rehabilitation.* 2004. p. 29–46.

- 989 109. Dovat L, Lambercy O, Ruffieux Y, Chapuis D, Gassert R, Bleuler H, et al. A haptic knob for
990 rehabilitation after stroke. 2006 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and
991 Systems. Beijing, China: IEEE; 2006.
- 992 110. Ballester BR, Maier M, Duff A, Cameirao M, Bermudez S, Duarte E, et al. A critical time
993 window for recovery extends beyond one-year post-stroke. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 2019;350–7.
- 994 111. Kam JWY, Griffin S, Shen A, Patel S, Hinrichs H, Heinze HJ, et al. Systematic comparison
995 between a wireless EEG system with dry electrodes and a wired EEG system with wet electrodes.
996 *NeuroImage*. 2019;184:119–29.
- 997 112. Mathewson KE, Harrison TJL, Kizuk SAD. High and dry? Comparing active dry EEG electrodes
998 to active and passive wet electrodes. *Psychophysiology*. 2017;54:74–82.
- 999 113. Saab J, Battes B, Grosse-Wentrup M. Simultaneous EEG recordings with dry and wet electrodes
1000 in motor-imagery. In proceedings. Graz, Austria; 2011.
- 1001 114. Abdalsalam E, Yusoff MZ, Kamel N, Malik AS, Mahmoud D. Classification of Four Class
1002 Motor Imagery for Brain Computer Interface. In: Ibrahim H, Iqbal S, Teoh SS, Mustaffa MT, editors.
1003 9th International Conference on Robotic, Vision, Signal Processing and Power Applications. Springer
1004 Singapore; 2017. p. 297–305.
- 1005 115. Grummett TS, Leibbrandt RE, Lewis TW, De Los Angeles D, Powers DMW, Willoughby JO, et
1006 al. Measurement of neural signals from inexpensive, wireless and dry EEG systems. *Physiological*
1007 *Measurement*. 2015;36.
- 1008 116. Mladenov T, Kim K, Nooshabadi S. Accurate motor imagery based dry electrode brain-computer
1009 interface system for consumer applications. 2012 IEEE 16th International Symposium on Consumer
1010 Electronics. 2012. p. 1–4.
- 1011 117. Guger C, Krausz G, Edliner G. Brain-computer interface control with dry EEG electrodes.
1012 *Proceedings of the 5th International Brain-Computer Interface Conference*. 2011. p. 316–9.
- 1013 118. Srinivasan R. Methods to improve the spatial resolution of EEG. *International Journal of*
1014 *Bioelectromagnetism*. 1999;1:102–11.
- 1015 119. Liao K, Xiao R, Gonzalez J, Ding L. Decoding individual finger movements from one hand
1016 using human EEG signals. *PLOS ONE*. 2014;9:e85192.
- 1017 120. Johnson MJ, Micera S, Shibata T, Guglielmelli E. Rehabilitation and assistive robotics [TC
1018 Spotlight]. *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*. 2008;15:16–110.
- 1019 121. Arvaneh M, Guan C, Ang K, Quek C. Optimizing the Channel Selection and Classification
1020 Accuracy in EEG-Based BCI. *Biomedical Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*. 2011;58:1865–73.
- 1021 122. Quattrocchi G, Greenwood R, Rothwell JC, Galea JM, Bestmann S. Reward and punishment
1022 enhance motor adaptation in stroke. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*.
1023 2016;88:730–6.
- 1024

Table 2. Summary of Studies

Authors	Participants	Study Design	Task Design	BCI-Hand Robot	Main Outcomes
Studies involving stroke patients					
Ang et al., 2014 [75]	N=27 (7F:14M) Moderate to severe impairment of UE function Mean age: 54.2y Mean stroke duration: 385.1 days	3-armed RCT of motor function with MI-BCI-device as intervention Control groups: device only (Haptic Knob), SAT	Photo manipulation: hand opening and closing, pronation and supination Cue: visual (photo) Feedback: visual (photo) and kinaesthetic	EEG: 27 channels to classify ERD/ERS and coupled with EMG to confirm MI Device: Haptic Knob, 2-DOF for hand grasping and knob manipulation Actuation: DC brushed motors with linear belt drive Control: trigger	Clinical outcome measure: FMMA Distal, improvement in weeks 3, 6, 12, 24 BCI-device group = 2.5±2.4, 3.3±2.3, 3.2±2.7, 4.2±3.1 Device only group = 1.6±2.5, 2.9±3.0, 2.5±2.6, 2.5±3.0 SAT group = 0.4±1.1, 1.9±1.9, 1.0±1.3, 0.3±2.1
Barsotti et al., 2015 [76]	N=3 (1F:2M) Chronic stroke survivors with right arm hemiparesis Mean age: 62±12y	Probing MI classification by BCI training, time-frequency analysis and robot trajectories Uncontrolled	Reaching-grasping-releasing Cue: visual Feedback: kinaesthetic Minimum time required to perform MI = 2s	EEG: 13 channels to classify ERD Device: BRAVO 2-DOF hand orthosis attached to full UE exoskeleton Actuation: DC motors with rigid links Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracy during BCI training = 82.51±2.04% Average delay from visual cue to robot initiation = 3.45±1.6s Average delay due to patient's ability to start MI = 1.45s
Bundy et al., 2017 [77]	N=10 Chronic hemiparetic stroke with moderate to severe UE hemiparesis Mean age: 58.6±10.3y	Motor function evaluation before and after intervention by MI-BCI from unaffected hemisphere	Opening of affected hand Cue: visual Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 8 channels to classify ERD Device: 3-pinch grip, 1-DOF hand exoskeleton	Clinical outcome measure: ARAT Score, improvement from baseline to completion (12 weeks) Mean ± SD = 6.20±3.81

Bundy et al. (cont'd)		Uncontrolled		Control: continuous depending on spectral power	Note: 5.7 ARAT Score is the minimal clinically important difference in chronic stroke survivors
Carino-Escobar et al. 2019 [85]	N=9 (4F:5M) Subacute ischaemic stroke Mean age: 59.9±2.8y Mean stroke duration: 158(±74)-185(±73) days	Determine longitudinal ERD/ERS patters and functional recovery with BCI-robot Uncontrolled	Extension-flexion of hand fingers Cue: visual (Graz MI) Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 11 channels to classify ERD/ERS Device: hand finger orthosis Actuation: DC motor with screw system for linear displacement, flexible links Control: trigger	FMA-UE: N=3 reported equal or higher than 3 score gains, N=3 no score gains, Mean longitudinal ERD/ERS: beta bands have higher association with time since stroke onset than alpha, and strong association with UL motor recovery
Chowdhury et al., 2018-b [78]	N=20 10 healthy and 10 hemiplegic stroke patients Mean age (healthy, stroke): 41±9.21y, 47.5±14.23y	Probe non-adaptive classifier (NAC) vs. Covariate Shift adaptive classifier (CSAC) of MI in EEG Control group: healthy participants	Extension-flexion of hand fingers Cue: visual Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 12 channels with EMG to classify ERD/ERS Device: EMOHEX 3-finger, 3-DOF each, exoskeleton (thumb, index, middle) Actuation: servomotors with rigid links Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracies during BCI training: Healthy group: calibration = 78.50±9.01%, NAC = 75.25±5.46%, CSAC = 81.50±4.89% Patient group: calibration = 79.63±13.11%, NAC = 70.25±3.43%, CSAC = 75.75±3.92%
Chowdhury et al., 2018-c [79]	N=4 (2F:2M) Chronic hemiplegic stroke patients, right-handed, left hand impaired Mean age: 44.75±15.69y Mean stroke duration: 7 ±1.15mo	Motor function evaluation by using active physical practice followed by MI-BCI-controlled device intervention Uncontrolled	Extension-flexion of hand fingers Cue: visual Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 12 channels with force sensors to classify ERD/ERS Device: EMOHEX 3-finger, 3-DOF each, exoskeleton (thumb, index, middle) Actuation: servomotors with rigid links Control: trigger	Classification accuracies of 4 participants: P01 = 81.45±8.12%, P02 = 70.21±4.43%, P03 = 76.88±4.49%, P04 = 74.55±4.35% Clinical outcome measures: GS and ARAT Scores, improvement from baseline to completion (6 weeks) GS scores: group mean difference = +6.38 kg, p=0.06

Chowdhury et al., 2018-c (cont'd)					ARAT scores: group mean difference = +5.66, p<0.05
Frolov et al., 2017 [80]	N=74 (26F:48M) BCI 55: Control 19 Subacute or chronic stroke with mild to hemiplegic hand paresis, right-handed	Multi-centre RCT of MI-BCI-controlled hand exoskeleton Control group: SHAM	3 Tasks: (1) motor relaxation, (2) imagery of left-hand opening, (3) imagery of right-hand opening Cue: visual Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 30 channels to classify the three mental tasks by Bayesian classifier based on covariance matrices Device: hand exoskeleton by Neurobotics, Russia Actuation: pneumatic motors with spring flexors Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracy during BCI training = 40.6% Clinical outcome measures: FMMA Distal and ARAT Scores, improvement in 10 days of training FMMA Distal = 2.0, p<0.01 (BCI) and 1.0, p=0.046 (control) ARAT Grasp = 3.0, p<0.01 (BCI) and 1.0, p=0.0394 (control) ARAT Grip = 1.0, p<0.01 (BCI) and 1.0, p=0.045 (control) ARAT Pinch = 1.0, p<0.01 (BCI) and 0.0, p=0.675 (control)
Norman et al., 2018 [82]	N=8 (All male) Chronic cortical and subcortical single haemorrhagic or ischaemic stroke (at least 6 months) Mean age: 59.5±11.8y	Implementation of sensorimotor rhythm (SMR) control on robot-assistive movement Uncontrolled	Extension of hand finger Cue: visual Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 16 channels mapping SMR changes Device: FINGER robot Actuation: Linear servo-tube actuator with rigid links Control: Visual - continuous (colour change respective to SMR), Robot - trigger	Mean classification accuracies: 8 participants: 83.1%, 76.3%, 73.3%, 68.2%, 74.5%, 86.5%, 47.9%, 40.0% Box and blocks test (BBT): At screening: mean score = 14.3±10.0, mean change after therapy = 4.3±4.5 (range 0-12). Higher score changes in participants who demonstrated SMR control but not significant (p=0.199)
Ono et al., 2016-a [81]	N=21 (9F:12M) Chronic stroke patients with hemiplegic hands Mean age: 57.9±2.4y	Probe congruent vs. incongruent MI feedback strategies Control groups: congruent (synchronous proprioceptive and visual feedback) and	Grasping of a tennis ball with a hand Cue: visual (video of hand performing action) Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 9 channels to classify ERD Device: Power Assist Hand - Team ATOM, Atsugi, Japan	Mean classification accuracies: Congruent feedback = 56.8±5.2%, chance level=36.4±4.5% Incongruent feedback = 40.0±3.5%, chance level 35.4±4.5%

Ono et al., 2016-a (cont'd)		incongruent (proprioceptive feedback given 1s after visual)		Actuation: pneumatic motors with rigid links Control: trigger	
Tsuchimoto et al., 2019 [84]	N=18 (3F:14M) Chronic haemorrhagic or ischaemic stroke (from 2mo onwards) Mean age: 58±10y	Implementation of MI-controlled robotic orthosis as neurofeedback Control: SHAM	Extension of hand finger Cue: unspecified Feedback: kinaesthetic and electrical stimulation	EEG: 5 channels to classify MI Device: robotic finger orthosis Actuation: servo motors with rigid links Control: trigger	Significant time-intervention interaction in the ipsilesional sensorimotor cortex. Higher coactivation of sensory and motor cortices for neurofeedback group in the ipsilesional sensorimotor cortices as compared to SHAM
Wang et al., 2018 [83]	N=24 (4F:20M) Chronic stroke patients with paralysed hands Mean age: 54±9y	Implementation of action observation and motor imagery (AO+MI) with kinaesthetic feedback Control: SHAM	Hand grasping Cue: visual (video of hand action / textual cues in SHAM group) Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 16 channels to classify ERD Device: robot hand Control: Trigger	AO+MI with kinaesthetic feedback group showed significant improvements in FMA-UE across longitudinal evaluation [$\chi^2(2) = 7.659, p = 0.022$], no significant difference in SHAM group [$\chi^2(2) = 4.537, p = 0.103$]

Authors	Participants	Study Design	Task Design	BCI-Hand Robot	Main Outcomes
Studies involving healthy participants					
Bauer et al., 2015 [97]	N=20 (11F:9M) Right-handed Mean age: 28.5±10.5y	Study on MI as compared to motor execution (ME) using BCI-device	Opening of left hand Cue: auditory Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 31 channels to detect ERD, with EMG to classify MI from execution and account for tonic contraction Device: Amadeo, Tyromotion, Austria Control: discontinuation of ERD stops finger extension	Principal component analyses (between MI and execution) generated coefficients for the visual (VIS) and kinaesthetic (KIS) imagery scale, BCI-robot performance (BRI), tonic contraction task (MOC) and visuomotor integration task (VMI). VIS and KIS yielded high coefficients on MI while MOC and VMI yield high coefficients on ME. BRI show high coefficient yields on both MI and ME.

Cantillo-Negrete et al., 2015 [86]	N=1	Design and implementation of a MI-controlled hand orthosis	Extension-flexion of right-hand finger Cue: visual (modified Graz) Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 11 channels to detect MI Device: 1-DOF hand finger orthosis Actuation: DC motor with screw system for linear displacement, flexible links Control: trigger	Correctly classified trials = 78%
Chowdhury et al., 2015-a [87]	N=6 Age range: 20-30y	Study of cortico-muscular coupling in robotic finger exoskeleton control	Extension-flexion of hand fingers Cue: visual Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 10 channels with EMG to classify MI Device: 3-finger, 3-DOF each, exoskeleton (thumb, index, middle) Actuation: servomotors with rigid links Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracies: passive execution = 69.17%, hand execution = 71.25%, MI = 67.92%
Coffey et al., 2014 [92]	N=3 (All male) Right-handed Age range: 24-28y	Design and implementation of a MI-controlled hand orthosis	Hand digit and wrist contraction and extension Cue: visual (Graz MI) Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 27 channels to classify MI Device: hand glove controlled by Arduino Actuation: pneumatic Control: trigger	Glove inflation-deflation cycle = 22s Classification accuracies of 3 participants: A = 92.5%, B = 90.0%, C = 80.0%
Diab et al., 2016 [103]	N=5	Design and implementation of EEG-triggered wrist orthosis with accuracy improvement	Hand opening and closing Cue: verbal instruction Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 14 channels to detect hand movement-related EEG Device: actuated Talon wrist orthosis Actuation: linear Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracies: simulation studies = 95%, online BCI training = 86%

Fok et al., 2011 [102]	N=4	Design and implementation of a MI-controlled hand orthosis	Hand opening and closing Cue: unspecified Feedback: visual (cursor movement) and kinaesthetic	EEG: 14 channels to detect MI-related ERD Device: actuated Talon wrist orthosis Actuation: linear actuator Control: trigger	EEG signals from imagined hand movement was correlated with the contralesional hemisphere and utilised to trigger the actuation of orthosis ERD was detected from 12 Hz bin power of EEG during move condition
Li et al., 2019 [88]	N=14 (4F:10M) Mean age: 23.8±0.89y	Design and implementation of an attention-controlled hand exoskeleton with rigid-soft mechanism	Hand grasping Cue: visual (video of hand action) Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 3 channels to map signals relative to attention Device: hand exoskeleton Actuation: linear actuator with rigid-soft mechanism Control: Trigger	Mean classification accuracy: 95.54% actuation success rate against the attention threshold
Holmes et al., 2012 [93]	N=6 (All male, young adults)	Design and implementation of a MI-controlled hand orthosis	Hand opening and closing Cue: textual Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 14 channels to detect hand movement-related EEG Device: ExoFlex Hand Exoskeleton controlled by Arduino Actuation: linear actuator connected to chained links that flex Control: trigger	Classification accuracies of 6 participants: T001 = 95%, T002 = 98%, D001 = 91%, U001 = 93%, E001 = 87%, E002 = 86%
King et al., 2011 [104]	N=1 (Female) 24y	Contralateral control of hand orthosis using EEG-based BCI	Right hand idling and grasping Cue: textual	EEG: 63 channels to control contralateral hand movement Device: hand orthosis	Offline classification accuracy = 95.3±0.6%, $p < 3.0866 \times 10^{-25}$

King et al. (cont'd)			Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	Actuation: servomotors attached to Bowden cables as tendons Control: trigger	Average lag from voluntary contractions to BCI-robot control = 2.24 ± 0.19 s (after 5 sessions)
Naros et al., 2016 [98]	N=32 (16F:16M) Mean age: 25.9 ± 0.5 y	2x2 factorial design with parameters: adaptive classifier threshold and non-adaptive classifier threshold, contingent feedback and non-contingent feedback	Opening of right hand Cue: auditory Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 32 channels to detect ERD, with EMG to classify MI (FC3, C3, CP3 used) Device: Amadeo, Tyromotion, Austria Control: trigger	Significant enhancement in group 1 (adaptive classifier + contingent feedback), $p=0.0078$ Significant reduction in group 4 (non-adaptive classifier + non-contingent feedback), $p=0.0391$ Motor performance improvement over baseline from first and last tasks, significant results: Group 1 (adaptive classifier + contingent feedback), $p=0.0313$ Group 4 = (non-adaptive classifier + non-contingent feedback), $p=0.0411$
Ono et al., 2018-b [100]	N=28 Right-handed except 1	Implementation of an action observation strategy with visual and proprioceptive, or auditory feedback to MI Control group: SHAM	Grasping of a tennis ball with a hand Cue: visual (video of hand performing action) Feedback: visual, kinaesthetic and auditory	EEG: 9 channels to classify ERD Device: Power Assist Hand - Team ATOM, Atsugi, Japan Actuation: pneumatic motors with rigid links Control: trigger	AO+MI + proprioceptive and visual feedback: Mean MI-ERD powers of correct feedback vs SHAM provide significant interaction, $F_{1,17}=6.618$, $p=0.020$ (6 days) Statistically significant increase in MI-ERD power in correct feedback group over baseline, $p=0.012$ (6 days)
Stan et al., 2015 [94]	N=9	Trigger a hand orthosis using a P300 speller BCI	Spell E (enable), A (hand opening) and B (hand closing) in P300 speller BCI to perform hand grasping, moving and releasing objects Cue: textual (spelling)	EEG: 8 channels focusing on visual cortex Device: hand orthosis Actuation: 2 servomotors and	Mean classification accuracies: 100% (on 6 th letter flash during calibration)

Stan et al. (cont'd)			Feedback: visual (textual) and kinaesthetic	current feedback circuitry Control: trigger	
Ramos-Murguialday et al., 2012 [95]	N=23 Mean age (contingent positive, contingent negative, SHAM): 26.6±4y, 26.5±5y, 26.2±2y	Probing MI with proprioceptive feedback Experimental groups: contingent positive, contingent negative feedback Control group: SHAM	5 tasks: MI without direct control, MI with direct control, passive, active, rest Cue: auditory Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 61 channels with EMG to classify ERD/ERS Device: hand orthosis Actuation: DC motor M-28 with a worm gearhead and Bowden cables for each finger Control: trigger	Contingent positive feedback provided higher BCI performance during MI without feedback than contingent negative and SHAM; and higher during MI with or without feedback as compared to rest
Ramos-Murguialday and Birbaumer, 2015 [96]	N=9 Right-handed Mean age: 26.6±4y	Detect oscillatory signatures of motor tasks during EEG	5 tasks: MI without direct control, MI with direct control, passive, active, rest Cue: auditory Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG: 61 channels with EMG to classify ERD/ERS Device: hand orthosis Actuation: DC motor M-28 with a worm gearhead and Bowden cables for each finger Control: trigger	Significant change in power in all frequency ranges during MI with direct control before trial initiation Kinaesthetic feedback increased significant changes in alpha and beta power; therefore, increasing BCI performance
Randazzo et al., 2018 [90]	N=9 (2F:7M) Mean age: 23±5y	Design and implementation of a hand orthosis with testing of kinaesthetic effects in EEG	4 tasks: rest (REST), exoskeleton-induced hand motions (EXO), MI of right hand (MI), exoskeleton-induced hand motions plus MI (MIEXO) Cue: visual Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 16 channels to detect MI Device: mano hand exoskeleton Actuation: linear servomotors attached to Bowden cables as tendons Control: passive (exoskeleton not dependent on MI to	Mean classification accuracies among groups: (vs REST) MI = 63.02±5.91%, EXO = 69.64±5.74%, MIEXO = 72.19±6.57% MIEXO vs EXO = 69.91±9.86% Chance level at 95% confidence = 58% (N=50 trials)

Randazzo et al. (cont'd)				move during MIEXO task)	
Tacchino et al., 2017 [91]	N=8 (7F:1M) Right-handed Mean age: 26.3±1.9y	2x2 factorial design with parameters: glove, no glove, active movement, passive movement	Opening and closing of hand, 4 tasks: (A) glove with active movement, (B) glove with passive movement, (C) no glove with active movement, (D) no glove and no movement Cue: auditory Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 19 channels with EMG to detect ERD/ERS (C3, F3, Cz used) Device: Gloreha hand rehabilitation glove Actuation: electric actuators with Bowden cables on each finger Control: passive (glove not dependent on brain-state during tasks)	Statistically significant ERD changes in beta and mu bands were observed to initiate earlier in tasks A and C (involves active movement) Stronger and longer ERD was observed in tasks A and B (involves robotic assistance) suggesting reinforced afferent kinaesthetic feedback
Vukelic and Gharabaghi, 2015 [99]	N=11 (4F:7M) Right-handed Mean age: 25.83±3.1y	Assessment sensorimotor activity during MI with either visual or kinaesthetic feedback	Right hand opening Cue: visual (coloured cursor ball) Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic (separated by experimental groups)	EEG: 128 channels to detect ERD/ERS during MI (F3, CP3, C3 used) Device: Amadeo, Tyromotion, Austria Control: trigger	MI + kinaesthetic feedback group resulted in higher beta ERS (p=0.02) during rest and higher beta ERD (p=0.04) during MI Kinaesthetic feedback provides higher stability and sustained beta ERD activity than visual feedback
Witkowski et al., 2014 [101]	N=12 (4F:8M) Right-handed Mean age: 28.1±3.63y	Assessment performance and safety of EEG-EOG hybrid BCI	Right hand grasping Cue: visual (coloured squares and arrows) Feedback: kinaesthetic	EEG: 5 channels with EOG and EMG to detect ERD during MI Device: HX hand exoskeleton Actuation: DC motors with Bowden cables for thumb and index fingers Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracies: EEG only = 63.59±10.81% EEG/EOG hybrid = 60.77±9.42% Mean safety criterion violations during rest: EEG only = 45.91±26.8% EEG/EOG hybrid = 10.14±0.3%

Zhang et al., 2019 [89]	N=6 (2F:4M) Right-handed Age range: 23-26y	Implementation of a multimodal system using EEG, EMG and EOG to control a soft-robotic hand	Graz visualisation and auditory instructions, eye movements and physical practice (hand gestures) Cue: visual (Graz MI), auditory Feedback: visual and kinaesthetic	EEG with EMG and EOG: 40 channels to analyse ERD/ERS patterns Device: Soft pneumatic finger Actuation: pneumatic actuator with soft structures Control: trigger	Mean classification accuracies: EOG = 94.23% EEG = 31.46% EMG = 36.38% Multimodal = 93.83±0.02%
----------------------------	--	---	---	--	---

1027

1028 UE = Upper Extremity, MI = Motor Imagery, BCI = Brain-Computer Interface, RCT = Randomised Clinical Trial, SAT = Standard Arm Therapy,

1029 EMG = Electromyography, EOG = Electrooculography, ERD/ERS = Event-Related Desynchronisation/Synchronisation, FMMA = Fugl-Meyer Motor Assessment,

1030 ARAT = Action Research Arm Test, GS = Grip Strength, DOF = Degrees-of-Freedom

1031

1032

1033 **List of Abbreviations**

1034	ADL	Activities of Daily Living
1035	ANN	Artificial Neural Network
1036	AO	Action Observation
1037	AR	Augmented Reality
1038	ARAT	Action Research Arm Test
1039	BCI	Brain-Computer Interface
1040	BMI	Brain-Machine Interface
1041	CDRH	Center for Devices and Radiological Health
1042	CNN	Convolutional Neural Network
1043	CSD	Covariate Shift Detection
1044	CSP	Common Spatial Pattern
1045	DC	Direct Current
1046	ECoG	Electrocorticography
1047	EEG	Electroencephalography
1048	EMG	Electromyography
1049	EOG	Electrooculography
1050	ERD	Event-Related Desynchronisation
1051	ERP	Event-Related Potential
1052	ERS	Event-Related Synchronisation
1053	ERSP	Event-Related Spectral Perturbation
1054	FBCSP	Filter Bank Common Spatial Pattern
1055	FIR	Finite Impulse Response
1056	FMA-UE	Fugl-Meyer Motor Assessment – Upper Extremity
1057	GS	Grip Strength

1058	IIR	Infinite Impulse Response
1059	LDA	Linear Discriminant Analysis
1060	ME	Motor Execution
1061	MI	Motor Imagery
1062	PEDro	Physiotherapy Evidence Database
1063	PMA	Premarket Approval
1064	PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis
1065	PROSPERO	International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews
1066	PS	Pinch Strength
1067	QSR	Quality System Requirement
1068	RCT	Randomised Clinical Trial
1069	RNN	Recurrent Neural Network
1070	SAT	Standard Arm Therapy
1071	SVM	Support Vector Machine
1072	TRA	Technology Readiness Assessment
1073	TRL	Technology Readiness Levels
1074	UK-MRC	United Kingdom Medical Research Council
1075	VR	Virtual Reality