Independent Component Analysis of Electrophysiological Data



Scott Makeig Institute for Neural Computation University of California San Diego

28th EEGLAB Workshop

November, 2018

Blind EEG Source Separation by Independent Component Analysis

Skull Scalp |

CSF

ICA can find distinct EEG source activities -- and their 'simple' scalp maps!

Independent Component Analysis of Electroencephalographic Data

Seott Makrig Naval Hoalth Rosearch Center P.O. Rox 85/22 San Diego CA 92/86-5/22 soottbeplanag, ahre, aavy, ail

Tuyy-Ping Jung Naval Reath Research Center and Computational Neurohiology Lah The Salk Institute, P.O. Das S2600 San Diego. Co. 92186-3800 jung@all.e.etu Anthony J. Bell Computational Neurobiology Lah The Salk Institute, P.O. Rox S3600 San Diego, CA 92385-360 teopficialk.edu

Transmer J. Sejaowski Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Computational Neurobiology Lah The Salt Institute, P.O. Tax 8500 San Diego, CA 92185-5600 terryfsallz.edu

Abstract

Recause of the distance hetween the skull and hain and their different resistivities, electroencepholographic (FPG) data collected from any point on the human scalp includes activity generated within a large hum area. This spatial smearing of PERI data hy volume conduction does not involve significant time delays, however, auggenting that the Independent Component Analysis (ICA) algorithm of Tell and Rejnamski [] is suitable for performing hind source sepanation on P.B.7 data. The K7A algorithm separates the problem of apprecidentification from that of appreciacalination. First rarolta of applying the ICA algorithm to FEG and ment-related potential (FRP) data collected during a sustained auditory detection task show: [1] KOA training is insensitive to different random seeds. [2] ICA may he used to segregate obvious artifactual F.B.2 components (fire and muscle noise, eye movements) from other sources. (2) ICA is sapable of isolating overlapping P.P.O phenomena, including alpha and theta human and spatially-separable FRP components, to reparate ICA charmels. (4) Nonstationarities in EEG and hehavional state can be tracked using ICA via changes in the amount of residual correlation hetween ICA-filtered output channels.

Tony Bell, developer of Infomax ICA



S. Makeig, S. Enghoff (2000)

ICA Assumptions

 Mixing is linear at electrodes Propagation delays are negligible Component locations are fixed ? Component time courses are independent • # components <= # scalp channels Contribution to EEG **# Scalp channels**

Effective sources →

Are EEG effective source signals independent?



Properties of EEG Independent Components

- Maximally Temporally Independent
- Concurrently Active and Spatially Overlapping
- *Dipolar* Scalp Maps (Delorme et al., 2012)
- Functionally Distinct
- Between-Subject Similarity / Complexity



ICA vs. PCA



PCA simply decorrelates the outputs using an **orthogonal mixing matrix**.

PCA makes each successive component account for as much **variance** in the data as possible.

ICA makes each component account for as much **temporally independent information** in the data as possible, with no constraints on the mixing matrix.

PCA lumps – ICA splits!

Arnaud Delorme & S. Makeig, 2016





Onton, Makeig (2006)



J. Onton & S. Makeig (2009)

The response (at Cz) sums 238 independent sources



J. Onton & S. Makeig (2009)

No more than ~30% of any scalp channel variance is produced by any one brain source!

Scalp EEG signals are strong mixtures of brain sources.

In this sense scalp channel signals are *epiphenomena*. *Source* signals are the EEG phenomena of real interest!



ICA finds Non-Brain Independent Component (IC) Processes ...



... separates them from the remainder of the data ...

J. Onton & S. Makeig



... and also separates cortical brain IC processes



Julie Onton & S. Makeig (2006)



ICA is a linear data decomposition method



Infomax ICA learning approach

How to make the outputs statistical independent? Minimize their redundancy or mutual information.

Consider the joint entropy of two components,



Historical Remarks

- Herault & Jutten ("Space or time adaptive signal processing by neural network models", *Neural Nets for Computing Meeting*, Snowbird, Utah, 1986): Seminal paper
- Bell & Sejnowski (1995): Information maximization (Infomax)
- Makeig, Bell, Jung, Sejnowski (1996); ICA decomposition of EEG
- Amari et al. (1996): Natural gradient learning
- Cardoso (1996): Joint approximate diagonalization (JADE)
- Hyvarinen (1999): (fastICA)
- Lee/Girolami (1999): Mixture model ICA (Extended Infomax)
- Palmer (2006): Adaptive mixture ICA (AMICA)
- **Applications of ICA to biomedical signals**
 - EEG/ERP analysis (Makeig, Bell, Jung & Sejnowski, *NIPS* 1996)
 - fMRI analysis (McKeown et al., 1998)
 - Fetal/mother ECG separation (Cardoso, 1998)
 - Electrocorticography (ECoG) (Whitmer, 2010)

Important Recent Result (2012)

Amica

Those linear decompositions of multi-channel EEG data that find ICs whose time courses are **more** temporally **independent** ...

Also find more ICs whose scalp maps are highly 'dipolar' – i.e., ICs compatible with the spatial projection of a single local cortical (or non-brain, artifactual) source process – whose location can be accurately estimated.

More independent time courses $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ Larger number of dipolar ICs

41.8 42 42.2 42.4 42.6 42.8 43 43.2 Mutual information reduction (kbits/sec)

Hypothesis: Dipolar ICs = Localized cortical source processes

Delorme et al., PLOS One, 2012



2012

S. Makeig, 2011

Important Recent Result

Amica

Those linear decompositions of multi-channel EEG data that find ICs whose time courses are **more** temporally **independent** ...

Also find more ICs whose scalp maps are highly 'dipolar' – i.e., ICs compatible with the spatial projection of a single local cortical (or non-brain, artifactual) source process – whose location can be accurately estimated.

More independent time courses $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ Larger number of dipolar ICs

Dipolar ICs = Localized cortical source processes

Delorme et al., PLOS One, 2012

Are locations of EEG effective source signals similar across tasks?

Are source locations within task similar across participants?



Effective Source Density

Visual Working Memory



Sternberg letter memory task

dipoledensity()

Effective Source Density Eyes-closed emotion imagination



>> dipoledensity()

Onton & Makeig, 2005

Effective Source Density Letter twoback with feedback



Letter twoback with feedback

Effective Source Density Auditory novelty oddball



Auditory oddball plus novel sounds

Effective Source Density A. Old/new word memory



Word memory (old/new) task

-----MMM-----

Effective Source Density B. Visually cued selective response



Visually cued button press task

Are source dynamics similar across participants?



S. Makeig (2007)

Example: frontal midline theta cluster



Goal: To cluster equivalent ICs across subjects



J. Onton, 2005



erpimage()

Onton, Delorme & Makeig, 2005.

Why analyze sources instead of channel activities? ERSP IC 7 IC 7 B Component ERSP Component ITC d8 CD Channel ERSP (dB) 20 618 10 800 1200 400 -3 1200 IC 4 400 800 1200 IC4 с Channel of 30 interest 20 10 ITC 800 1200 400 800 1200 400 Channel ITC IC 5 IC 5 D н requency (Hz) 30 10 20 â 10 -10 1200 400 800 EFØ Time (ms) 800 800 Time (m

J. Onton & S. Makeig, 2005



Auditory Deviance Response



The deepest mental trap in electrophysiology lurks in the word "THE" !!!



Rissling et al., 2014

| PEAK AMPLITUDES | ERP | r² | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Scalp Electrode (Ez) | | | | | | | | |
| Verbal IO (WRAT) | P3a | 0.11 | | | | | | |
| Functional Capacity (UPS | RON | 0.12 | | | | | | |
| Superior Temporal | | | MMN P3a RON MMN P3a RON | | | | | |
| Working Memory (LNS Reorder) | RON | 0.15 | | | | | | |
| Verbal IQ (WRAT) | RON | 0.15 | | | | | | |
| Immediate Verbal Memory (CVLT) | RON | 0.28 | | | | | | |
| Delayed Verbal Memory (CVLT) | RON | 0.26 | | | | | | |
| Functional Capacity (UPSA) | MMN | 0.48 | | | | | | |
| Functional Capacity (UPSA) | RON | 0.26 | | | | | | |
| R Inferior Frontal | | | | | | | | |
| Negative Symptoms (SANS) | RON | 0.36 | | | | | | |
| Psychosocial Functioning (501) | KUN | 0.24 | A S MAN | | | | | |
| Auditory Attention (LNS Forward) | MMN | 0.38 | -2 µV -2 | | | | | |
| Working Memory (LNS Reorder) | MMN | 0.30 | | | | | | |
| Verbal IQ (WRAT) | MMN | 0.46 | Contri SZ | | | | | |
| Ventral Mild Cingulate | | | | | | | | |
| Positive Symptoms (SAPS) | RON | 0.29 | | | | | | |
| Negative Symptoms (SANS) | P3a | 0.36 | | | | | | |
| Immediate Verbal Momory (C)/LT) | DON | 0.41 | | | | | | |
| Delayed Verbal Memory (CVLT) | RON | 0.24 | | | | | | |
| Verbal IQ (WRAT) | RON | 0.29 | | | | | | |
| Executive Functioning (WCST) | RON | 0.24 | | | | | | |
| Anterior Cingulate | | | | | | | | |
| Functional Status (GAF) | MMN | 0.18 | | | | | | |
| Functional Status (GAF) | RON | 0.17 | | | | | | |
| Immediate Verbal Memory (CVLT) | RON | 0.25 | | | | | | |
| Delayed Verbal Memory (CVLT) | RON | 0.17 | | | | | | |
| Medial Crisicorrontal | | | | | | | | |
| Positive Symptoms (SAPS) | P3a | 0.40 | | | | | | |
| Negative Symptoms (SANS) | P3a | 0.54 | | | | | | |
| Psychosocial Functioning (SOE) | . 34 | 0.37 | | | | | | |
| Functional Capacity (UPSA) | P3a | 0.32 | | | | | | |
| Dorsal Mid Cingulate | | | | | | | | |
| Verbal IQ (WRAT) | P3a | 0.15 | | | | | | |
| Executive Functioning (WCST) | MMN | 0.18 | | | | | | |

| I | PEAK LATENCIES | ERP | r² | | | | P |
|---|----------------------------------|-----|------|-------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 2 | Scalp Electrode (Fz) n/a | | | > | | | |
| | Superior Temporal | | | | MMN P3a | RON | MMN P3a RON |
| - | Functional capacity (UPSA) | MMN | 0.25 | | | | |
| | Delayed Verbal Memory (CVLT) | MMN | 0.17 | | ~ ~ ~ | \mathbf{i} | |
| F | R Inferior Frontal | | | _ | | | |
| - | Negative Symptoms (SANS) | RON | 0.51 | 4 Std | | | 4 |
| | Psychosocial Functioning (SOE) | RON | 0.25 | · · · | | | |
| | Executive Functioning (WCST) | MMN | 0.30 | 2 | | | |
| | Executive Functioning (WCST) | P3a | 0.28 | | and the life | | Martin Children |
| | | | | | NEW! | | |
| - | Negative Symptoms (SANS) | P3a | 0.33 | -2 | μν 🐄 | A. | -2 |
| | Negative Symptoms (SANS) | NON | 0.33 | | | | ~ 7 |
| | Psychosocial Functioning (SOF) | P3a | 0.31 | | Cnt | r | SZ |
| | Verbal IQ (WRAT) | MMN | 0.25 | | | | |
| | Executive Functioning (WCST) | P3a | 0.30 | | | | |
| | Anterior Cingulate | | | | | | |
| - | Functional Capacity (UPSA) | RON | 0.17 | | | | |
| | Verbal IO (WRAT) | MMN | 0.24 | | | | |
| | Auditory Attention (LNS-Forward) | MMN | 0.17 | | | | |
| 1 | Medial Orbitofrontal | | - | | | | |
| - | Negative Symptoms (SANS) | RON | 0.41 | | | | |
| | Positive Symptoms (CAPC) | PON | 0.40 | | | | |
| | Auditory Attention (LNS-Forward) | MMN | 0.29 | | | | |
| | Executive Functioning (WCST) | P3a | 0.32 | | | | |
| | Dorsal Mid Cingulate | | | | | | |
| - | Negative Symptoms (SANS) | MMN | 0.20 | | | | |
| | Negative Symptoms (SANS) | P3a | 0.17 | | | | |
| | Global Functioning (GAF) | RON | 0.24 | | | | |
| | Functional Capacity (UPSA) | P3a | 0.13 | | | | |

Why don't all subjects contribute to every IC cluster?



Onton & Makeig, 2005

Subject differences?



Subject differences?



Subject differences?



Properties of EEG Independent Components

- Maximally Temporally Independent
- Concurrently Active and Spatially Overlapping
- Dipolar Scalp Maps
- Functionally Distinct
- Between-Subject Similarity / Complexity



