

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/98482/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Arns, M., Batail, J. M., Biolac, S., Congedo, M., Daudet, C., Drapier, D., Fovet, T., Jardri, R., Le-Van-Quyen, M., Lotte, F., Mehler, David, Micoulaud-Franchi, J.A., Purper-Ouakil, D. and Vialatte, F. 2017. Neurofeedback: One of today's techniques in psychiatry? *Encephale* 43 (2) , pp. 135-154. 10.1016/j.encep.2016.11.003

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.encep.2016.11.003>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Neurofeedback: one of today's techniques in psychiatry?

Neurofeedback en psychiatrie: Une technique du présent ?

Authors (in alphabetical order)

Martijn ARNS¹, Jean-Marie BATAIL², Stéphanie BIOULAC³, Marco CONGEDO⁴,
Christophe DAUDET⁵, Dominique DRAPIER², Thomas FOVET⁶, Renaud JARDRI⁶, Michel
Le VAN QUYEN⁷, Fabien LOTTE⁸, David MEHLER⁹, Jean-Arthur MICOULAUD
FRANCHI^{3*}, Diane PURPER-OUAKIL¹⁰, François VIALATTE¹¹, The NExT group¹²

1 Research Institute Brainclinics Nijmegen, Netherlands ; Department of Experimental Psychology, Utrecht University Utrecht, Netherlands.

2 Academic Psychiatry Department, Centre Hospitalier Guillaume Régnier, Rennes, France; EA 4712 Behavior and Basal Ganglia, CHU Rennes, Rennes 1 University, France.

3 Univ. Bordeaux, SANPSY, USR 3413, F-33000 Bordeaux France, CNRS, SANPSY, USR 3413, F-Bordeaux, France.

4 GIPSA-lab, CNRS and Grenoble Alpes University, Grenoble, France.

5 Univ. Bordeaux, F-33000 Bordeaux France

6 Lille, CNRS, UMR-9193, SCA-Lab, équipe psychIC et CHU Lille, Pôle de psychiatrie (CURE), Hôpital Fontan, F-59000 Lille, France.

7 Institut du Cerveau et de la Moelle Epinière, UMRS 1127, CNRS UMR 7225, Hôpital de la Pitié-Salpêtrière, Paris, France, Université Pierre et Marie Curie - Paris 6, Paris, France

8 Inria Bordeaux Sud-Ouest, Project-Team Potioc / LaBRI – Talence, France.

9 Cardiff University Brain Imaging Centre (CUBRIC), School of Psychology, Cardiff University, United Kingdom; Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Muenster, Muenster, Germany

10 CHU Montpellier-Saint Eloi, Médecine psychologique pour enfants et adolescents (MPEA1), 80 avenue Augustin Fliche, 34295 Montpellier Cedex.

11 Laboratoire Plasticité du Cerveau, UMR 8249, ESPCI Paris Tech, PSL Research University, 10 rue Vauquelin 75005 Paris, France.

12 The NExT (Neurofeedback Evaluation & Training) group of the AFPBN

* Corresponding author:

Dr. MICOULAUD FRANCHI Jean-Arthur

Services d'explorations fonctionnelles du système nerveux, Clinique du sommeil, CHU de Bordeaux, Place Amélie Raba-Leon, 33076 Bordeaux

E-mail adresse : jarthur.micoulaud@gmail.com

1 **Résumé**

2 **Introduction**

3 Le neurofeedback consiste à mesurer, chez un sujet, une activité cérébrale et à traiter le signal
4 au moyen d'une interface technique afin d'en extraire un paramètre d'intérêt qui sera présenté
5 en temps réel au participant sous la forme d'une information visuelle ou auditive. L'objectif
6 est d'apprendre au sujet à modifier ce paramètre et donc à moduler son activité cérébrale et
7 cognitive. Cependant, l'utilisation du neurofeedback en pratique clinique pour la prise en
8 charge des troubles psychiatriques reste controversée.

9 **Méthode**

10 Cet article présente une synthèse de la 1^{ère} journée nationale sur le neurofeedback organisé par
11 la section NExT (*Neurofeedback Evaluation & Training*) de l'Association française de
12 psychiatrie biologique et de neuropharmacologie (AFPBN). Un état des lieux de l'utilisation
13 du neurofeedback en électroencéphalographie (EEG) et en imagerie par résonance
14 magnétique fonctionnelle (IRMf) est proposé. Pour intégrer l'arsenal thérapeutique, cette
15 technique doit en effet répondre aux exigences de *l'evidence based medicine*.

16 **Résultats**

17 Les études montrent une efficacité probable du neurofeedback en EEG pour le trouble du
18 déficit de l'attention / hyperactivité (TDAH) chez les enfants. Pour les autres troubles
19 psychiatriques, le nombre d'études est encore trop limité pour se positionner. En ce qui
20 concerne le neurofeedback en IRMf, le niveau de preuve reste, pour l'heure, trop faible pour
21 justifier une utilisation clinique. Les modalités d'emploi du neurofeedback, notamment en ce
22 qui concerne les indications médicales, les protocoles d'utilisation (activité(s) cérébrale(s)
23 ciblée(s), caractéristiques d'apprentissage) et les outils de mesure employés (EEG, IRMf,
24 mode de traitement du signal) restent donc à clarifier.

25 **Conclusion**

26 Le vaste champ de recherche du neurofeedback implique à la fois des psychiatres, des
27 neurophysiologistes et des chercheurs du domaine des interfaces cerveaux-ordinateurs. Les
28 futurs travaux devront s'attacher à déterminer les critères permettant d'optimiser les séances
29 de neurofeedback afin de mieux comprendre ses effets, le tout dans l'optique d'une utilisation
30 en pratique clinique dans certaines indications. L'étude des processus d'apprentissage
31 constitue un élément clé autour duquel les futures recherches devront se focaliser.

32 **Mots clefs**

33 Neurofeedback ; Électroencéphalographie ; imagerie fonctionnelle par résonance magnétique
34 en temps réel ; Troubles psychiatriques

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objectives**

3 Neurofeedback is a technique that aims to teach a subject to regulate a brain parameter
4 measured by a technical interface to modulate his/her related brain and cognitive activities.
5 However, the use of neurofeedback as a therapeutic tool for psychiatric disorders remains
6 controversial. The aim of this review is to summarize and to comment the level of evidence of
7 electroencephalogram (EEG) neurofeedback and real-time functional magnetic resonance
8 imaging (fMRI) neurofeedback for therapeutic application in psychiatry.

9 **Method**

10 Literature on neurofeedback and mental disorders but also on Brain Computer Interfaces
11 (BCI) used in the field of neurocognitive science has been considered by the group of expert
12 of the NExT (Neurofeedback Evaluation & Training) section of the French Association of
13 Biological Psychiatry and Neuropsychopharmacology (AFPBN).

14 **Results**

15 Results show a potential efficacy of EEG-neurofeedback in the treatment of attentional-
16 deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in children, even if this is still debated. For other
17 mental disorders, there is too limited research to warrant the use of EEG-neurofeedback in
18 clinical practice. Regarding fMRI-neurofeedback, the level of evidence remains too weak, for
19 now, to justify clinical use. The literature review highlights various unclear points, such as
20 indications (psychiatric disorders, pathophysiologic rationale), protocols (brain signals
21 targeted, learning characteristics), and techniques (EEG, fMRI, signal processing).

22 **Conclusion**

23 The field of neurofeedback involves psychiatrists, neurophysiologists and researchers in the
24 field of brain-computer-interfaces. Future studies should determine the criteria for optimizing
25 neurofeedback sessions. A better understanding of the learning processes underpinning
26 neurofeedback could be a key element to develop the use of this technique in clinical practice.

27

28 **Keywords**

29 Neurofeedback; EEG; real-time fMRI; psychiatric disorder

30

1	Plan	
2	1 Introduction.....	5
3	2 Electroencephalographic neurofeedback (EEG-NF).....	6
4	2.1 Level of Evidence.....	6
5	2.1.1 Attentional-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, the emblematic disorder.....	6
6	2.1.2 Other psychiatric disorders.....	7
7	2.2 Advantages and pitfalls of EEG neurofeedback.....	7
8	2.3 EEG neurofeedback and the vigilance system.....	9
9	2.4 EEG neurofeedback and new target methods.....	10
10	2.4.1 EEG neurofeedback based on inverse solutions.....	10
11	2.4.2 EEG neurofeedback based on BSS/ICA.....	11
12	2.4.3 EEG neurofeedback based on stereotactic EEG.....	11
13	3 Functional magnetic resonance imagery and neurofeedback.....	12
14	3.1 Level of Evidence.....	12
15	3.1.1 Major Depressive Disorder, the emblematic disorder.....	13
16	3.1.2 Other psychiatric disorders.....	13
17	3.2 Advantages and pitfalls of fMRI neurofeedback.....	14
18	3.3 fMRI neurofeedback and new target method.....	15
19	4 Human learning and neurofeedback.....	16
20	4.1 Theory of human learning.....	16
21	4.2 Human learning and Brain Computer Interface.....	19
22	5 Conclusion.....	20
23		
24		
25		
26		

1 **1 Introduction**

2 Neurofeedback can be considered as a biofeedback technique (*i.e.* a technique which consists
3 in measuring a physiological activity using a technical interface to extract a parameter of
4 interest; this parameter is then presented in real-time to the participant, typically *via* visual or
5 auditory feedback [1]; the goal is to teach the subject to modify the parameter). When the
6 physiological activity is a brain activity, biofeedback is called neurofeedback. Thus,
7 neurofeedback allows the subject to voluntarily modulate his/her related brain and cognitive
8 activities [1, 2](see **Figure 1**).

9 The first observation of neurofeedback, was based on the classical conditioning principles
10 applied to the electroencephalogram (EEG). Classical conditioning involves learning new
11 behaviors through the process of association. Neurofeedback originates from the 1930s based
12 on the work of Gustave Durup and Alfred Fessard, who were two emblematic figures of
13 psychophysiology and neurophysiology in France. They observed that brain activity (alpha
14 blocking response) could be modified according to the classical conditioning principles (*i.e.*
15 to develop an association between an EEG activity (alpha blocking response), a behavior and
16 cognitive response, and a signal of feedback [3]. In 1941, Jasper & Shagass published the first
17 systematic study that investigated classical conditioning of EEG [4]. Subsequent studies in the
18 1960s confirmed that alpha blocking could indeed be conditioned and related to some specific
19 cognitive activities of the trained subject [5].

20 After a serious decline during the 1980s and 1990s, mainly due to the poor reliability of
21 methods used for recording brain activity, the technique gained ground again in the early
22 2000s with a renewed interest both in scientific and societal terms [6]. Thanks to the principle
23 on which it is based and to the fertile dynamic nature of ongoing research in a range of
24 clinical, therapeutic and fundamental topics, neurofeedback can be considered a technology of
25 today [6, 7]. However, despite great interest in neurofeedback research [8-10], significant
26 controversy exists, particularly in psychiatry and neurology [7, 11]. With regard to the
27 efficacy of neurofeedback in brain disorders, opinions within the scientific community appear
28 to be rather sharply divided [7, 9, 12] comprising an optimistic group who consider
29 neurofeedback to be effective and a skeptical group who do neither assign scientific or
30 therapeutic value to neurofeedback training. This article aims to review the evidence of EEG
31 neurofeedback (EEG NF) and real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging
32 neurofeedback (fMRI NF) in psychiatric disorders. The advantages and pitfalls for each of
33 both neurofeedback techniques are discussed, and new perspectives are highlighted. Lastly,

1 research on the learning process through the link between neurofeedback and brain computer
2 interfaces (BCIs) is discussed.

3 **2 Electroencephalographic neurofeedback (EEG-NF)**

4 **2.1 Level of Evidence**

5 Most trials on the efficacy of EEG neurofeedback in psychiatric disorders have significant
6 methodological weaknesses (in particular: size of the population studied, none randomized or
7 none blinded protocol, inadequate control group, low quality of the EEG neurofeedback
8 session) [13]. This point could explain the skepticism of many researchers and clinicians
9 concerning the effectiveness of EEG neurofeedback to treat psychiatric disorders [12].
10 However, a number of studies have presented good methodological criteria (studies designed
11 with controlled, randomized, and open or blind protocols, a primary endpoint related to the
12 treated disorder and assessed using standardized measurement tools, and an identifiable EEG
13 neurophysiological target) particularly in the field of attentional-deficit/hyperactivity disorder
14 (ADHD) [9, 12, 14].

15 **2.1.1 Attentional-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, the emblematic disorder**

16 Four meta-analyses discussed the therapeutic interest of EEG neurofeedback in ADHD [15-
17 18]. Computed effect size (ES) in the meta-analyses can be considered as small between 0.2
18 and 0.5, medium between 0.5 and 0.8 and large above 0.8. The first meta-analysis conducted
19 by Arns et al. (2009) found an effect size (ES) that was more larger for the domain of
20 inattention (ES=0.81, 95% CI=0.39-1.23) than for the domain of hyperactivity (ES=0.39,
21 95% CI=0.05-0.75) in ADHD [16]. The second meta-analysis of Sonuga-Barke et al. (2013)
22 found a significant ES using parent ratings in randomized controlled trials (RCTs) (ES=0.59,
23 95% CI=0.31-0.87), but this result was no longer significant (ES=0.29, 95% CI=-0.02-0.61,
24 though trend, $p=0.07$) when looking at “probably blinded” teacher ratings [17]. The third
25 meta-analysis of Micoulaud-Franchi et al. (2014) found an ES that was significantly higher
26 than in the control group on “probably blinded” teacher ratings for the inattention dimension
27 of ADHD in RCTs (ES=0.30, 95% CI=0.03-0.58) [18]. The fourth meta-analysis of Cortese et
28 al (2016) is the updated Sonuga-Barke et al. meta-analysis and reported similar results
29 (ADHD total symptoms, ES=0.35, 95% CI=0.11-0.59; inattention, ES= 0.36, 95% CI= 0.09-
30 0.63; hyperactivity/impulsivity, ES=0.26, 95% CI=0.08-0.43 for parent ratings, but non
31 significant ES for “probably blinded” teacher ratings) [15]. However, a sub-analysis in this
32 meta-analysis focused on standard neurofeedback protocols (based on the Arns et al. criteria

1 [12]), and for this sub-analysis a significant ES for probably blinded ratings was found
2 (ADHD total symptoms ES=0.35, 95% CI=0.04-0.69) [12]. RCTs that have compared EEG
3 neurofeedback with medication found that methylphenidate was not superior to EEG
4 neurofeedback training [19, 20]. In the study of Meisel et al. (2013), significant pre-post
5 academic performance improvements were obtained only in the neurofeedback group [19].
6 However, studies that added EEG neurofeedback to methylphenidate treatment did not report
7 ‘add-on’ improvements on clinical symptoms [21, 22] or cognitive function [23].

8 **2.1.2 Other psychiatric disorders**

9 There has been too limited research (i.e. lack of RCTs and independent replications) on the
10 following indications to warrant its use in clinical practice: Depression [24], Addictions [25,
11 26], Anxiety disorders [27, 28].

12 **2.2 Advantages and pitfalls of EEG neurofeedback**

13 Despite the meta-analyses presented before, the effectiveness of EEG neurofeedback in
14 treating ADHD remains debated because of the studies that were included [12, 29-34]. These
15 choices warrant some explanations. For example, in the meta-analysis of Micoulaud-Franchi
16 et al. (2014), the well-controlled, randomized and blinded study conducted by Arnold et al.
17 (2013) [35] was not included because the EEG neurofeedback protocol was not based on the
18 basic learning theory used in standard EEG neurofeedback protocols (particularly because of
19 the type of reinforcement chosen) [1]. Moreover, the EEG recording was carried out using an
20 unconventional setup, with electrodes placed on the forehead, a region known to be
21 problematic for recording because of muscular artefacts. The study by Arnold et al. thus
22 highlights the need to avoid some pitfalls regarding technical issues of electrophysiology [36]
23 and technical issues of learning [1, 37] when a study on neurofeedback is conducted. In
24 further support of this notion is the above reported result from the Cortese et al. (2016) meta-
25 analysis, who reported that when focusing on ‘standard neurofeedback protocols’ significant
26 effects are found for both parent as well as teacher rated symptoms. Further emphasizing the
27 need to evaluate neurofeedback not as a singular phenomenon (neurofeedback as an umbrella
28 term i.e. medication) but evaluate it based on the specific protocol used (specific protocol i.e.
29 antidepressant, psychostimulant) [15]. These aspects are too rarely discussed in the debate of
30 EEG neurofeedback efficacy. Considering the absence of a current consensus [12, 38-40],
31 these points will be crucial in the next years to gradually improve the practice of EEG
32 neurofeedback in psychiatry [41].

1 Two groups of technical issues can be identified in EEG neurofeedback protocols: i)
2 electrophysiology because the practice of EEG neurofeedback requires high quality
3 recordings of EEG signal [9, 36]; ii) learning because the practice of EEG neurofeedback
4 requires attention to some important technical aspects as described below and in **Table 1**.
5 The number of sessions is the first technical aspect, which is usually between 20 and 30, one
6 to three times per week, but the ideal number and the optimum inter-session duration have not
7 been defined yet [42]. It should be noted that efficacy with regards to the inattention
8 dimension in ADHD is proportional to the number of neurofeedback sessions [16] and
9 seemed to be maintained over time [43].
10 Second is the choice of the threshold of reward, which is essential. Adjusting a threshold (and
11 a given occupation time) determines the number of positive reinforcements required to
12 strengthen the subject in a type of neurocognitive strategy. The threshold may be set
13 automatically or manually. When the threshold is determined automatically there is a
14 continuous updating of a threshold in order to give positive reinforcement to the subject for a
15 given percentage of occupation time below or above the threshold. The threshold is
16 continuously calculated according to signal just before. When the threshold is determined
17 manually, the professional determines the threshold based on a baseline recorded before the
18 neurofeedback session. If the number of positive reinforcement is too high or too low during
19 the session, the professional can adjust the threshold. The manual threshold seems to lead to
20 better learning [1, 42]. Indeed, if the subject is being asked to increase the amplitude of a
21 given brain activity and the threshold is calculated automatically, he will always be getting a
22 percentage of feedback even if the amplitudes are decreased across time. However, the
23 manual threshold requires performing a baseline measurement before each session and the
24 adjustment during the session by the professional complicates the standardization of
25 neurofeedback protocol.
26 Third is the type of positive reinforcement. This can be visual or auditory, proportioned
27 (graduated) or binary (present or absent), immediate or delayed, simple or complex, and
28 frequent or rare. Visual feedback, which is proportionate, immediate and simple, seems to
29 allow for better learning [42]. The number of reinforcements must be sufficient to maintain
30 the motivation of the subject. However, if the number of reinforcement is too high the
31 learning process can be altered [39, 42]. Note that positive reinforcement incorporated in an
32 entertaining interface (such as video games) may increase the motivation of the subject but
33 could impair learning according to some authors [1, 14].

1 Fourth is the evaluation of the training parameter during one session (evolution of the
2 performance), and the evaluation of the learning curve across the sessions (evolution of the
3 training parameter) that should be determined to ensure that a learning process occurs during
4 neurofeedback treatment. Lastly, the “transfer sessions” allow for the generalization of skills
5 learned in daily life [12, 14, 40].

6 **2.3 EEG neurofeedback and the vigilance system**

7 Neurophysiological targets for EEG neurofeedback in ADHD are underpinned by
8 pathophysiological relevance related to the vigilance system. EEG neurofeedback
9 traditionally records a limited amount of information provided by a single electrode placed on
10 the scalp. This information concerns the EEG power in certain spectral bands: the beta band
11 (12-21 Hz) and the theta band (4-8 Hz) [44, 45]. In a simple manner, an increase in the central
12 frontal beta band can be related to an increase in vigilance [46], and an increase in central
13 frontal theta band is related to a decrease in vigilance with subjective diurnal sleepiness and
14 possibly entering the first stage of sleep [45, 47]. Interestingly, an increase in theta power and
15 a decrease in beta power were observed in a subgroup of ADHD patients (greater theta/beta
16 (TBR) ratio) [48]. These EEG patterns suggest a link between the vigilance system, sleep
17 problems and ADHD (particularly in the subgroup with the greater TBR ratio) [49]. As a
18 result, decreasing TBR can be a potentially interesting target for EEG neurofeedback [50-52].
19 Indeed, it was shown that TBR neurofeedback is more effective in the subgroup of patients
20 with the greater TBR ratio [53].

21 Several studies have also demonstrated that sensori-motor rhythm neurofeedback (SMR), a
22 frequency that overlaps with to the TBR protocol, results in increased sleep spindle density
23 during sleep [54, 55], decreased sleep latency [54] and increased total sleep time [54, 56].
24 More specifically, it was recently demonstrated that SMR neurofeedback in ADHD resulted
25 in reduced inattention, hyperactivity and impulsivity, and these effects were mediated by
26 reduced sleep onset latency [50], further demonstrating a causal link between delayed sleep
27 onset latency and ADHD symptoms, specifically inattention. The TBR neurofeedback
28 overlaps with the SMR protocol, with clinical effects on ADHD indistinguishable from SMR
29 neurofeedback. However, the effect of TBR neurofeedback was not be mediated via sleep
30 onset latency normalization [50]. The effect of TBR neurofeedback could be mediated via a
31 reduction in diurnal sleepiness [49], but further research is needed to investigate the exact
32 working mechanism of TBR neurofeedback in ADHD [14].

1 **2.4 EEG neurofeedback and new target methods**

2 The major limitation of “traditional” neurofeedback resides in the limited information
3 provided by a single electrode placed on the scalp, which is a differentially measured
4 potential with respect to a reference electrode. It is known that the EEG signal reflects mainly
5 the superposition of the electric potential created by ionic charge oscillation (due to
6 postsynaptic potentials) around the pyramidal cells found in the neocortex [57]. The potential
7 generated from a large population of neurons beneath the electrode are superimposed to create
8 the measurable EEG. Put differently, the response of the electrode is highly spatially
9 unspecific. It has been suggested that this lack of spatial specificity may impede the ability of
10 subjects to acquire control over the region of interest (ROI), i.e., the brain structures to be
11 trained [58]. Another limitation of traditional neurofeedback is the filtering resulting from the
12 choice of the reference electrode placement; depending on the position of the active and
13 reference electrode on the scalp, the measurement is sensitive to current flowing in the ROI
14 along one direction only. Therefore, a considerable improvement in the neurofeedback
15 technique can be obtained considering spatial-specific brain activity, solving implicitly the
16 issue of the chosen reference. Two possible improvements in this sense have been proposed,
17 namely, basing the neurofeedback not on the signal captured by the two scalp electrodes but
18 on EEG inverse solutions or on EEG blind source separation. Both methods require the use of
19 multiple electrodes (a minimum of eight); it is indeed the spatial information contained in
20 such a multivariate EEG recording that allow for better estimates of the ROI’s current.

21 **2.4.1 EEG neurofeedback based on inverse solutions**

22 An EEG inverse solution is a mathematical method used to estimate the intracranial current
23 generated in the observed scalp potential. Once the current is estimated in the ROI, its density
24 (energy) provides an appropriate feedback signal. By acquiring data from 19 electrodes,
25 Congedo, Lubar and Joffe (2004) demonstrated learned control of the cognitive division of
26 the anterior cingulate cortex using the inverse solution known as *low resolution*
27 *electromagnetic tomography* (LORETA) [59, 60]. Subsequent studies confirmed the viability
28 and further explored the correlates of LORETA-neurofeedback of the anterior cingulate
29 cortex [61, 62]. This preliminary work was replicated and reiterated later by several other
30 research groups using other inverse solutions in proof-of-concept studies [63, 64].

1 **2.4.2 EEG neurofeedback based on BSS/ICA**

2 Over the past 20 years, research on blind source separation (BSS) has developed into a
3 burgeoning signal processing method with applications across a wide variety of fields. It has
4 since been proven valuable in identifying cortical sources of brain activity associated with
5 cognitive task performance [65]. Such a spatial filtering technique may provide an ideal way
6 to train specific brain regions or networks in a neurofeedback setting. In fact, a blind source
7 separation filter can estimate both the location and the direction of current, thus yielding a
8 sharper filter compared to an inverse solution [66]. Further advantages of such spatial filters
9 are that they are computationally inexpensive (important for ‘real-time’ feedback) and
10 potentially more robust in the presence of artefacts. The viability of BSS neurofeedback has
11 been explored in two studies; the first aimed to suppress excessive theta in deep frontal
12 medial regions for the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder [67], the second aimed to
13 enhance theta activity on a source localized into deep medial-temporal regions associated
14 with spatial-navigation abilities [68].

15 **2.4.3 EEG neurofeedback based on stereotactic EEG**

16 As early as the 1960s, the important work by Fetz (1969) on primates showed the operant
17 conditioning of single cell spike trains in the motor cortex [69]. The motor cortex is probably
18 the most obvious place to search for cortical signals directly associated with volitional
19 movement [70]. This may be one of the reasons why a substantial part of invasive
20 neurofeedback research has been conducted on paralyzed or lock-in patients, recognizing the
21 need of people with disabilities and aiming to restore their communicative or motor functions.
22 In this context, brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) were tested in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis,
23 brain stem stroke and spinal cord lesions using cortical neuronal activity recorded by
24 implanted electrodes [71]. Nevertheless, conscious control has also been shown to be possible
25 at the cellular level in human temporal lobe structures [72]. The successful cases in these
26 applications encouraged the usage of invasive neurofeedback for other neurological and
27 neuropsychiatric conditions. Such a technique has been called BrainTV [73]. The technique
28 enables to combine the spatial resolution of fMRI neurofeedback and the temporal resolution
29 of scalp-level EEG neurofeedback [74]. Thus, despite the invasive nature of BrainTV, these
30 protocols could be a response to some limitations of neurofeedback protocols in the future.
31 In this context, neurofeedback can indeed be performed in patients with drug resistant
32 epilepsy undergoing long-term monitoring, where depth electrodes are implanted for clinical
33 diagnostics. The effects of self-induced intracortical oscillatory activity (4-8 Hz) were studied

1 in several neurosurgical patients. It was found that subjects learned to robustly and
2 specifically induce oscillations in the target frequency, confirmed by increased oscillatory
3 event density [75]. As controls improved during learning, induced oscillatory activity at the
4 target electrode became functionally decoupled from distant sites, which predicted the
5 individual session-to-session performance variability. Furthermore, in another study [75],
6 patients were trained to up-regulate the relative proportion of the gamma rhythm at different
7 fronto-temporal cortical locations. In line with previous findings, on monkeys using direct
8 cortical recordings [76], it was found that most subjects learned to specifically increase local
9 cortical gamma power. These findings suggest that the effects of voluntary control of
10 intracortical oscillations can be exploited to specifically target plasticity processes to
11 reconfigure network activity, with a particular relevance for memory function or skill
12 acquisition [77]. In particular, abnormalities in gamma oscillations exist in a number of
13 neurologic and psychiatric diseases [78]. Thus, the specific rectification of gamma
14 oscillations could ameliorate some of the deficits caused by these pathological conditions
15 [77].

16 **3 Functional magnetic resonance imaging and neurofeedback**

17 Real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging neurofeedback (fMRI neurofeedback) is a
18 rather recent development for providing neurofeedback training based on blood oxygenation
19 contrasts (blood-oxygen level dependent, BOLD) [79]. fMRI neurofeedback training can
20 overcome some limitations of more traditional forms of neurofeedback, such as EEG-
21 neurofeedback, because of its better spatial resolution and whole brain coverage. In particular,
22 the whole brain coverage makes fMRI neurofeedback a promising technique for non-invasive
23 psychiatric rehabilitation because it allows to train patients in self-regulating subcortical brain
24 areas [80]. Depending on the disease model of interest, patients can be either trained to
25 increase or decrease the activity of relevant brain areas [10].

26 **3.1 Level of Evidence**

27 Due to the novelty of the technique, studies that have so far provided evidence for the clinical
28 use of fMRI neurofeedback are limited. This section will focus on recent developments in the
29 field and on clinical and translational applications. A more comprehensive review on relevant
30 designs and training paradigms can be found elsewhere [10].

1 **3.1.1 Major Depressive Disorder, the emblematic disorder**

2 The psychiatric disorder most studied in the context of fMRI neurofeedback is major
3 depressive disorder. The use of fMRI neurofeedback in treating depression is based on the
4 pathophysiological model of emotional dysfunction during a depressive episode [81, 82].
5 Therefore, published studies have so far mainly focused on the up-regulation of brain areas or
6 even on specific structures that are involved in emotions, including parts of the limbic system
7 (e.g., the amygdala) and the ventral prefrontal cortex [83]. To date, no randomized control
8 trials (RCTs) have been published, and the current literature consists exclusively of open label
9 and pilot studies [84-86]. These studies have demonstrated the feasibility of the technique and
10 suggested that patients are able to self-regulate their brain activity in target areas. In one study
11 [86], improvements in mood were only found in the group that received fMRI neurofeedback
12 training but not in a control group, suggesting a link between neurofeedback success, positive
13 emotions (as accessed by self-reports in autobiographic memory recall and happiness ratings)
14 and clinical improvement (e.g., HDRS-17). To rule out unspecific effects (e.g., regression to
15 the mean) of these pilot findings, RCTs are needed that are based on larger samples and
16 appropriate clinical control conditions, including randomization and blinded assessments.
17 Two ongoing (Young, clinicaltrials.gov: NCT02709161; Moll et al., NCT01920490), one
18 completed single blind (Linden et al., NCT01544205), and one completed double blind
19 (Young et al., NCT02079610) RCT are currently listed.

20 **3.1.2 Other psychiatric disorders**

21 For other psychiatric conditions, such as schizophrenia, addiction, obsessive compulsive
22 disorder and eating disorder, the feasibility of fMRI neurofeedback training has been
23 investigated in pilot studies with small sample sizes (for review [10]). These studies used
24 different target areas including the insula in schizophrenia and in psychopathic personality
25 disorder and the anterior cingulate cortex to reduce craving in nicotine addiction.

26 . The Collaborative Research Project BRAINTRAIN is a European consortium that focuses
27 on the improvement and translation of real-time fMRI neurofeedback protocols for clinical
28 applications (braintrainproject.eu). Current registered RCTs investigate therapeutic effects of
29 fMRI neurofeedback in alcohol addiction (Linden et al., NCT02486900), Anxiety in
30 adolescents (Cohen-Kadosh et al., NCT02440451) and autism spectrum disorder (Castelo-
31 Branco et al., NCT02440451). Finally, an independent RCT is focusing on training the
32 functional connectivity between reward- and impulse-related brain areas in eating disorders
33 (Hallschmid et al., NCT02148770).

1 **3.2 Advantages and pitfalls of fMRI neurofeedback**

2 The gold standard for evaluating a therapeutic technique requires assessing its efficacy in a
3 double-blind randomized and placebo-controlled trial. However, some of these requirements
4 can pose a challenge for the evaluation of fMRI neurofeedback training. First, implementing a
5 double-blind design can be limited because most current training protocols require (at least in
6 the early learning phase) that patients engage in specific conscious processes through explicit
7 mental strategies.

8 Second, designing an appropriate placebo-controlled condition for neurofeedback protocols
9 requires careful consideration depending on the study type. Three main types of controls have
10 been proposed and tested so far:

- 11 • Transfer runs, during which patients are instructed to engage in the same cognitive
12 strategies in or outside the scanner but without being provided with neurofeedback.
- 13 • “Sham” neurofeedback, which entails either random or yoked feedback based on some
14 other patient’s brain activity. However, sham feedback bears the risk that patients
15 notice the non-contingency of the feedback [10].
- 16 • An active control group that receives veridical feedback from target areas of another
17 functional system that is neither involved in the pathophysiology of the respective
18 condition nor in the task (i.e., cognitive strategy) of interest. However, a recent study
19 has demonstrated that neurofeedback training itself involves various brain regions
20 besides the individual target areas, including structures of reward circuitry (basal
21 ganglia, striatum) and parts of the prefrontal cortex [87]. Further, such a control group
22 cannot control for potential unspecific effects due to the high-tech laboratory setting.
23 Including a third treatment as a usual control group that receives standard therapy
24 could address this problem at the expense of increased trial costs.

25 Third, it remains to be tested how to optimize neurofeedback protocols for psychiatric
26 conditions. This includes:

- 27 • Defining effective target areas or the networks for a particular psychiatric condition
28 based on a pathophysiological model. Target areas can either be chosen a priori based
29 on anatomical landmarks, or they can be functionally defined using a so-called
30 “localizer” task (e.g., presenting emotionally valenced visual stimuli in a
31 neurofeedback protocol for depression [86]). Similarly, target areas for functional
32 connectivity-based neurofeedback are determined by the correlation of activity among
33 brain areas that belong to a network of interest.

- 1 • Determining efficient study designs with regard to the duration and number of
2 sessions to exploit regarding the learning capacities of patients who have cognitive
3 impairments (e.g., attention and memory deficits).
- 4 • The nature of task instructions for patients, either given explicit strategies at hand
5 (e.g., imaging positive autobiographical memories) or task instructions that rather
6 focus on the goal to achieve a certain target level in the feedback while patients learn
7 implicitly the effect of various strategies [88].
- 8 • The design of the interface, such as the modality of feedback (e.g., visual, auditory or
9 tactile), the mode of feedback presentation (e.g., continuous or intermittent) and the
10 complexity of the presented feedback (e.g., for visual feedback, a thermometer display
11 or more complex scenes based on virtual reality)

12 **3.3 *fMRI neurofeedback and new target method***

13 As previously described, different strategies exist to optimally define a target area, also called
14 region(s) of interest (ROI) [10]. This ROI can be localized using structural information but
15 can also be functionally defined. In the latter, the patient is asked to perform a specific task in
16 the scanner and task responsive areas can be used as the ROI to provide real-time fMRI
17 neurofeedback.

18 For fMRI neurofeedback with a therapeutic purpose, both methods rely on our a priori
19 knowledge of the underlying neural mechanisms of the disorder/symptom we want to relieve.
20 Such strategies appear very relevant for disorders with persistent (or tonic) symptoms, i.e.,
21 symptoms that do not change much over time (e.g., depressive mood) but pose special
22 challenges for more acute symptoms, characterized by intrusiveness and phasic activity (e.g.,
23 hallucinations in schizophrenia or obsessions in obsessive compulsive disorder). For the latter
24 symptoms, which are associated with transitory brain-states, strategies using pre-defined
25 anatomical targets appear poorly appropriate. On the contrary, training patients to self-
26 regulate the activity of brain regions that re-activate during the occurrence of subjective
27 symptoms could be an interesting alternative.

28 To address this issue, a first method could be to induce symptoms while scanning to localize
29 functional activations associated with the targeted subjective experience that can then be used
30 as the ROI for fMRI neurofeedback. However, in some cases (such as hallucinations [89]),
31 symptom provocation may not be possible, and another method to detect the onset of
32 symptoms together with the associated brain activation patterns is needed.

1 Machine-learning, and particularly the recent development for fMRI analysis of linear support
2 vector machines (LSVMs), offers several advantages in this context. Such techniques classify
3 functional or anatomical patterns using a multivariate strategy and thus allow for decoding
4 and capturing the fine-grained spatial pattern of BOLD activity to predict future mental states,
5 such as perception or free choices [90]. In the same way, it is now possible to develop
6 classifiers able to quickly detect the emergence of subjective symptoms by detecting specific
7 patterns of brain activity identified during symptomatic periods [91, 92]. Such fine-grained
8 activity patterns can be used as the signal that is fed back to the patient during neurofeedback
9 protocols. However, to be eligible for this strategy, the patient's symptoms must exhibit some
10 specific features, such as frequent occurrence (i.e., the symptom must occur several times
11 during the fMRI session) [93].

12 Combining LSVM (or other advanced machine learning classifiers) and fMRI neurofeedback
13 could constitute a promising way to develop fMRI neurofeedback for the treatment of phasic
14 psychiatric symptoms. However, considering the potential cost necessary to implement fMRI
15 neurofeedback, proof-of-concept studies are urgently required.

16 **4 Human learning and neurofeedback**

17 The learning process is crucial in neurofeedback and requires models to understand the
18 mechanism of feedback learning [94]. A good practice guide is also of critical importance for
19 the evaluation of these interventions and to reach higher standards in clinical practice [9].
20 Learning during neurofeedback can be either explicit or implicit [94]. In the explicit learning
21 process, the user observes a feedback signal, which is a direct correlate of the neurosignal to
22 be regulated. In the implicit learning process, the signal is not explicitly presented to the
23 subject but instead changes some detail(s) of the experimental conditions. For example, a
24 person using a videogame whose content (e.g., changing levels of difficulty or access to
25 bonus items) evolves depending upon his frontal alpha rhythm is receiving implicit feedback;
26 he/she does not know directly that his brainwaves have changed, but he/she experiences
27 indirect effects of this physiological change.

28 **4.1 Theory of human learning**

29 From the perspective of the experimenter, operant conditioning has historically been the
30 dominant interpretation of neurofeedback mechanisms; in this case the feedback is modeled
31 as an implicit infra-cognitive reinforcement learning (RL) signal [1]. Such an approach is
32 indeed supported by animal studies: for example, prefrontal cortical neurons can be controlled

1 by rhesus monkeys through an operant conditioning paradigm [95]. The problem lies with the
2 definition of the reward: the interpretation of the biosignal depends upon the motivational
3 state of the subject. Furthermore, RL has two possible mechanisms [96]:

- 4 • either the subject is in a goal-directed setup and supports his learning from an internal
5 model, in which case learning is termed as model-based RL;
- 6 • or the subject has no model of the outside events and learning arises from simple
7 associations, termed as model-free RL.

8 The two issues associated with operant conditioning are therefore to determine the reward
9 mechanisms and the type of RL.

10 From the perspective of the subject, neurofeedback relies on two specific biofeedback skills
11 [97]:

- 12 • discrimination, which is the aptitude to achieve an inner perception of the biological
13 variable,
- 14 • and self-maintenance, which is the ability to affect the biological variable and to
15 effectively change it in the intended direction.

16 The acquisition of these skills could be either explicit or implicit, depending on the type of
17 neurofeedback.

18 During an implicit neurofeedback procedure, learning is more likely to follow a model-free
19 RL mechanism. The subject scans the different percepts available to him/her at a given time.
20 Several levels of salience filters attribute weights to both external and internal percepts based
21 on their physical, temporal, motivational, and emotional properties [98]. The resulting neural
22 representations then go through a competitive selection process to determine which
23 information enters working memory (WM). This filtering layer is referred to as bottom-up
24 attention and will, for example, allow a loud, unexpected sound to enter almost anyone's WM
25 (in addition to triggering subcortical responses).

26 During an explicit neurofeedback procedure, a model-based RL is triggered: the subject seeks
27 to reach a goal (regulating the feedback signal). Top-down signals may therefore alter the
28 bottom-up selection process by modifying the behavior of salience filters (e.g., emotional
29 regulation) or by enhancing or inhibiting a neural representation that has already entered WM
30 and has gained or lost salience through high-level processing (voluntary attention and percept
31 inhibition, respectively). The subjects will then manipulate their different neural
32 representations to determine if a correlation between the feedback and the neural
33 representation can be established with the feedback, which is a typical set-shifting task. Set-

1 shifting indeed refers to the ability to switch between different high-level neural
2 representations of a percept on the basis of a feedback [99]. Sustained attention is another top-
3 down component of attention and refers to the ability to maintain neural representations in
4 WM over time [100], which is necessary for long-lasting neurofeedback sessions.

5 The interaction between these top-down and bottom-up processes lead to the dual-process
6 theory for neurofeedback mechanisms [101] (**Figure 2**), a theory that categorizes the
7 cognitive functions supporting neurofeedback into two main types of processing:

- 8 • more automatic and capacity-free processes
- 9 • vs. more controlled and capacity-limited processes.

10 These two processes lead to opposing perspectives on proper feedback designs:

- 11 • one based on bottom-up operant conditioning strategies [102];
- 12 • and another based on a top-down cognitive paradigm where higher cognitive functions
13 percolate down from large-scale oscillations to small-scale and single-neuronal
14 activities [77].

15 Recent models of explicit neurofeedback learning are based on a top-down skill learning
16 paradigm [42]. Skill learning is a paradigm that describes the mechanisms involved in the
17 acquisition of complex perceptual, cognitive, or motor skills. One can identify two significant
18 properties of a motor action [103]:

- 19 • its performance, i.e., the quality of the subject’s own movement (how to do the
20 action);
- 21 • and its result, i.e., the success or failure of the action (what shall be performed).

22 The subject can learn about these two properties either by himself or with external help.

23 When the subject has direct access to these two observables, it is termed “intrinsic feedback.”

24 When the information comes from an external source (for example, a sports coach or a
25 device), it is termed “external feedback.” Extrinsic feedback helps to accelerate and facilitate
26 the learning process [104], especially when it is not redundant with internal feedback. It has
27 informational functions and motivational properties with important influences on learning
28 [105]. Successful feedback learning is an adaptation of internal feedback in a way that
29 incorporates the external feedback [106]. Neurofeedback provides scaffolding for the subject,
30 helping him/her to acquire or improve task-related discrimination and self-maintenance skills.

31 A possible resolution of the apparent contradiction between top-down and bottom-up models
32 would be to postulate the existence of interactions between these two types of processing.

33 Model-free RL and model-based RL form two cooperative systems with model-free RL

1 driving online behavior and model-based RL working offline in the background to
2 continuously adjust model-free RL. Once the subject becomes proficient with the task, model-
3 free RL progressively dominates with time. As a consequence, early explicit neurofeedback
4 learning can become implicit with time, and there is a continuum between the two learning
5 mechanisms [1].

6 **4.2 Human learning and Brain Computer Interface**

7 A brain-computer interface (BCI) can be defined as a system that translates the brain activity
8 patterns of a user into messages or commands for an interactive application, this activity
9 being measured and processed by the system [107]. With a BCI, the user's brain activity is
10 usually measured via EEG and processed by the system. For instance, a BCI can enable a user
11 to move a cursor to the left or to the right of a computer screen by imagining left or right hand
12 movements, respectively. Because they make computer control possible without any physical
13 activity, EEG-based BCIs have revolutionized many applications areas, notably enabling
14 severely motor-impaired users to control assistive technologies, e.g., to control text input
15 systems or wheelchairs, as a rehabilitation device for stroke patients, or as new gaming input
16 device, for example [108-110].

17 Such BCI-based systems are used for communication and control applications in which the
18 user voluntarily sends mental commands to the application. These types of BCIs are known
19 either as active BCI (or explicit), when the user performs mental tasks (e.g., imagining
20 movement), or as reactive BCI, when the users have to attend to stimuli (e.g., flickering visual
21 images) [111, 112]. There is yet another category of BCI: passive BCI (or implicit), for which
22 the mental state of the user is passively estimated, without any voluntary mental command
23 from the user, to adapt the application in real-time to this mental state [111, 112].

24 BCIs, similarly to neurofeedback, thus rely on a closed loop that exploits brain activity in real
25 time, specifically by acquiring EEG signals, preprocessing them (filtering), extracting
26 relevant features describing the user's state or intent and translating them into feedback to
27 close the loop. Although both BCIs and neurofeedback share similar technological tools, their
28 original purposes were very different: BCIs enable users to control an external object, such as
29 a computer or an orthosis, whereas neurofeedback enables their users to acquire control of
30 themselves. Although some BCIs, e.g., BCIs based on mental imagery tasks, involve a
31 learning process, and thus require the user to perform self-regulation, self-regulation is not the
32 final objective [113]. As such, it can be said that neurofeedback is used to train users to learn
33 how to control a BCI.

1 It should be noted though that the boundaries between BCI and neurofeedback remain blurry
2 and are a subject of debate (see [114] for more detailed discussions). For instance, recently,
3 active BCI systems that can detect imagined movements of the hands have been used to
4 perform stroke rehabilitation by guiding users to self-regulate their brain activity in motor
5 brain areas damaged by stroke [115], similar to neurofeedback. Passive BCIs can also be used
6 to give feedback to a user regarding his own high-level mental states, such as mental stress or
7 attention, to implicitly help him/her to self-regulate those states [115], again, similar to
8 neurofeedback.

9 In these examples above, there are nonetheless differences between BCIs and neurofeedback.
10 Indeed, contrary to classical neurofeedback approaches, BCIs usually heavily rely on machine
11 learning tools to estimate some specific mental states [116]. BCIs typically use a set of
12 example of EEG data that are recorded while the target user is in the mental state to be
13 detected. Such data are used to calibrate a classifier to recognize this mental state using
14 machine learning. Most neurofeedback approaches do not use a data-driven approach or
15 machine learning to provide feedback to the user. Nevertheless, there is no fundamental
16 constraint preventing neurofeedback from using machine learning as BCIs do, and future
17 neurofeedback approaches could benefit from machine learning algorithms initially developed
18 for BCI to provide more specific and robust feedback.

19 Overall, BCIs (both active/explicit and passive/implicit) and neurofeedback are clearly related
20 approaches and technologies. Although they are primarily studied separately, they could both
21 benefit from one another, notably in terms of EEG signal processing, feedback design and
22 user training. In the future, it is not unlikely that BCI and neurofeedback share similar
23 research paths.

24 **5 Conclusion**

25 This review highlights the growing body of evidence for use of neurofeedback in the field of
26 psychiatry. Neurofeedback remains a very promising technique thanks to the progress of i)
27 the techniques used (such as multivariate EEG recording for a better ROI localization, or
28 coupled EEG-fMRI neurofeedback protocols), ii) signal processing (such as EEG-low
29 resolution electromagnetic tomography or linear support vector machines in fMRI for phasic
30 psychiatric disorders), and iii) understanding of the learning skills (both model-free and
31 model-based reinforcement learning).

32 Thus, neurofeedback is a today's technique that is largely inspired by the original works of
33 Durup and Fessard. However, it remains to be clarified whether the therapeutic effect of

1 neurofeedback is clinically meaningful and how to optimally perform neurofeedback in a
2 clinical setting. The respective place of neurofeedback techniques in the clinical
3 armamentarium has to be defined. The field of neurofeedback involves psychiatrists,
4 neurophysiologists and researchers in the field of brain-computer-interfaces. Future studies
5 should determine the criteria for optimizing neurofeedback sessions. A better understanding
6 of the learning processes underpinning neurofeedback could be a key element to develop the
7 use of this technique in clinical practice.


8

9

10

11

- 1 **Figure 1**
- 2 Principle of neurofeedback
- 3




- 4
- 5
- 6

1 **Figure 2**

2 Dual process theory of neurofeedback. Bottom-up operant conditioning and top-down skill
3 learning processes improve self-maintenance and discrimination skills. Implicit feedbacks
4 interact mostly with the bottom-up system, whereas explicit feedbacks first interact with the
5 top-down system, before becoming progressively integrated as the subject becomes
6 independent from the feedback, which becomes then mostly a bottom-up reinforcement
7 signal, migrating towards the operant conditioning mechanism.

8
9



10
11
12
13
14
15
16

1 **Table 1**

2 Principles and technical aspects of learning during neurofeedback

3

Aim of the learning during neurofeedback	
Learnability	The parameters of interest can be regulated by the learner
Perceptibility	The parameter of interest can be perceived by the learner without exceeding his/her perception capabilities
Mastery	The learner gains progressively control over the sessions
Motivation	The learner should be preserved from boredom and not experience disengagement from the task
Autonomy	The learner achieves progressive independence from the feedback and can self-regulate the brain signal of interest without feedback
Technical aspects related to the learning	
Quality of signal recording	Quality of the signal-to-noise ratio / Method to avoid artefact
Signal processing	Signal processing method to compute the parameter of interest
Occupation time	Time above or below a threshold until a reward is given
Threshold	Automatically adapted or manually
Number of positive reinforcements	Number of positive reinforcements above or below a certain number until the threshold is modified
Perceptual modality of feedback	Type of cue used to provide feedback (e.g. visual, auditory or tactile)
Mode of feedback presentation	Continuous or intermittent
Complexity of the feedback	e.g., for visual feedback, a thermometer display or more complex scenes based on virtual reality
Number of sessions	Number of session to obtain a learning
Duration of a session	Duration of a session and number of block per session
Inter session duration	Duration between two sessions
Training curve	Evaluation of the training parameter during the session
Learning curve	Evolution of the training across the sessions
Role of the professional	Task instructions and motivation given to the subject before, during and after the session
Transfer sessions	Generalization of learned skills to activities of daily living i.e. in an ecologically relevant setting

4

5

6

7

1 **References**

2

- 3 [1] Sherlin LH, Arns M, Lubar J, et al. Neurofeedback and basic learning theory:
4 implications for research and practice. *Journal of Neurotherapy* 2011;15:292-304.
- 5 [2] Micoulaud-Franchi JA, Quiles C, Fond G, et al. The covariation of independent and
6 dependant variables in neurofeedback: a proposal framework to identify cognitive
7 processes and brain activity variables. *Conscious Cogn* 2014;26:162-8.
- 8 [3] Durup G, Fessard A. L'électroencéphalogramme de l'homme. Observations psycho-
9 physiologiques relatives à l'action des stimuli visuels et auditifs. *L'année psychologique*
10 1935;36:1-32.
- 11 [4] Jasper H, Shagass C. Conditioning of the occipital alpha rhythm in man. *Journal of*
12 *Experimental Psychology* 1941;28:373-88.
- 13 [5] Milstein V. Contingent Alpha Blocking: Conditioning or Sensitization?
14 *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol* 1965;18:272-7.
- 15 [6] Thibault RT, Lifshitz M, Raz A. The self-regulating brain and neurofeedback:
16 Experimental science and clinical promise. *Cortex* 2016;74:247-61.
- 17 [7] Micoulaud-Franchi JA, Fovet T. Neurofeedback: time needed for a promising non-
18 pharmacological therapeutic method. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2016;3:e16.
- 19 [8] deCharms RC. Reading and controlling human brain activation using real-time
20 functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2007;11:473-81.
- 21 [9] Micoulaud-Franchi JA, McGonigal A, Lopez R, et al. Electroencephalographic
22 neurofeedback: Level of evidence in mental and brain disorders and suggestions for
23 good clinical practice. *Neurophysiol Clin* 2015;45:423-33.
- 24 [10] Fovet T, Jardri R, Linden D. Current Issues in the Use of fMRI-Based Neurofeedback
25 to Relieve Psychiatric Symptoms. *Curr Pharm Des* 2015;21:3384-94.
- 26 [11] Thibault RT, Raz A. When can neurofeedback join the clinical armamentarium?
27 *Lancet Psychiatry* 2016;3:497-8.
- 28 [12] Arns M, Heinrich H, Strehl U. Evaluation of neurofeedback in ADHD: The long and
29 winding road. *Biol Psychol* 2014;95:108-15.
- 30 [13] Schoenberg PL, David AS. Biofeedback for psychiatric disorders: a systematic
31 review. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback* 2014;39:109-35.
- 32 [14] Gevensleben H, Rothenberger A, Moll GH, et al. Neurofeedback in children with
33 ADHD: validation and challenges. *Expert Rev Neurother* 2012;12:447-60.
- 34 [15] Cortese S, Ferrin M, Brandeis D, et al. Neurofeedback for Attention-
35 Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: Meta-Analysis of Clinical and Neuropsychological
36 Outcomes From Randomized Controlled Trials. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*
37 2016;55:444-55.
- 38 [16] Arns M, de Ridder S, Strehl U, et al. Efficacy of neurofeedback treatment in ADHD:
39 the effects on inattention, impulsivity and hyperactivity: a meta-analysis. *Clin EEG*
40 *Neurosci* 2009;40:180-9.
- 41 [17] Sonuga-Barke EJ, Brandeis D, Cortese S, et al. Nonpharmacological interventions for
42 ADHD: systematic review and meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials of dietary
43 and psychological treatments. *Am J Psychiatry* 2013;170:275-89.
- 44 [18] Micoulaud Franchi J, Geoffroy P, Fond G, et al. EEG Neurofeedback treatments in
45 children with ADHD: An updated meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Front*
46 *Hum Neurosc* 2014;doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00906.

- 1 [19] Meisel V, Servera M, Garcia-Banda G, et al. Reprint of "Neurofeedback and standard
2 pharmacological intervention in ADHD: a randomized controlled trial with six-month
3 follow-up". *Biol Psychol* 2014;95:116-25.
- 4 [20] Duric NS, Assmus J, Gundersen D, et al. Neurofeedback for the treatment of children
5 and adolescents with ADHD: a randomized and controlled clinical trial using parental
6 reports. *BMC Psychiatry* 2012;12:107.
- 7 [21] Bink M, van Nieuwenhuizen C, Popma A, et al. Behavioral effects of neurofeedback
8 in adolescents with ADHD: a randomized controlled trial. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*
9 2015;24:1035-48.
- 10 [22] Ogrim G, Hestad KA. Effects of neurofeedback versus stimulant medication in
11 attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: a randomized pilot study. *J Child Adolesc*
12 *Psychopharmacol* 2013;23:448-57.
- 13 [23] Bink M, van Nieuwenhuizen C, Popma A, et al. Neurocognitive effects of
14 neurofeedback in adolescents with ADHD: a randomized controlled trial. *J Clin*
15 *Psychiatry* 2014;75:535-42.
- 16 [24] Choi SW, Chi SE, Chung SY, et al. Is alpha wave neurofeedback effective with
17 randomized clinical trials in depression? A pilot study. *Neuropsychobiology* 2011;63:43-
18 51.
- 19 [25] Scott WC, Kaiser D, Othmer S, et al. Effects of an EEG biofeedback protocol on a
20 mixed substance abusing population. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse* 2005;31:455-69.
- 21 [26] Graap K, Freides D. Regarding the database for the Peniston Alpha-Theta EEG
22 Biofeedback protocol. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback* 1998;23:265-72.
- 23 [27] Rice KM, Blanchard EB, Purcell M. Biofeedback treatments of generalized anxiety
24 disorder: preliminary results. *Biofeedback Self Regul* 1993;18:93-105.
- 25 [28] Agnihotri H, Paul M, Singh Sandhu J. Biofeedback approach in the treatment of
26 Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Iran Journal of Psychiatry* 2007;2:90-5.
- 27 [29] Arns M, Strehl U. Evidence for efficacy of neurofeedback in ADHD? *Am J Psychiatry*
28 2013;170:799-800.
- 29 [30] Sonuga-Barke E, Brandeis D, Cortese S, et al. Response to Chronis-Tuscano et al. and
30 Arns and Strehl. *Am J Psychiatry* 2013;170:800-2.
- 31 [31] van Dongen-Boomsma M. Dr van Dongen-Boomsma replies. *J Clin Psychiatry*
32 2014;75:779.
- 33 [32] van Dongen-Boomsma M, Vollebregt MA, Slaats-Willemse D, et al. Dr van Dongen-
34 Boomsma and colleagues reply. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2014;75:290.
- 35 [33] Cannon RL, Pigott HE, Surmeli T, et al. The problem of patient heterogeneity and
36 lack of proper training in a study of EEG neurofeedback in children. *J Clin Psychiatry*
37 2014;75:289-90.
- 38 [34] Dagenais E, Leroux-Boudreault A, El-Baalbaki G, et al. Doubting the
39 efficacy/effectiveness of electroencephalographic neurofeedback in treating children
40 with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder is as yet unjustified. *J Clin Psychiatry*
41 2014;75:778-9.
- 42 [35] Arnold LE, Lofthouse N, Hersch S, et al. EEG neurofeedback for ADHD: double-blind
43 sham-controlled randomized pilot feasibility trial. *J Atten Disord* 2013;17:410-9.
- 44 [36] Deuschl G, Eisen A. Recommendations for the Practice of Clinical Neurophysiology:
45 Guidelines of the International Federation of Clinical Physiology. Amsterdam: Elsevier;
46 1999.
- 47 [37] Vollebregt MA, van Dongen-Boomsma M, Slaats-Willemse D, et al. What future
48 research should bring to help resolving the debate about the efficacy of EEG-
49 neurofeedback in children with ADHD. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2014;8:321.

- 1 [38] Zuberer A, Drandeis D, Drechsler R. Are treatment effects of neurofeedback training
2 in children with ADHD related to the successful regulation of brain activity? A review on
3 the learning of regulation of brain activity and a contribution to the discussion on
4 specificity. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2015;doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2015.00135.
- 5 [39] Gruzelier JH. EEG-neurofeedback for optimising performance. III: A review of
6 methodological and theoretical considerations. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2013.
- 7 [40] Mayer K, Wyckoff SN, Strehl U. One size fits all? Slow cortical potentials
8 neurofeedback: a review. *J Atten Disord* 2012;17:393-409.
- 9 [41] Hammond D, Bodenhamer-Davis G, CGluck G, et al. Standards of Practice for
10 Neurofeedback and Neurotherapy: A Position Paper of the International Society for
11 Neurofeedback & Research. *Journal of Neurotherapy* 2011;15:54-64.
- 12 [42] Strehl U. What learning theories can teach us in designing neurofeedback
13 treatments. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2014;8:894.
- 14 [43] Leins U, Goth G, Hinterberger T, et al. Neurofeedback for children with ADHD: a
15 comparison of SCP and Theta/Beta protocols. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback*
16 2007;32:73-88.
- 17 [44] Oken BS, Salinsky MC, Elsas SM. Vigilance, alertness, or sustained attention:
18 physiological basis and measurement. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2006;117:1885-901.
- 19 [45] Hegerl U, Hensch T. The vigilance regulation model of affective disorders and
20 ADHD. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2012;44:45-57.
- 21 [46] Haenschel C, Baldeweg T, Croft RJ, et al. Gamma and beta frequency oscillations in
22 response to novel auditory stimuli: A comparison of human electroencephalogram
23 (EEG) data with in vitro models. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2000;97:7645-50.
- 24 [47] Strijkstra AM, Beersma DG, Drayer B, et al. Subjective sleepiness correlates
25 negatively with global alpha (8-12 Hz) and positively with central frontal theta (4-8 Hz)
26 frequencies in the human resting awake electroencephalogram. *Neurosci Lett*
27 2003;340:17-20.
- 28 [48] Arns M, Conners CK, Kraemer HC. A decade of EEG Theta/Beta Ratio Research in
29 ADHD: a meta-analysis. *J Atten Disord* 2013;17:374-83.
- 30 [49] Bioulac S, Micoulaud-Franchi JA, Philip P. Excessive daytime sleepiness in patients
31 with ADHD--diagnostic and management strategies. *Curr Psychiatry Rep* 2015;17:608.
- 32 [50] Arns M, Feddema I, Kenemans JL. Differential effects of theta/beta and SMR
33 neurofeedback in ADHD on sleep onset latency. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2014;8:1019.
- 34 [51] Arns M, Kenemans JL. Neurofeedback in ADHD and insomnia: Vigilance stabilization
35 through sleep spindles and circadian networks. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2013.
- 36 [52] Monastra VJ, Monastra DM, George S. The effects of stimulant therapy, EEG
37 biofeedback, and parenting style on the primary symptoms of attention-
38 deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback* 2002;27:231-49.
- 39 [53] Arns M, Drinkenburg W, Leon Kenemans J. The effects of QEEG-informed
40 neurofeedback in ADHD: an open-label pilot study. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback*
41 2012;37:171-80.
- 42 [54] Hoedlmoser K, Pecherstorfer T, Gruber G, et al. Instrumental conditioning of human
43 sensorimotor rhythm (12-15 Hz) and its impact on sleep as well as declarative learning.
44 *Sleep* 2008;31:1401-8.
- 45 [55] Serman MB, Howe RC, Macdonald LR. Facilitation of spindle-burst sleep by
46 conditioning of electroencephalographic activity while awake. *Science* 1970;167:1146-8.
- 47 [56] Cortoos A, De Valck E, Arns M, et al. An exploratory study on the effects of tele-
48 neurofeedback and tele-biofeedback on objective and subjective sleep in patients with
49 primary insomnia. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback* 2010;35:125-34.

1 [57] Congedo M, Gouy-Pailler C, Jutten C. On the blind source separation of human
2 electroencephalogram by approximate joint diagonalization of second order statistics.
3 Clin Neurophysiol 2008;119:2677-86.

4 [58] Philippens IH, Vanwersch RA. Neurofeedback training on sensorimotor rhythm in
5 marmoset monkeys. Neuroreport 2010;21:328-32.

6 [59] Pascual-Marqui RD, Michel CM, Lehmann D. Low resolution electromagnetic
7 tomography: a new method for localizing electrical activity in the brain. Int J
8 Psychophysiol 1994;18:49-65.

9 [60] Congedo M, Lubar JF, Joffe D. Low-resolution electromagnetic tomography
10 neurofeedback. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng 2004;12:387-97.

11 [61] Cannon R, Congedo M, Lubar J, et al. Differentiating a network of executive
12 attention: LORETA neurofeedback in anterior cingulate and dorsolateral prefrontal
13 cortices. Int J Neurosci 2009;119:404-41.

14 [62] Cannon R, Lubar J, Congedo M, et al. The effects of neurofeedback training in the
15 cognitive division of the anterior cingulate gyrus. Int J Neurosci 2007;117:337-57.

16 [63] Liechti MD, Maurizio S, Heinrich H, et al. First clinical trial of tomographic
17 neurofeedback in attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: evaluation of voluntary
18 cortical control. Clin Neurophysiol 2012;123:1989-2005.

19 [64] Bauer H, Pllana A. EEG-based local brain activity feedback training-tomographic
20 neurofeedback. Front Hum Neurosci 2014;8:1005.

21 [65] Onton J, Delorme A, Makeig S. Frontal midline EEG dynamics during working
22 memory. Neuroimage 2005;27:341-56.

23 [66] Congedo M, Sherlin L. EEG Source Analysis: Methods and Clinical Implications. In:
24 Press A, editor. Neurofeedback and Neuromodulation Techniques and Applications. New
25 York: Coben, R.
26 Evans, J.R.; 2010.

27 [67] Koprivova J, Congedo M, Raszka M, et al. Prediction of treatment response and the
28 effect of independent component neurofeedback in obsessive-compulsive disorder: a
29 randomized, sham-controlled, double-blind study. Neuropsychobiology 2013;67:210-23.

30 [68] White DJ, Congedo M, Ciorciari J. Source-based neurofeedback methods using EEG
31 recordings: training altered brain activity in a functional brain source derived from blind
32 source separation. Front Behav Neurosci 2014;8:373.

33 [69] Fetz EE. Operant conditioning of cortical unit activity. Science 1969;163:955-8.

34 [70] Fetz EE. Volitional control of neural activity: implications for brain-computer
35 interfaces. J Physiol 2007;579:571-9.

36 [71] Hochberg LR, Serruya MD, Friehs GM, et al. Neuronal ensemble control of prosthetic
37 devices by a human with tetraplegia. Nature 2006;442:164-71.

38 [72] Cerf M, Thiruvengadam N, Mormann F, et al. On-line, voluntary control of human
39 temporal lobe neurons. Nature 2010;467:1104-8.

40 [73] Lachaux JP, Jerbi K, Bertrand O, et al. BrainTV: a novel approach for online mapping
41 of human brain functions. Biol Res 2007;40:401-13.

42 [74] Petitmengin C, Lachaux J. Microcognitive science: bridging experiential and
43 neuronal microdynamics. Front Hum Neurosci 2013;27:617.

44 [75] Bagdasaryan J, Valderrama M, Navarrete M, et al. Reconfiguration of network
45 activity through voluntary control of intracranial oscillations. Scientific Reports 2016;in
46 revision.

47 [76] Engelhard B, Ozeri N, Israel Z, et al. Inducing gamma oscillations and precise spike
48 synchrony by operant conditioning via brain-machine interface. Neuron 2013;77:361-
49 75.

- 1 [77] Bagdasaryan J, Le Van Quyen M. Experiencing your brain: neurofeedback as a new
2 bridge between neuroscience and phenomenology. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2013;7:680.
- 3 [78] Uhlhaas PJ, Singer W. Neural synchrony in brain disorders: relevance for cognitive
4 dysfunctions and pathophysiology. *Neuron* 2006;52:155-68.
- 5 [79] Weiskopf N. Real-time fMRI and its application to neurofeedback. *Neuroimage*
6 2012;62:682-92.
- 7 [80] Weiskopf N. Real-time fMRI and its application to neurofeedback. *Neuroimage*
8 2011.
- 9 [81] Giacobbe P, Mayberg HS, Lozano AM. Treatment resistant depression as a failure of
10 brain homeostatic mechanisms: implications for deep brain stimulation. *Exp Neurol*
11 2009;219:44-52.
- 12 [82] Phillips ML, Ladouceur CD, Drevets WC. A neural model of voluntary and automatic
13 emotion regulation: implications for understanding the pathophysiology and
14 neurodevelopment of bipolar disorder. *Mol Psychiatry* 2008;13:829, 33-57.
- 15 [83] Micoulaud-Franchi JA, Fakra E, Cermolacce M, et al. [Towards a new approach of
16 neurophysiology in clinical psychiatry: Functional magnetic resonance imaging
17 neurofeedback applied to emotional dysfunctions]. *Neurophysiol Clin* 2012;42:79-94.
- 18 [84] Hamilton JP, Glover GH, Bagarinao E, et al. Effects of salience-network-node
19 neurofeedback training on affective biases in major depressive disorder. *Psychiatry Res*
20 2016;249:91-6.
- 21 [85] Young KD, Zotev V, Phillips R, et al. Real-time FMRI neurofeedback training of
22 amygdala activity in patients with major depressive disorder. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e88785.
- 23 [86] Linden DE, Habes I, Johnston SJ, et al. Real-time self-regulation of emotion networks
24 in patients with depression. *PLoS One* 2012;7:e38115.
- 25 [87] Emmert K, Kopel R, Sulzer J, et al. Meta-analysis of real-time fMRI neurofeedback
26 studies using individual participant data: How is brain regulation mediated?
27 *Neuroimage* 2016;124:806-12.
- 28 [88] Marxen M, Jacob MJ, Muller DK, et al. Amygdala Regulation Following fMRI-
29 Neurofeedback without Instructed Strategies. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2016;10:183.
- 30 [89] Fovet T, Orlov N, Dyck M, et al. Translating neurocognitive models of auditory-
31 verbal hallucinations into therapy : using real-time fMRI neurofeedback to treat voices.
32 *Front Psychiatry* 2016;7.
- 33 [90] Kriegeskorte N, Kreiman G. *Visual Population Codes: Toward a Common*
34 *Multivariate Framework for Cell Recording and Functional Imaging*: MIT Press; 2012.
- 35 [91] Sitaram R, Lee S, Ruiz S, et al. Real-time support vector classification and feedback
36 of multiple emotional brain states. *Neuroimage* 2010;56:753-65.
- 37 [92] LaConte SM, Peltier SJ, Hu XP. Real-time fMRI using brain-state classification. *Hum*
38 *Brain Mapp* 2007;28:1033-44.
- 39 [93] Jardri R, Thomas P, Delmaire C, et al. The neurodynamic organization of modality-
40 dependent hallucinations. *Cereb Cortex* 2013;23:1108-17.
- 41 [94] Gaume A, Vialatte A, Mora-Sánchez A, et al. A psychoengineering paradigm for the
42 neurocognitive mechanisms of biofeedback and neurofeedback. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*
43 2016;doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.06.012.
- 44 [95] Schafer RJ, Moore T. Selective attention from voluntary control of neurons in
45 prefrontal cortex. *Science* 2011;332:1568-71.
- 46 [96] Dayan P, Berridge KC. Model-based and model-free Pavlovian reward learning:
47 revaluation, revision, and revelation. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci* 2014;14:473-92.
- 48 [97] Epstein LH, Blanchard EB. Biofeedback, self-control, and self-management.
49 *Biofeedback Self Regul* 1977;2:201-11.

1 [98] Menon V, Uddin LQ. Saliency, switching, attention and control: a network model of
2 insula function. *Brain Struct Funct* 2010;214:655-67.

3 [99] Kehagia AA, Murray GK, Robbins TW. Learning and cognitive flexibility:
4 frontostriatal function and monoaminergic modulation. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*
5 2010;20:199-204.

6 [100] Gazzaley A, Nobre AC. Top-down modulation: bridging selective attention and
7 working memory. *Trends Cogn Sci* 2012;16:129-35.

8 [101] Wood G, Kober SE, Witte M, et al. On the need to better specify the concept of
9 "control" in brain-computer-interfaces/neurofeedback research. *Front Syst Neurosci*
10 2014;8:171.

11 [102] Stermann MB, Eegner T. Foundation and Practice of Neurofeedback for the
12 Treatment of Epilepsy. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback* 2006;31:21-5.

13 [103] Salmoni AW, Schmidt RA, Walter CB. Knowledge of results and motor learning: a
14 review and critical reappraisal. *Psychol Bull* 1984;95:355-86.

15 [104] Poole JL. Application of motor learning principles in occupational therapy. *Am J*
16 *Occup Ther* 1991;45:531-7.

17 [105] Wulf G, Shea C, Lewthwaite R. Motor skill learning and performance: a review of
18 influential factors. *Med Educ* 2010;44:75-84.

19 [106] Synofzik M, Thier P, Lindner A. Internalizing agency of self-action: perception of
20 one's own hand movements depends on an adaptable prediction about the sensory
21 action outcome. *J Neurophysiol* 2006;96:1592-601.

22 [107] Lotte F, Bougrain L, Clerc M. Electroencephalography (EEG)-based Brain-
23 Computer Interfaces. *Wiley Encyclopedia on Electrical and Electronics Engineering*
24 2015.

25 [108] Birbaumer N, Cohen LG. Brain-computer interfaces: communication and
26 restoration of movement in paralysis. *J Physiol* 2007;579:621-36.

27 [109] Daly JJ, Wolpaw JR. Brain-computer interfaces in neurological rehabilitation.
28 *Lancet Neurol* 2008;7:1032-43.

29 [110] Wolpaw JR, Birbaumer N, McFarland DJ, et al. Brain-computer interfaces for
30 communication and control. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2002;113:767-91.

31 [111] George L, Lécuyer A. An overview of research on "passive" brain-computer
32 interfaces for implicit human-computer interaction. *International Conference on*
33 *Applied Bionics and Biomechanics - Workshop W1 "Brain-Computer Interfacing and*
34 *Virtual Reality": ICABB 2010* 2010.

35 [112] Zander TO, Kothe C. Towards passive brain-computer interfaces: applying brain-
36 computer interface technology to human-machine systems in general. *J Neural Eng*
37 2011;8:025005.

38 [113] Lotte F, Jeunet C. Towards Improved BCI based on Human Learning Principles. 3rd
39 *International Brain-Computer Interfaces Winter Conference* 2015.

40 [114] Perronnet L, Lécuyer A, Lotte F, et al. Brain Training with Neurofeedback. In: Clerc
41 M, Bougrain L, Lotte F, editors. *Brain-Computer Interfaces* 2016.

42 [115] Ramos-Murguialday A, Broetz D, Rea M, et al. Brain-machine interface in chronic
43 stroke rehabilitation: a controlled study. *Ann Neurol* 2013;74:100-8.

44 [116] Lotte F. A Tutorial on EEG Signal-processing Techniques for Mental-state
45 Recognition in Brain-Computer Interfaces. *Guide to Brain-Computer Music Interfacing*
46 2014:133-61

47

48