Detecting Syntactic Violations from Single-trial EEG using Recurrent Neural Networks
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ABSTRACT
We propose a method with neural network models to detect language anomalies using electroencephalogram (EEG) signals. To the best of our knowledge, there have been few studies on classifying single-trial EEG signals related to language processing such as syntactic processing in sentence comprehension. We evaluated neural network models, i.e., stacked autoencoder (SAE) and long-short term memory (LSTM) for detecting syntactically anomalous sentences from single-trial EEG signals.

18 participants listened to sentences, some of which are syntactically anomalous, and responded by pressing a key on a keyboard. To compare SAE and LSTM with a traditional model, support vector machine (SVM), we trained all three with the recorded EEG data and tested them on unseen data.
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Table 1: An example of paired syntactically correct and incorrect sentences. The sentence starting with the asterisk in b is syntactically incorrect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct Sentence</th>
<th>Incorrect Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Tori-ga sora-o ton-da</td>
<td>*Tori-ga sora-ga ton-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bird flew in the sky.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOM: nominative case marker; ACC: accusative case marker; PAST: past tense morpheme.
participants. The LSTM exhibited higher accuracy (61.3%) than SAE (58.3%) and SVM (58.4%). We found that LSTM performs better for single-trial of EEG signals during syntactic processing.
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INTRODUCTION

Previous studies showed that event-related potentials (ERPs) of EEG reflect the syntactic process in sentence comprehension with elicitations of distinctive components called P600 [10], which can be observed when a sentence contains a grammatical error. ERP signals generally are observed by averaging multiple-trial EEG signals due to the low signal-to-noise ratio of EEG signals [8].

Many researchers tackled classification problems of P300 signals at the single-trial level [3] [7]. Recent studies have found that neural network models are promising for classifying EEG signals, e.g. with stacked autoencoders (SAE) in [14] or long short-term memory (LSTM) in [1]. However, to the best of our knowledge, few studies have focused on classification of language-related EEG signals (relatively low signal-to-ratio) at the single-trial level [11], especially with neural network models.

Tanaka et al. [13], investigated the performance of single-trial EEG classification for syntactic and semantic violations in spoken sentences. They extracted time and spectral features based on the specific prior knowledge on the ERP components (P600 and N400). However, as mentioned above, neural network models are promising for classifications of EEG without such a specific feature extraction [1]; therefore, we evaluated the models without depending on specific prior knowledge of the ERP components. Overall, the contribution of this study is that we found how promising neural network models (SAE and LSTM) classify EEG signals for syntactic errors.

METHOD

EEG Data Acquisition

Materials. We defined a double-nominative case as a syntactic violation. Syntactically anomalous Japanese sentences were manually created by referring to [12] and [9]. In a syntactic incorrect sentence,
the double-nominative case was included at the second phrase of the sentence; therefore, we marked the nominative case of the second phrase as the onset of the synchronous stimulus (t=0). In the table 1, there is an example of paired syntactically correct and incorrect sentences. We used 40 syntactically correct and 40 syntactically incorrect sentences recorded speech of a professional female narrator.

**Participants.** We carried out the experiment in accordance with the recommendations of our institutional ethics committee. All participants wrote informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. 19 graduate students (16 males and 3 females, mean age: 24.2) participated.

**Procedure.** The participants were instructed to look at a fixation cross at the center of the monitor and refrain from blinking and moving. Figure 1 shows the experimental procedure.

**EEG Recording and Preprocessing.** We used ActiCAP with 32-ch active electrodes as the EEG cap by Brain Products. Preprocessing of the recorded EEGs was done in the following manner: (1) re-referencing the average of the reference channels (TP9 and TP10); (2) FIR high-pass filtering of 0.3 Hz; (3) epoching at -100 to 900 ms of the synchronous onset for each trial excluding the fillers (4) setting a threshold of artifact rejection for removing epochs containing signal amplitudes below -350 or above 350 µV without considering the signals of FP1 and FP2 channels due to eye-blink artifacts; (5) automatically removing muscle artifacts, then removing them based on visual inspection; (6) downsampling to 250 Hz; (7) using an Independent Component Analysis algorithm to correct eye-related artifacts, so that eye-related components could be removed by calculating the correlations with the FP1 and FP2 channels, and by visual inspection of the topographies and waveforms; (8) a second artifact rejection of epochs that exceeded the thresholds of -120 and 120 µV. After the above artifact-rejection procedure, one participant was removed because of a large number of rejected epochs (more than 30% of the epochs were rejected). This procedure is described in detail in [13].

**Classification Models**

**Stacked Autoencoders.** An Autoencoder (AE) is a two-layered neural network model that learns the low-dimensional representation of an input vector with a vector from a small hidden layer [5]. With SAEs and greedy layer-wise pre-training of these AEs, a multi-layer neural network can effectively learn the high representation of input vector [2]. We used the encoder part of an SAE and link the last hidden layer of the encoder to the softmax layer for classifications.

**Long-Short Term Memory.** Long short-term memory (LSTM) was proposed in 1997 to solve the gradient vanishing problem of standard Recurrent Neural Network by introducing a gated cell [6].
Feature Extraction and Classification

For feature extractions, we used the windowed means paradigm following to [3]. With this method, we can extract the feature vector of an epoch at a channel. Figure 2 explains the manner of extraction.

For training of the SAE, we concatenated feature vectors of all channels into one column vector of the epoch, and the size of the feature vector was 434 dimensions. After the normalization step, the mean of the feature vectors was 0 and standard deviation was 1 (showed in figure 3). Unlike the SAE, a sequential feature vector such as EEG data can be inputted into LSTM [4]. Figure 4 shows the flow of feature extraction and classification using LSTM. The shape of the feature vector was 14 * 31 dimensions, and normalization was done in the same manner as in the case of SAE.

For classifications, we used a linear-kernel SVM as the baseline model, SAE, and LSTM.

The training data were a concatenation of 14 participants' data and the test data were that of other 4 participants'. We arranged the number of epochs so that there would be the same number of syntactically correct and incorrect epochs in the both of training and test data.

For optimization of hyper-parameters of the models, we conducted a grid-search by using 10-fold cross-validation on the training data. The hyper-parameters were as follows, C = {0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100} for SVM; the number of hidden units {10, 50, 100, 200, 300}, number of hidden layers {1, 2, 3} and the activation function (sigmoid, rectified linear) for SAE; and number of hidden units {5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30} for LSTM (whose number of hidden layer is 1). After we found the optimal hyper-parameters, we trained the models with all the training data and evaluated the trained models with the test data.

Finally, with the best performed model and hyper-parameters on the single-trial analysis, we also investigated classification performances on averaging multiple-trials EEG signals (from 2 to 20 times).

RESULTS

Table 2 shows the average accuracies on the test data for each model. LSTM outperformed SVM and SAE on the test data, and LSTM achieved over 60% accuracy which is statistically significantly higher than the chance level (two-tailed binomial test; p < 0.01). Figure 5 shows the accuracies of each model for participant. Figure 6 represents the accuracies per each averaging trial of the best model (LSTM).

CONCLUSIONS

We detected syntactic violations in spoken sentences from single-trial EEG signals with neural network models, and found that LSTM achieved an accuracy of 61.3%; therefore, sequential recurrent neural models are feasible to properly classify high-dimensional sequential EEG signals.
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