Bangladesh (IUB)

IUB Academic Repository

Electrical and Electronics Engineering

Article

2016-10-15

Methods for Artifact Detection and Removal from Scalp EEG: A Review

Islam, Md Kafiul

Elsevier

http://dir.iub.edu.bd:8180/handle/123456789/277 Downloaded from IUB Academic Repository See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275955830

Methods for Artifact Detection and Removal from Scalp EEG: A Review (In Press)

Article in Clinical Neurophysiology · October 2016

DOI: 10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002

CITATIONS	5	READS	
0		53	
3 autho	rs:		
	Md. Kafiul Islam		Amir Rastegarnia
	Independent University, Bangladesh	\sim	71 PUBLICATIONS 217 CITATIONS
	42 PUBLICATIONS 54 CITATIONS		SEE PROFILE
	SEE PROFILE		
			Zhi Yang
		L,	Peking University
			107 PUBLICATIONS 1,140 CITATIONS
			SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Low-Cost Digitization of Saline Dropper Set View project



Real-time Imaging/Monitoring of Vein during Blood Draw/Collection and Canula Insertion for Infants View project

AUTHOR QUERY FORM

	Journal: NEUCLI	Please e-mail your responses and any corrections to:
ELSEVIER	Article Number: 2534	E-mail: corrections.esme@elsevier.thomsondigital.com

Dear Author,

Please check your proof carefully and mark all corrections at the appropriate place in the proof (e.g., by using on-screen annotation in the PDF file) or compile them in a separate list. Note: if you opt to annotate the file with software other than Adobe Reader then please also highlight the appropriate place in the PDF file. To ensure fast publication of your paper please return your corrections within 48 hours.

For correction or revision of any artwork, please consult http://www.elsevier.com/artworkinstructions.

Any queries or remarks that have arisen during the processing of your manuscript are listed below and highlighted by flags in the proof. Click on the 'Q' link to go to the location in the proof.

Location in	Query / Remark: click on the Q link to go					
article	Please insert your reply or correction at the corresponding line in the proof					
	Reference(s) given here were noted in the reference list but are missing from the text – please position each reference in the text or delete it from the list.					
Q1	The author names have been tagged as given names and surnames (surnames are highlighted in teal color). Please confirm if they have been identified correctly.					
Q2	Please provide the name of the city for affiliation a.					
Q3	Uncited references: This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please cite each reference in the text or, alternatively, delete it.					
Q4	One or more sponsor names and the sponsor country identifier may have been edited to a standard format that enables better searching and identification of your article. Please check and correct if necessary.					
Q5	Please verify the presentation of the appendices.					
Q6	Please provide the correct link of the website address in this paragraph.					
Q7	Please provide an update for reference [39].					
Q8	Please provide the volume number and page range for reference [69].					
Q9	Please verify the presentation of the tables.					
Q10	Please provide the significance of the asterisk present in table 5.					
	Please check this box or indicate your approval if you have no corrections to make to the PDF file					

Thank you for your assistance.

Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology (2016) xxx, xxx-xxx



Disponible en ligne sur

ScienceDirect www.sciencedirect.com Elsevier Masson France

www.em-consulte.com/en

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW/REVUE GÉNÉRALE

Methods for artifact detection and removal from scalp EEG: A review

Les méthodes de détection et de rejet d'artefact de l'EEG de scalp : revue de littérature

، ما Md Kafiul Islam^a, Amir Rastegarnia^{b,*}, Zhi Yang^a

7 Q2 a Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore

8 ^b Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Malayer, Malayer, Iran

9 Received 26 February 2016; accepted 7 July 2016

10	KEYWORDS	
11	Ambulatory EEG;	
12	Artifact removal;	
13	Brain-computer	
14	interface (BCI);	
15	Empirical mode	
16	decomposition (EMD);	
17	Independent	
18	component analysis	
19	(ICA);	
20	Scalp EEG;	
21	Wavelet transform	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Summary Electroencephalography (EEG) is the most popular brain activity recording technique used in wide range of applications. One of the commonly faced problems in EEG recordings is the presence of artifacts that come from sources other than brain and contaminate the acquired signals significantly. Therefore, much research over the past 15 years has focused on identifying ways for handling such artifacts in the preprocessing stage. However, this is still an active area of research as no single existing artifact detection/removal method is complete or universal. This article presents an extensive review of the existing state-of-the-art artifact detection and removal methods from scalp EEG for all potential EEG-based applications and analyses the pros and cons of each method. First, a general overview of the different artifact types that are found in scalp EEG and their effect on particular applications are presented. In addition, the methods are compared based on their ability to remove certain types of artifacts and their suitability in relevant applications (only functional comparison is provided not performance evaluation of methods). Finally, the future direction and expected challenges of current research is discussed. Therefore, this review is expected to be helpful for interested researchers who will develop and/or apply artifact handling algorithm/technique in future for their applications as well as for those willing to improve the existing algorithms or propose a new solution in this particular area of research. © 2016 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: rastegar@tabrizu.ac.ir (A. Rastegarnia).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002 0987-7053/© 2016 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

29	
30	MOTS CLÉS
31	Analyse en
32	composantes
33	indépendantes ;
34	EEG ambulatoire ;
35	EEG de scalp ;
36	Interface
37	cerveau-machine ;
38	Mode de
39	décomposition
40	empirique ;
41	Rejet d'artefact ;
42	Transformation en
43	ondelettes
14	
45	
46	
47	
10	

ARTICLE IN PRESS

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

Résumé L'électroencéphalographie (EEG) est une technique d'exploration du cerveau très utilisée dans une large gamme d'applications. L'un des problèmes couramment rencontrés dans les enregistrements EEG est la présence d'artefacts qui viennent de sources autres que l'activité cérébrale et contaminent significativement les signaux acquis. En conséquence, de nombreux travaux de recherche ont été effectués depuis les années 2000 pour identifier les moyens d'éliminer ces artefacts dans une étape de prétraitement du signal. Ceci est toujours l'objet de recherches actives, car aucune méthode existante de détection et rejet d'artefacts n'est parfaite et n'a pu faire l'objet d'un consensus. Cet article présente une revue détaillée et un état de l'art concernant les méthodes de détection et rejet d'artefacts à partir des enregistrements EEG de scalp pour toutes les applications potentielles basées sur l'EEG et analyse les avantages et les inconvénients de chaque méthode. Tout d'abord, un apercu général des différents types d'artefacts qui peuvent s'observer dans l'EEG de scalp et leur impact en fonction d'applications particulières sont présentées. Puis, les méthodes sont comparées en fonction de leur capacité à éliminer certains types d'artefacts et de leur valeur dans les différentes applications pertinentes (seule une comparaison « fonctionnelle » est présentée et non l'évaluation de la performance de ces méthodes). Enfin, les orientations futures et les défis des recherches actuelles sont discutées. Cette revue devrait être utile pour les chercheurs intéressés à développer et/ou à appliquer des algorithmes ou techniques de manipulation d'artefacts EEG dans leurs travaux futurs, ainsi que pour ceux qui souhaitent améliorer les algorithmes existants ou de proposer de nouvelles solutions dans ce domaine de recherche spécifique. © 2016 Elsevier Masson SAS. Tous droits réservés.

51 Introduction

49 50

Electroencephalography (EEG) is a non-invasive recording 52 technique that measures the electrical activity of brain 53 by placing electrodes on the scalp [65]. Due to its non-54 invasiveness and cost-benefit ratio, EEG has been the most 55 preferred method of brain recording in clinical studies, lab 56 experiments, patient health monitoring [36], diagnosis and 57 many other applications. Unfortunately, EEG recordings are 58 often contaminated by different forms of artifacts, such as 59 artifacts due to electrode displacement, motion artifacts, 60 ocular artifacts and EMG artifacts from muscle activity. 61 These offending artifacts not only misinterpret the underly-62 ing neural information processing but may also themselves 63 be difficult to identify. For example, during patient mon-64 itoring in a critical care unit or during epilepsy seizure 65 detection, artifacts may increase the chance of false alarms 66 [26,84]. Another example is during brain-computer interface 67 (BCI) applications, where artifacts can modify or alter the 68 shape of a neurological event (e.g. event-related potential 69 or ERP) that drives the BCI system and that eventually results 70 in an unintentional control of the device [100]. The same 71 problem may occur during sleep study [82] and diagnosis 72 of other neurological disorders such as Alzheimer's disease 73 (AD) [13], schizophrenia [95], etc. Therefore, artifact detec-74 tion and removal is one of the most important preprocessing 75 steps for neural information processing applications. 76

77 The variety of artifacts and their overlap with signals of interest in both spectral and temporal domains, even some-78 times in the spatial domain, makes it difficult for simple 79 signal preprocessing technique to identify them from EEG. 80 Therefore, the use of simple filtering or amplitude thresh-81 olds to remove artifacts often results in poor performance 82 both in terms of signal distortion and artifact removal. So far, 83 a large number of methods/algorithms have been developed 84 for artifact detection and removal from EEG signals. How-85 ever, as we will discuss in this paper, there is no universal 86

complete solution yet available for this particular problem. More specifically, a careful review of the relevant artifact detection removal algorithms/methods reveals that there is a gap between designed algorithm and its target application. Most of the available techniques are not application-specific and therefore unnecessary computational burden arises.

Considering this issue, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive survey on the existing state-of-the-art artifact detection and removal methods from scalp EEG for all potential EEG-based applications. It is worthy to note that this research deals with artifacts and their handling methods found only in scalp EEG recordings, not stimulation artifacts or artifacts found in simultaneous EEG-fMRI recordings. There are several useful algorithms proposed in the literature to remove artifacts from such EEG-fMRI signals, such as [2,3,25]. Interested researchers can take a look at these references for more information. In addition, since currently there is no universal standard quantitative metric available for performance evaluation of existing artifact removal methods,¹ this paper does not report such performance evaluation, but rather provides only the functional comparison between methods.

To this end, first we briefly introduce typical artifact types that are found in scalp EEG. Then, we provide a comparative analysis of the existing methods/algorithms with their advantages, limitations and application-specific challenges. Finally, the future direction is discussed to provide application-specific solutions with reasonable complexity, optimized performance and most importantly with feasible

¹ There are a couple of articles [39,52] that proposed to use simulated EEG data for performance evaluation of any artifact removal method in a quantitative manner. Interested readers who wish to explore the quantitative performance evaluation technique of any artifact removal method are requested to consult the mentioned articles for more details.

Scalp EEG artifacts

solutions. We believe that this review paper can help
researchers to choose the most suitable artifact handling
method for a particular EEG-based application. Moreover,
it would also be useful for those researchers interested
in designing and implementing new methods/algorithms to
handle artifacts in a more efficient way, keeping in mind the
particular application.

A list of symbols and notations commonly used in this paper is shown in Table 1.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 125 ''EEG and artifact characterization'' introduces typical EEG 126 and artifact characteristics. Section ''Existing artifact hand-127 ling methods" briefly describes the mechanism of all the 128 existing methods for artifact detection and removal. Section 129 "Comparison between methods" provides a comparative 130 analysis between the methods and their suitability for differ-131 ent applications. Section "Discussion" discusses the current 132 status of artifact handling software plug-ins and also pro-133 vides future directions of this research. Finally, section 134 "Conclusions" gives concluding remarks. 135

136 EEG and artifact characterization

137 EEG characteristics

EEG is the recording of the electrical activities from sur-138 face/scalp of the brain and typically described in terms 139 of rhythms and transients. The rhythmic activity of EEG is 140 divided into bands of frequency. Although the common EEG 141 rhythms are delta, theta, alpha and beta waves, however, 142 recently the gamma wave comes into EEG analysis in cer-143 tain cases. Moreover, mu wave is also considered as a variant 144 because of lack of association with dysfunction or diseases. 145 The corresponding frequency bands of these waves are given 146 in Table 2. 147

148 Artifacts

EEG recordings are often contaminated by different forms 149 of artifacts. The artifacts in EEG recording are of various 150 types that come from different sources. In broad sense, arti-151 facts in EEG can be originated from internal and external 152 sources and contaminate the recordings in both temporal 153 and spectral domains with wide frequency band. Internal 154 source of artifacts are due to physiological activities of 155 the subject (e.g. ECG, EMG/muscle artifacts, EOG) and its 156 movement. External source of artifacts are environmental 157 interferences, recording equipment, electrode pop-up and 158 159 cable movement. Also some artifacts may present in several neighboring channels (global) while some of them can 160 be found only in single-channel (local). In addition, some 161 artifacts appear as regular periodic events such as ECG or 162 pulse artifacts (regular/periodic) while some others may be 163 extremely irregular. An example of artifact-contamination 164 is illustrated in Fig. 1. 165

A summary of different artifact types and their origins is
 provided in Table 3.

Table 1Description of notations.

Symbol	Description
TVD	Total variation de-noising
EIH	Energy interval histogram
EAS	Ensemble average subtraction
PWC-PSVM	Probabilistic SVM with pairwise coupling
APF	Adaptive predictor filter
OPTIMI	Online predictive tools for intervention in
	mental illness
RBF-ANN	Radial basic function based artificial neural
FORCe	Fully online and automated artifact
SFΔ	Signal fraction analysis
GSVD	Generalized singular value decomposition
FDS	Exponentially damped sinusoidal
RMVR	Robust minimum variance beamforming
STE-TS	Space-time-frequency time/segment
GWDH	Group method of data handling
PNN	Polynomial neural network
	Decision tree technique
	Wavelet neural network
	Component subspace projection algorithm
CJFA	Spectral ratio
	Europhic Tacio
	adaptive radial basis function networks
	Eunctional link neural network with
I LINIT-ANTIS	adaptive poural fuzzy informace system
	Aultiple artifact rejection algorithm
FOOR	Fourth order Tensor method
	Underdetermined blind source separation
	Tomporal do correlation source separation
	lagged auto mutual information clustering
EDD	Event-related potential
	Contrast-to-poise ratio
FFMD	Ensemble empirical mode decomposition
	Multi-set canonical correlation analysis
WDT	Wavelet packet transform
	local singular spectrum analysis
	Multivariate singular spectrum analysis
(C	Correlation coefficient
RRMSF	Relative root-mean-squared error
IDM	Linear programming machine
IRSS	loint blind source separation
DENID	Poak signal-to-noise ratio
	Enhanced automated wavelet-ICA
CCA	Stationary subspace analysis
CRSS	Constrained BSS
MI	Mutual information
FASTEP	Fully automated statistical thresholding for
TAJILI	FEG artifact rejection
OSET	Open-source electrophysiological toolbox
AAR	Automatic artifact removal
	Automatic FEG artifact detector based on
	the joint use of spatial and temporal
	features
BCI	Brain-computer-interface

09

ARTICLE IN PRESS

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190



Figure 1 Left: a scalp EEG segment where all channels are more or less contaminated with muscle activity during the 10 seconds. Right: the 10-second scalp EEG recordings with 21 channels from a long-term Epilepsy Monitoring Unit (OSG EEG recorders, Rumst, Belgium). The seizure EEG was contaminated with muscle artifacts and eye blinks. Muscle artifacts can be observed between 0 sec and 3.9 sec on channels F7, T3, T5, C3, and T1 and between 5 sec and 10 sec on channels F8, T4, F4, C4, and P4 [16].

Table 2 EEG rhythm: bands.	s with their correspond	ing frequency
Rhythm or transient	EEG signal component	Frequency band (Hz)
Rhythm	Delta Theta Alpha Beta Gamma	<4 4-8 8-13 14-30 > 30
Transient	Mu Seizure and inter-ictal activities	7.5–12.5 0.5–30

¹⁶⁸ Existing artifact handling methods

In this section, we present the different artifact handling
 methods found from extensive literature review.

Artifact avoidance

Artifact avoidance is a preventive and precautionary way to avoid or minimize artifacts by instructing the subject to remain still and try to avoid unnecessary blinks, eye/body movements and so on. Also by proper grounding of the EEG recorder, one can reduce the supply mains interference. Although artifact avoidance is not the best way to get rid of artifacts completely, minimizing artifacts can reduce both the data loss and the computational complexity. However, based on applications, sometimes this is a very unrealistic solution; e.g. in an ambulatory EEG monitoring or braincomputer interface (BCI) application. Moreover, there are several limitations to employ such approach since some of the physiological artifacts (e.g. ECG) are involuntary and therefore cannot be avoided. In addition, the subject cannot limit eye blinking or movement for a long period of time, especially if the subject is a child. Therefore, there will always be some artifacts present in the recording and those should be handled in the digital signal processing domain.

Artifact types and sources									
Physiological/internal Extra-physiological/external									
Ocular	Cardiac	Muscle	Others	Instrumental	Interference	Movement			
Eye blink Eye movement Eye flatter REM sleep	ECG pulse	Chewing Swallowing Clenching Sniffing Talking Scalp contraction	Gloss kinetic Skin Respiration	Electrode Displacement and pop-up Cable movement Poor ground	Electrical Magnetic Sound Optical EM waves	Head movement Body movement Limbs movement Tremor Other movements			

Scalp EEG artifacts

191 Artifact detection

Identifying artifacts is the first and most important step 192 for handling artifacts. Often the artifacts overlap with 193 EEG signals in both spectral and temporal domains such 194 that it becomes difficult to use simple filtering or straight 195 forward signal processing technique. In many applica-196 tions, it is required to identify or separate artifacts in 197 real-time, therefore knowing both the artifact and sig-198 199 nal characteristics is really necessary in order to detect them faster. Detection of artifacts may refer to detecting 200 a particular epoch or detecting an independent component 201 to be artifactual after performing independent compo-202 nent analysis, ICA (detail about ICA is given later in this 203 section). 204

Whether it should be detected in time domain or frequency domain or even in both by utilizing time-frequency analysis, this decision depends on the type of artifacts and/or type of applications. Some of other factors for selecting a detection method include:

- availability of a reference artifact source;
- the number of available recording channels;
- the need for removing the artifacts after detection stage.

A few existing methods adopted the idea of machine 213 learning for artifact separation from useful EEG signal by 214 training a classifier with (supervised) or without (unsuper-215 vised) labeled training datasets. Once artifactual epochs 216 are identified by applying a machine learning algorithm, 217 such epochs are either highlighted as artifact annotator to 218 the clinicians for helping in decision making (e.g. epileptic 219 seizure detection) or can be rejected before examina-220 tion from clinician or before sending to automated signal 221 processing system [70]. 222

Machine learning techniques are mainly two types: super-223 vised and unsupervised learning. Among supervised learning 224 algorithms, two most popular methods used for classifica-225 tion between artifact and brain signals are artificial neural 226 network (ANN) [11,38,40,57,83] and support vector machine 227 (SVM) [6,44,70,71,85,87]. Among unsupervised learning, k-228 means clustering and outlier detection are most common 229 in this particular area of research [70]. A basic approach 230 to classify artifact from EEG by using the machine learning 231 classifier is shown in Fig. 2. 232

233 Artifactual segment rejection

One way to reduce the effects of artifacts is to reject/cancel 234 the epoch or segment of EEG data which is labeled as arti-235 factual. The major drawback of this method is that it also 236 removes important EEG information, which results in the 237 loss of data [52,66]. This was an early technique of handling 238 artifacts, but nowadays with the introduction of recent sig-239 nal processing techniques, the preference is for techniques 240 for artifact removal or correcting them instead of rejecting 241 the data epoch. However, in certain applications, this tech-242 nique can still work reasonably well, e.g. offline analysis or 243 during training of any classifier. 244

Training



Prediction



Figure 2 Machine learning classification for identifying artifactual epoch from clean EEG epoch.

Artifact removal

Artifact removal involves canceling or correcting the artifacts without distorting the signal of interest. This is primarily done in two ways: either by filtering and regression or by separating/decomposing the EEG data into other domains.

Regression

Regression analysis [43,101], using a multi-modal linear model between observed and a reference signal, is a traditional way of identifying artifactual samples and consequently removing such sample that do not belong to the model. Observed artifact-contaminated EEG signal and an artifact reference signal are common methods for removing some physiological artifacts such as ocular and cardiac artifacts.

However, such regression analysis often fails when there is no reference channel available. In addition, EEG signal being non-linear and non-stationary process, linear regression is not the best choice for analysis in such applications. Moreover, it can only be used to treat few particular types of artifact, not all types.

Blind source separation

One of the most popular artifact detection/removal methods is based on blind source separation (BSS) [33,43,62,86,97], which aims to extract the individual unknown source signals from their mixtures and possibly to estimate the unknown mixing channels using only the information within the mixtures observed at the output of each channel with no, or very limited, knowledge about the source signals and the mixing channel. Let denote by X the observed signals in multi-channel recordings, which is assumed to be linear mixture of the sources, S with additive white noise vector N, i.e.

277 278

(1)

Please cite this article in press as: Islam MK, et al. Methods for artifact detection and removal from scalp EEG: A review. Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

28

ARTICLE IN PRESS

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

360

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

385

386



Figure 3 Illustration of blind source separation technique.

Then, the objective is to find an estimate of the linear mixture matrix A, denoted by W by an iterative process and obtain an estimate for the source signals as follows

$$S = WX$$
 (2)

A basic BSS technique is illustrated in Fig. 3. The main assumption with BSS is that the number of sources can be at most (or lower) equal to that of observed channels and the sources need to be independent (for ICA) or maximally uncorrelated (for CCA) from each other:

• ICA: independent component analysis (ICA) is based on 288 blind source separation (BSS) technique where it is 289 assumed that the sources are linearly independent. The 290 major problem with ICA-based artifact detection and 291 removal is that, it is often not automatic. It requires 292 manual intervention to reject independent components 293 (ICs) with visually detected artifacts after decomposi-294 tion. However, it (i.e. artifact detection and removal) 295 can be made automatic by labeling the ICs through some 296 features that can quantify the possibility of being artifac-297 tual. Such procedure is performed by combining ICA with 208 another complementary method such as Wavelet Trans-299 form or Empirical Mode Decomposition (EMD) or using classifier like SVM or even with a help of reference chan-301 nel [110]. However, even in such case, the artifactual ICs 302 may also contain some residual neural signals. Therefore, 303 during signal reconstruction after completely rejecting 304 that particular IC, it introduces distortion to the neu-305 ral signal. Another problem is that it cannot operate on 306 single-channel data, since the number of recording chan-307 nels must be at least equal to the number of independent 308 sources. The computational complexity is another fac-309 tor that limits the choice of ICA for artifact removal in 310 applications that require online/real-time implementa-311 tion of the algorithm. Finally, the involvement of iterative 312 process in computing ICA algorithm makes it difficult 313 to perform robustly. E.g. ICA may be useful to remove 314 global artifacts such as ocular artifacts [11,27,31,43,46] 315 or sometimes other physiological artifacts. There are few 316 works reported the use of modified [23] or constrained 317 ICA [1,41,79,86] for automated and better performance 318 in artifact detection and removal; 319

CCA: canonical correlation analysis or CCA is another BSS 320 method for separating a number of mixed or contaminated 321 signals that uses second-order statistics (SOS) to generate 322 components derived from their uncorrelated nature. By 323 looking for uncorrelated components, the approach uses 324 a weaker condition than statistical independence sought 325 by the ICA algorithm. ICA does not take temporal cor-326 relations into account while CCA addresses this point by 327 being capable of finding uncorrelated components [91]. So 328 329 the spatial correlation being zero while it optimizes only the temporal correlation (i.e. auto-correlation). Then CCA attempts to find an ordered set of components from maximum auto-correlation to least auto-correlation. The component with least auto-correlation corresponds mostly to artifacts. The advantages of CCA over ICA are being automatic and more computationally efficient;

• MCA: morphological component analysis (MCA) decomposes the recorded signal into components that have different morphological characteristics where each component is sparsely represented in an over-complete dictionary [91]. It is only applicable to certain known artifacts whose wave shape or morphology are known and stored in a database. The efficacy of this method greatly depends on the available artifact-template database. In [106, 107], MCA is used to remove ocular artifacts and some of the muscle artifacts originating from jaw clenching, swallowing, and eyebrow rising.

Time-frequency representation

Time-frequency analysis of non-stationary time series data is quite popular in biomedical signal processing, e.g. in EEG signal processing. The reason of using simultaneous time and frequency domain analysis is because of the non-stationary properties of this type of signal. Therefore, any momentary change in frequency values for any signal components (e.g. either artifact or seizure) [76,90] can be captured in a particular temporal window. In [69], a time-frequency analysis of ocular artifacts (OAs) including blinks and saccades found in EOG have been reported where the results reveal that frequencies up to 181 Hz can be present in a subject's EOG for certain tasks. This finding suggests that if EOG is used for ocular artifact removal from EEG, then EOG should be sampled at least 362 Hz to avoid aliasing.

The common time-frequency representation is based on the short-time Fourier Transform (STFT). This method is not so effective as it has uniform time-frequency resolution at all frequencies. For EEG, since the bandwidth is around 0.5–120 Hz (although most of the time we are only interested in < 30 Hz) and many of the artifacts (specially motion and ocular artifacts) appear in the lower frequency region (<10 Hz), therefore, it is required to have high frequency resolution in lower frequency region which STFT cannot provide. To address this issue, a wavelet-based approach can be used as the wavelet transform, and provides proportional resolution in each frequency band suitable for EEG signals.

Wavelet transform

The wavelet transform is a time-scale representation method that decomposes signal f(t) into basis functions of time and scale which are dilated and translated versions of a basis function $\psi(t)$ called mother wavelet [51]. Translation is accomplished by considering all possible integer translations of $\psi(t)$ and dilation is obtained by multiplying t by a scaling factor, which is usually factors of 2. The following equation shows how wavelets are generated from the mother wavelet:

$$\psi_{j,k}(t) = 2^{j/2} \psi(2^{j/2}t - k) \tag{3}$$

where *j* indicates the resolution level and *k* is the translation in time. This is called dyadic scaling, since the scaling factor



Figure 4 An example structure of 2-level decomposition by discrete wavelet transform.

is taken to be 2. Wavelet decomposition is a linear expansion
 and it is expressed as

⁸⁹
$$f(t) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} [c_k \phi(t-k)] + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} d_{j,k} \psi(2^j t-k)$$
 (4)

where $\phi(t)$ is the scaling function and c_k and $d_{j,k}$ are the coarse and detail level expansion coefficients, respectively. A wide variety of functions could be chosen as the mother wavelet as long as following equation is satisfied:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \psi(t) dt = 0$$
 (5)

There are several techniques based on wavelet theory, such as wavelet packets, wavelet approximation and decomposition, discrete and continuous wavelet transform, and so forth. The most commonly used technique is Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT). The DWT is derived from continuous wavelet transform with discrete input. The relation between input and output can be represented as

402
$$\mathbf{x}_{a,L}[n] = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbf{x}_{a-1,L}[2n-k]g[k]$$
 (6)
403 $\mathbf{x}_{a,H}[n] = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbf{x}_{a-1,L}[2n-k]h[k]$ (7)

where g[n] is a low pass filter just like scaling function and h[n] is a high pass filter just like mother wavelet function. Briefly, discrete wavelet transform is entering of a signal into a low pass filter to get the low frequency component and into a high pass filter to get the high frequency component. An example structure of 2-level decomposition by discrete wavelet transform is shown in Fig. 4 [51].

Once the signal is decomposed into detail and approximate coefficients, thresholding is applied on the coefficients to denoise the signal from artifacts. Then the new sets of coefficients (all detail with final level approx. coefficients)
are added up to reconstruct back the artifact-reduced signal.

417 Empirical mode decomposition

EMD is an empirical and data-driven method developed to 418 perform on non-stationary, non-linear, stochastic processes 419 and therefore it is ideally suitable for EEG signal analysis and 420 processing. However, the computational complexity of EMD 421 is quite heavy, so may not be suitable for online applications. 422 Moreover, the theory behind EMD is still not complete and 423 so far used in empirical studies, therefore it is difficult to 424 predict its robustness in all EEG recordings. 425

EMD algorithm decomposes a signal, *s*[*n*] into a sum decomponents/functions, *c*[*n*] called

Table 4 Process flow of EMD algorithm to generate IMFS.

Input: data sequence s[n]

- 1. Identify all the local extrema
- 2. Separately connect all the maxima and minima with natural cubic spline lines to form the upper, *u*[*n*], and lower, *l*[*n*], envelopes
- 3. Find the mean of the envelopes as z[n] = [u[n] + 1[n]]/2
- Take the difference between the data and the mean as the proto-IMF, h[n] = s[n] - z[n]
- 5. Check the proto-IMF against the definition of IMF and the stoppage criterion to determine if it is an IMF
- 6. If the proto-IMF does not satisfy the definition, repeat step 1 to 5 on *h*[*n*] as many time as needed till it satisfies the definition
- 7. If the proto-IMF does satisfy the definition, assign the proto-IMF as an IMF component, *c*[*n*]
- 8. Repeat the operation step 1 to 7 on the residue, q[n] = s[n] - c[n], as the data
- 9. The operation ends when the residue contains no more than one extremum

intrinsic mode functions (IMF) with well defined instantaneous frequencies [58,94]. There are two basic conditions to be an IMF: (i) the number of extrema must be equal (or at most may differ by one) to the number of zero crossings (ii) any point, the mean value of the two envelopes defined by the local maxima and the local minima has to be zero [58]. The general process flow of EMD algorithm is shown in Table 4. EEMD: it is an enhanced version of EMD (enhanced empirical mode decomposition) and inspired from the fact that EMD algorithm is very sensitive to noise, which often leads to mode mixing complication. Therefore, EEMD is proposed which uses an average number of ensembles (IMFs) from EMD as the optimal IMFs thus it provides a noise-assisted data analysis method [94].

Adaptive filtering

An adaptive filter is a system with a linear filter that has a transfer function controlled by variable parameters and a means to adjust those parameters according to an optimization algorithm [89]. The filter weights can adapt based on the feedback from output of the system and it requires a reference input to compare the desired output with the observed output. An improved adaptive filtering by optimal projection which is based on common spatial pattern for artifact removal is mentioned in [9,10], especially for epilepsy patient's EEG [74]. Let s[n] denote the observed signal which is combination of the original EEG, x[n] and additive artifact r[n]. Then, if the artifact source v[n] is available from a dedicated channel (e.g. EOG or ECG); an adaptive algorithm (e.g. LMS, RLS, etc.) can be used to derive an artifact-free EEG, x'[n] given that the desired EEG and artifact signal are independent (or at least uncorrelated [91]). An illustration of the use of adaptive filter for EOG artifact removal is shown in Fig. 5.

Principal component analysis (PCA)

PCA is a type of spatial filter that transforms the time domain datasets into a different space by rotating axes in

428

429

461 462 463

459

460



Figure 5 Typical use of adaptive filtering in canceling physiological artifacts with available artifact source channel as reference.

an N-dimensional space (where n is the number of varia-464 bles or EEG channels) such that each dimension in the new 465 space has minimum variance and the axes are orthogonal to 466 each other [17]. PCA reduces data dimension and highlights 467 specific features of data, which is usually difficult to iden-468 469 tify in the spatially unfiltered data as the new components are created by weighted combinations of all EEG channels. 470 Two recent papers proposed artifact removal method based 471 on PCA: Turnip [98] reported the use of robust PCA after 472 preprocessing is done based on wavelet de-noising and band-473 pass-filtering; while Turnip and Junaidi [99] compared PCA 474 with ICA for artifact removal and found ICA performs better 475 than PCA. Both these papers have evaluated their method 476 qualitatively; therefore, it is not possible to comment exclu-477 sively on the efficacy of PCA in detecting and removing 478 artifacts. One important limitation of PCA (or SVD) is that 479 it fails to separate/identify ocular or similar artifacts from 480 EEG when amplitudes are comparable since PCA depends on 481 the higher order statistical property [79]. 482

483 Hybrid methods

In recent years, researchers have been keen to utilize the
advantages of different methods by combining them into
a single method for artifact detection and removal, i.e. a
hybrid method which has two or more stages. Some of these
methods are discussed below:

wavelet-BSS: this hybrid method formed by integrat-489 ing two popular methods: wavelet transform and blind 490 source separation is mainly inspired from the fact that 491 only BSS-based separation of artifactual components (e.g. 492 ICs) is often erroneous since the separated artifactual 493 component also contains residual neural information. 494 Therefore, completely rejecting such component will 495 introduce significant distortion in reconstructed EEG 496



Figure 7 Process flow of the hybrid BSS-SVM algorithm.

signal. Hence, the multi-channel datasets are transformed into ICs or CCs and then possible artifactual component is decomposed by wavelet transform to different frequency bands of detail coefficients. After that, the artifactual coefficients are denoised by thresholding, which eventually preserve the residual neural signals of low amplitude after thresholding the higher artifactual segments. The related articles are [14,34,50,52] for wavelet-ICA, [109] for wavelet-CCA. On the other hand, there are similar hybrid methods that can be applied to single-channel EEG data by reversing the order of wavelet transform and BSS blocks. For example Calcagno et al. and Mammone and Morabito [12,52] reported artifact removal by first decomposing signal into wavelet coefficients then artifactual coefficients are passed through BSS block to separate artifacts from neural signal. However, typically the prior way is more known to the research community s wavelet enhanced ICA or wavelet enhanced CCA. An example of such method is shown in Fig. 6. Please note that the type of wavelet transform can be DWT, CWT, SWT or sometimes WPT [8];

- EMD-BSS: this hybrid method involves BSS with EMD instead of wavelet transform. The difference is that usually the first stage is to decompose the signal into IMFs by EMD or EEMD and then apply BSS (ICA or CCA) on the IMFs to identify artifactual component followed by rejecting the artifactual IC or CC. The general process flow of this hybrid method is also shown in the same Fig. 6. Such methods are reported in [16,94,108];
- BSS-SVM: Shoker et al. [87] reported a hybrid BSS-SVM algorithm for eye blink and ECG artifact removal where certain carefully chosen features are extracted from separated source components and then fed into a SVM classifier to identify artifact components followed by removing them. Finally, the rest of the source components are re-projected to reconstruct artifact-free EEG. The whole system is illustrated in Fig. 7;
- REG-BSS: Klados et al. [43] reported a hybrid methodology by combining BSS and regression-based adaptive filtering (with vEOG and hEOG as reference channels) for rejection





Please cite this article in press as: Islam MK, et al. Methods for artifact detection and removal from scalp EEG: A review. Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002

8

497

498

499

500

501

502

529

534 535

+Model NEUCLI 2534 1–19

ARTICLE IN PRESS

Scalp EEG artifacts



Figure 8 Process flow of the hybrid REG-BSS methodology.



Figure 9 Process flow of the hybrid ICA-ARX methodology.

of ocular artifacts as shown in Fig. 8. Similar techniques 537 have been used by [31] to remove ocular artifacts by com-538 bining ICA and adaptive filtering. Another hybrid approach 539 combining ICA and Auto-Regressive eXogenous (ARX) was 540 proposed by Wang et al. [102] to remove ocular artifacts 541 robustly as shown in Fig. 9. In this method, ARX is used 542 to reduce the negative effect induced by ICA by building 543 the ARX multi-models based on the ICA correlated sig-544 nals and the reference EEG that are selected prior to the 545 artifact-contamination: 546

other hybrid methods: Nguyen et al. [63] report EOG arti-547 • fact removal using a hybrid method combined of Wavelet 548 decomposition and Artificial Neural Network and termed 549 as Wavelet Neural Network (WNN) where the reference 550 EOG channel is only required during training of ANN clas-551 sifier. A method combining DWT and ANC (Adaptive noise 552 canceler) is proposed in [73] to remove ocular artifacts 553 where the OA reference is derived from DWT decomposi-554 tion and then used in the adaptive filter as reference. On 555 the other hand, Navarro et al. [60] used the combination 556 of EMD and adaptive filter (with RLS algorithm) to remove 557 ECG artifacts from EEG recordings. The authors in [38] 558 presented a new way to remove EOG and EMG artifacts 559 from EEG by using a hybrid combination of functional link 560 neural network (FLNN) and adaptive neural fuzzy infer-561 ence system (ANFIS). The ANFIS usually has two parts: 562 a non-linear antecedent and a linear consequent; how-563 ever, in their proposed system, the second part is replaced 564 with the FLNN to enhance the non-linear approximation 565 ability. Then an adaptive filtering algorithm adjusts the 566 parameters of both ANFIS and FLNN. 567

568 Statistical features

Several statistical features [37,57,66] are used in machine
 learning classifier or during threshold calculation in
 wavelet/EMD/ICA-based methods for separating or identi fying artifacts from EEG signal of interest. Some of such
 features are discussed in Appendix A.

574 Comparison between methods

In order to compare different artifact handling methods
qualitatively, several factors need to be considered that can
evaluate the pros and cons of these methods. Such factors
are described as follows: a detailed comparison between the
existing artifact detection and removal methods in the literature found from recognized journals is provided in Table 5.

Removal performance

The performance evaluation of artifact removal methods found in the literature is always problematic. It can be done either by visually by expert(s) which is subjective (not standard) or by synthetic/semi-synthetic data (but uncertainty of reconstructed data whether perfectly realistic or not). Since there is neither any ground truth data available nor any universal or standard quantitative metric(s) used in the literature that can capture both amount of artifact removal and distortion. Therefore, it is guite difficult to compare different artifact removal methods based on their ability to remove artifacts since very few quantitative evaluations have been reported in the literature. Most of the published articles evaluated their method in terms of some gualitative plots. In addition, very few of them guantified the distortion to desired EEG signals due to the removal effect. Therefore, it is not fair to tell which performs best based on the study.

Automatic or semi-automatic

Most of the EEG-based applications require automated information processing, particularly when it is an online/realtime implementation. In addition, manual identification of artifactual component or epoch is very time-consuming and laborious for multi-channel long-term data sequences. Therefore, many signal processing techniques have been proposed, and some useful a priori signal or artifact statistics/characteristics have been utilized. Among them, BSS-based techniques can sometimes be semi-automated because of identification of artifactual component may require some training or parameter selection/tuning. Although there are few papers available that propose automated identification of ICs after ICA [104,111]; however, they both require training samples for supervised classification and in addition requires an extra information in the form of contact impedance measurement [31]. If the method involves ICA for automatic detection of artifacts, then there has to be another stage (or method) in order to make the whole process automated.

Real-time/online implementation

Online/real-time implementation requires the algorithm to be fast enough and to have low-enough complexity for such application. Here, online implementation refers to the algorithms implemented in software platform capable of online/real-time processing, not in hardware platform. However, some EEG-based applications such as wireless ambulatory EEG monitoring may require on-chip implementation of the artifact detection/removal algorithm. In such cases, the computational complexity has to be minimal, which is a great challenge, and so far to the best of our

Please cite this article in press as: Islam MK, et al. Methods for artifact detection and removal from scalp EEG: A review. Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002

9

581

583

584

585

586 587 588

580

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

M.K. Islam et al.

10

Q10

 Table 5
 Comparative analysis of artifact removal methods found in literature published in recognized journals.

Articles	Type of artifacts	Method	Online/ real-time	Automated	Reference	Multi/ single- channel	Application
Shoker et al. [87]	Eye blink	ECG BSS-SVM (SOBI-SVM)	NIA	Y	Ν	Multi	General; e.g. ERP analysis
Park et al. [72]	ECG	ÈIH-EAS	Y	Y	Ν	Single	General; e.g. sleep/wake state or epilepsy monitoring
Hamaneh et al. [34]	EKG	ICA-CWT	N/A	Y	Template	Multi	General; e.g. epilepsy monitoring
Shao et al. [85]	Eye blink + ECG	ICA-weighted PWC-PSVM	N/A	Y	Template	Multi	General
Zhao et al. [110]	Ocular	DWT-APF	Y	Y	Ν	Single	Monitor mental health (OPTIMI), portable applications
De Clercq et al. [20]	Muscle	ССА	Ν	Ν	Ν	Multi	Epilepsy monitoring; applied on ictal datasets
Ng et al. [62]	EOG + EMG	SOBI-SWT	N/A	Y	Ν	Multi	μ rhythm extraction
Mateo et al. [54]	Ocular	RBF based ANN	N/A	Y	EOG channel (vEOG + hEOG)	Single	General
Anderson et al. [4]	EOG + 60-Hz noise	GSVD-SFA	May be	Ν	EOG channel	Multi	BCI; mental task
Van Huffel et al. [19]	Muscle + 50- Hz noise	SVD	N/A	Ν	Ν	Single/multi	Ictal EEG
Daly et al. [18]	Head movement	ICA	Ν	Semi- automated	Accelerometer	Multi	General; BCI
Noureddin et al. [68]	EOG + Blink	Adaptive Filter (RLS and H_{α})	Y	Y	Eye Tracker	Multi	General
Peng et al. [73]	Ocular	DWT-ANC	May be	Y	Ν	Single	OPTIMI, portable applications
Nazarpour et al. [61]	Blink	STF-TS-RMVB	Y	Y	Ν	Multi	General
James et al. [41]	Ocular	cICA	Y	Y	Derived reference	Multi	Seizure analysis
Schetinin et al. [83]	ECG, EOG, muscle, and electrode noise	PNN-GMDH- DTT	N/A	Y	Template	Multi	Sleeping newborns
Mahajan et al. [50]	Eye blink	ICA-DWT with statistics	N/A	Y	Ν	Multi	General
Kierkels et al. [42]	EOG	Kalman filter	N/A	Y	Eye tracker	Single	General
Sweeney et al. [94]	Motion	EEMD-CCA	N/A	Y	Ν	Single	Ambulatory single-channel applications
Wang et al.	Ocular	ICA-ARX	N/A	Y	Ν	Multi	General
Burger et al. [11]	EOG	ICA-WNN	N/A	Ν	Ν	Multi	General

Scalp EEG artifacts

Table 5(Continued)

Articles	Type of artifacts	Method	Online/ real-time	Automated	Reference	Multi/ single- channel	Application
Klados et al.	Ocular	REG-ICA	Ν	Ν	EOG	Multi	General
O'Regan et al. [71]	Head movement	Feature fusion (69) to SVM	N/A	Y	Gyroscope	Single	Ambulatory EEG: seizure monitoring + BCI
Ma et al. [49]	Ocular	BSS-based CSPA	N/A	Y	Ν	Multi	General
Ma et al.	Muscle	ICA-SR	N/A	Y	Ν	Multi	General
Jafarifarmand et al. [40]	Ocular muscular and ECG	Adaptive FLN- RBFN-based filter (ANC)	N/A	Y	ECG, EOG, EMG	Single/multi	General
Nguyen et al. [63]	EOG	WNN	Y	Y, training required	EOG only for training	Single	Mental and visual task
Hu et al. [38]	EOG and EMG	FLNN-ANFIS	May be	Y	EOG, EMG	Single/multi	General
Hartmann et al. [35]	Most types	Iterative Bayesian Estimation (MMSE)	N/A	Y	N	Single/multi	Epilepsy monitoring
Sameni et al. [81]	Ocular	Generalized Eigenvalue decomposi- tion	N/A	Y	EOG	Multi	General
Akhtar et al. [1]	Most types	Spatially cICA + Wavelet de-noising	N/A	Y	May be sometimes	Multi	General
Molla et al. [58]	EOG	Adaptive filtering (EMD-based filter)	N/A	Y	Fractional Gaussian noise	Single	General
LeVan et al. [45]	Ocular, EMG, movement	ICA + Bayesian classification	N/A	Y	ECG	Multi	Ictal scalp EEG for epilepsy diagnosis
Lawhern et al. [44]	Ocular, muscle, movement	AR model (fea- ture) + SVM	Yes	Y	Ν	Single	Real-time EEG applications
Hallez et al. [33]	Muscle and ocular	BSS (CCA/spatial cICA) + RAP- MUSIC	N/A	Semi- automated*	N	Multi	Ictal EEG source imaging
Bhattacharyya et al. [6]	All of them	26D features + bi- classification	N/A	Y	Ν	Single	Neonatal seizure detection
Flexer et al.	Ocular	ICA	N/A	Semi- automated	Ν	Multi	Blind subjects
Teixeira et al. [96]	EOG + baseline drifts	Local SSA + embedding dimension	N/A	Y	Ν	Single	General
Ge et al. [28]	Ocular	FOOBI based on UBSS	N/A	Y	N	Multi	Only for healthy subjects; not for epilepsy

Table 5 (Continued)

Articlos	Type of	Mothod	Online /	Automated	Poforonco	Multi/	Application
Articles	artifacts	Method	real-time	Automated	Reference	single- channel	Аррисаціон
Nicolaou et al. [64]	EOG, EMG and ECG	TDSEP + LAMIC	N/A	Y	EOG	Multi	Discovery and analysis of ERP
Rashed-Al- Mahfuz et al. [77]	Ocular	EMD	N/A	Y	Simulated	Multi	BCI
Guerrero- Mosquera et al. [31]	Ocular	Adaptive filtering + ICA	N/A	Y	Fpl, Fp2, F7 and F8 Electrodes	Multi	General
Mammone et al. [52]	Ocular + muscle + electrical shift	EAWICA (wICA)	Ν	Y	Ν	Multi	General
Winkler et al. [104]	EOG + EMG	TDSEP (based on ICA) + LPM	Y	Y	Ν	Multi	BCI
Chen et al. [16]	Muscle	EEMD-JBSS	N/A	Y	Ν	Single	General + ictal EEG
Zeng et al. [108]	EOG	SSA (BSS) + EMD	Ν	Ν	Ν	Multi	Diagnosis

knowledge, no real-time hardware implementation has been
 performed.

632 Single or multi-channel

BSS-based methods require multi-channels to function, the 633 more number of channels the better for separating indi-634 vidual sources. Therefore, such methods cannot be used 635 in low-channel (e.g. 4-6) or single-channel based appli-636 cations (e.g. in ambulatory monitoring of epilepsy patient 637 or ambulatory BCI-prosthesis). On the other hand, Wavelet 638 transform and EMD-based techniques can work with single-639 channel analysis by decomposing a single data sequence into 640 multiple components (approx./detail coefficient for wavelet 641 decomposition and IMF for EMD). 642

643 Reference channel

Most of the available methods require a dedicated arti-644 fact channel to be functional. In order to remove ocular or 645 cardiac artifacts, the reference channel often provides sat-646 isfactory complementary information to identify ECG/EOG 647 artifacts. Besides, real-time contact impedance measure-648 ment can provide the complementary information about 649 artifacts due to electrode pop, movement or loose con-650 nection. Some movement tracking devices such as motion 651 captured camera, accelerometer and/or gyroscope can help 652 to detect motion artifacts. 653

654 **EOG**

Many articles reported to remove EOG artifacts by the use of EOG reference channel [27,43,110]. In [110], a hybrid denoising method has been reported that combines discrete wavelet transformation (DWT) and an adaptive predictor filter (APF) for automatic identification and removal of ocular artifacts for portable EEG applications which is found to achieve lower MSE and higher correlation between cleaned and original EEG in comparison with existing methods such as wavelet packet transform (WPT) and independent component analysis (ICA), discrete wavelet transform (DWT) and adaptive noise cancellation (ANC). Another article [43] reported an automated ocular artifact removal method using adaptive filtering and ICA with the help of vertical (vEOG) and horizontal (hEOG) EOG channel as reference. On the other hand, Flexer et al. [27] proposed an ICA-based ocular artifact removal method from blind subjects' EEG utilizing both vertical and horizontal EOG references.

ECG

Authors in [21] proposed removal/reduction of ECG/cardiac artifacts from EEG using a separate ECG reference channel. In [31], an automatic method based on a modified ICA algorithm has been proposed that works for a single-channel EEG and the ECG (as reference) which gives promising results when compared with two popular methods that use a reference channel namely ensemble average subtraction (EAS) and adaptive filtering. The other two articles proposed their methods for application in neonatal EEG monitoring. Another paper [60] proposed a combination of EMD and adaptive filtering based method for ECG artifact removal in preterm EEG and reported up to 17% improvement in correlation coefficient between original and cleaned datasets compared with removal by only adaptive filtering.

Eye tracker

Both Kierkels et al. [42] and Noureddin et al. [68] reported techniques for removal of ocular artifacts by using an eye tracker as reference. The advantage of using eye tracker is that it can reduce the undesired EEG distortion produced by using an EOG channel as reference since EOG

660

688 689 690

691

692

693

Scalp EEG artifacts

not only captures ocular events but also some frontal EEG 694 events. Besides, in practical daily applications, the use of 605 eye tracker removes the requirement of EOG electrodes 696 attached to the face. Results in [42] show significantly 607 improved performance in removing of only eye movement 698 artifacts by combining Kalman filter with the eye tracker 699 information compared with three other popular methods 700 namely Regression, PCA, and SOBI. On the other hand, 701 Noureddin et al. [68] introduced an online algorithm for ocu-702 lar artifacts (both movements and blink) removal from EEG 703 by utilizing a high-speed eye tracker (> 400 Hz) along with 704 the frontal EEG as reference instead of EOG channel. The 705 article used two adaptive filters (RLS and H) to prove the 706 efficacy of their proposed technique, which was shown to 707 outperform the techniques using only EOG as reference. 708

709 Accelerometer

There are few articles reported to have used accelerometer 710 recordings in conjunction with EEG recordings for detecting 711 motion artifacts [82,93]. In [82], it has been shown that 712 movement artifacts can be detected automatically using 713 an accelerometer with a developed algorithm based on AR 714 modeling and thus can increase the speed efficiency for 715 automatic computation of EEG model parameters compared 716 with manual detection of movement artifacts. Sweeney 717 reported in [93] that the use of accelerometer as refer-718 ence channel not only can detect motion artifacts but also 719 can remove them with the use of different filtering tech-720 niques such as adaptive filters, Kalman filtering and Wiener 721 filtering. 722

723 Gyroscope

Authors in [71] proposed to detect different head movement 724 artifacts automatically by using a gyroscope as complemen-725 tary features in fusion with EEG features and finally with 726 the help of SVM, to classify artifacts from neural informa-727 tion. The method is inspired by the realization of an artifact 728 detection system for implementing with the point-of-care 729 REACT (Real-time EEG Analysis for event detection) tech-730 nology that has potential application in the detection of 731 732 neurological events (e.g. seizure events) in adults. The arti-733 facts were generated for 10 different types of head-related movements using 14-channel Emotiv EEG headset and the 734 movement time was recorded for validation during arti-735 fact detection. The reported accuracy in terms of Avg. ROC 736 areas was 0.802 and 0.907 for participant independent and 737 dependent systems respectively. 738

739 Contact impedance measurement

Bertrand et al. and Mihajlovic et al. [5,55,56] reported that 740 by measuring the change in contact impedance due to head 741 movements can help to estimate the motion artifacts and by 742 utilizing this information with an adaptive filter in combina-743 tion with band-pass filtering, the artifacts can be reduced 744 significantly in real-time. The article also studies the effect 745 of head movement artifacts on EEG recordings results in 746 contaminating the spectral domain in < 20 Hz frequency. 747

748 Motion captured camera

Authors in [32] proposed a channel and IC-based method
 to remove movement artifacts during walking and running

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

774

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

from a high-density EEG recordings (248-channel) with the help of kinematics and kinetics information acquired from a 8-camera, 120 frames/s, motion capture system. The subject was asked to walk and run on a custom built, dual-belt, force measuring treadmill with two 24-inwide belts mounted flush with the floor while simultaneously both brain and body dynamics were recorded. The findings conclude that high-density EEG is possible to use in order to study brain dynamics during whole body movements; and the artifact from rhythmic gait events can be reduced by template regression procedure.

Robustness

Robustness is an important issue in developing any artifact removal algorithm as artifacts are of diverse types and contaminate the EEG differently in different recording environments. Some of the factors that should be considered for robustness include artifact-SNR, type of artifact, duration of artifacts, subject-variability, environmental variability, application-specificity.

Discussion

Current status

Although significant amount of efforts has been made to develop methods for artifact detection and removal in EEG applications, it is still an active area of research. Most of them handle single type of artifact, many of them cannot work for single-channel EEG, some of them require training data, some require a dedicated reference channel, some are designed for general purpose applications that often leads to overcorrection of data and some of them are not fully automated. Some of the currently available major software plug-in GUIs are discussed in Appendix B.

Future direction

Here we present the future direction for handling artifacts by raising realistic issues, proposing some ideas and providing recommendation based on review of existing solutions.

Probability mapping

From the above literature review of existing solutions for artifact handling, it is obvious that artifacts are of different types and not all types will play major role in all EEG-based applications. Sometimes, clinicians prefer manual event detection than automated algorithm for certain disease diagnosis (e.g. seizure detection). However, such manual analysis is also time-consuming. In such cases, if we can give the users an option to choose which particular artifacts they want to be detected and/or removed with what amount (%) for each epoch or data-segment of duration 1sec (depends on application), then the process would still be automated with tuning facilities for the users either to turn-ON or remain OFF if not required. In order to implement such facility, a probability mapping of artifacts can be proposed (something similar to the idea of [105]) for each epoch of data based on some statistical features to

quantify the probability of an epoch to be artifactual. Then 803 the user can opt for some threshold of probability above 804 which he/she may want to remove artifacts while below 805 the threshold, to preserve the epoch as it is. Thus it is pos-806 sible to design automated artifact detection and removal 807 algorithm, which is application-specific with tuning facil-808 ity for user. This would greatly enhance the signal analysis 809 process by avoiding the chance of removing important sig-810 nal information. In addition, it will reduce the unnecessary 811 computational resources and time by focusing on the desired 812 artifacts for detection/removal (i.e. only those types to be 813 expected to affect the signal quality) and ignoring the rest 814 of them. 815

816 Standard performance evaluation

One of the important issues in evaluating the perfor-817 mance of any artifact detection or removal method is 818 that there is no universal standard quantitative metric 819 for the researchers to use. Most of the methods men-820 tioned in the literature use some gualitative time/frequency 821 domain plot to evaluate the artifact removal performance 822 or evaluated by the clinical expert. Sweeney et al. [92] 823 proposed a recording methodology for accurate evalua-824 tion and comparison between different artifact removal 825 techniques/algorithms which presented the EEG recordings 826 of two separate but highly-correlated channels that allow 827 recording both artifact-contaminated and artifact-free sig-828 nal simultaneously. It also presented a tagging algorithm 829 employing two accelerometers for generating a quality-of-830 signal (QOS) metric, which can be used to for multiple 831 purposes such as classification of motion artifacts, activation 832 of artifact removal technique only when required and iden-833 tification of the artifact-contaminated epochs. Thus, this 834 approach can provide accurate measurements of quantita-835 tive metrics for fair performance evaluation. 836

However, such methodology still requires intervention to 837 the recording technique and also extra reference channel 838 for accelerometer data, which may not be feasible in every 839 application (e.g. portable EEG recordings). Although it is 840 highly encouraged for the removal performance to be evalu-841 ated by the domain experts, however, such evaluation varies 842 from one expert to another and still is manual and/or gual-843 itative evaluation. Therefore, it is an urge to have a single 844 standard evaluation method consists of both gualitative and 845 more importantly quantitative metrics or ways for evaluat-846 ing the performance in a more realistic and fair manner. 847

848 Ground truth data

Another reason of not being able to evaluate artifact 849 removal performance fairly is that the lack of availability 850 of ground truth data. It's now equally important to have 851 a public database with sufficiently long-term EEG recor-852 dings without or minimal artifacts to be used as a ground 853 truth data. Besides such, an acceptable mathematical model 854 to generate basic EEG rhythms and finally integrate them 855 to simulate an EEG sequence with standard 10-20 system 856 EEG channels is required for quantitative evaluation of any 857 existing/future artifact removal methods. In addition, more 858 study is necessary to characterize as much as possible of all 859 860 artifact types, specially the motion artifacts for different 861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

880

890

891

892

893

894

805

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

movement in an ambulatory environment [15]. Thus, it will be easier to label both ground truth EEG and artifacts.

Recommendation

In order to choose the right artifact handling method, we need to consider the particular application, required specification to be satisfied given the computational resources and recording environment available. There are EEG applications where only one or two types of artifacts affect the later stage information decoding or processing, thus it is not wise to attempt to identify and remove all the artifacts as other artifacts may not (or minimally) harm a particular signal processing purpose. If any reference channel is available in the targeted application, then regression or adaptive filtering technique may be a preferred solution. In the case of ambulatory EEG monitoring, when number of channels are fewer, no reference channel is available and wireless EEG transfer preferred, in such case it is recommended to use computationally cheaper method that can work without reference and on single or few channels, e.g. wavelet-based methods since BSS-based methods may not perform satisfactory with less number of channels. In some applications, if it is possible to have some a priori knowledge about artifacts and some training data available, and the application only require to identify artifacts not to remove them, then machine learning based classifiers can be good choice. If the EEG recording involves high-density channels, then PCA may be preferred to reduce the dimensionality before applying any artifact removal methods, such as BSS-based methods. If the application is based on offline analysis, then we can afford some computational expensive techniques such as ICA or EMD.

Conclusions

An extensive analysis of the existing methods for artifact detection and removal has been presented with their comparison, advantages and limitations. The research on handling artifacts present in the typical EEG recordings is still an active area of research and none of the existing methods can be considered as the perfect solution. Most of the solutions do not consider the particular application, therefore, not optimized for that application. Although, most of the removal algorithms provide good performance. however, they are only suitable for offline analysis because of their high computational complexity and unsupervised nature. Some of them even require a dedicated reference channel, which is not feasible for some applications. Further studies are required to characterize the properties of commonly encountered artifacts and to observe the effects of their contamination to the desired later stage signal processing/analysis. Some applications may only require to identify artifacts and not to remove them, e.g. in applications where classification/identification of two classes are required. In such cases, a more realistic mathematical model of the desired event(s) to be identified is essential in order to easily ignore other non-brain signals (i.e. artifacts or interferences). Finally, the future direction will be to provide application-specific solutions with reasonable complexity, optimized performance and most importantly with feasible solutions.

962 963 964 965 966

967

968

969

970

961

971 972

972

974 975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

1001

1002

1003

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

Scalp EEG artifacts

919 Disclosure of interest

⁹²⁰ The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

921Q3 Uncited Reference

922 **[67].**

923 Acknowledgments

⁹²Q4 This work was supported by A*STAR PSF Grant R-263-000-⁹²⁵ 699-305 and NUS YIA Grant R-263-000-A29-133.

926 Appendix A. Statistical features

927 Time Domain Features

Entropy, *H*: is a measure of uncertainty of information content [78], of a discrete random variable *x* with possible values $x_1, ..., x_n$, can be calculated as:

$$H(x) = E[-\ln(P(x))]$$
 (8)

Here *E* is the expected value operator and P(x) is the probability mass function of *x*.

Kurtosis, Kr: Kurtosis is the measure of ''peakedness'' of
 probability distribution function [50] and is calculated for a
 real-valued random variable x as follows

$$\kappa r[\mathbf{x}] = \frac{\mu^4}{\sigma^4} \tag{9}$$

where μ and σ are the mean and standard deviation of random variable x.

Line Length, $\angle[n]$: Line length, a signal feature for seizure onset detection as reported by [24,59], for a discrete time signal x[k] can be represented by,

⁴³
$$\mathscr{L}[n] = \sum_{k=n-N}^{n} abs[x[k-1] - x[k]]$$
 (10)

where N is the time window length. Here N = 1 sec.

Maximum, *M*: It is the maximum or peak value of an epoch and noted down as a feature.

NEO, Ψ : The ability of Non-linear Energy Operator (NEO) to enhance signal's transition or large amplitude event [53,57,75] is sometimes considered as feature for seizure classification. The NEO operator Ψ applied to a discrete time variable x[n] is calculated as follows

$$\Psi[x[n]] = x[n]^2 - x[n+1]x[n-1]$$
(11)

Usually the mean and/or variance of $\Psi[x[n]]$ for each epoch are used as feature(s).

955 Frequency Domain Features

Spectral features along with temporal or spatial features are
 often used for EEG classification. As mentioned before, EEG
 rhythms have different spectral bands, therefore sometimes
 the relative power in those bands are used as features for
 classifier training. It is important to note that apart from the

rhythms, there are recently reported High Frequency Oscillations (HFO having band of 80–200 Hz), Ripple (200–600 Hz) bands present in EEG. In addition, the frequency band of typical Scalp EEG is 0.05–128 Hz while epileptic seizure appears in 0.5–29 Hz [26]. These bands and their FFT or spectral power are useful features for separating artifacts from EEG.

FFT, F: Fast Fourier Transform or FFT is the frequency representation of time domain signal values. For feature extraction, we have used the mean of the absolute of FFT values for each epoch computed over the entire frequency range of EEG signal (i.e. 0-128 Hz).

F = mean(abs[FFT(k)])(12)

Maximum FFT, F_{max} : This feature is the maximum or peak value of the absolute of FFT values.

$$F_{\max} = \max(abs[FFT(k)]) \tag{13}$$

Spatial distribution or topographic mapping helps to identify the origin of many artifacts (e.g. ocular artifacts are dominant in frontal EEG channels) [93]. In addition, some artifacts may appear in several nearby channels (global artifacts such as eye blink) where some appear only in one channel (i.e. local artifacts). Therefore, spatial features along with their spectral content are important to identify artifacts from EEG signals [57,88].

Appendix B. Software plug-ins

FORCe

Fully Online and automated artifact Removal for brain-Computer interfacing or FORCe is the most recent method reported in [18] that is based on a unique combination of WT, ICA and thresholding. Compared with two other stateof-the-art methods namely LAMIC and FASTER, FORCe has been shown to outperform them significantly and is capable of removing different types of artifacts including eye blink, EOG and EMG. One of salient features of FORCe is that it doesn't require any reference channel and can operate on fewer numbers of channels which makes it suitable for ambulatory EEG applications.

FASTER

FASTER stands for *Fully Automated Statistical Thresholding for EEG artifact Rejection* which is an unsupervised algorithm for parameter estimation in both EEG time series and in the ICs of EEG [66]. The achieved sensitivity and specificity is > 90% for detection of EOG and EMG artifacts, linear trends and white noise in the contaminated channels.

LAMIC

Lagged auto-mutual information clustering (LAMIC) is a clustering algorithm developed for automatic artifact removal from EEG [64]. The method involves data decomposition by a BSS algorithm called TDSEP (Temporal De-correlation

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

1070

1071

1072

1073

1074

1075

1076

1082

1083

1084

1085

1086

1087

1088

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

16

source SEParation), which is a temporal extension of ICA. Then the components are clustered using the similarity of their lagged Auto-Mutual Information (AMI). This is inspired from the fact that EEG and artifacts are different from their temporal dynamics point of view. The clustering procedure follows the usual steps of hierarchical clustering.

1016 PureEEG

This is an automatic EEG artifact removal algorithm for 1017 epilepsy monitoring that based on a neurophysiological 1018 model by utilizing an iterative Bayesian estimation scheme 1019 [35]. The method targets to remove most of the artifact 1020 types and does not require any manual intervention. The 1021 authors reported the performance of PureEEG from two 1022 independent clinical experts perspective and its found to 1023 be significantly improving the readability of EEG recordings 1024 after artifact removal. 1025

1026 OSET

OSET is an Open-Source Electrophysiological Toolbox for biomedical signal generation, modeling, processing, and filtering [80]. It can remove cardiac artifacts from any bioelectrical signal including EEG. It can also handle and remove EOG artifacts from multi-channel EEG using techniques based on semi-blind source separation.

1033 **MARA**

Multiple Artifact Rejection Algorithm (MARA) is an open-1034 source MATLAB-based EEGLAB² plug-in which automatically 1035 identify the artifact-contaminated independent compo-1036 nents for artifact rejection [103,104]. The main part of 1037 MARA is a supervised machine learning algorithm that learns 1038 from labeled components by experts and utilizes six fea-1039 tures based on spatial, spectral and temporal domain. It can 1040 handle any type of artifact. 1041

1042 **AAR**

Automatic Artifact Removal (AAR), a MATLAB toolbox which 1043 can be integrated as a plug-in into EEGLAB, includes dif-1044 ferent artifact removal methods for removing only EOG 1045 and EMG artifacts [29]. In order to remove only EOG arti-1046 facts, regression-based methods such as least mean squares 1047 (LMS), conventional re-cursive least squares (CRLS), sta-1048 ble re-cursive least squares (SRLS) and algorithms based 1049 on the H norm are used. For removing both EOG and 1050 EMG artifacts, spatial filters based techniques have been 1051 adopted. 1052

² EEGLAB is an open-source MATLAB-based interactive GUI toolbox for analyzing and processing continuous and event-related EEG, MEG and other electrophysiological signals. It uses ICA, time-frequency analysis, artifact rejection, event-related statistics and different modes for visualizing the averaged or single-trial EEG data [22].

ADJUST

ADJUST, reported by Mognon et al. [57], is an EEGLab supported plug-in for automated EEG artifact detection. This algorithm is based on the combined use of stereotyped artifact-specific spatial and temporal features to automatically identify the artifactual ICs after ICA is performed. Four different artifact types (i.e. eye blink, vertical eye movement, horizontal eye movement and generic discontinuities) are chosen for extracting features such as temporal kurtosis, spatial average and variance difference, maximum epoch variance, spatial eye difference. The key feature of ADJUST is that it is entirely automated and unsupervised with reported accuracy of 95.2% in classifying all of the four artifacts. It can also successfully reconstruct the clean ERP topographies from heavy artifact-contamination.

PREP Pipeline

The PREP pipeline is a standardized preprocessing tool for large-scale EEG analysis [7], which includes an automatically generated report for each dataset processed. The salient features of this toolbox include (i) removal of line-noise without incorporating typical filtering technique, (ii) referencing the signal robustly, and (iii) identification of bad channels relative to the reference.

Makoto's Preprocessing Pipeline

This pipeline is Makoto Miyaksohi's personally recommended EEG preprocess pipeline [30], which is a forever beta version. Interested readers are requested to consult the following link for more details: [http://sccn.ucsd. Q6 edu/wiki/Makoto's preprocessing pipeline].

FieldTrip

This is an open-source MATLAB toolbox for MEG and EEG analysis which offers advanced analysis methods of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data, such as timefrequency analysis, source reconstruction using dipoles, distributed sources and beamformers and non-parametric statistical testing [69].

ERPLAB

ERPLAB is also EEGLAB-compatible open-source toolbox for analyzing ERP data, which has artifact rejection capability in both manual and automated manner [47].

References

- Akhtar MT, Mitsuhashi W, James CJ. Employing spatially constrained ICA and wavelet denoising, for automatic removal of artifacts from multichannel EEG data. Signal Process 2012;92:401–16.
- [2] Allen PJ, Polizzi G, Krakow K, Fish DR, Lemieux L. Identification of EEG events in the MR scanner: the problem of

Scalp EEG artifacts

1167

pulse artifact and a method for its subtraction. Neuroimage 1998:8:229-39.

- [3] Allen PJ, Josephs O, Turner R. A method for removing imaging artifact from continuous EEG recorded during functional MRI. Neuroimage 2000;12:230-9.
- [4] Anderson CW, Knight JN, O'Connor T, Kirby MJ, Sokolov A. Geometric subspace methods and time-delay embedding for EEG artifact removal and classification. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng 2006;14:142-6.
- [5] Bertrand A, Mihajlovic V, Grundlehner B, Hoof CV, Moonen M. Motion artifact reduction in EEG recordings using multichannel contact impedance measurements. In: Proceedings of IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference (BioCAS). 2013. p. 258-61.
- [6] Bhattacharyya S, Biswas A, Mukherjee J, Majumdar AK, Majumdar B, Mukherjee S, et al. Detection of artifacts from high energy bursts in neonatal EEG. Comput Biol Med 2013;43:1804-14.
- [7] Bigdely-Shamlo N, Mullen T, Kothe C, Su KM, Robbins KA. The prep pipeline: standardized preprocessing for large-scale EEG analysis. Front Neuroinformatics 2015;9:1-20.
- [8] Bono V, Jamal W, Das S, Maharatna K. Artifact reduction in multichannel pervasive EEG using hybrid WPT-ICA and WPT-EMD signal decomposition techniques. In: Proceedings of IEEE Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). 2014. p. 5864 - 8
- [9] Boudet S, Peyrodie L, Gallois P, Vasseur C. Filtering by optimal projection and application to automatic artifact removal from EEG. Signal Process 2007;87:1978-92.
- [10] Boudet S, Peyrodie L, Forzy G, Pinti A, Toumi H, Gallois P. Improvements of adaptive filtering by optimal projection to filter different artifact types on long duration EEG recordings. Comput Methods Programs Biomed 2012;108:234-49.
- [11] Burger C, Heever DJVD. Removal of EOG artefacts by com-1132 bining wavelet neural network and independent component 1133 analysis. Biomed Signal Process Control 2015;15:67-79. 1134
- 1135 [12] Calcagno S, Foresta FL, Versaci M. Independent component analysis and discrete wavelet transform for artifact removal 1136 in biomedical signal processing. Am J Appl Sci 2014; 11:57-68. 1137
- [13] Cassani R, Falk TH, Fraga FJ, Kanda PA, Anghinah R. 1138 The effects of automated artifact removal algorithms on electroencephalography-based Alzheimer's disease diagnosis. 1140 Front Aging Neurosci 2014;6:55. 1141
- [14] Castellanos NP, Makarov VA. Recovering EEG brain signals: 1142 artifact suppression with wavelet enhanced independent 1143 component analysis. J Neurosci Methods 2006;158:300-12. 1144
- [15] Chang BS, Schachter SC, Schomer DL. Atlas of ambulatory 1145 EEG. Academic Press; 2005. p. 56-74. 1146
 - [16] Chen X, He C, Peng H. Removal of muscle artifacts from single-channel EEG based on ensemble empirical mode decomposition and multiset canonical correlation analysis. J Appl Math 2014.
- [17] Cohen MX. Analyzing neural time series data: theory and 1151 practice. MIT Press; 2014. p. 51-4. 1152
 - [18] Daly I, Scherer R, Billinger M, Muller-Putz G. Force: fully online and automated artifact removal for braincomputer interfacing. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng 2015;23:725-36.
- [19] De Clercq W, Vanrumste B, Papy JM, Van Paesschen W, Van 1157 Huffel S. Modeling common dynamics in multichannel signals 1158 with applications to artifact and background removal in EEG 1159 recordings. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2005;52:2006-15. 1160
- [20] De Clercq W, Vergult A, Vanrumste B, Van Paesschen W, Van 1161 Huffel S. Canonical correlation analysis applied to remove 1162 muscle artifacts from the electroencephalogram. IEEE Trans 1163 Biomed Eng 2006;53:2583-7. 1164
- [21] De Vos M, Deburchgraeve W, Cherian P, Matic V, Swarte 1165 R, Govaert P, et al. Automated artifact removal as 1166

preprocessing refines neonatal seizure detection. Clin Neurophysiol 2011;122:2345-54.

- [22] Delorme A, Makeig S. EEGLAB: an open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. J Neurosci Methods 2004;134:9-21.
- [23] Devuyst S, Dutoit T, Stenuit P, Kerkhofs M, Stanus E. Cancelling ECG artifacts in EEG using a modified independent component analysis approach. EURASIP J Advances Signal Process 2008:2008:180.
- [24] Esteller R, Echauz J, Tcheng T, Litt B, Pless B. Line length: an efficient feature for seizure onset detection. In: Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. 2001. p. 1707-10.
- [25] Ferdowsi S, Sanei S, Abolghasemi V, Nottage J, O'Daly O. Removing ballistocardiogram artifact from EEG using short and long-term linear predictor. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2013;60:1900-11.
- [26] Fisher RS, Vickrey BG, Gibson P, Hermann B, Penovich P, Scherer A, et al. The impact of epilepsy from the patient's perspective I. Descriptions and subjective perceptions. Epilepsy Res 2000;41:39-51.
- [27] Flexer A, Bauer H, Pripfl J, Dorffner G, Using ICA. for removal of ocular artifacts in EEG recorded from blind subjects. Neural Netw 2005;18:998-1005.
- [28] Ge S, Han M, Hong X. A fully automatic ocular artifact removal from EEG based on fourth-order tensor method. Biomed Eng Lett 2014;4:55-63.
- [29] Gomez-Herrero G. Automatic artifact removal (AAR) toolbox v1. 3 (release 09. 12. 2007) for MATLAB. Tampere University of Technology; 2007.
- [30] Groppe DM, Makeig S, Kutas M. Identifying reliable independent components via split-half comparisons. Neuroimage 2009;45:1199-211.
- [31] Guerrero-Mosquera C, Navia-Vazquez A. Automatic removal of ocular artifacts using adaptive filtering and independent component analysis for electroencephalogram data. IET Signal Process 2012;6:99-106.
- [32] Gwin JT, Gramann K, Makeig S, Ferris DP. Removal of movement artifact from high-density EEG recorded during walking and running. J Neurophysiol 2010;103:3526-34.
- [33] Hallez H, De Vos M, Vanrumste B, Van Hese P, Assecondi S, Van Laere KP, et al. Removing muscle and eye artifacts using blind source separation techniques in ictal EEG source imaging. Clin Neurophysiol 2009;120:1262-72.
- [34] Hamaneh MB, Chitravas N, Kaiboriboon K, Lhatoo SD, Loparo K, et al. Automated removal of EKG artifact from EEG data using independent component analysis and continuous wavelet transformation. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2014;61:1634-41.
- [35] Hartmann M, Schindler K, Gebbink T, Gritsch G, Kluge T. Pure EEG: Automatic EEG artifact removal for epilepsy monitoring. Neurophysiol Clin 2014;44:479-90.
- [36] Hirsch L, Brenner R. Atlas of EEG in critical care. John Wiley and Sons Ltd; 2010. p. 187-216.
- [37] Hsu WY, Lin CH, Hsu HJ, Chen PH, Chen IR. Wavelet-based envelope features with automatic EOG artifact removal: application to single-trial EEG data. Expert Syst Appl 2012;39:2743-9.
- [38] Hu J, Wang CS, Wu M, Du YX, He Y, She H. Removal of EOG and EMG artifacts from EEG using combination of functional link neural network and adaptive neural fuzzy inference system. Neurocomputing 2015;151:278-87.
- [39] Islam MK, Rastegarnia A, Yang Z. A wavelet-based artifact Q7 reduction from scalp EEG for epileptic seizure detection. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform [to appear].
- [40] Jafarifarmand A, Badamchizadeh MA. Artifacts removal in EEG signal using a new neural network enhanced adaptive filter. Neurocomputing 2013;103:222-31.

Please cite this article in press as: Islam MK, et al. Methods for artifact detection and removal from scalp EEG: A review. Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002

1099

1103

1104

1105

1106

1109

1112

1113

1114

1123 1124 1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1139

1147

1148

1149

1150

1153

1154

1155

1156

1121

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

1313

1314

1315

1316

1317

1318

1319

1320

1321

1322

1323

1324

1325

1326

1327

1328

1329

1330

1331

1332

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

1341

1342

1343

1344

1345

1346

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

1354

1355

1356

1357

1358

1359

1360

1361

1362

1363

1364

1365

1366

1367

1368

1369

1370

- 1235[41] James CJ, Gibson OJ. Temporally constrained ICA: an appli-
cation to artifact rejection in electromagnetic brain signal
analysis. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2003;50:1108–16.
- [42] Kierkels JJ, Riani J, Bergmans JW, Van Boxtel GJ. Using an eye tracker for accurate eye movement artifact correction.
 IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2007;54:1256–67.
- [43] Klados MA, Papadelis C, Braun C, Bamidis PD. Reg-ica: a hybrid
 methodology combining blind source separation and regression techniques for the rejection of ocular artifacts. Biomed
 Signal Process Control 2011;6:291–300.
- [24] Lawhern V, Hairston WD, McDowell K, Westerfield M, Robbins
 K. Detection and classification of subject-generated artifacts
 in EEG signals using autoregressive models. J Neurosci Methods 2012;208:181–9.
- [45] LeVan P, Urrestarazu E, Gotman J. A system for automatic artifact removal in ictal scalp EEG based on independent component analysis and Bayesian classification. Clin Neurophysiol 2006;117:912–27.
- [1253 [46] Li Y, Ma Z, Lu W, Li Y. Automatic removal of the eye blink
 artifact from EEG using an ICA-based template matching
 approach. Physiol Meas 2006;27:425.
- [47] Lopez-Calderon J, Luck SJ. EEPLAB: an open-source toolbox
 for the analysis of event-related potentials. Front Hum Neurosci 2014;8:1–14.
- [48] Ma J, Bayram S, Tao P, Svetnik V. High-throughput ocular artifact reduction in multichannel electroencephalography (EEG)
 using component subspace projection. J Neurosci Methods 2011;196:131–40.
- [49] Ma J, Bayram S, Tao P, Svetnik V. Muscle artifacts in multichannel EEG: characteristics and reduction. Clin Neurophysiol 2012;123:1676-86.
- [50] Mahajan R, Morshed BI. Unsupervised eye blink artifact denoising of EEG data with modified multiscale sample entropy, kurtosis, and wavelet-ICA. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 2015;19:158–65.
- 1270[51] Mallat S. A wavelet tour of signal processing: the sparse way.12713rd edition Academic press; 2008. p. 535–90.
- [52] Mammone N, Morabito FC. Enhanced automatic wavelet
 independent component analysis for electroencephalographic
 artifact removal. Entropy 2014;16:6553–72.
- [53] Maragos P, Kaiser J, Quatieri T. On amplitude and frequency
 demodulation using energy operators. IEEE Trans Signal Pro cess 1993;41:1532–50.
- [54] Mateo J, Torres AM, Garcia MA. Eye interference reduction in electroencephalogram recordings using a radial basic function. IET Signal Process 2013;7:565–76.
- [55] Mihajlovic V, Li H, Grundlehner B, Penders J, Schouten
 A. Investigating the impact of force and movements on impedance magnitude and EEG. In: Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC), 2013 35th Annual International Conference of the IEEE. 2013. p. 1466–9.
- [56] Mihajlovic V, Patki S, Grundlehner B. The impact of head
 movements on EEG and contact impedance: an adaptive
 filtering solution for motion artifact reduction. In: Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC), 2014
 36th Annual International Conference of the IEEE. 2014.
 p. 5064–7.
- [57] Mognon A, Jovicich J, Bruzzone L, Buiatti M. Adjust: an automatic EEG artifact detector based on the joint use of spatial and temporal features. Psychophysiology 2011;48:229–40.
- [58] Molla MKI, Islam MR, Tanaka T, Rutkowski TM. Artifact suppression from EEG signals using data adaptive time domain filtering. Neurocomputing 2012;97:297–308.
- [59] Mukhopadhyay S, Ray G. A new interpretation of nonlinear
 energy operator and its efficacy in spike detection. IEEE Trans
 Biomed Eng 1998;45:180–7.
- 1301[60] Navarro X, Poree F, Carrault G. ECG removal in preterm1302EEG combining empirical mode decomposition and adaptive

filtering. In: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2012 IEEE International Conference. 2012. p. 661–4.

- [61] Nazarpour K, Wongsawat Y, Sanei S, Chambers JA, Oraintara S. Removal of the eye-blink artifacts from EEGs via STF-TS modeling and robust minimum variance beamforming. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2008;55:2221–31.
- [62] Ng SC, Raveendran P. Enhanced rhythm extraction using blind source separation and wavelet transform. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2009;56:2024–34.
- [63] Nguyen HAT, Musson J, Li F, Wang W, Zhang G, Xu R, et al. EOG artifact removal using a wavelet neural network. Neurocomputing 2012;97:374–89.
- [64] Nicolaou N, Nasuto SJ. Automatic artefact removal from event-related potentials via clustering. J VLSI Signal Process Syst Signal Image Video Technol 2007;48:173–83.
- [65] Niedermeyer E, Da Silva FL. Electroencephalography: basic principles, clinical applications, and related fields. 5th edition Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2004.
- [66] Nolan H, Whelan R, Reilly R. Faster: fully automated statistical thresholding for EEG artifact rejection. J Neurosci Methods 2010;192:152–62.
- [67] Noureddin B, Lawrence PD, Birch GE. Time-frequency analysis of eye blinks and saccades in EOG for EEG artifact removal. In: Neural Engineering, 2007. CNE'07. 3rd International IEEE/EMBS Conference on neural Engineering. 2007. p. 564-7.
- [68] Noureddin B, Lawrence PD, Birch GE. Online removal of eye movement and blink EEG artifacts using a high-speed eye tracker. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2012;59:2103–10.
- [69] Oostenveld R, Fries P, Maris E, Schoffelen JM. Fieldtrip: open source software for advanced analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data. Comput Intell Neurosci 2010. Q8
- [70] O'Regan S. Artefact detection and removal algorithms for EEG diagnostic systems. PhD thesis. University College Cork; 2013.
- [71] O'Regan S, Faul S, Marnane W. Automatic detection of EEG artefacts arising from head movements using EEG and gyroscope signals. Med Eng Phys 2013;35:867–74.
- [72] Park HJ, Jeong DU, Park KS. Automated detection and elimination of periodic ECG artifacts in EEG using the energy interval histogram method. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2002;49:1526–33.
- [73] Peng H, Hu B, Shi Q, Ratcliffe M, Zhao Q, Qi Y, et al. Removal of ocular artifacts in EEG-an improved approach combining DWT and ANC for portable applications. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 2013;17:600–7.
- [74] Peyrodie L, Gallois P, Boudet S, Cao H, Barbaste P, Szurhaj W. Evaluation of the AFOP/DAFOP method for automatic filtering of EEGs of patients with epilepsy. J Clin Neurophysiol 2014;31:152-61.
- [75] Potamianos A, Maragos P. A comparison of the energy operator and the Hilbert transform approach to signal and speech demodulation. Signal Process 1994;37:95–120.
- [76] Rankine L, Stevenson N, Mesbah M, Boashash B. A nonstationary model of newborn EEG. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 2007;54:19–28.
- [77] Rashed-Al-Mahfuz M, Islam MR, Hirose K, Molla MKI. Artifact suppression and analysis of brain activities with electroencephalography signals. Neural Regen Res 2013;8:1500.
- [78] Richman JS, Moorman JR. Physiological time-series analysis using approximate entropy and sample entropy. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol 2000;278:2039–49.
- [79] Roy V, Shukla S. Automatic removal of artifacts from EEG signal based on spatially constrained ICA using Daubechies wavelet. Int J Modern Educ Comput Sci (IJMECS) 2014;6:31.
- [80] Sameni R. The Open Source Electrophysiological Toolbox (OSET). http://www.oset.ir/ [Online].
- [81] Sameni R, Gouy-Pailler C. An iterative subspace denoising algorithm for removing electroencephalogram ocular artifacts. J Neurosci Methods 2014;225:97–105.

1372

1373

1389

1390

1391

1393

1394

Scalp EEG artifacts

- [82] Savelainen A. Movement artifact detection from electroencephalogram utilizing accelerometer. Master's thesis. Aalto University School of Science and Technology; 2011.
- [83] Schetinin V, Schult J. The combined technique for detection of 1374 artifacts in clinical electroencephalograms of sleeping new-1375 borns. IEEE Trans Inf Technol Biomed 2004;8:28-35. 1376
- [84] Seneviratne U, Mohamed A, Cook M, D'Souza W. The util-1377 ity of ambulatory electroencephalography in routine clinical 1378 practice: a critical review. Epilepsy Res 2013;105:1-12. 1379
- [85] Shao SY, Shen KQ, Ong CJ, Wilder-Smith EP, Li XP. Auto-1380 1381 matic EEG artifact removal: a weighted support vector machine approach with error correction. IEEE Trans Biomed 1382 Eng 2009;56:336-44. 1383
- [86] Shoker L, Sanei S, Latif M. Removal of eye blinking artifacts 1384 from EEG incorporating a new constrained BSS algorithm. In: 1385 Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 2004. IEMBS'04. 1386 26th Annual International Conference of the IEEE, volume 1. 1387 2004. p. 909-12. 1388
 - [87] Shoker L, Sanei S, Chambers JA. Artifact removal from electroencephalograms using a hybrid BSS-SVM algorithm. IEEE Signal Process Lett 2005;12:721-4.
- [88] Skupch AM, Dollfuss P, Furbass F, Gritsch G, Hartmann MM, 1392 Perko H, et al. Spatial correlation based artifact detection for automatic seizure detection in EEG. In: Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC). 2013. p. 1972-5. 1395
- [89] Stearns SD. Adaptive signal processing. Prentice Hall; 1985. 1396
- [90] Stevenson N, Rankine L, Mesbah M, Boashash B. Newborn EEG 1397 seizure simulation using time-frequency signal synthesis. In: 1398 Proc. APRS Workshop on Digital Image Computing. 2005. p. 1399 145-51. 1400
- [91] Sweeney K, Ward T, McLoone S. Artifact removal in physiolog-1401 1402 ical signals-practices and possibilities. IEEE Trans Inf Technol Biomed 2012:16:488-500. 1403
- [92] Sweeney K, Ayaz H, Ward TE, Izzetoglu M, McLoone SF, 1404 Onaral B. A methodology for validating artifact removal tech-1405 niques for physiological signals. IEEE Trans Inf Technol Biomed 1406 1407 2012:16:918-26.
- [93] Sweeney K. Motion artifact processing techniques for phys-1408 iological signals. PhD thesis. National University of Ireland 1409 Mavnooth: 2013. 1410
- 1411 [94] Sweeney K, McLoone SF, Ward TE. The use of ensemble empirical mode decomposition with canonical correlation analysis 1412 as a novel artifact removal technique. IEEE Trans Biomed Eng 1413 2013:60:97-105 1414
- [95] Takahashi T, Cho RY, Mizuno T, Kikuchi M, Murata T, Takahashi 1415 K, et al. Antipsychotics reverse abnormal EEG complexity in 1416 drug-naive schizophrenia: a multiscale entropy analysis. Neu-1417 roimage 2010;51:173-82. 1418
- [96] Teixeira AR, Tome AM, Lang EW, Gruber P, Da Silva AM. 1419 1420 Automatic removal of high-amplitude artefacts from singlechannel electroencephalograms. Comput Methods Programs 1421 Biomed 2006;83:125-38. 1422
- [97] Ting K, Fung P, Chang C, Chan F. Automatic correction of arti-1423 1424 fact from single-trial event-related potentials by blind source separation using second order statistics only. Med Eng Phys 1425 2006;28:780-94.

- [98] Turnip A. Automatic artifacts removal of EEG signals using robust principal component analysis. In: Technology, Informatics, Management, Engineering, and Environment (TIME-E), 2014 2nd International Conference. 2014. p. 331-4.
- [99] Turnip A, Junaidi E. Removal artifacts from EEG signal using independent component analysis and principal component analysis. In: Technology, Informatics, Management, Engineering, and Environment (TIME-E), 2014 2nd International Conference. 2014. p. 296-302.
- [100] Vaughan TM, Heetderks W, Trejo L, Rymer W, Weinrich M, Moore M, et al. Brain-computer interface technology: a review of the second international meeting. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil 2003;11:94-109.
- [101] Wallstrom GL, Kass RE, Miller A, Cohn JF, Fox NA. Automatic correction of ocular artifacts in the EEG: a comparison of regression-based and component-based methods. Int J Psychophysiol 2004;53:105-19.
- [102] Wang Z, Xu P, Liu T, Tian Y, Lei X, Yao D. Robust removal of ocular artifacts by combining independent component analysis and system identification. Biomed Signal Process Control 2014;10:250-9.
- [103] Winkler I, Haufe S, Tangermann M. Automatic classification of artifactual ICA-components for artifact removal in EEG signals. Behav Brain Funct 2011;7:30.
- Winkler I, Brandl S, Horn F, Waldburger E, Allefeld C, [104] Tangermann M. Robust artifactual independent component classification for BCI practitioners. J Neural Eng 2014:11:035013.
- [105] Yang Z, Liu W, Keshtkaran MR, Zhou Y, Xu J, Pikov V, et al. A EC-PC threshold estimation method for in vivo neural spike detection. J Neural Eng 2012;9:046017.
- [106] Yong X, Ward RK, Birch GE. Artifact removal in EEG using morphological component analysis. In: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, 2009. ICASSP 2009. IEEE International Conference. 2009. p. 345-8.
- [107] Yong X, Ward RK, Birch GE. Generalized morphological component analysis for EEG source separation and artifact removal. In: Neural Engineering, 2009. NER'09. 4th International IEEE/EMBS Conference. 2009. p. 343-6.
- [108] Zeng H, Song A, Yan R, Qin H. EOG artifact correction from EEG recording using stationary subspace analysis and empirical mode decomposition. Sensors 2013;13:14839-59.
- [109] Zhao C, Qiu T. An automatic ocular artifacts removal method based on wavelet-enhanced canonical correlation analysis. In: Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, EMBC, 2011 Annual International Conference of the IEEE. 2011. p. 4191–4.
- [110] Zhao Q, Hu B, Shi Y, Li Y, Moore P, Sun M, et al. Automatic identification and removal of ocular artifacts in EEG - improved adaptive predictor filtering for portable applications. IEEE Trans Nanobioscience 2014;13:109-17.
- [111] Zou Y, Nathan V, Jafari R. Automatic identification of artifactrelated independent components for artifact removal in EEG recordings. IEEE J Biomed Health Inform 2016;20:73-81.

Please cite this article in press as: Islam MK, et al. Methods for artifact detection and removal from scalp EEG: A review. Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology (2016), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neucli.2016.07.002

1426

1427

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

1434

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439

1440

1441

1442

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

1465

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477