



HAL
open science

Evaluative vs explanatory neurofeedback: What is their impact on athletes' MI-NF performance and cognitive load?

Eléa Rossignol, Pierre Fayol, Margaux Izac, Léa Pilette, Franck Di Rienzo, Etienne Guillaud, Aymeric Guillot, Thomas Michelet, Bernard N'kaoua, Camille Jeunet-Kelway

► **To cite this version:**

Eléa Rossignol, Pierre Fayol, Margaux Izac, Léa Pilette, Franck Di Rienzo, et al.. Evaluative vs explanatory neurofeedback: What is their impact on athletes' MI-NF performance and cognitive load?. Journées CORTICO 2023, May 2023, Paris, France. hal-04211660

HAL Id: hal-04211660

<https://hal.science/hal-04211660>

Submitted on 20 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Evaluative vs explanatory neurofeedback: What is their impact on athletes' MI-NF performance and cognitive load?

Eléa Rossignol¹, Pierre Fayol³, Margaux Izac^{1,2}, Léa Pillette³, Franck Di Rienzo⁴, Etienne Guillaud¹, Aymeric Guillot⁴, Thomas Michelet¹, Bernard N'Kaoua², Camille Jeunet-Kelway¹


¹Université de Bordeaux, CNRS, EPHE, INCIA, UMR5287 F-33000 Bordeaux, France - ²Université de Bordeaux, INSERM, BPH Research Center, UMR1219, Bordeaux, France

³Université de Rennes, Inria, CNRS, IRISA-F35000 Rennes, France - ⁴Laboratoire Interuniversitaire de Biologie de la Motricité (EA 7424, LIBM), Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, 69622 Villeurbanne, France

1. Neurofeedback : Aim

Neurofeedback (NF) enables us to **be aware of our cerebral activity** and find strategies to modify it in order to reach the optimal cerebral activity for a specific cognitive task.

For example : *kinaesthetic motor imagery (MI) generates sensorimotor desynchronisation (SMR-ERD) in the sensorimotor cortex.*



2. Neurofeedback : Limits

Mostly not ecological and abstract.


Lack of usability^[1], generating:

- Lack of transferability in real training environments
- Lack of motivation and usability

NF trainings are **almost exclusively designed with evaluative feedback.**

Conceptual reviews declare that ^[2,3,4,5] :

- **Explanatory feedback** is suited for **novice NF users**
- **Evaluative feedback** is suited for **expert users**



3. How can we improve NF training design?

Using **virtual reality (VR)** to :


- Immerse athletes in their habitual training environment
- Increase their motivation, embodiment and NF performances ^[6,7,8]

Using the **most suited feedback for each user** depending on their **level of expertise** (evaluative, explanatory, both)

4. Aim of our study


Based on aforementioned studies results, we will use VR to :

Identify, for each athlete, neurofeedback characteristics that provide the most relevant information to maximise usability and performance without overloading the athlete.




5. Experimental approach

44 basketball players of different levels (of sport, MI and NF expertise)...



...doing **MI of a specific basketball task...** (free throw)



...while using :

- **VR** (ecological environment + motivation)
- **EEG** (NF + SMR recording)
- **Eye tracking system** (visual focus on feedback) ...



...in presence/absence of explanatory/evaluative feedback,...

...and answering **questionnaires** beforehand and afterwards.


- **Personality** (*BigFive*)
- **MI expertise** (*MIQ-3f + IUQ*)
- **Cognitive Load** (*NASA-TLX*)
- **Usability**

Design:

- **Within-subject** paradigm
- Independent variables
 - **Evaluative NF** (presence/absence)
 - **Explanatory NF** (presence/absence)
- Dependent variables
 - **MI-NF performance** (*SMR-ERD*)
 - **Usability**
 - **Cognitive load**


6. Expected results

MI-NF Performance




- Better MI-NF performance with explanatory NF than without.
- Better MI-NF performance with evaluative NF than without it, what is more when there is no explanatory NF.

Usability



- Better usability with explanatory NF than without.
 - Better usability with evaluative NF than without, only when there is no explanatory NF.
- In other words, explanatory NF is sufficient to reach a high level of usability so in its presence, evaluative NF doesn't have any influence.*

Cognitive Load



- Higher cognitive load with explanatory NF than without.
- Higher cognitive load with evaluative NF than without it, what is more when there is explanatory NF.

Globally, we expect the best MI-NF performances and usability with both explanatory and evaluative feedback combined, despite a high associated cognitive load

7. Let's talk

- What kind of feedback is the most suitable for users to estimate their NF performance?
- What factors are to be considered in priority to maximise NF learning? E.g., are high MI performances a reliable predictor of long-term learning if associated with high workload and low usability?
- What neurophysiological pattern(s) should be reinforced during MI-based NF trainings?

@ elea.rossignol@etu.u-bordeaux.fr

[1] Teillet, S., et al. (2016). *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*

[2] Roc, A., et al. (2021). *Journal of Neural Engineering*.

[3] Shute, V. J. (2008). *Review of Educational Research*.

[4] Magill, R. A. (1994). *Quest*.

[5] Schumacher, J., et al. (2015). *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*.

[6] Jeunet, C. (2016). Phd thesis, Université de Bordeaux

[7] Juliano, J. M., et al. (2020). *Sensors*.

[8] Mercier-Ganady, J., et al. (2014). *IEEE Virtual Reality (VR)*.