

Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning for Electroencephalography-to-Text Generation with Curriculum Learning

Xiachong Feng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin

Harbin Institute of Technology, China

{xiachongfeng, xcfeng, bqin}@ir.hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Electroencephalography-to-Text generation (EEG-to-Text), which aims to directly generate natural text from EEG signals has drawn increasing attention in recent years due to the enormous potential for Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs). However, the remarkable discrepancy between the subject-dependent EEG representation and the semantic-dependent text representation poses a great challenge to this task. To mitigate this challenge, we devise a Curriculum Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning strategy (C-SCL), which effectively recalibrates the subject-dependent EEG representation to the semantic-dependent EEG representation, thus reducing the discrepancy. Specifically, our C-SCL pulls semantically similar EEG representations together while pushing apart dissimilar ones. Besides, in order to introduce more meaningful contrastive pairs, we carefully employ curriculum learning to not only craft meaningful contrastive pairs but also make the learning progressively. We conduct extensive experiments on the ZuCo benchmark and our method combined with diverse models and architectures shows stable improvements across three types of metrics while achieving the new state-of-the-art. Further investigation proves not only its superiority in both the single-subject and low-resource settings but also its robust generalizability in the zero-shot setting¹.

1 Introduction

Devastating neurological conditions such as spinal cord injuries or neuromuscular disorders can suddenly lead to people losing their ability to communicate [Stanger and Cawley, 1996; Claassen *et al.*, 2019]. Such patients may still have intact language and cognitive skills, but injuries might hinder them from expressing themselves [Felgoise *et al.*, 2016]. Fortunately, Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) can restore language abilities to such patients by decoding neural activities into the natural language (Brain-to-Text), which can drastically improve their quality of life [Brumberg *et al.*, 2018].

¹Our codes and models will be made public.




Figure 1: Illustration of the EEG-to-Text generation task. The left part shows the EEG recording process, in which one subject reads a sentence on the screen while recording its EEG signals. Concurrently, the eye-tracking device permits defining exact word boundaries via fixations. Given the recorded EEG signals, the task aims to generate the sentence that stimulates those EEG signals.

To pursue this goal, various Brain-to-Text works are proposed, building upon either *invasive brain recordings*, such as electrocorticography (ECoG) [Anumanchipalli *et al.*, 2019; Makin *et al.*, 2020; Metzger *et al.*, 2022], or *non-invasive brain recordings*, such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) [Zou *et al.*, 2022] and electroencephalography (EEG) [Wang and Ji, 2022]. Amongst, EEG shows its superior benefits in portability and cost-effectiveness in real-world applications, thus EEG-to-Text generation gains a lot of research interest recently [Wang and Ji, 2022; Défossez *et al.*, 2022]. Figure 1 depicts the task flow.

However, we claim that existing studies neglect the discrepancy between the *subject-dependent EEG representation* and the *semantic-dependent text representation*, which inevitably degrades EEG-to-Text model performance. To explain why it becomes a crucial challenge for this task, we present brain topological graphs to intuitively visualize the discrepancy under two situations. Firstly, as shown in Figure 2(a), EEG representations elicited by the same subject skewed towards being similar, no matter what the sentence stimulus is, demonstrating the same subject is prone to favour similar cognitive patterns in the face of different sentence stimuli. Secondly, on the contrary, Figure 2(b) reveals that different subjects act variously even disparately in terms of the same sentence stimulus. These observations are in line with findings in previous studies, including neuroscience [Adolphs, 2002] as well as some machine learning research areas, such as emotion classification [Shen *et al.*, 2022] and visual recognition [Lee *et al.*, 2022]. On this account, such subject-dependent EEG representation nega-

tively impacts the performance of EEG-to-Text model from two perspectives. On the one hand, it introduces a “many-to-one” generation problem (multiple EEG signals correspond to the same sentence), which is challenging for training current sequence-to-sequence generation models. On the other hand, it largely hinders good cross-subject generalizability since transferring original subject-dependent EEG representation to unseen subjects is intractable.

To address this issue, we propose a novel Curriculum Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning strategy (C-SCL), which can effectively re-calibrate the original subject-dependent EEG representation into our desirable semantic-dependent EEG representation so that it can be better adapted to the EEG-to-Text generation task. In detail, the core part of our C-SCL is the Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning strategy (SCL), which aims to maximize the similarities of EEG representations across subjects *w.r.t.* the identical sentence stimulus (positive pairs) while minimizing the similarities of EEG representations *w.r.t.* the different sentence stimuli (negative pairs). Note that the critical ingredient for successful contrastive learning is to construct hard positive and negative pairs. However, based on the random selection, we witness that nearly 45.93% of total constructed contrastive pairs already satisfy the final objective, where positive pairs are similar and negative pairs are dissimilar. Therefore, we manufacture contrastive pairs in different difficulties by pre-computing similarities between numerical EEG signals (e.g., hard positive pairs initially have low similarity while hard negative pairs have high similarity) and drawing support from curriculum learning to not only introduce hard contrastive pairs but also enable a progressive learning process by learning from easy pairs to hard pairs. With the integration of curriculum learning, we finalize our Curriculum Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning strategy (C-SCL).

We conduct experiments on the ZuCo benchmark [Hollenstein *et al.*, 2018; Hollenstein *et al.*, 2020] and evaluate the generation performance via three types of metrics. Experimental results show the effectiveness of our proposed method across various models and architectures. Further investigation empirically shows its benefits in both the single-subject setting and low-resource settings as well as its robust generalizability in the zero-shot setting. In summary: (a) We take the first step to mitigating the challenge of the discrepancy between the subject-dependent EEG representation and the semantic-dependent text representation for the EEG-to-Text generation task; (b) We devise a curriculum semantic-aware contrastive learning strategy that succeeds at yielding the semantic-dependent EEG representation; (c) We conduct extensive experiments on the ZuCo benchmark that demonstrates the effectiveness of our method and its robustness and superior generalizability.

2 Related Work

2.1 Brain-to-Text Generation

Brain-to-Text generation task aims to generate the text given corresponding brain signals. According to the classification criterion of vocabulary size, there are two series of related works: *closed vocabulary* and *open vocabulary* brain-to-text




Figure 2: Brain topological graph of the sentence-level EEG representation (averaged word-level EEG representations). (a) Four topological graphs denote the EEG representations elicited by the same subject in response to four different sentences. (b) Four topological graphs describe the EEG representations elicited by four different subjects corresponding to the same sentence.

generation. The first line of works generates words in small closed vocabularies [Makin *et al.*, 2020; Moses *et al.*, 2021]. For example, Moses *et al.* [2021] focus on a 50-word vocabulary. While exhibiting promising generation accuracy and speed, expanding access to a larger vocabulary enables effective day-to-day communication. Accordingly, Wang and Ji [2022] study the problem of open vocabulary EEG-to-Text decoding task by utilizing pre-trained language models (PLMs) [Lewis *et al.*, 2019]. It brings two benefits: on the one hand, PLMs offer a large vocabulary, on the other hand, PLMs can serve as a bridge between brain signals and linguistic information [Millet *et al.*, 2022]. In our work, we focus on the open vocabulary EEG-to-Text generation due to the non-invasive nature and widespread application prospects of EEG-based BCIs. Specifically, we pay particular attention to the challenge of the discrepancy between the subject-dependent EEG representation and the semantic-dependent text representation for the EEG-to-Text generation task.

2.2 Contrastive Learning

Contrastive learning is a technique that aims to make the representation of a given anchor data to be similar to its positive pairs while being dissimilar to its negative pairs. It shows promising results in computer vision [Hadsell *et al.*, 2006; Chen *et al.*, 2020; He *et al.*, 2020] and has gained popularity in natural language processing [Giorgi *et al.*, 2021; Gao *et al.*, 2021]. After witnessing its superiority in the above areas, contrastive learning is attracting the attention of neuroscientists and has been applied to several EEG-based classification tasks [Mohsenvand *et al.*, 2020; Cheng *et al.*, 2020; Défossez *et al.*, 2022; Shen *et al.*, 2022; Lee *et al.*, 2022]. More recently, Shen *et al.* [2022] propose a contrastive learning method to tackle the cross-subject emotion recognition problem. Défossez *et al.* [2022] devise a contrastive learning objective to align representations of brain signals and natural speech. In our work, we devise a novel curriculum semantic-aware contrastive learning strategy, aiming to learn semantic-dependent EEG representations, which effectively reduce the discrepancy between the EEG and text representations.

	Train	Valid	Test
# pairs	14567	1811	1821
# unique_sent	1061	173	146
# subject	30	30	30
avg.words	19.89	18.80	19.23

Table 1: Statistics for the ZuCo benchmark. “# pairs” means the number of EEG-text pairs, “# unique_sent” represents the number of unique sentences, “# subject” denotes the number of subjects and “avg.words” means the average number of words of sentences.

3 Preliminaries

In this section, we first describe the task formulation and then introduce the ZuCo benchmark.

3.1 Task Formulation

Given a sequence of word-level EEG features \mathbf{E} , EEG-to-Text generation task aims at producing a sentence \mathcal{S} via a model θ , where \mathbf{E} consists of $|\mathbf{E}|$ features $[e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{|\mathbf{E}|}]$ and \mathcal{S} consists of $|\mathcal{S}|$ tokens $[s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{|\mathcal{S}|}]$. $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ symbolizes a word-level EEG feature vector and θ denotes the parameters of a sequence-to-sequence model. Each sequence of EEG features \mathbf{E} is associated with a subject $p_i \in \mathbb{P}$, \mathbb{P} being a set of subjects. During the training phase, EEG-Text pairs come from various subjects and the learning objective. At the test phase, sentences are totally unseen. Besides, the train, valid and test sets maintain the same set of subjects \mathbb{P} .

3.2 ZuCo Benchmark

We use the ZuCo dataset, which is a corpus of EEG signals and eye-tracking data during natural reading. The reading materials are collected from movie reviews and Wikipedia articles. Specifically, following Wang and Ji [2022], we utilize the combination of both ZuCo [Hollenstein *et al.*, 2018] and ZuCo 2.0 [Hollenstein *et al.*, 2020] to form our final ZuCo benchmark. For each EEG-text pair in the dataset, EEG signals are composed of a sequence of word-level EEG features \mathbf{E} . For each word-level feature e , 8 frequency bands are recorded and denoted as the following: theta1 (4-6Hz), theta2 (6.5-8Hz), alpha1 (8.5-10Hz), alpha2 (10.5-13Hz), beta1 (13.5-18Hz) beta2 (18.5-30Hz) and gamma1 (30.5-40Hz) and gamma2 (40-49.5Hz). Each band of the feature has a fixed dimension of 105. We concatenate all 8 bands of features to construct the final word-level feature vector with a dimension of 840 ($e \in \mathbb{R}^{840}$). Additionally, all features are Z-scored as done by Willett *et al.* [2021]. We further split the dataset into train, valid and test (80%,10%,10%) parts following Wang and Ji [2022]. Note that each part of the dataset maintains the same subject set with no overlapping sentences. Table 1 shows the statistics of the ZuCo benchmark².

4 Method

In this section, we thoroughly introduce our curriculum semantic-aware contrastive learning strategy (C-SCL) step

²We omit EGG signals that contain *NaN* values following Wang and Ji [2022]. Therefore, different subjects may associate with different sentence sets.




Figure 3: Illustration of our semantic-aware contrastive learning strategy (SCL). (a) Positive pairs derive from EEG signals corresponding to the same sentence elicited by different subjects. In contrast, (b) Negative pairs come from EEG signals elicited by different subjects corresponding to different sentences.

by step, including (1) semantic-aware contrastive learning, (2) curriculum learning, (3) the backbone model BRAIN-TRANSLATOR and (4) the overall learning procedure.

4.1 Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning

Motivation. The critical ingredient of training a superior model for EEG-to-Text generation is reducing the discrepancy between the *subject-dependent EEG representation* and the *semantic-dependent text representation*. To this end, we draw support from contrastive learning [Hadsell *et al.*, 2006], which is skilled at re-calibrating the representation space, and propose our semantic-aware contrastive learning strategy (SCL) by pulling semantically similar EEG representations together (positive pairs) and pushing apart dissimilar ones (negative pairs). Note that we use intrinsic semantics as a criterion to guide the surface EEG contrastive learning, which implicitly aligns two modalities, thus achieving the *semantic-dependent EEG representation*.

Positive Pairs. One important question in contrastive learning is how to construct positive pairs $(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_i^+)$. Towards achieving our goal of learning semantic-dependent EEG representations, given an anchor EEG representation \mathbf{E}_i with its corresponding sentence \mathcal{S}_i , we randomly choose one EEG \mathbf{E}_i^+ from the positive set \mathbb{E}_i^+ , in which all EEG signals are correspond to the same sentence stimulus \mathcal{S}_i across different subjects, as shown in Figure 3(a). Such positive pairs will promote clustering of semantically similar EEG signals.

Negative Pairs. Practically speaking, original in-batch negatives insufficiently provide weak supervision for contrastive learning. To alleviate this problem, Gao *et al.* [2021] verify that introducing specially designed negative pairs can stimulate the learning process. Inspired by this conclusion, given the anchor EEG representation \mathbf{E}_i elicited by p_i with its corresponding sentence \mathcal{S}_i , we construct the negative pair $(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_i^-)$, where \mathbf{E}_i^- satisfies two conditions³: (1) \mathbf{E}_i^- corresponds to sentences except for \mathcal{S}_i and (2) \mathbf{E}_i^- is elicited by subjects except for p_i . All \mathbf{E}_i^- that satisfy both conditions form the negative set \mathbb{E}_i^- , as shown in Figure 3(b).

³In our preliminary experiments, we consider both two conditions and only the first condition, the results show that considering both conditions can achieve better results.

4.2 Curriculum Learning

Motivation. The key point for effective contrastive learning is to construct hard contrastive pairs. However, after the examination of our SCL, we witness that nearly 45.93% of total constructed contrastive pairs already satisfy the final objective⁴. To overcome this problem, we employ curriculum learning to not only introduce hard contrastive pairs but also ensure the model learning efficiency, thus finalizing our Curriculum Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning strategy (C-SCL). Compared with SCL that randomly selects positive sample and negative sample from \mathbb{E}_i^+ and \mathbb{E}_i^- respectively, C-SCL selects samples in an easy-to-hard order.

Curriculum Criterion. *How to determine the ordering?* Recall that our goal is to introduce hard contrastive pairs, where positive pairs are initially far away from each other while negative pairs are oppositely similar. Therefore, we pre-calculate the cosine similarity between two EEG representations and craft contrastive pairs of varying difficulties by taking the pre-calculated similarity into consideration. Specifically, given an anchor EEG representation \mathbf{E}_i , for positive pair construction, we calculate similarities between the \mathbf{E}_i and all $\mathbf{E}_i^+ \in \mathbb{E}_i^+$ and then sort the \mathbb{E}_i^+ in the descending order, resulting in \mathbb{E}_i^+ . On the contrary, for negative set \mathbb{E}_i^- , we sort it in the ascending order and attain \mathbb{E}_i^- . Both hard positive and negative samples *w.r.t.* the anchor \mathbf{E}_i are located at the end of the \mathbb{E}_i^+ and \mathbb{E}_i^- , respectively. In other words, samples in the \mathbb{E}_i^+ and \mathbb{E}_i^- are now in an easy-to-hard order.

Curriculum Level. *What are the curriculum levels?* We conduct preliminary experiments by setting up the number of curriculum levels from 2 to 5 and finally decide to split the \mathbb{E}_i^+ and \mathbb{E}_i^- into 3 levels due to their better performance. In detail, we split the sorted \mathbb{E}_i^+ into three consecutive sets, including $[\mathbb{E}_i^{\text{easy}+}, \mathbb{E}_i^{\text{medium}+}, \mathbb{E}_i^{\text{hard}+}]$ and \mathbb{E}_i^- into $[\mathbb{E}_i^{\text{easy}-}, \mathbb{E}_i^{\text{medium}-}, \mathbb{E}_i^{\text{hard}-}]$ ⁵.

Curriculum Scheduler. *When to update the curriculum?* We adopt an One-Pass scheduler with a linear pace [Bengio *et al.*, 2009] to progressively train the model in an easy-to-hard order. For example, when reaching to the hard level, given an anchor EEG \mathbf{E}_i , we select positive sample and negative sample from $\mathbb{E}_i^{\text{hard}+}$ and $\mathbb{E}_i^{\text{hard}-}$, respectively.

4.3 Backbone Model

Our backbone model BRAINTRANSLATOR inherits a typical Encoder-Decoder framework, which first encodes a sequence of word-level EEG features \mathbf{E} to distributed representations and then generates the target sentence \mathcal{S} with the decoder. Concretely, the model is composed of the *pre-encoder* and the *pre-trained seq2seq model*, in which the pre-encoder serves as a bridge between representation spaces of EEG and text.

⁴We run SCL for 10 epochs on the ZuCo train set, resulting in 145670 (14567×10) contrastive triples, in which 66906 triples already satisfy the final objective, leading to $\frac{66906}{145670} = 45.93\%$.

⁵Example contrastive pairs of different difficulties are shown in the supplementary file.

Algorithm 1: Curriculum Semantic-aware Contrastive Learning

Input: EEG \mathbf{E}_i with its corresponding subject p_i and sentence \mathcal{S}_i ; a dict $f_s : \mathcal{S}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}_i}$ maps \mathcal{S}_i to a set of EEG signals $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}_i}$; a dict $f_p : p_i \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{p_i}$ maps p_i to a set of EEG signals \mathbb{E}_{p_i} ; a set of all sentences \mathcal{S} ; current curriculum level `curr_level`;

Output: a contrastive triple $(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_i^+, \mathbf{E}_i^-)$.

```

1 Function C_SCL( $\mathbf{E}_i$ , curr_level):
   | // positive sample
2    $\mathbb{E}_i^+ = f_s(\mathcal{S}_i) \setminus \mathbf{E}_i$ ;
3    $\mathbb{E}_i^+ = \text{cur\_cri}(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbb{E}_i^+, \text{descending})$ ;
4   curriculums = cur\_lev( $\mathbb{E}_i^+$ );
5    $\mathbf{E}_i^+ = \text{cur\_sche}(\text{curriculums}, \text{curr\_level})$ ;
   | // negative sample
6    $\mathbb{E}_i^- = f_s(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_i) - f_p(p_i)$ ;
7    $\mathbb{E}_i^- = \text{cur\_cri}(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbb{E}_i^-, \text{ascending})$ ;
8   curriculums = cur\_lev( $\mathbb{E}_i^-$ );
9    $\mathbf{E}_i^- = \text{cur\_sche}(\text{curriculums}, \text{curr\_level})$ ;
10  return  $(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_i^+, \mathbf{E}_i^-)$ ;

   | // curriculum criterion
11 Function cur\_cri( $\mathbf{E}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}$ , order):
12   sims = list();
13   for  $\mathbf{E}_j \in \mathbb{E}$  do
14     | sim_j = cosine\_similarity( $\mathbf{E}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_j$ );
15     | sims.append(sim_j);
16   indices = sims.sort(order);
17   return  $\mathbb{E}[\text{indices}]$ ;

   | // curriculum level
18 Function cur\_lev( $\mathbb{E}$ ):
19    $[\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}}, \mathbb{E}^{\text{medium}}, \mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}}] = \text{split}(\mathbb{E})$ ;
20   return  $[\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}}, \mathbb{E}^{\text{medium}}, \mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}}]$ ;

   | // curriculum scheduler
21 Function cur\_sche(curriculums, curr_level):
22    $\mathbb{E}^{\text{select}} = \text{select}(\text{curriculums}, \text{curr\_level})$ ;
23    $\mathbf{E} = \text{random\_select}(\mathbb{E}^{\text{select}})$ ;
24   return  $\mathbf{E}$ ;

```

Formally speaking, the overall model is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{E}^{N_1} &= \text{Pre-Encoder}(\mathbf{E}) \stackrel{N_1}{:=} \text{FFN}(\text{ATT}(\mathbf{E}^{n-1})) \\
 \mathbf{X}^{N_1+N_2} &= \text{Pre-trained Encoder}(\mathbf{E}^{N_1}) \\
 &\quad \stackrel{N_2}{:=} \text{FFN}(\text{ATT}(\mathbf{X}^{n-1})) \\
 \mathbf{Y}^M &= \text{Pre-trained Decoder}(\mathbf{Y}^0, \mathbf{X}^{N_1+N_2}) \\
 &\quad \stackrel{M}{:=} \text{FFN}(\text{ATT}(\text{ATT}(\mathbf{Y}^{m-1}), \mathbf{X}^{N_1+N_2}))
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\stackrel{N}{:=}$ denotes N identical encoding layers and $\stackrel{M}{:=}$ denotes M decoding layers. \mathbf{Y}^0 describes the shifted right version of \mathcal{S} , $\text{FFN}(\cdot)$ represents a position-wise feed-forward network, and $\text{ATT}(\cdot)$ represents a multi-head attention⁶.

⁶Detailed illustration for BRAINTRANSLATOR is shown in the supplementary file.

Model	ROUGE(%) \uparrow			BLEU(%) \uparrow				WER(%) \downarrow
	R-1	R-2	R-L	B-1	B-2	B-3	B-4	
BRAINBART-LARGE [Wang and Ji, 2022]	37.85	18.83	35.92	34.79	24.38	19.58	17.02	70.31
BRAINBART-LARGE (w/ SCL)	38.71	20.05	36.73	35.65	25.74	21.31	18.96	69.12
BRAINBART-LARGE (w/ C-SCL)	39.14	20.35	37.12	35.91	25.96	21.31	18.89	68.48
BRAINBART-BASE	36.46	17.75	34.23	33.64	23.60	18.78	16.23	73.01
BRAINBART-BASE (w/ SCL)	36.70	17.92	34.55	34.18	24.07	19.31	16.79	72.27
BRAINBART-BASE (w/ C-SCL)	37.01	18.05	34.69	34.55	24.39	19.61	17.04	71.65
BRAINPEGASUS-LARGE	37.50	16.10	34.27	34.56	22.57	17.07	14.26	76.21
BRAINPEGASUS-LARGE (w/ SCL)	39.34	18.07	35.83	36.35	24.74	19.38	16.62	74.54
BRAINPEGASUS-LARGE (w/ C-SCL)	40.18	19.20	36.72	37.24	25.89	20.63	17.92	73.43
BRAINPEGASUS-BASE	36.70	14.37	33.23	33.74	21.05	14.80	11.53	78.19
BRAINPEGASUS-BASE (w/ SCL)	36.74	15.33	33.29	33.84	21.88	16.38	13.60	77.95
BRAINPEGASUS-BASE (w/ C-SCL)	37.27	15.21	33.66	34.20	21.73	16.26	13.50	76.59
BRAINT5-LARGE	32.17	12.12	29.81	30.43	19.24	13.48	10.32	83.69
BRAINT5-LARGE (w/ SCL)	32.65	14.84	30.33	31.06	20.80	15.87	13.25	82.61
BRAINT5-LARGE (w/ C-SCL)	32.87	14.87	30.54	31.18	20.91	15.98	13.40	81.91
BRAINT5-BASE	31.12	7.77	27.65	27.05	13.31	6.44	3.38	86.46
BRAINT5-BASE (w/ SCL)	31.37	8.56	28.17	28.38	14.90	8.08	4.81	86.15
BRAINT5-BASE (w/ C-SCL)	31.38	8.63	28.15	28.46	14.95	8.06	4.86	85.10

Table 2: Test set results on the ZuCo benchmark. \uparrow means higher is better. \downarrow means lower is better.

4.4 Learning Procedure

The overall training process follows a two-step manner.

Firstly, we adopt our C-SCL to train the pre-encoder, Algorithm 1 shows the entire strategy. Formally, we have the contrastive triple $(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{E}_i^+, \mathbf{E}_i^-)$ for a given anchor \mathbf{E}_i . After the transformation of the pre-encoder, we can get $(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i^+, \mathbf{h}_i^-)$, where \mathbf{h}_i is the averaged vector of the outputs of the pre-encoder. Following the contrastive framework in Gao *et al.* [2021], we minimize the cross-entropy loss ℓ_i defined by (N is the mini-batch size):

$$\ell_i = -\log \frac{e^{\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i^+) / \tau}}{\sum_{j=1}^N (e^{\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i^+) / \tau} + e^{\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_i^-) / \tau})} \quad (2)$$

where τ is a temperature hyperparameter⁷. $\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_i, \mathbf{h}_j)$ is the cosine similarity. Note that our SCL works in an on-line manner, which means both positive and negative pairs are constructed dynamically along with the training process. This increases the distribution of contrastive pairs, thus improving training efficiency.

Secondly, based on the contrastive-trained pre-encoder, we jointly fine-tune all the parameters of the BRAINTRANSLATOR to minimize the cross-entropy loss in a parallel training corpus (\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{S}) :

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{S}) \in (\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{S})} \log p(\mathbf{S} | \mathbf{E}; \theta) \quad (3)$$

5 Experiments

5.1 Baseline Models

We adopt the previous state-of-the-art BRAINBART [Wang and Ji, 2022] as our baseline model, which is composed

⁷The key for successful EEG contrastive training is the tiny τ , we show our parameter search experiments in the supplementary file.

of the Transformer pre-encoder⁸ and the BART pre-trained seq2seq model [Lewis *et al.*, 2019]. Besides, we further employ other two types of widely used pre-trained seq2seq models, including PEGASUS [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] and T5 [Raffel *et al.*, 2020], building upon the Transformer pre-encoder to form BRAINPEGASUS and BRAINT5 respectively. All the above three models come in two model-size variants, including LARGE and BASE, leading to six models in total.

5.2 Evaluation Protocol

Following Wang and Ji [2022], we adopt ROUGE [Lin, 2004] and BLEU [Papineni *et al.*, 2002] for evaluating our EEG-to-Text generation task. Besides, following Metzger *et al.* [2022], we also adopt Word Error Rate (WER) as our metric to examine more fine-grained generation performance.

5.3 Implementation Details

Our pre-encoder consists of 6 layers, each with 8 heads and a hidden dimension of 2048. The dimension of the input EEG representation is 840. For the contrastive training process, we use Adam with learning rate of 0.001 with a batch size of 32. τ is set to 0.00001. For the overall training process, we first load the checkpoint of contrastive-trained pre-encoder and then fine-tune the whole model using Adam with learning rate of $2e-5$ and batch size of 32. For the generation process, following Wang and Ji [2022], we equip our model with greedy decoding to produce final sentences. For all three metrics, we use standard implementations provided by HuggingFace⁹.

⁸We also try Conformer [Gulati *et al.*, 2020] as the pre-encoder. However, the experimental results show no major difference. Accordingly, we keep using the Transformer pre-encoder in our paper.

⁹<https://github.com/huggingface/evaluate>




Figure 4: t-SNE visualization of sentence-level EEG representations of sentences in the training set, which are (a) original EEG representations and (b) generated by the pre-encoder after C-SCL. Different colours mean different subjects. Each dot represents a sentence. The red box dots represent the EEG representations corresponding to the same sentence “He and his wife had seven children”.

6 Results

6.1 Automatic Evaluation

Table 2 shows the performance of our SCL and C-SCL on the ZuCo benchmark. Overall, we can find that SCL can consistently attain strong performance across various baseline models and architectures. With the enhancement of curriculum learning, C-SCL can further boost performance. Except for the main observations, our empirical results also demonstrate the following two findings. Firstly, BART performs well. Although this finding is exclusively derived from results based on three pre-trained seq2seq models, it still provides the guideline for choosing future backbone seq2seq models for EEG-to-Text generation task: choosing task-agnostic language models (e.g., BART) rather than task-oriented models (e.g., PEGASUS for summarization and T5 requiring task prompts). Secondly, EEG-to-Text generation also follows the scaling law, which means the generation performance scales up with the increasing number of model parameters.

6.2 Analysis

Embedding visualization. To verify whether our C-SCL can achieve learning semantic-dependent EEG representations. We give a straightforward comparison via t-SNE between the original EEG representations (Figure 4(a)) and EEG representations obtained after the transformation of the contrastive-trained pre-encoder (Figure 4(b)). We can easily observe that our learned EEG representations of the same sentence tend to be closer compared with original desultorily distributed ones. This result coincides with our initial goal. Besides, Figure 4(a) also shows distinct subject clusters (different colours)¹⁰ while Figure 4(b) reveals the more equally distributed subjects. Nevertheless, Figure 4(b) also shows the EEG representations of the same sentence are not fully clustered. Instead, multiple sub-clusters are formed, which indicates achieving a desirable semantic-dependent EEG representation space is a challenging task.

¹⁰We provide subject labels for each distinct cluster in the supplementary file.




Figure 5: Results of different methods testing on 4 subjects respectively, including both male and female, youth and middle-aged, e.g., ZPH-male-26 describes the subject identified as ZPH, is male and 26 years old. BRAINBART-LARGE (Single) means that training and testing on the data of a single subject. Others mean that training on the whole data while testing on the data of a single subject.

Single-subject setting. Given that the subject-dependent EEG representation poses a great challenge to the EEG-to-Text generation task, in this analysis, we aim to answer one question: *Whether single-subject training is a more suitable way for the EEG-to-Text generation task?* To verify this, we test both mixed-subjects training and single-subject training methods on data of 4 distinct subjects. The results are shown in Figure 5. Compared with single-subject training, all other three mixed-subjects training methods achieve remarkable improvements, which precisely indicate that it is worth exploring mixed-subjects training methods. Besides, the results also show the effectiveness of our proposed SCL and C-SCL at a more fine-grained level.

Low-resource setting. To verify the robustness of our methods on varying data sizes, we provide datasets of different sizes to train the pre-encoder using SCL and C-SCL, then fine-tune the whole model. Note that the size of the test set is the same across all experiments. The results are shown in Figure 6. We can find that the model performance clearly improves with the growing of dataset size in terms of different types of metrics. Prominently, our methods show great advantages in the low-resource setting. Especially when only using 25% of the dataset, our C-SCL can directly reduce the WER from 92.83% to 78.89%, achieving comparable results compared with using 50% of the dataset.

Zero-shot setting. To verify the generalizability of our methods, we conduct zero-shot experiments by training on the partial ZuCo dataset, which excludes the data of one selected test subject. The results are shown in Figure 7. We




Figure 6: Results of different training data sizes.




Figure 7: Zero-shot results by training on data that excluded the final test subject.

can see that our methods yield strong performance for unseen ZPH and ZKB respectively. We attribute this good generalizability to the fact that contrastive learning not only learns better representations for currently available subjects but also optimizes a distinguishable representation space that can be easily transferred and adapted to unseen subjects.

Single-curriculum setting. To verify the necessity of curriculum learning for our C-SCL. We individually perform SCL based on contrastive pairs from each curriculum level, including $SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}})$, $SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{medium}})$ and $SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}})$. Then, we select one third of the data from each curriculum level and conduct C-SCL based on the fixed $[\frac{\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}}}{3}, \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\text{medium}}}{3}, \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}}}{3}]$. Note that all the above contrastive learning datasets keep the same size and the fine-tuning is based on the whole ZuCo train part. The results are shown in Table 3. Firstly, we can find that curriculum learning indeed does good to the model performance. Besides, both $SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}})$ and $SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}})$ achieve relatively lower results. We attribute this fact to that easy pairs are insignificant but directly leveraging hard pairs is quite challenging for the model learning.

	R-1↑	B-1↑	WER↓
$SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}})$	37.89	34.82	70.05
$SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{medium}})$	38.21	35.10	69.83
$SCL(\mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}})$	37.92	35.08	70.09
$C-SCL([\frac{\mathbb{E}^{\text{easy}}}{3}, \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\text{medium}}}{3}, \frac{\mathbb{E}^{\text{hard}}}{3}])$	38.52	35.34	69.49

Table 3: Results of different curriculum levels.

6.3 Case Study

Figure 8 shows the generation case. We can find that our method can generate the same sentence for EEG signals

Baseline: BrainBART	
ZPH	He was educated radio in famous Railroad and the serveded for York City government to prompt workings of the radio.
ZKB	He was born founding in the famous Railroad and and grownwed up in York City leded for its United.
ZJM	He was a member in the Alamo Railroad and lived in York City government to allow from the govered.
Our: BrainBART (w/ C-SCL)	
ZPH	He was a member in various famous Railroad and the serveded for President York City Senate to havecede from the United.
ZKB	
ZJM	
Golden	
ZPH	He was a participant in the Underground Railroad, and even petitioned the New York state Legislature to secede from the Union in a protest against slavery.
ZKB	
ZJM	

Figure 8: Generations for EEG signals of different subjects. The EEG signals correspond to the same sentence. “ZPH”, “ZKB”, and “ZJM” are three subjects.

elicited by different subjects based on learned semantic-dependent EEG representations, whereas the baseline model produces different ones. Besides, our result is more semantic-related compared with baseline results, which indicates the semantic-dependent EEG representation can enhance the generation performance. However, there still exists a large gap between our generation and the golden reference. We believe future works should pay attention to the following research directions: (1) Strategies by jointly modelling continuous word-level EEG signals and the syntactic structure of sentences, since current generation still failed to capture the linguistic structure; (2) Strategies to close the gap between the word-level EEG feature and token-level generation, since current generation still has several spelling errors.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a curriculum semantic-aware contrastive learning strategy (C-SCL) to reduce the discrepancy between the subject-dependent EEG representation and the semantic-dependent text representation. The experimental results based on the ZuCo benchmark demonstrate its effectiveness for the EEG-to-Text generation task. Besides, our analyses also verify the robustness and superior generalizability of our C-SCL in the low-resource setting and the zero-shot setting, respectively. Moreover, single-subject setting experiments also point the necessity of exploring mixed-subjects training methods for the EEG-to-Text generation task.

References

- [Adolphs, 2002] Ralph Adolphs. Neural systems for recognizing emotion. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 12(2):169–177, 2002.
- [Anumanchipalli *et al.*, 2019] Gopala K Anumanchipalli, Josh Chartier, and Edward F Chang. Speech synthesis from neural decoding of spoken sentences. *Nature*, 568(7753):493–498, 2019.
- [Bengio *et al.*, 2009] Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*, pages 41–48, 2009.
- [Brumberg *et al.*, 2018] Jonathan S Brumberg, Kevin M Pitt, Alana Mantie-Kozlowski, and Jeremy D Burnison. Brain-computer interfaces for augmentative and alternative communication: A tutorial. *American journal of speech-language pathology*, 27(1):1–12, 2018.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2020] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020.
- [Cheng *et al.*, 2020] Joseph Y. Cheng, Hanlin Goh, Kaan Dogrusoz, Oncel Tuzel, and Erdrin Azemi. Subject-aware contrastive learning for biosignals. *ArXiv*, abs/2007.04871, 2020.
- [Claassen *et al.*, 2019] Jan Claassen, Kevin Doyle, Adu Matory, Caroline Couch, Kelly M Burger, Angela Velazquez, Joshua U Okonkwo, Jean-Rémi King, Soojin Park, Sachin Agarwal, et al. Detection of brain activation in unresponsive patients with acute brain injury. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 380(26):2497–2505, 2019.
- [Défossez *et al.*, 2022] Alexandre Défossez, Charlotte Caucheteux, Jérémy Rapin, Ori Kabeli, and Jean-Rémi King. Decoding speech from non-invasive brain recordings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.12266*, 2022.
- [Felgoise *et al.*, 2016] Stephanie H Felgoise, Vincenzo Zaccaro, Jason Duff, and Zachary Simmons. Verbal communication impacts quality of life in patients with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis and Frontotemporal Degeneration*, 17(3-4):179–183, 2016.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2021] Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6894–6910, 2021.
- [Giorgi *et al.*, 2021] John Giorgi, Osvald Nitski, Bo Wang, and Gary Bader. DeCLUTR: Deep contrastive learning for unsupervised textual representations. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 879–895, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Gulati *et al.*, 2020] Anmol Gulati, James Qin, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Niki Parmar, Yu Zhang, Jiahui Yu, Wei Han, Shibo Wang, Zhengdong Zhang, Yonghui Wu, and Ruoming Pang. Conformer: Convolution-augmented transformer for speech recognition. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.08100, 2020.
- [Hadsell *et al.*, 2006] Raia Hadsell, Sumit Chopra, and Yann LeCun. Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. In *2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'06)*, volume 2, pages 1735–1742. IEEE, 2006.
- [He *et al.*, 2020] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020.
- [Hollenstein *et al.*, 2018] Nora Hollenstein, Jonathan Rotzstejn, Marius Troendle, Andreas Pedroni, Ce Zhang, and Nicolas Langer. Zuco, a simultaneous eeg and eye-tracking resource for natural sentence reading. *Scientific data*, 5(1):1–13, 2018.
- [Hollenstein *et al.*, 2020] Nora Hollenstein, Marius Troendle, Ce Zhang, and Nicolas Langer. ZuCo 2.0: A dataset of physiological recordings during natural reading and annotation. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 138–146, Marseille, France, May 2020. European Language Resources Association.
- [Lee *et al.*, 2022] Pilhyeon Lee, Sunhee Hwang, Jewook Lee, Minjung Shin, Seogkyu Jeon, and Hyeran Byun. Inter-subject contrastive learning for subject adaptive eeg-based visual recognition. In *2022 10th International Winter Conference on Brain-Computer Interface (BCI)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2022.
- [Lewis *et al.*, 2019] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019.
- [Lin, 2004] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- [Makin *et al.*, 2020] Joseph G Makin, David A Moses, and Edward F Chang. Machine translation of cortical activity to text with an encoder–decoder framework. *Nature neuroscience*, 23(4):575–582, 2020.
- [Metzger *et al.*, 2022] Sean L Metzger, Jessie R Liu, David A Moses, Maximilian E Dougherty, Margaret P Seaton, Kaylo T Littlejohn, Josh Chartier, Gopala K Anumanchipalli, Adelyn Tu-Chan, Karunesh Ganguly, et al. Generalizable spelling using a speech neuroprosthesis in an individual with severe limb and vocal paralysis. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):1–15, 2022.

- [Millet *et al.*, 2022] Juliette Millet, Charlotte Caucheteux, Pierre Orhan, Yves Boubenec, Alexandre Gramfort, Ewan Dunbar, Christophe Pallier, and Jean-Remi King. Toward a realistic model of speech processing in the brain with self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01685*, 2022.
- [Mohsenvand *et al.*, 2020] Mostafa Neo Mohsenvand, Mohammad Rasool Izadi, and Pattie Maes. Contrastive representation learning for electroencephalogram classification. In Emily Alsentzer, Matthew B. A. McDermott, Fabian Falck, Suproteem K. Sarkar, Subhrajit Roy, and Stephanie L. Hyland, editors, *Proceedings of the Machine Learning for Health NeurIPS Workshop*, volume 136 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 238–253. PMLR, 11 Dec 2020.
- [Moses *et al.*, 2021] David A Moses, Sean L Metzger, Jessie R Liu, Gopala K Anumanchipalli, Joseph G Makin, Pengfei F Sun, Josh Chartier, Maximilian E Dougherty, Patricia M Liu, Gary M Abrams, et al. Neuroprosthesis for decoding speech in a paralyzed person with anarthria. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 385(3):217–227, 2021.
- [Papineni *et al.*, 2002] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002.
- [Raffel *et al.*, 2020] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, Peter J Liu, et al. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.
- [Shen *et al.*, 2022] Xinke Shen, Xianggen Liu, Xin Hu, Dan Zhang, and Sen Song. Contrastive learning of subject-invariant eeg representations for cross-subject emotion recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 2022.
- [Stanger and Cawley, 1996] Carol A Stanger and Michael F Cawley. Demographics of rehabilitation robotics users. *Technology and Disability*, 5(2):125–137, 1996.
- [Wang and Ji, 2022] Zhenhailong Wang and Heng Ji. Open vocabulary electroencephalography-to-text decoding and zero-shot sentiment classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 5350–5358, 2022.
- [Willett *et al.*, 2021] Francis R Willett, Donald T Avansino, Leigh R Hochberg, Jaimie M Henderson, and Krishna V Shenoy. High-performance brain-to-text communication via handwriting. *Nature*, 593(7858):249–254, 2021.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2020] Jingqing Zhang, Yao Zhao, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter Liu. Pegasus: Pre-training with extracted gap-sentences for abstractive summarization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11328–11339. PMLR, 2020.
- [Zou *et al.*, 2022] Shuxian Zou, Shaonan Wang, Jiajun Zhang, and Chengqing Zong. Cross-modal cloze task: A new task to brain-to-word decoding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 648–657, 2022.

BRAINTRANSLATOR

BRAINTRANSLATOR takes word-level EEG features as input and produces the corresponding sentence. It mainly consists of three parts: (a) Word-Level EEG Feature Construction that concatenates features of different bands of one word to form the final word-level EEG feature. (b) Pre-encoder that transforms original EEG features into the pre-trained Seq2Seq embedding space, and (c) Pre-trained Seq2Seq that takes a sequence of transformed embeddings and produces the final output sentence. The number in the rectangle denotes the dimension of the vector. The overall architecture is shown in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Illustration of the BRAINTRANSLATOR.

Parameter Search for τ




Figure 10: Contrastive training loss with respect to different τ .

Figure 10 shows the contrastive training loss under different τ ¹¹. We can find that setting τ to a small number is critical for

¹¹The figure is obtained via <https://wandb.ai/>

successful EEG contrastive training. This is due the original EEG signals are similar to each other, a small τ can produce more distinguishable EEG representations, thus enabling the effective contrastive learning. We conduct preliminary experiments and find that setting τ to 0.00001 yields better EEG-to-Text generation performance.

Example Contrastive Pairs




Figure 11: Contrastive pairs of different difficulties.

Figure 11 provides two examples for contrastive pairs of different difficulties. We can clearly find that the easy pair already satisfy the condition: positive pairs are similar while negative pairs are dissimilar. In contrast, the hard contrastive pair instead follows the condition: positive pairs are dissimilar while negative pairs are similar.

t-SNE Visualization of Original EEG Signals




Figure 12: t-SNE visualization of sentence-level EEG representations of sentences in the ZuCo train set. Each dot represents a sentence. Different colours mean different subjects. Distinct clusters are labelled with corresponding subjects.

We project sentence-level EEG representation of each sentence in the training set (averaged word-level EEG representations of sentences) to two-dimensional space via t-SNE, as shown in Figure 12. We can clearly find that the EEG representations elicited by the same subject tend to be closer.