Proceedings of CONF-SPML 2026 Symposium: The 2nd Neural Computing and Applications Workshop 2025
DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

Deep Analysis of BCI Neural Signals Based on AI Intent Prediction

Haoze Li

School of Digital Science, Shanghai Lida University, Shanghai, China
1492948238@qq.com

Abstract. In recent years, Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) technology has advanced rapidly, emerging as a critical bridge between the human brain and external devices with promising applications in medical rehabilitation, intelligent control, and other fields. However, the accurate parsing of neural signals and efficient prediction of user intent remain key challenges that hinder the widespread practical implementation of BCI systems. This study focuses on the deep analysis of BCI neural signals based on AI intent prediction, aiming to address two core research questions: how to enhance the accuracy of AI-based intent prediction through in-depth neural signal analysis, and which AI algorithms are most suitable for processing BCI neural signal data. First, relevant research progress was systematically summarized through a literature review. Then, the characteristics of BCI neural signals were analyzed using data analysis techniques. Finally, the effectiveness of different AI algorithms was verified via algorithm simulation. The research results demonstrate that integrating advanced AI algorithms with deep neural signal analysis technology can significantly improve the accuracy of intent prediction. This finding not only provides a new approach to overcoming the existing bottlenecks in BCI technology but also lays a theoretical and practical foundation for the further development and application of BCI systems.

Keywords: AI Intent Prediction, Brain-Computer Interface (BCI), Neural Signal Analysis, BCI Technology

1. Introduction

BCI technology, which establishes direct communication between the human brain and external devices without relying on traditional peripheral nervous systems, has gained wide attention from academia and industry. In medical rehabilitation, it offers hope to patients with severe motor disabilities (e.g., amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) or spinal cord injuries) by enabling control of assistive devices via thoughts [1]. In intelligent control, it has the potential to revolutionize human-computer interaction in virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR).

Despite promising prospects, BCI systems face critical challenges. Low intent prediction accuracy is a major issue: neural signals are complex, variable, and easily contaminated by physiological artifacts (e.g., eye blinks, muscle tension) and environmental electromagnetic interference, complicating feature extraction and intent decoding [2]. Latency is another bottleneck;

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

even a few hundred milliseconds of delay can degrade performance in real-time tasks like prosthesis control.

To address these challenges, researchers increasingly integrate AI with BCI neural signal analysis. Machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) excel at processing high-dimensional data and identifying subtle patterns, aligning with neural decoding needs. This paper explores how AI-driven intent prediction can deepen BCI signal interpretation, improving accuracy and reducing latency.

The study adopted a three-step approach: (1) a systematic literature review to map advances in BCI and AI intent prediction, identifying gaps; (2) data analysis to characterize BCI neural signals (complexity, variability, low amplitude, noise vulnerability) to guide AI model selection; (3) algorithm simulations to benchmark classical ML (Support Vector Machines, Linear Discriminant Analysis) and DL (Convolutional Neural Networks, Recurrent Neural Networks, Transformers) for signal decoding and intent prediction.

This study is significant theoretically (advancing knowledge of BCI-AI synergy) and practically (guiding BCI system design to enhance performance and promote applications in medicine, industry, and daily life) [3].

2. Overview of BCI and AI intent prediction

2.1. Basic principles of BCI technology

BCI works by capturing neural signals, processing them, and converting results into commands, forming a direct brain-external device link. A standard system includes five stages:

Signal Acquisition: Captures neural signals via invasive (electrodes implanted in brain tissue, high resolution but risky) or non-invasive (EEG, MEG, fNIRS; safer but lower signal quality) methods [4].

Preprocessing: Removes noise/artifacts using filtering (low-pass, high-pass), artifact suppression (e.g., independent component analysis for eye blinks), and normalization.

Feature Extraction: Isolates task-relevant features (time-domain: amplitude, latency; frequency-domain: power spectral density; time-frequency: wavelet coefficients).

Classification/Recognition: Uses ML/DL to translate features into user intent (e.g., distinguishing left/right hand motor imagery).

Application Interface: Converts intent into device commands (e.g., controlling prostheses or wheelchairs) [5].

2.2. Development status of AI intent prediction

AI intent prediction in BCI involves decoding neural signals to discern user intent, with rapid progress driven by ML/DL.

2.2.1. Traditional ML

Support Vector Machines (SVM): Finds optimal hyperplanes to maximize class margins, performing well in high-dimensional spaces (e.g., motor-imagery decoding, P300 speller tasks) [6].

Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA): Reduces dimensions by maximizing between-class/within-class scatter ratio, offering high accuracy with low computational cost for linearly separable data.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

2.2.2. Deep learning

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs): Captures spatial structure in signals (e.g., EEG electrode activity distribution) via convolutional layers [7].

Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs): (LSTM/GRU variants) model temporal dependencies, ideal for dynamic BCI tasks.

Transformers: Uses self-attention to capture long-range dependencies, effective for complex temporal neural signals [8].

Challenges remain: inter-individual neural variability, signal drift (due to fatigue/mood), and scarce annotated data limiting model generalization.

2.3. Significance of combining BCI and AI intent prediction

Improved Accuracy: AI (especially DL) automatically learns complex features from raw signals, capturing low-level (amplitude/frequency) and high-level (motor imagery patterns) information [9].

Reduced Latency: Lightweight AI models embedded in edge devices eliminate delays from heavy signal processing.

Enhanced Adaptability: AI learns user-specific neural patterns and adjusts in real-time, enabling personalized control without manual recalibration. It also fuses multi-modal data (EEG, MEG, ECG) for richer intent inference [10].

Advanced Neuroscience: AI uncovers brain function mechanisms by analyzing large neural datasets.

3. Characteristics and acquisition of BCI neural signals

3.1. Characteristics of BCI neural signals

3.1.1. Complexity and variability

Neural signals are complex due to non-linear, non-stationary interactions of billions of neurons. Variability stems from: (1) inter-individual differences (anatomy, activation patterns); (2) intra-individual drift (fatigue, mood, attention); (3) recording context (electrode placement, task instructions) [11]. Traditional signal processing (assuming stationarity/linearity) struggles, leading to low BCI accuracy.

3.1.2. Weakness and noise interference

Neural signals are weak (EEG: microvolts (μV), vs. ECG/EMG: millivolts (mV)). Noise includes:

Physiological: Eye blinks, muscle tension, heartbeat.

Environmental: Power-line hum (50/60 Hz), electronic interference [12].

Noise suppression (filtering, artifact removal) is critical but imperfect; filters may distort signals, and artifact-rejection tools do not eliminate all noise.

3.2. Acquisition methods of BCI neural signals

3.2.1. Invasive acquisition technology

Implants electrodes directly into brain tissue for high-resolution, high signal-to-noise ratio data:

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

Intracortical BCIs: Microelectrodes in the cerebral cortex capture single-neuron activity, enabling precise control (e.g., monkey-operated robotic arms) [13].

ECoG BCIs: Electrodes on the cortex capture broader activity, with better spatial resolution than EEG.

Limitations: Surgical risks (infection, hemorrhage), long-term signal degradation (scar tissue), high cost, and specialized expertise needs [14].

3.2.2. Non-invasive acquisition technology

Captures signals from the scalp without surgery, suitable for widespread use:

EEG: Dominant method, with millisecond temporal resolution, low cost, and portability, but low spatial resolution and high noise.

MEG: Detects magnetic fields, offering better spatial resolution than EEG but requiring expensive shielded rooms.

fNIRS: Measures brain blood oxygenation, portable and low-cost but with low temporal (seconds) and spatial resolution [15].

fMRI: Tracks blood flow for high spatial resolution but slow (seconds/minutes), unsuitable for real-time BCI.

4. AI algorithms for BCI neural signal analysis and intent prediction

4.1. Traditional machine learning algorithms

4.1.1. Support Vector Machines (SVM)

A supervised classifier that maximizes class margins via optimal hyperplanes. In BCI, it decodes neural signals (e.g., distinguishing left/right hand motor imagery) using temporal/spectral features.

Advantages: Performs well in high-dimensional spaces, effective with small samples, handles non-linearity via kernels (linear, polynomial, RBF) [16].

Limitations: High computational complexity for large datasets, sensitive to kernel/regularization parameters requiring extensive cross-validation.

4.1.2. Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA)

Reduces dimensions by maximizing between-class/within-class scatter ratio, used for feature reduction and classification in BCI.

Advantages: Fast training/testing, interpretable linear boundaries, high accuracy for linearly separable data (e.g., P300 spelling).

Limitations: Relies on assumptions (multivariate normal distribution, common covariance matrix) violated by neural signals, sensitive to outliers.

4.2. Deep learning algorithms

4.2.1. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN)

Adapts to 1D neural signals via convolutional (extracts local features), pooling (downsamples), and fully connected (integrates features) layers. In BCI, it learns spatial-temporal patterns from raw EEG (e.g., motor imagery) without manual feature engineering.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

Advantages: Automatically learns hierarchical features, good generalization, real-time processing via lightweight architectures and GPU/TPU acceleration [17].

Limitations: Requires large labeled datasets (risk of overfitting with small data), high computational load for deep architectures.

4.2.2. Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN)

Processes sequential data via a hidden state carrying temporal information. LSTM/GRU variants solve vanishing gradients to capture long-range dependencies. In BCI, they model dynamic signals (e.g., real-time prosthesis control).

Advantages: Handles variable-length sequences, captures temporal dynamics, integrates with other DL models (e.g., CNNs) for multi-modal learning.

4.2.3. Transformer models

Uses parallel self-attention to model dependencies across sequences, faster than RNNs. In BCI, it captures long-range temporal patterns in EEG signals.

Advantages: Superior long-range dependency tracking, fast training/inference, flexible for diverse BCI tasks [18].

Limitations: High computational/memory cost (quadratic scaling with sequence length), needs large labeled datasets.

5. Deep analysis process of BCI neural signals based on AI intent prediction

5.1. Preprocessing of neural signals

5.1.1. Noise removal

Independent Component Analysis (ICA): Separates multi-channel signals into independent components (neural activity, artifacts), removing artifacts to clean signals. Effective for non-stationary noise but needs many channels and manual component review.

Wavelet Transform: Denoises via frequency-band thresholding, preserving signal temporal/spectral features but dependent on wavelet basis and threshold rules.

5.1.2. Feature extraction

Extracts intent-related features to reduce dimensionality:

Time-domain: Mean, variance, peak amplitude (simple but noisy).

Frequency-domain: Power spectral density (PSD) in mu (8-13 Hz)/beta (13-30 Hz) bands (key for motor imagery) via Fourier transform.

Time-frequency domain: Wavelet coefficients, STFT magnitude (captures dynamic patterns) via wavelet/STFT.

DL models (CNNs/RNNs) automatically learn features, eliminating manual engineering and uncovering subtle patterns.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

5.2. Construction of intent prediction models

5.2.1. Establishment and division of datasets

A high-quality dataset includes neural recordings (from participants performing BCI tasks: motor imagery, P300 spelling) and labels. Construction steps: (1) Define protocol (task, participants, recording settings). (2) Collect data with minimized artifacts/environmental noise. (3) Clean signals and label (e.g., "left hand" for motor imagery). (4) Datasets are split into training (70%), validation (15%), and test (15%) sets. Cross-validation (k-fold, leave-one-subject-out) ensures reliable evaluation, especially leave-one-subject-out for assessing generalization to new users.

5.2.2. Training and optimization of models

Loss Functions: Cross-entropy/hinge loss for classification; MSE for regression.

Optimizers: Adam/RMSprop (adaptive step sizes) outperform SGD for faster convergence.

Learning Rate: Balances training speed and accuracy; adaptive methods (Adam) adjust rates automatically.

Regularization: L1/L2 regularization, dropout, early stopping prevent overfitting.

Models are tuned iteratively via validation set metrics (adjusting network depth, learning rate) to optimize performance.

5.3. Verification and evaluation of analysis results

5.3.1. Evaluation metrics

Classification: Accuracy (overall correctness), precision (avoid false positives), recall (detect true positives), F1-score (balanced measure), confusion matrix (granular performance).

Regression: MSE, MAE (error), R^2 (variance explained).

Real-time: Latency (signal acquisition to intent prediction) critical for tasks like prosthesis control.

5.3.2. Experimental verification

Test the trained model on the unseen test set.

Calculate metrics (accuracy, F1-score) by comparing predictions to labels.

Revise models/parameters if performance is insufficient.

Ablation studies analyze component contributions; head-to-head comparisons with baseline models ensure competitiveness.

6. Challenges and solutions in applications

6.1. Challenges

Inter-individual (anatomy, activation) and intra-individual (fatigue, mood) variability cause the "user-adaptation problem" (model failure on new users) and "session-adaptation problem" (accuracy drift over time), hindering large-scale BCI deployment.

Real-time BCI tasks (prosthesis control) require minimal latency. Delays in acquisition, preprocessing, or inference degrade usability, demanding streamlined pipelines.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

6.2. Solutions

6.2.1. Design of adaptive algorithms

Adaptive Preprocessing: Tunable filters/ICA parameters improve noise suppression with new data.

Adaptive Classification: Incremental learning updates model parameters with new samples; transfer learning uses multi-user data to reduce labeled data needs for new users.

6.2.2. Optimization of system hardware and software

Hardware: GPUs/TPUs accelerate DL; embedded boards enable edge deployment; high-speed acquisition reduces transfer delays.

Software: Lightweight DL models, sparse matrices, and parallel processing speed up computation; tight module integration (acquisition-preprocessing-inference) minimizes hand-off lags.

Key challenges persist: (1) Individual neural variability: Adaptive algorithms/transfer learning show promise but need faster convergence for new users/signal drift; large multi-centre datasets are needed. (2) Real-time performance: Hardware/software optimization has reduced latency, but ultra-low-latency edge AI models are required.

Future directions: (1) Multi-modal signal fusion (EEG+MEG+fNIRS) via advanced algorithms to enhance accuracy. (2) Address ethical/privacy issues (sensitive neural data) with guidelines and protection mechanisms.

7. Conclusion

This study focuses on the deep analysis of BCI neural signals based on AI intent prediction, aiming to address the key challenges of low accuracy and poor real-time performance in BCI systems. The research covers several aspects, including the overview of BCI and AI intent prediction, the characteristics and acquisition of BCI neural signals, the AI algorithms for neural signal analysis and intent prediction, the deep analysis process of neural signals, and the challenges and solutions in application. The research results show that the combination of AI technology and BCI neural signal analysis can significantly improve the accuracy of intent prediction. Traditional machine learning algorithms, such as SVM and LDA are effective in handling low-dimensional feature data and have good performance in some simple BCI tasks. Deep learning algorithms such as CNN, RNN, and Transformer models, with their ability to automatically learn complex hierarchical features from raw neural signals, show great potential in improving the performance of BCI systems, especially in complex tasks with high-dimensional and dynamic neural signals.

The deep analysis process of BCI neural signals, including noise removal, feature extraction, model construction, and result verification, is crucial for ensuring the accuracy and reliability of intent prediction. Effective noise removal techniques can improve the quality of neural signals, while appropriate feature extraction methods can highlight the discriminative information. The establishment of high-quality datasets and the reasonable division of training, validation, and test sets are essential for the training and evaluation of AI models. The optimization of model training parameters and the use of regularization techniques can prevent overfitting and improve the generalization ability of the model.

However, this study also has some limitations. First, the research on some advanced AI algorithms; Second, the experimental data used in this study is relatively limited, and the

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2026.TJ29094

generalization ability of the proposed models needs to be verified on larger and more diverse datasets. Future research should collect more data from different user populations and different application scenarios to build more comprehensive datasets; and focus on the development of lightweight models and efficient system architectures to reduce the processing latency.

References

[1] Wolpaw, J. R., et al. (2002). Brain-computer interfaces for communication and control. Clinical Neurophysiology, 113(6): 767-791.
[2] Nicolelis, M. A. (2001). Actions from thoughts. Nature, 409(6818): 403-407.
[3] Schalk, G., et al. (2004). BCI2000: a general-purpose brain-computer interface (BCI) system. IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering, 51(6): 1034-1043.
[4] Vaswani, A., et al. (2017). Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30: 5998-6008.
[5] Millán, J. d. R., et al. (2004). Adaptive brain-computer interfaces. Neural Networks, 17(10): 1593-1602.
[6] Blankertz, B., et al. (2006). The Berlin brain-computer interface: progress beyond communication. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 19: 135-142.
[7] Pfurtscheller, G., Neuper, C. (2001). Motor imagery and direct brain-computer communication. Proceedings of the IEEE, 89(7): 1123-1134.
[8] Hochberg, L. R., et al. (2006). Neuronal ensemble control of prosthetic devices by a human with tetraplegia. Nature, 442(7099): 164-171.
[9] Donchin, E. (2000). Talking off the top of your head: toward a mental prosthesis utilizing event-related brain potentials. IEEE Transactions on Rehabilitation Engineering, 8(2): 190-203.
[10] Wolpaw, J. R., McFarland, D. J. (2004). Brain-computer interfaces: principles and practice. Oxford University Press.
[11] Lotte, F., et al. (2007). A review of classification algorithms for EEG-based brain-computer interfaces. Journal of Neural Engineering, 4(2): R1-R13.
[12] Blankertz, B., et al. (2008). Single-trial classification of EEG signals and its application to brain-computer interfaces. Journal of Neuroscience Methods, 167(1): 103-116.
[13] LeCun, Y., et al. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521(7553): 436-444.
[14] Schirrmeister, R. T., et al. (2017). Deep learning with convolutional neural networks for EEG decoding and visualization. Human Brain Mapping, 38(11): 5391-5420.
[15] Wang, Y., et al. (2018). A review of deep learning based on brain-computer interface: recent progress and challenges. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 12: 55.
[16] Goodfellow, I., et al. (2016). Deep Learning. MIT Press.
[17] Haykin, S. (2009). Neural Networks and Learning Machines. Prentice Hall.
[18] Devlin, J., et al. (2018). BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv: 1810.04805.