# How Many Bytes Can You Take Out Of Brain-To-Text Decoding?

Richard J. Antonello Department of Computer Science The University of Texas at Austin rjantonello@utexas.edu

Jerry Tang Department of Computer Science The University of Texas at Austin jerrytang@utexas.edu Nihita Sarma Department of Computer Science The University of Texas at Austin nihitasarma@utexas.edu

Jiaru Song Department of Computer Science The University of Texas at Austin jiarus@cs.utexas.edu

Alexander G. Huth The University of Texas at Austin Departments of Computer Science and Neuroscience huth@cs.utexas.edu

# Abstract

Brain-computer interfaces have promising medical and scientific applications for aiding speech and studying the brain. In this work, we propose an information-based evaluation metric for brain-to-text decoders. Using this metric, we examine two methods to augment existing state-of-the-art continuous text decoders. We show that these methods, in concert, can improve brain decoding performance by upwards of 40% when compared to a baseline model. We further examine the informatic properties of brain-to-text decoders and show empirically that they have Zipfian power law dynamics. Finally, we provide an estimate for the idealized performance of an fMRI-based text decoder. We compare this idealized model to our current model, and use our information-based metric to quantify the main sources of decoding error. We conclude that a practical brain-to-text decoder is likely possible given further algorithmic improvements.

# 1 Introduction

Recent advancements in natural language processing research [1–4] have spurred developments in our ability to decode language from brain recordings [5–10]. These *semantic decoding models* are typically built either as direct decoders [11, 12] or as Bayesian decoders [8, 10, 13]. *Direct decoders*, as their name implies, directly regress from brain recordings to a linguistic feature space [12]. *Bayesian decoders*, which we primarily use in this work, use Bayes' law to invert *language encoding models*, which solve the problem of predicting neural recordings from a linguistic feature space such as the hidden states of a language model [14–17].

Bayesian semantic decoders for fMRI were introduced in [8], which established that it is possible to continuously predict the words that a person is hearing or thinking from fMRI recordings. This decoder is structured as a beam search that uses a language model to propose extensions to a beam of decoder predictions. The relative probabilities of observing the brain data given each extension are estimated using an encoding model and the most likely extensions are maintained on the beam.

Brain decoding has been demonstrated for a variety of other domains including vision [18–22] and motor volition [23–25]. In language, brain decoding has been demonstrated using other recording modalities such as ECoG [26, 27], EEG [28–32], and MEG [33, 34]. Recently, brain decoders that use recordings from invasive techniques such as ECoG have become highly accurate, and have the potential to be used as speech neuroprostheses. However, these techniques require neurosurgical implantation of recording electrodes. In contrast, semantic decoders operate on signals that can be measured non-invasively using methods like functional MRI, which could eventually provide a cheaper and safer alternative.

Semantic decoding models have attained reasonable performance on continuous language, but in order to be useful as a neuroprosthetic device, the decoding accuracy must be excellent [35]. Yet these models are still very new, and there are likely significant algorithmic gains that can be made. Furthermore, evaluating these models remains challenging, as they tend to paraphrase text rather than producing word strings with exact matches. In this work, we establish a quantitative information-theory based metric for evaluating and comparing semantic decoding models across datasets and subjects. We identify two relatively simple methods for improving the performance of existing state-of-the-art decoding models[8]. We show that these methods are capable of substantially improving semantic decoding models both qualitatively and using our new metric. We then use a noise ceiling analysis to explore the theoretical limits of semantic decoding models, providing an estimation for their potential performance and qualifying what is achievable at the spatiotemporal resolution provided by modern 3T fMRI. We conclude with a discussion of the practical consequences of an ideal or near-ideal decoder, as well as ethical considerations.

# 2 Methods

### 2.1 Bayesian Decoding

The goal of language decoding is to find the word sequence S that maximizes the probability distribution P(S|R) over word sequences given brain responses R. In Bayesian decoding, this can be done by using a voxel-wise encoding model (and multivariate normal noise model) to estimate P(R|S) and a language model to estimate P(S) [8, 17, 20].

A voxel-wise encoding model  $\hat{R}$  is trained to predict brain responses  $\hat{R}(S)$  from features of S [16]. Assuming that BOLD signals are affected by Gaussian random noise, the probability distribution P(R|S) can be modeled as a multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean  $\mu = \hat{R}(S)$  and covariance  $\Sigma = \langle (R - \hat{R}(S))^T (R - \hat{R}(S)) \rangle$  [20]. The covariance  $\Sigma$  models the structure of correlated noise across voxels. In this study, stimulus features were extracted from intermediate layers of language models [36–39]. Voxel-wise encoding models  $\hat{R}$  were estimated using linear regression, and noise covariance  $\Sigma$  was computed with a bootstrapping procedure that used the residuals between the encoding model predictions and the actual responses to held-out stories.

The probability that the participant heard a word sequence S, P(S|R), can be approximated as P(R|S)P(S). However, it is computationally infeasible to evaluate P(R|S) and P(S) for all possible word sequences. Instead, the most likely word sequence can be approximated by iteratively constructing word sequences using a beam search algorithm [8, 40]. In beam search, the k most likely word sequences are retained for each time step. The language model then proposes likely continuations for each sequence on the beam by sampling from P(S) and the encoding model evaluates the probability of the observed brain responses, P(R|S), under each continuation. The k most likely continuations are retained on the beam for the next time step. This process is repeated until the entire scan is decoded.

#### 2.2 Evaluating Decoding Models

Decoders were evaluated on brain responses while participants listened to a test story that was not used for model training. Decoding performance was quantified by comparing the decoder predictions for a participant to the actual words that the participant heard [8]. There are many metrics for quantifying the similarity between two word sequences. Because this decoder operates on semantic representations, we quantified similarity using BERTScore, which is a metric designed to quantify similarity of meaning [41]. In BERTScore the two word sequences are embedding as semantic vectors

using a neural network language model, and a similarity score is computed using the semantic vectors. We computed the BERTScore between the predicted and actual words in every 20-second window of the test story, and averaged the scores across windows to summarize decoding performance for the entire story. These scores were reported as the number of standard deviations above chance level, which was determined by generating word sequences using the language model without using any brain data.

While BERTScore is useful for measuring semantic similarity, the values themselves are somewhat arbitrary and do not correspond to any intuitive notion of decoder quality. To resolve this issue, in addition to the BERTScore metric, we also evaluate our decoding models on an *identification metric* that we refer to in this paper as LogRank. This metric measures how well a given decoder can identify the correct stimulus for a given response among a set of distractor stimuli. Let  $E_{\theta}$  be an estimator of P(R|S) for arbitrary stimulus-response pairs parameterized by our encoding model and noise covariance estimation, jointly described by  $\theta$ . The LogRank of a particular stimulus-response pair (S, R) is defined with respect to a distractor stimuli dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  as

$$\text{LogRank}_{\mathcal{D}}(S, R) = \log_2 \left( \text{rank} \left( E_{\theta}(S, R), E_{\theta}(\mathcal{D}, R) \right) \right)$$

Here, rank  $(E_{\theta}(S, R), E_{\theta}(\mathcal{D}, R))$  represents the ordinal rank of the estimated probability  $E_{\theta}(S, R)$ among all estimated probabilities  $E_{\theta}(S', R)$  for  $S' \in \mathcal{D}$ . That is, for a given stimulus-response pair (S, R), the LogRank of that pair is the log-base-2 of the rank of the "ground truth" P(R|S) from among all distractors. Alternatively, LogRank can be thought of as the number of additional bits of information that would be required to correctly resolve S as matching R using the given decoder from among the elements of  $\mathcal{D}^1$ . For example, if  $\mathcal{D}$  contained all possible stimuli, an average LogRank of 0 would correspond to an oracle decoder that is perfectly able to recover the stimulus that corresponds to any response. This particular interpretation is useful for studying the informatic properties of decoding models and is used frequently in this work.

#### 2.3 Techniques for Improving Decoding

We provide and analyze the effects of two methods for improving Bayesian decoding models. These methods are Minimum Bayes Risk (MBR) decoding and encoding model scaling. Each method trades additional computational effort in exchange for improved decoding performance.

## 2.3.1 Minimum Bayes Risk Decoding

Maximum a priori (MAP) decoding tends to fall into pathological local minima when generated sequences deviate significantly from the data that  $E_{\theta}$  was trained on. This effect is especially pronounced with the overlapping mix of semantic information that can be extracted from brain signals. Fortunately, these pathological local minima tend to be transient and highly dependent on the parameterization of  $E_{\theta}$ . Our proposed solution to this problem is to augment the standard MAP beam search with a Minimum Bayes Risk (MBR) ensembling approach that averages out pathological examples while retaining semantic themes common across many slightly different versions of  $E_{\theta}$ . Let N be the number of ensembled decoding models. We use a leave-one-out approach where we train N separate instances of  $E_{\theta}$  by removing one stimulus from the  $E_{\theta}$  training dataset and retraining on the remaining data. For each of these N leave-one-out generated models, we generate a sequence of words  $S_n = \{w_1, w_2, ..., w_l\}$ . We then ensemble the set of sequences  $\{S_1, S_2, ..., S_N\}$  as follows: We instantiate a new beam search with the same parameters, except instead of trying to maximize P(R|S) with our search, we now instead optimize

$$\max_{T} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \textbf{BERTScore}(S_i, T)$$

That is, we use beam search to find a target sequence T that is most semantically similar to all other generated sequences according to BERTScore. As a practical consideration, we use a sliding window of the past 20 words when computing BERTScore during decoding to ensure that there are no major temporal deviations from the original sequences. Notably, this approach does not utilize

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Note that computing this metric does not require that any elements of  $\mathcal{D}$  have measured responses.

any information from the future to decode the past, so it remains feasible for online decoding. The computational cost of this ensembling scales linearly in the size of N. In this work, we test MBR ensembles up to size N = 50.



Figure 1: *Decoding methods.* (a) Subjects listen to natural speech while blood-oxygen-leveldependent (BOLD) brain responses are recorded using fMRI. Encoding models use linear regression to predict BOLD responses from features extracted from the stimuli using Llama. (b) A Bayesian decoder uses the encoding model to reconstruct stimulus words from fMRI data. A beam search is performed over word sequences, with candidate beam continuations sampled from GPT-1. The probability of observing the brain responses given the proposed sequences is then evaluated using the encoding model. The best candidate sequences are preserved for the next step. (c) Decoding performance can be improved by ensembling via minimum Bayes risk (MBR). An ensemble of encoding models are estimated by sampling the training data, then are used to decode word sequences. A second beam search then finds a word sequence that is maximally similar to all the ensemble decoded sequences.

## 2.3.2 Encoding Model Scaling

Past studies have shown that scaling is an effective means of improving encoding model prediction performance [42]. We compare a decoding model that uses a finetuned version of GPT-1 (125 million parameters) as a P(R|S) estimator to parameterize  $E_{\theta}$  against one that uses a pretrained Llama-2 model (13 billion parameters). Hidden states were extracted from the 9th layer of the GPT-1 model and the 14th layer of the Llama-2 model. For the optimal decoding analyses in Section 3.2, we used the 14th layer of the pretrained Llama-3 model (8 billion parameters).

We generally follow the method described by Antonello et al. [42] for encoding model generation of the larger Llama encoding models. For the smaller encoding models, we use the method and code provided Tang et al. [8]. The main practical difference is that the larger encoding models are trained on embeddings extracted from longer context windows. These context window sizes for each model were selected based on coordinate descent. In all cases the same GPT-1 model was used as a language model to estimate P(S). This was done intentionally to mitigate the effects of bias in the LM's training dataset for comparison purposes. To accommodate onset-time-correlated artifacts that manifest in long-context encoding models, a suite of stepwise linear functions of the form y = floor(k, t) was regressed out of the test fMRI data for those models, for varying values of k.

## 2.4 MRI data

We used publicly available functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data collected from 3 human subjects as they listened to 20 hours of English language podcast stories over Sensimetrics S14 headphones. Stories came from podcasts such as *The Moth Radio Hour, Modern Love*, and *The Anthropocene Reviewed*. Each 10-15 minute story was played during a separate scan. Subjects were not asked to make any responses, but simply to listen attentively to the stories. For encoding model training, each subject listened to roughly 95 different stories, giving 20 hours of data across 20 scanning sessions, or a total of ~33,000 datapoints for each voxel across the whole brain. For model testing, the subjects listened to two test stories 5 times each, and one test story 10 times, at a rate of 1 test story per session. The test story with 10 repeats was used for the majority of experiments, whereas all three were used during general informatic analyses (Fig 2c). Decoding was always performed using the first repeat of a given story, with additional repeats being used for the analysis in Section 3.2.

Details of the MRI methods can be found in the original publications [43, 8, 42], but important points are summarized here. MRI data were collected on a 3T Siemens Skyra scanner at The University of Texas at Austin Biomedical Imaging Center using a 64-channel Siemens volume coil. Functional scans were collected using a gradient echo EPI sequence with repetition time (TR) = 2.00 s, echo time (TE) = 30.8 ms, flip angle = 71°, multi-band factor (simultaneous multi-slice) = 2, voxel size = 2.6mm x 2.6mm x 2.6mm (slice thickness = 2.6mm), matrix size = 84x84, and field of view = 220 mm. Anatomical data were collected using a T1-weighted multi-echo MP-RAGE sequence with voxel size = 1mm x 1mm.

In addition to motion correction and coregistration [43], low frequency voxel response drift was identified using a 2nd order Savitzky-Golay filter with a 120 second window and then subtracted from the signal. The mean response for each voxel was subtracted and the remaining response was scaled to have unit variance.

The original publications on this dataset stated that all subjects were healthy and had normal hearing. The experimental protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at The University of Texas at Austin. Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects.

	GPT-1	Llama-2	G	PT-1 + M	BR		Llama-2	2 + MBR	
Subj.	Single	Single	5 runs	10 runs	20 runs	5 runs	10 runs	20 runs	50 runs
S01	14.6	16.7	16.8	16.8	17.6	19.5	21.2	22.1	21.4
S02	14.6	15.9	17.2	16.7	17.8	18.2	19.7	21.0	21.4
S03	18.7	20.0	21.9	22.4	23.5	21.9	23.4	25.4	26.1
Avg	16.0	17.5	18.6	18.6	19.6	19.8	21.4	22.8	23.0

Table 1: Ablation results showing improvements in BERTScore for each of the methods as well as the sum of both methods. BERTScore is measured in standard deviations from a random baseline generated by the GPT-1 language model without consideration of P(R|S)). For all subjects, we see improvements from 40-50%.

#### 2.5 Estimating an idealized semantic decoding model

The encoding model predictions for a stimulus should ideally match the participant's actual brain responses to that stimulus. In practice, encoding models may differ from actual brain responses, leading to suboptimal decoding performance.

One potential source of decoding error is encoding model misspecification, such as extracting suboptimal features from language stimuli. To characterize decoding performance using an optimal encoding model, we performed identification for a test story using averaged responses across 9 subsequent repeats of that story. The averaged responses provide a noise ceiling that captures the explainable signal in each voxel. The difference in identification performance between the encoding model and the inter-trial ceiling quantifies the amount of improvement that can be attained by using a better encoding model.

Another potential source of decoding error is measurement noise. If there is structure to these errors across voxels, it can bias decoder predictions. As a result, it is useful to account for this structure when comparing the encoding model predictions and the actual recorded responses [44]. Previous studies have modeled the structure of the noise by computing the covariance of the encoding model residuals on held out stories not used in encoding model training [8, 20]. To assess whether improving the noise model will improve decoding performance, we compared identification performance for the actual noise model with identification performance for a ceiling noise model. In order to isolate the structure of noise that is repeatable across trials, we used brain responses while the participants listened to 9 subsequent repeats of the test story. We computed the true noise covariance for each of the repeats, and averaged covariance matrices across repeats to create a ceiling noise model. The difference in identification performance between the estimated noise model and the inter-trial noise model quantifies the amount of improvement that can be attained by using a better noise model.

For each idealized model, we evaluate the number of bits that have been extracted from the model using the LogRank metric. We perform a "Pareto correction" on the data, which helps us resolve instances when  $|\mathcal{D}|$ , the number of distractors tested, is not large enough that any distractor stimulus is preferred to the true stimulus. This causes a significant fraction of our data to be "censored", meaning we cannot resolve the true number of bits beyond a certain threshold, in this case, beyond  $\log_2 |\mathcal{D}| - 1$ . In these cases, we fit a Pareto distribution to the existing data, and extract a power-law relationship  $y = kx^a$ . This relationship is then interpolated past the resolution threshold. Since the area under a power-law is undefined, the censored probability mass is distributed as conservatively as possible below the extrapolated relationship. Let  $p_{\text{censored}}$  be the probability mass of the Pareto distribution that was censored. For each distribution, we compute the value of  $x_{\min}$  such that

$$\int_{x_{\min}}^{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}} kx^a \, dx = p_{\text{censored}}$$

and then distribute the remainder of the probability mass between  $x_{min}$  and  $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$ . Due to the conservative nature of this estimation procedure, estimates of "bits extracted" elsewhere in this paper should be considered lower bounds.

## 2.6 Compute specifications

The generation and use of the models presented in this paper required significant computational resources. Ridge regression was performed using compute nodes with 128 cores (2 AMD EPYC 7763 64-core processors) and 256GB of RAM. In total, roughly 2,000 node-hours of compute was expended for these models. Feature extraction for language models was performed on specialized GPU nodes similar to the AMD compute nodes but with 3 NVIDIA A100 40GB cards. Feature extraction and subsequent decoding required roughly 4000 node-hours of compute on these GPU nodes. In total, this research used an estimated  $5 \times 10^{21}$  floating point operations.

# **3** Results

#### 3.1 Improving Decoding Performance

**Table 1** demonstrates the main performance improvements of our brain-to-text decoding methods. Across all subjects, MBR with Llama-2 results in an estimated 40-50% improvement in measured BERTScore similarity to the ground truth story, with the average BERTScore across subjects increasing from 16.0 to 23.0. Examining the ablation results, we see that the majority of the contribution comes from MBR rather than scaling. However it also appears that there are some second-order effects, with scaling having greater power when combined with MBR than when used without ensembling. In particular, the benefit of 20 runs of MBR is only  $2.1\sigma$  for GPT-1 on average, whereas it is  $5.3\sigma$  for Llama-2. This suggests that the implicit prior adopted by beam search may be ill-suited to the problem of continuous brain-to-text decoding, and that the semantic ensembling procedure ameliorates this problem somewhat, with greater benefits for better models. This result also points to an underexplored avenue for future decoding research, as it may be the case that Bayesian decoding models could benefit more from adoption of more effective priors, rather than simply better estimation of P(R|S) and  $\Sigma$ .



Figure 2: Comparison of Decoding Models: (a) Comparison of Llama-2 with MBR over GPT-1 Baseline: Semantic similarity of each model output with the ground truth is plotted on the y-axis over the timecourse of a held-out test story. The Llama-2 model with MBR is shown to outperform GPT-1 in almost all cases. (b) Computational Costs of Decoding: A log-plot comparing computational cost aginst estimated performance. A clear cost-performance tradeoff is visualized. (c) Number of Bits Extracted: The estimated amount of information extracted using the P(R|S) approximators built from each model is visualized. Llama-2 extracts about 2.8 more bits of information, after Pareto correction. The number of bits is estimated by the number of distractors that are ranked better than the ground truth. (d) Qualitative Performance Comparison: Two well-decoded extended contexts from each decoding model (Llama-2 with a 50 run MBR ensemble, GPT-1) are presented. The ground truth text is presented bordered by green. For each decoding, words are colored based on whether they are semantically-correct (blue), gist-capturing (purple), or incorrect (red)

**Figure 2a** illustrates the performance improvement across the timecourse of a test story. A sliding window of the BERTScore of each method's output against the ground truth is plotted. We see that, for nearly every TR, the fully ensembled (50 run) Llama-2 decoding model outperforms the GPT-1 decoder. The average window score rises here from  $3.7\sigma$  for the GPT-1 encoder to  $5.2\sigma$  for the Llama-2 decoder, over a 40% increase.

**Figure 2b** shows the relationship between decoding performance and inference costs, with higher costs associated with better performance. We note that the Pareto frontier suggested by this plot is to first ensemble and then only when reaching diminishing returns, use scaling as a means to further improve performance. As the 20-run GPT-1 ensemble is both cheaper and performs better than the single-run Llama model, it is probable that there are further improvements to be made on the algorithmic side in terms of computational efficiency and more effectively managing this tradeoff. We note that the current computational cost of our best decoder is largely impractical for virtually all non-research settings, requiring about 500 hours of A100 runtime to decode a 15 minute fMRI scan. Further algorithmic work into reducing this cost to enable online decoding is essential if these methods are to have practical value.

Figure 2c compares the number of bits extracted by each P(R|S) encoding model estimator on subject S3. We see that the Llama-2 encoding model is consistently able to outperform the GPT-1



Figure 3: Informatic properties of Bayesian decoding (a) Power law dynamics: Plotted is the proportion of distractors from the total set that are evaluated as having a higher P(R|S) over the ground truth stimuli for S3. The relationship obeys a power law and can be modelled with a Pareto distribution (red line). (b) Idealized encoding performance: Idealized encoding models were computed by averaging responses across different repeats of the test story. With 9 repeats of the test story, identification using averaged responses led to an average 2.7 bits of improvement over the current state-of-the-art encoding model. (c) Idealized noise estimation: Idealized noise models were computed by averaging noise covariance matrices across different repeats of the test story. With 9 repeats of the test story, identification using idealized noise models led to an average 1.2 bits of improvement over the current state-of-the-art noise model. S1 is omitted from these analyses due to poor test story repeatability. These results suggest further room for improvement in P(R|S) estimation.

encoding model, with over 30% of all ~900 test TRs being correctly identified from among over 140,000 distractor stimuli. After performing the Pareto correction described in Section 2.5, we estimate that the GPT-1 decoder extracts 11,1 bits on average for a given TR, whereas the Llama-2 decoder extracts 13.9 bits, a 2.8 bit correction. Versions of **Figure 2c** for other subjects are provided in the Appendix.

**Figure 2d** provides some qualitative examples of decoder quality comparing the two models on well-decoded TRs. The Llama-2 model (*blue*) is able to sometimes capture complex and nuanced sentiments, in comparison to the GPT-1 model, which often correctly captures simple semantic themes but does not successfully tie them together. Full decoded texts for this test story using the 50-run MBR ensemble are provided in the Appendix for each of the three test subjects.

#### 3.2 Estimating Idealized Decoding Models

In addition to improving the performance of these models, we also studied their statistical and informatic properties. **Figure 3a** plots a log-log histogram showing the distribution of the proportion of preferred distractors to total distractors for each of our ~900 test TRs. This number includes the ground truth stimulus itself, so the numerator is always at least 1. A lower number indicates that very few distractors are rated as more likely to cause the observed fMRI data than the true stimulus, with a proportion of  $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|}$  corresponding to ideal performance. We observe that the relationship is governed by a Zipfian power law and can be therefore modelled by a Pareto distribution [45]. As word frequencies are themselves governed by a similar distribution, it may be reasonable to assume that this relationship is a byproduct of the statistics of natural language itself rather than of the biological and physical processes in the brain.

**Figure 3b** explores how many bits of information could additionally be extracted over our current model from brain responses if our encoding model  $E_{\theta}$  was optimal. To get an estimate of the noise ceiling, we averaged the responses across several repeats of the same test story. We then substituted the predicted response in these for these averaged responses and then computed the increase in the average number of extracted bits. We find that, with an optimal encoding performance, we would be able to extract an additional 2.7 bits of information over our current state-of-the-art models. Due to the conservative nature of the "bits extracted metric (see Section 2.5), this is probably a lower bound, with additional room for improvement likely.

**Figure 3c** answers a similar question, but from the perspective of improving our noise covariance estimation. We examined how many additional bits of information could be extracted from our current model with better covariance estimatation procedures. To do this, we averaged the noise covariance across repeats of the same test story and substituted this averaged covariance as a replacement for the existing noise covariance estimation. We find that better noise covariance estimation could yield at least an average additional 1.2 bits of improvement over the current model.

# 4 Discussion

In this paper, we have demonstrated a substantial improvement in the state-of-the-art for non-invasive semantic brain-to-text decoding, improving existing models by upwards of 40% on our held-out test stimulus. The improvement relies on two primary modifications. First, we found that decoding performance can be improved by using more powerful language models during encoding, reflecting previous findings that encoding model performance scales with the effectiveness of the language model used to extract features [42]. If recent trends in language model scaling continue, we expect that decoding performance will continue to improve as well. Second, we show that decoding performance can also be improved by developing new algorithms that leverage the growing amount of computing power through methods such as ensembling. These techniques may provide an avenue for improving decoding performance orthogonal to improvements in language models.

In addition to these significant empirical improvements, our study also characterizes the gap between current language decoding performance and the best possible performance that can be achieved using fMRI. We found that using an ideal encoding model could increase identification performance by an average of 2.7 bits, while using an ideal noise model could improve identification performance by an average of 1.2 bits. These estimates are only lower bounds, and indicate that there is a substantial amount of improvement that can be attained purely through algorithmic advances. Further enhancements may also arise from developing more effective methods for translating the information extracted by these models into natural language.

Better decoding performance has critical practical implications. Currently, motor decoders that use invasive brain recordings are sufficiently accurate to improve communication for people who have lost the ability to speak due to injuries such as strokes, or diseases such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis [23, 46]. Our results show that non-invasive semantic decoding could eventually provide a safer and cheaper alternative to these ECoG-based decoding methods that require costly neurosurgery.

On the other hand, improved decoding performance has important implications for mental privacy. Previous studies have found that semantic decoders only produce accurate predictions when brain data are collected with a participant's cooperation [8]. For instance, participants could actively prevent decoders from predicting a story that they are hearing just by thinking about something else. It is important to continually evaluate these models as decoding algorithms become more powerful.

The relative ease with which we were able to substantially boost the state-of-the-art for semantic decoding suggests that additional advancements are likely to follow in the near future. Society should prepare for this outcome by adopting forward-looking mental privacy standards and regulations.

# Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge and thank the Texas Advanced Computing Center (TACC) at The University of Texas at Austin for providing HPC resources that have significantly contributed to the research results reported within this paper. This work was funded by grants from the NIDCD and NSF (1R01DC020088-001), the Burroughs-Wellcome Foundation, a gift from Intel Inc, and the support of the William Orr Dingwall Foundation. We thank Aditya Vaidya and Matthew Weidner for their aid and thoughtful suggestions in assisting with this work.

# References

- [1] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [2] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI Blog*, 1(8), 2019.
- [3] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
- [4] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971, 2023.

- [5] Jingyuan Sun, Shaonan Wang, Jiajun Zhang, and Chengqing Zong. Towards sentence-level brain decoding with distributed representations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 7047–7054, 2019.
- [6] Jon Gauthier and Roger Levy. Linking artificial and human neural representations of language. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1910.01244, 2019.
- [7] Pengfei Sun, Gopala K Anumanchipalli, and Edward F Chang. Brain2char: a deep architecture for decoding text from brain recordings. *Journal of neural engineering*, 17(6):066015, 2020.
- [8] Jerry Tang, Amanda LeBel, Shailee Jain, and Alexander G Huth. Semantic reconstruction of continuous language from non-invasive brain recordings. *Nature Neuroscience*, pages 1–9, 2023.
- [9] Charlotte Caucheteux, Alexandre Gramfort, and Jean-Rémi King. Deep language algorithms predict semantic comprehension from brain activity. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):16327, 2022.
- [10] Subba Reddy Oota, Manish Gupta, Raju S Bapi, Gael Jobard, Frédéric Alexandre, and Xavier Hinaut. Deep neural networks and brain alignment: Brain encoding and decoding (survey). arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10246, 2023.
- [11] Francisco Pereira, Bin Lou, Brianna Pritchett, Samuel Ritter, Samuel J Gershman, Nancy Kanwisher, Matthew Botvinick, and Evelina Fedorenko. Toward a universal decoder of linguistic meaning from brain activation. *Nature communications*, 9(1):963, 2018.
- [12] Nicolas Affolter, Beni Egressy, Damian Pascual, and Roger Wattenhofer. Brain2word: decoding brain activity for language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.04765*, 2020.
- [13] Daohan Zhang, Zhenjie Wang, Youkun Qian, Zehao Zhao, Yan Liu, Xiaotao Hao, Wanxin Li, Shuo Lu, Honglin Zhu, Luyao Chen, et al. A brain-to-text framework of decoding natural tonal sentences. *bioRxiv*, pages 2024–03, 2024.
- [14] Tom M Mitchell, Svetlana V Shinkareva, Andrew Carlson, Kai-Min Chang, Vicente L Malave, Robert A Mason, and Marcel Adam Just. Predicting human brain activity associated with the meanings of nouns. *science*, 320(5880):1191–1195, 2008.
- [15] Leila Wehbe, Brian Murphy, Partha Talukdar, Alona Fyshe, Aaditya Ramdas, and Tom Mitchell. Simultaneously uncovering the patterns of brain regions involved in different story reading subprocesses. *PloS* one, 9(11):e112575, 2014.
- [16] Alexander G Huth, Wendy A De Heer, Thomas L Griffiths, Frédéric E Theunissen, and Jack L Gallant. Natural speech reveals the semantic maps that tile human cerebral cortex. *Nature*, 532(7600):453–458, 2016.
- [17] Thomas Naselaris, Kendrick N Kay, Shinji Nishimoto, and Jack L Gallant. Encoding and decoding in fmri. *Neuroimage*, 56(2):400–410, 2011.
- [18] Kendrick N Kay, Thomas Naselaris, Ryan J Prenger, and Jack L Gallant. Identifying natural images from human brain activity. *Nature*, 452(7185):352–355, 2008.
- [19] Thomas Naselaris, Ryan J Prenger, Kendrick N Kay, Michael Oliver, and Jack L Gallant. Bayesian reconstruction of natural images from human brain activity. *Neuron*, 63(6):902–915, 2009.
- [20] Shinji Nishimoto, An T Vu, Thomas Naselaris, Yuval Benjamini, Bin Yu, and Jack L Gallant. Reconstructing visual experiences from brain activity evoked by natural movies. *Current biology*, 21(19):1641–1646, 2011.
- [21] Guohua Shen, Tomoyasu Horikawa, Kei Majima, and Yukiyasu Kamitani. Deep image reconstruction from human brain activity. *PLoS computational biology*, 15(1):e1006633, 2019.
- [22] Yu Takagi and Shinji Nishimoto. High-resolution image reconstruction with latent diffusion models from human brain activity. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14453–14463, 2023.
- [23] Francis R Willett, Erin M Kunz, Chaofei Fan, Donald T Avansino, Guy H Wilson, Eun Young Choi, Foram Kamdar, Matthew F Glasser, Leigh R Hochberg, Shaul Druckmann, et al. A high-performance speech neuroprosthesis. *Nature*, 620(7976):1031–1036, 2023.
- [24] Henri Lorach, Andrea Galvez, Valeria Spagnolo, Felix Martel, Serpil Karakas, Nadine Intering, Molywan Vat, Olivier Faivre, Cathal Harte, Salif Komi, et al. Walking naturally after spinal cord injury using a brain–spine interface. *Nature*, 618(7963):126–133, 2023.

- [25] Gopala K Anumanchipalli, Josh Chartier, and Edward F Chang. Speech synthesis from neural decoding of spoken sentences. *Nature*, 568(7753):493–498, 2019.
- [26] Xupeng Chen, Ran Wang, Amirhossein Khalilian-Gourtani, Leyao Yu, Patricia Dugan, Daniel Friedman, Werner Doyle, Orrin Devinsky, Yao Wang, and Adeen Flinker. A neural speech decoding framework leveraging deep learning and speech synthesis. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–14, 2024.
- [27] Junbo Chen, Xupeng Chen, Ran Wang, Chenqian Le, Amirhossein Khalilian-Gourtani, Erika Jensen, Patricia Dugan, Werner Doyle, Orrin Devinsky, Daniel Friedman, et al. Subject-agnostic transformer-based neural speech decoding from surface and depth electrode signals. *bioRxiv*, pages 2024–03, 2024.
- [28] Lawrence Ashley Farwell and Emanuel Donchin. Talking off the top of your head: toward a mental prosthesis utilizing event-related brain potentials. *Electroencephalography and clinical Neurophysiology*, 70(6):510–523, 1988.
- [29] Maham Saeidi, Waldemar Karwowski, Farzad V Farahani, Krzysztof Fiok, Redha Taiar, Peter A Hancock, and Awad Al-Juaid. Neural decoding of eeg signals with machine learning: A systematic review. *Brain Sciences*, 11(11):1525, 2021.
- [30] Alexandre Défossez, Charlotte Caucheteux, Jérémy Rapin, Ori Kabeli, and Jean-Rémi King. Decoding speech perception from non-invasive brain recordings. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(10):1097–1107, 2023.
- [31] Hanwen Liu, Daniel Hajialigol, Benny Antony, Aiguo Han, and Xuan Wang. Eeg2text: Open vocabulary eeg-to-text decoding with eeg pre-training and multi-view transformer. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02165, 2024.
- [32] Saydul Akbar Murad and Nick Rahimi. Unveiling thoughts: A review of advancements in eeg brain signal decoding into text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00726*, 2024.
- [33] Alexander M Chan, Eric Halgren, Ksenija Marinkovic, and Sydney S Cash. Decoding word and categoryspecific spatiotemporal representations from meg and eeg. *Neuroimage*, 54(4):3028–3039, 2011.
- [34] Debadatta Dash, Paul Ferrari, Daragh Heitzman, and Jun Wang. Decoding speech from single trial meg signals using convolutional neural networks and transfer learning. In 2019 41st Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC), pages 5531–5535. IEEE, 2019.
- [35] Sara Goering, Eran Klein, Laura Specker Sullivan, Anna Wexler, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Guoqiang Bi, Jose M Carmena, Joseph J Fins, Phoebe Friesen, Jack Gallant, et al. Recommendations for responsible development and application of neurotechnologies. *Neuroethics*, 14(3):365–386, 2021.
- [36] Shailee Jain and Alexander Huth. Incorporating context into language encoding models for fmri. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018. URL https://proceedings. neurips.cc/paper/2018/file/f471223d1a1614b58a7dc45c9d01df19-Paper.pdf.
- [37] Mariya Toneva and Leila Wehbe. Interpreting and improving natural-language processing (in machines) with natural language-processing (in the brain). In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/ file/749a8e6c231831ef7756db230b4359c8-Paper.pdf.
- [38] Martin Schrimpf, Idan Asher Blank, Greta Tuckute, Carina Kauf, Eghbal A Hosseini, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. The neural architecture of language: Integrative modeling converges on predictive processing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(45): e2105646118, 2021.
- [39] Charlotte Caucheteux and Jean-Rémi King. Brains and algorithms partially converge in natural language processing. *Communications Biology*, 5(1):1–10, 2022.
- [40] Christoph Tillmann and Hermann Ney. Word reordering and a dynamic programming beam search algorithm for statistical machine translation. *Computational linguistics*, 29(1):97–133, 2003.
- [41] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019.
- [42] Richard Antonello, Aditya Vaidya, and Alexander G. Huth. Scaling laws for language encoding models in fmri, 2023.

- [43] Amanda LeBel, Lauren Wagner, Shailee Jain, Aneesh Adhikari-Desai, Bhavin Gupta, Allyson Morgenthal, Jerry Tang, Lixiang Xu, and Alexander G Huth. A natural language fmri dataset for voxelwise encoding models. *bioRxiv*, pages 2022–09, 2022.
- [44] RS Van Bergen. Modeling correlated noise is necessary to decode uncertainty. *Neuroimage*, 180:78–87, 2018.
- [45] Mark EJ Newman. Power laws, pareto distributions and zipf's law. Contemporary physics, 46(5):323–351, 2005.
- [46] Sean L Metzger, Kaylo T Littlejohn, Alexander B Silva, David A Moses, Margaret P Seaton, Ran Wang, Maximilian E Dougherty, Jessie R Liu, Peter Wu, Michael A Berger, et al. A high-performance neuroprosthesis for speech decoding and avatar control. *Nature*, 620(7976):1037–1046, 2023.

# A Appendix / supplemental material

## A.1 GPT-1 vs. Llama-2 comparisons (other subjects)

Here we show copies of **Figure 2a** and **Figure 2c** using the data from other subjects, as the figure in the main text was generated with S03.



Figure A1: GPT-1 vs. Llama-2 + MBR (50 run) comparison for S01



Figure A2: GPT-1 vs. Llama-2 + MBR (50 run) comparison for S02





![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

# A.2 Power law dynamics (other subjects)

Here we show copies of **Figure 3a** generated using the data from other subjects, as the figure in the main text was generated with S03.

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure A5: Power law dynamics of proportion of preferred distractors for S01

![](_page_14_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure A6: Power law dynamics of proportion of preferred distractors for S02

# A.3 Full text of Llama2 + 50-run MBR ensembled decoded texts

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
i had no shoes on	long day i didn't	only reason people have	job i have no
i was crying i had no wallet	sleep much i was	trouble finding jobs i	savings but i'm not
but i was ok because	exhausted but i could	know because i do it	homeless i can afford
i had my cigarettes	have done with a cup	every day i don't	to buy groceries and
and i didn't want	of coffee i don't know	mind if you don't	gas i don't need a
any part of freedom	what made me decide	because it doesn't mean	job anymore because i
if i didn't have	to go home i guess	vou aren't good at	have no money to pay
my cigarettes	the worst thing about	it it's just a natural	for college my dad
when you live with	it was that the girl	reaction to things that	is an alcoholic he
someone who has	was really upset and	happened before you know	was always abusive and
a temper a verv	i was so angry and	what	it was verv
bad temper a			
very very bad temper	sad that i couldn't	to do if you do	difficult for me to
you learn to play	stand to talk to her	something wrong it's	deal with him i was
around that you	about it because i	very hard to say it	the one who would
learn this time i'll	didn't know how to	is what you want	say what i needed to
play possum and next	fix it she told me	but you will do	and not what he said
time i'll just be	to just say whatever	what is right in	or if he did so
real nice or i'll	she wanted and that	order to be successful	mething wrong then i
say yes to everything	i wasn't allowed to	you may not realize	could either argue or just
or you make yoursel	change anything and she	this but your goal is	walk away but that
scarce or you run	didn't care what i	to help your son	doesn't work for me
and this was one	did but i still	succeed but if he	the other reason i did
of the times when you	did it it was hard	fails that means you	this is that
iust run and as	and it hurt because i	have to do it alone i	
i was running i thought	knew that she had	would say that you	i had to move to
this was a great	the power to do it	should have done this	an area where i
place to jump out	again i went to the	in your home town but	couldn't see anything
because there were big	hospital that day and	this is where most	because the roads were
lawns and there	when they asked me to	of the people live the	too narrow for cars to
were cul de sacs and	sit down she said that	police will be there	pass by me at night my
sometimes he would	i should just leave	if they see you walking	dad would just vell
come after me and	her alone and go home	down the street so	at me to go home but
drive and yell stuff	i was like ok no	i say i want to leave	i kept saving no
at me to get back	thanks and walked out	here so we head	and running off into
in get back in and	to the parking lot	over to a park a block	the woods he was like
i was like no i'm out	with my friend we went	from my school and he	hev you can get
of here this is great	back inside the store	gets his phone and	the car back and i
and i went and hid	and i had my first	starts talking to some of	couldn't believe it
behind a cabana and	drink		but he had been driving
he left and i had my			
cigarettes and uh i			
started to walk in this			
beautiful neighborhood	with him it was about	the students i saw	around town for about
it was ten thirty at	minutes into the show	on the street and	hours i went to see
night and it was silent	and he was drunk i	it seems that the	him at about pm
and lovely and there	was at a bar with	guy was really good	and he was pretty drunk
was no sound except	two of my friends	at it and i think he	and the place was
for sprinklers ch ch	and this guy had a	was the one who	packed and we had a
ch ch ig ch ch ch ch	giant beer bottle on	decided to teach the	few beers and smoked
ig and i was enjoying	my bed and i	class a couple days	some weed the whole
myself	-		

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
and enjoying the absence	was so happy to	after it started but	night and it was
of anger and enjoying	finally be alone	i couldn't focus on	really hard to feel
these few hours i knew	and not have to talk	anything but how it	happy after a few
i'd have of freedom and	about what had happened	affected my life so	months of trying to be
just to perfect it i	in the past few days	much and how i could	the best i could i
thought i'll have a smoke	and how i felt i	not deal with it because	had no money to buy
and then it occurred to me	also started to wonder	i didn't want to feel	anything but i knew it
with horrifying speed i	if it was something i	that way anymore it	would be impossible to
don't have a light just	did that caused me to	is hard to understand	get a car since i didn't
then as if in answer i	lose it and then i	how it happened i can't	have insurance i asked
see a figure up ahead	went out to the	really explain why but i	a guy if he was
see a ligare ap alload	street and saw a man	felt the same way when	a con and
	coming towards	i saw it in the mirror the	a cop and
who is that it's not	me i thought hey	night before i thought	he said no but
him ok they don't have	that guy looks like	maybe my parents were	i didn't see any
a dog who is that what	my dad but i don't	in another room but	reason why he would
uh what are they doing	know him well he	i knew they were	be in the store
out on this suburban street	was walking down the	both there it was dark	because of what happened
and the person comes closer	street at this point	out but the hall	the guy walked in
and i could see it's a woman	and we saw him	light was on and i	and i saw that he
and then i can see she	coming towards us he	could see him moving	had his hand up
has her hands in her face	had his hand up	around he had his	the front of his shirt
oh she's crying and then	to his face and	hand on the wall and	and he was rubbing his
she sees me and she composes	was looking in our	then he was looking	face as i approached he
herself and she gets closer	direction and i was frozen	up at me he then	then turned around and
and i see she has no	in fear and he started	turned and walked away	looked at me and started
and I see she has no	talking to us we were	i ran over to him	crying as he walked back
	taiking to us we were	and i saw that	to his car
shoes on she has no shoes	both staring at him	his face was pale	his head was still
on and she's crying and	be was the same	he had a very	down and i was
she's out on the street	age and his eyes	similar look to the	very scared and confused
street i recognize her	were red from crying	guy i had seen	i think it was
though i've never met her	i remember seeing him	before but we didn't	because he didn't
and just as she passes	once but didn't know	really talk to him	recognize me but i
me she says you got a	who he was he looked	he came over and he	didn't really know him
cigarette and i say you	at me and asked	asked if we had	then he asked me
got a light and she says	me if i had a	any beer in the car	if i had a girlfriend
damn i hope so and then	girlfriend i said no	he didn't have any	i said no and that
sh first she digs into	but he didn't know	and we said no	i didn't think so
her cutoffs in the	so i went to her	he was a great guy	he did a quick
ner eutons in the	room and found a box of	but i didn't	check of my backpack
front nothing and then	her clothes i opened	know that until a	and found some paper
digs in the back and then	it up and it	vear later when he	towels in the back
she has this yest on that	was like a little	went to jail and	pocket of the pants
has fifty million little	black bag that had	we all saw the	and some other things
pockets on it and she's	a few things inside	pictures and the whole	that i wasn't sure
checking and checking and	of it that i couldn't	thing was a mess	where to find but
it's looking bad it's	figure out at first	but i didn't really	they were still there
looking very had she digs	and then i just	know that much about it	i looked at them a
back in the front again	grabbed a small box	until i came to	bit more and found
deep deep and she pulls	and opened it and	see the house and	a small bag of weed
out a pack of matches that	pulled out a huge	it was a hig place	in there that had
had been laundered at	nile of bills i	and everything was nice	probably been around years
least once ukoh we open	had thrown away but it	and all that but	old i didn't want
least once angli we open	was still worth it	i still	

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
it up and there is one	so i took it	got in trouble for	to smoke it so
match inside ok oh my	all home with me	smoking weed after a	i took the joint
god this takes on it's	i was like wow	couple weeks and i	and said oh well
like nasa now we got to	this is awesome i	was trying to keep	it's a waste of
like oh how are we gonna	mean you can do it	my cool so i sat	money but i think
do it ok and we hunker	again but i want	on the floor next	we can do it anyway
down we crouch on the	you to try to get	to the toilet and	i take a deep breath
ground and where's the	out of the car	waited i had my	and open the door
wind coming from we're	before the guy comes	hand in the bowl	a little bit so i
stopping i take out my	back you can tell	when he came to	can get my head
cigarettes let's get the	him to turn off	pick it up he said	up the guy comes
cigarettes ready oh my	the lights but you	you can't use it	over to me and says
brand she says not	don't know how much	because i know how	you can do it
surprising and	it	it feels	i don't have any
we both have our	will hurt so he	so i took it	experience with this
cigarettes at the ready	starts yelling at me	out of the bag	so he pulls out
she strikes once nothing	i do it again and	and it started to	the knife and cuts
she strikes again yes	again until my face	bubble and then popped	me up i feel the
fire puff inhale mm	is bloody i end	out i grabbed my	hot blood flow into
sweet kiss of that	up sitting down with	hand and held it	my mouth and then
cigarette and we sit	him and just looking	out to her while	i just sit there
there and we're loving	at him for the	she took the bottle	and try to suck it
the nicotine and we	first time i remember	i didn't want to	out i felt so
both need this right	how scared he was	take it because it	sick and i knew
now i can tell the	when we were in	was so weird to	that my life was
night's been tough	his room we sat	me after about minutes	about to end i
immediately we start		she	went back inside and
to reminisce			started
about our thirty second	there for about minutes	started to cry and	talking to my friends
relationship i didn't	talking about it then	i said that i wasn't	about how horrible the
think that was gonna	he starts saying things	ready to see her	day was and how
happen me neither oh	like you don't know	i felt so bad and	i couldn't believe it
man that was close oh	who i am and what	she was like oh	but i was glad
i'm so lucky i saw you	happened and then i	my god what happened	that he came over
yeah then she surprises	hear this guy ask	and then she asked	i wanted to tell
me by saying what was	me if i knew who	me why i was so	him about it and
the fight about and i	he was i said no	upset i said i don't	he asked me what
say wha what are they	i didn't and he says	know what you mean	happened he then said
all about and she said	you didn't know him	but it is obvious	i don't know what
i know what you mean	did you you	that you are angry	you mean what did
she said was it a bad one			i do to him
and and i said			and i replied
you know like medium	think i did and	about something i asked	oh it was nothing
she said oh and we start	then we start talking	what happened and he	he just went on
to trade stories about	about our mutual friends	said he went to	to tell me about
our lives we're both from	we went to the same	visit a friend in	his childhood in the
up north we're both kind	school but she lived	a town i lived in	united states he was
of newish to the neighborhood	in a city about	in the south i didn't	from the east coast
this is in florida we both	hours away from where	really know where it	he had lived there for
went to college not great	we were she had a	was he came back	years and was an
colleges but man we	great job but i	to the states to	excellent student at a
graduated and i'm actually	don't see her much	attend university he said	university he also had
finding myself a little	as a manager but	that he was a very	an engineering degree but
jealous of her because	she is really close	smart person but he	it didn't compare to
she has this really cool	to the other people	didn't think he	mine my mom had
	who work at this	would get a job as	a great job she
		an assistant to	

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
job washing dogs she had	company i know this	an engineering professor	worked as a secretary
horses back home and	because she had to	the thing is he	for a bank for years
she really loves animals	leave school because of	really doesn't want	and she has a degree
and she wants to be a vet	it but she said she	to work at a university	in accounting but it's
and i'm like man you're	wanted to be a teacher	so i think he can	just not possible i
halfway there i'm a waitress	i got a job at	only do so much but	could work at a bank
at an ice cream parlor so	a local coffee shop	he has an engineering	but i don't want
um that's not i don't know	i didn't like it	degree which i don't	to go back and
where i want to be but i	but i was happy	know what that means	do that it seems
know it's not that and	there and i did it	for me so i think	like you need to
then it gets a little	anyways one day the	i need to start talking	
deeper cg	guy comes	to people	
and we share some other	in with a bunch of	i can trust who	talk about what happened
stuff about what our lives	people who were already	don't really know	i think it is
are like things that i	in the room i didn't	me but i want to	important to explain
can't ever tell people at	know them well so	share what happened with	some things and maybe
home this girl i can tell	i couldn't tell them	them i feel that	i can help you get
her the really ugly stuff	what happened but they	if they don't like	a perspective on how
and she still understands	didn't really want to	me that they can't	you feel in your
how it can still be pretty	hear the story because	be trusted to not	own way i think it
she understands like how	they knew how much i	judge me for something	would be easier to
nice he's gonna be when	hated the fact that	i did wrong but if	understand it myself if
i get home and how	i didn't get to	i try to fix it	i understood how i felt
sweet that'll be	see him because	they will always hate	when i was younger my
	he didn't care and	me because i do it again	parents had no clue
			how much it
we are chain smoking	i couldn't stop crying	i can go to a bar	affected me so i
off each other oh that's	because of it so i	and drink some beer	decided to give them
almost out come on and	left it on the counter	but they will ask	a big hug and kiss
we we go through this	for him to take it	me to leave after i	their cheek then they
entire pack until it's	off and he did and	finish up i walk	pulled back and started
gone and then i say you	then i said i don't	outside and say i	crying i said okay
know what uh this is a	want to keep it	need to get a ride	that was it i didn't
little funny but you're	because i can't afford	home because i don't	have time to give
gonna have to show me	to get it back	know how to drive	them any of my money
the way to get home	because he didn't buy	in my state and i	i don't have a car
because although i'm	me a ticket i had	didn't have my license	i can't even get a
twenty three years old	no idea where to	yet so i asked him	license because of
i don't have my driver's	go so i asked him	if he could pick	this so i just
license yet and i just	if i could	me up to go	drove by and asked
jumped out right when			if she could
i needed to and she says			
well why don't you come back			
to my house and i'll	stay with him at	home he said sure i	drive me home she
give you a ride i say	my place he said sure	would like that so	says sure and we
ok great and we start	and we walked outside	we drive out of	go and i was like
walking and uh we get	together we started talking	town and down a main	ok so we get in
to this um lots of uh	and then i noticed that	road where it becomes	the car and she starts
lights and uh the roads	there were people	more rural the houses	driving to the address
are getting wider and wider	everywhere the whole street	get smaller and less	i give her the directions
and there's more cars and	was empty we looked up	populated i see a few	to her house and
i see um lots of stores	and saw the sky was lit	farms and then a	then we head over there
you know laundromats and	up with orange and	big town with lots	we walk through the
dollar stores and emerge centers	yellow and then a car came	of stores and	neighborhood and see a
_			police car with

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
and then we cross over	around the corner and	restaurants i drive	a red light on
us one and uh she leads	we watched it until	about a mile up a	the corner in the
me to some place and i	it pulled up to us	hill and i see this	street next to my
think no but yes carl's	and i thought oh my	sign that reads i	house i saw this guy
efficiency apartments	god it was the guy	don't like this place	and i freaked out
this girl lives there and	who ran the store i	but i also think	because i thought he was
it's horrible and it's	remember this i was	that the owner is a	my neighbor who had
lit up so bright just to	so freaked out because	complete idiot because	a huge house that
illuminate the horribleness	i knew that it was	he has a huge house	was really nice but
of it it's the kind of	a bad thing because	and the whole place	was not the kind
place where you drive your	of what	is built into the building	of place you would see
		_	in a movie where everyone
car right up and the	happened the guy was	so you can walk in	was living together
door's right there and	on the couch with a	the door without touching	but you couldn't go
there's fifty million	huge amount of alcohol	the wall the windows	in without a security
cigarette butts outside	and the room was full	are all covered and	camera in the front room
and there's like doors one	of people who were	there are a bunch of	the tv is always on
through seven and you	clearly drunk the whole	people in there that	and people are constantly
know behind every single	thing was pretty weird	are probably doing nothing	talking and laughing and
door there's some horrible	as the group was	but drinking or just	all sorts of weird stuff
misery going on there's	drinking and smoking weed	sitting around waiting for	going on i can't
someone crying or drunk	i didn't know what was	someone to call so	believe this is happening
or lonely or cruel and i	going on so i went	i'm like man i feel	i didn't know he
think oh god she lives	back inside and called	bad for him i really	was gay so i went
here how awful we go to	the cops i had to	do i was trying	to my room and
the door door number four	walk out	to tell him	
and she very			
very quietly keys in	of there and leave the	to leave when the	was just standing there
as soon as the door opens	door open because i	door opened and i saw	trying to calm myself
i hear the blare of	could see a man	him walking towards me	down i could hear the
television come out and	in his room in a	i could see that the	water running in the
on the blue light of the	suit that was covered	light from the kitchen	bathroom and the tv
television the smoke of a	in blood and he had	was off and his face	was off the only light
hundred cigarettes in that	a huge knife sticking	was covered in blood	came from the screen it
little crack of light and	out of his chest i	but i had never seen	was dark outside i
i hear the man and he says	remember him saying oh	him before so i said	heard her say you have
where were you and she says	you can go now but	hey man what are	to go now but i
never mind i'm back and	i told him i don't	you doing here you need	said ok i don't
he says you alright	want to he said	to go home he says i	think so and then she
and she says yeah i'm	ok but you can stay	don't know but i	was like oh okay
alright and then she turns	i walked over to my	want to talk to you	you can come with
to me and says you want	mom and she told me	i told him no but	me she then asked if
a beer and he says who	not to tell him to	then i see him look	i was sure about my
the fuck is that and she	come over he said he	at me and i think	mom i said yes and
pulls me over and he sees	didn't like it i	oh i can't believe	she was like oh
me and he says oh hey i'm	had a few beers and	this he must be	this is great so
not a threat just then he	started to get really	crazy i was staring	i took it out of his
takes a drag of his	drunk but the alcohol	at his hand and it	mouth and it was really
cigarette a very hard hard	was too much for	started moving a little	hard to swallow because
drag you know the kind	my head to handle and	faster than normal it	it felt like someone
that makes the end of it		was like the weirdest	was pushing
really heat up hot hot hot			

Ground Truth	S01	S02	<b>S03</b>
and long and it's a	i could only hold the	feeling you get when	my throat down and
little scary and i follow	glass up to the light	you touch your arm	then sucking it out
the cigarette down because	to see what i had done	but then you see the	then the water started
i'm afraid of that head	wrong but it was all	blood flow down the	flowing back up into
falling off and i'm	over my hand the blood	front of your body and	my body i didn't
surprised when i see in	was still running down	vou can feel your hand	realize what was happening
the crook of his arm a	my arm the nurse saw	on the ground in a	until my hand was
little boy sleeping a	that and tried to pull	way you never imagined	touching the bottom of
toddler and i think and	him away she then grabbed	possible so i went over	my leg and the other
just then the girl reaches	the iv bag and began	to his car and grabbed	was resting on the
underneath the bed and	to	a paper bag full	seat behind me he then
takes out a carton and			pulled a small bottle
she taps out the			out of the glove box
last s pack of cigarettes	fill it up with water	of food from his kitchen i	and poured some water in
in there and on the way	as i ran back to the	then walked around to	it then placed it next
up she kisses the little	room i looked at her and	the front door to open	to me as he sat back
boy and then she kisses	said something like hev	it and he asked me what	down he said hev buddy
the man and the man says	what are you doing here	i wanted and i said just	vou wanna come with me
again you alright and she	i'm gonna go get some	some food i went and	i replied yeah i want to
says yeah i'm just gonna	food so i left the room	got a few plates and	play this game we went
go out and smoke with her	and started walking down	then we started to eat	on a tour of the town
and so we go outside and	the street and i thought	the meal we had already	and we were talking about
sit amongst the cigarette	hey man i don't know	paid for and the guy	what kind of music the city
butts and smoke and i say	you i mean i think	was like wow dude that	was i said wow this is
wow that's your little boy	you're really	is awesome	amazing and
and she says yeah isn't he	5 5		C C
beautiful and i			
say yeah he is he is	weird but you could be	i think he is really	he replied yeah it was
beautiful he's my light	the best person you can	cool i mean i was and	so much fun he was a
he keeps me going she	be you don't know how	so was the other guy we	really great guy but he
says we finish our	to do this but i was	went out to dinner and	didn't have any money
cigarettes she finishes	told to go out and get	i didn't drink much because	he wasn't allowed to smoke
her beer i don't have	drunk with friends i didn't	i was worried i would get	weed because he was too
a beer cause i can't go	do it and then the guy	arrested or something like	scared of getting arrested
home with beer on my	came back into my room	that the police came and	and then one night i came
breath and she goes			home drunk and
inside to get the keys			
she takes too			
long in there getting	and i started to freak	searched my house but i	it was dark i didn't
the keys and i think	out thinking something	didn't hear them come	feel like talking to him
something must be wrong	was wrong but then i	back they said they couldn't	so i just left he said i
and she comes out and	remember him saying oh	find the keys to the	can't go with you because
she says look i'm really	hey you know i don't	car and i was scared	my dad doesn't have any
sorry but um like we	have any money to buy	because they didn't know	money for the bus but
don't have any gas in	a new car i think	the code to get into	that i could take a cab
the car it's already on	he said i can't do that	the house so i said okay	home or something so he told
e and he needs to get to	so 1 just go with him	1 can drive but 1 need	me to drive in the
work in the morning and	and tell him to do	a map first so he shows	direction of my house which
um 1 you know 1 1 m gonna	whatever it takes he then	me where it is he says	is about miles away and
be walk to work as it is	says well you can try	it's about minutes away	1 should head
so what i did was though	to find the place where	so we walk down	
nere look 1 drew out this			
map for you and you're			
really you're like a mile			
and a half from home and			
um if you walk			

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
three streets over	they are supposed to	the road to where he	down the road a little
you'll be back on that	meet and then i go in	lives and i take out a	ways until i see the
pretty street and you just	there and he asks me	small piece of paper and	sign and pull over and
take that and you'll be	to bring a small bag	write this on the inside	park the car the kid
fine and she also has	with a few bottles of	of the windshield with the	comes out with a bag of
wrapped up in toilet	wine in it i said ok	red pen that she gave	chips and a small box
paper seven cigarettes	and took them inside and	to me the whole thing	of candy i take them from
for me a third of her pack	we started talking and	was really cool and she	him and he says hey man
i note and a new pack of	he asked me about my	asked me what i wanted	i'm so glad i got
matches and she tells me	life and how i felt	for Christmas she told	to meet you i like you
good bye and that was	about him and		too and
great to meet you and	me to		
how lucky and that			
was fun and you know			
let's be friends and i	i said yes and then	call her anytime and	then he said ok well
say yeah ok and i walk	i left because i wasn't	i said sure and hung	that was weird i guess i
away but i kind of know	sure what was happening	up i didn't really know	just didn't want to go
we're not gonna be friends	but i wanted to see her	what to do but i thought	in there and he just
i might not ever see her	again it was really sad	she would be okay i	kind of left after that
again and i kind of know	when 1 realized she	don't think she ever talked	but 1 think 1t was really
1 don't think she's ever	didn't even know i was	about it i didn't really	interesting for me because i
going to be a vet and i	there until after 1	know what was happening	had always wanted to be a
cross and 1 walk away and	left i went home and	until i went to see her	doctor but it seemed like
maybe this would ve seemed	sat down to think i	after that and it was	they had a different
like a visit from my	felt a	hard to process	approach than what
possible future and scary	wave of panic that i	because 1 was so confused	1 was used to in high
but it kind of does the	had never experienced	and angry but then 1	it was really hard
opposite on the walk nome	feel like it may have an	started talking to my	to understand what was
I III like man that was	ieel like it was happening	had done and about how	like there were recented
and i'm going home now	so I said ney man	my sister was a horrible	all around us i noticed
to my nice boyfriend and	you know this guy that	person and how i didn't	one guy who was very
he is gonna he so extra	i went to bed and was	know it then the worst	big and scary looking but
happy to see me and we	really depressed he had	thing ever happened she	he was also a good friend
have a one bedroom	been drinking for months	was living in a tiny	and he had a small
apartment and we have	he was living in an	apartment with a lot of	anartment which he shared
two trees and there's	apartment with two other	stuff in	with two other guys it was a
two dees and dere s	guys and it	Starr m	while two other guys it was a
a vard and we have	was a huge house with a big	her bedroom and a kitchen	huge room with a ty
this jar in the kitchen	screen ty and a couch so	that had no electricity	in the corner and
where there's like	he could play video games	i had to pay for everything	a kitchen that was
loose money that we	i didn't have any money for	myself i didn't really	filled with food that
can use for anything	anything i had no friends	have any money saved up	he kept on hand i
like we would never	so i just staved there alone	but my mom would have	didn't have any money
ever run out of gas	until he left i started drinking	helped me out but i	because i wasn't paying
and um i don't have a	a lot and i didn't really	wasn't going to do	for anything and my
baby you know so i can	know what was happening	anything i just stayed	dad didn't want me to
leave whenever i want	until my friends found	with him for about two	go out drinking so i
i smoked all seven	out and they didn't	days until he stopped	just walked home that
cigarettes on the way	believe me	drinking i didn't know	night after work he said
home and people who have		how much he had had	that i needed to stop
never smoked cigarettes		but he said	smoking weed because
just think ick			i didn't

Ground Truth	S01	S02	S03
disgusting and poison	when i said it i couldn't	that it was good to	like the taste it was
but unless you've had	even explain it but i	feel like you are	disgusting and it made
them and held them dear	think it's important	not alone i think it	me feel sick but it
you don't know how great	that you know why it	is important to look	also helped me to be
they can be and what	happened you can do it	back on this moment	more comfortable around
friends and comfort and	because you are so powerful	with some sadness but	my friends who i was
kinship they can bring	you have an ability to help	it will come to a	close to and i found
it took me a long time	other people but you must not	head soon i feel that	a way to connect with
to quit that boyfriend	give up you need to learn	we need to change the	them after the breakup i
and then to quit	to accept what happened	past so we can live	think they got over it
	and move on i had a	it again we do it	
smoking and uh	girlfriend when i was	now it was a mistake	but i was still depressed
sometimes i still	and a year later she	but the guy is a	for months after she died
miss the smoking	divorced my		