World Journal of Neuroscience, 2025, 15(2), 105-125

ISSN Online: 2162-2019
ISSN Print: 2162-2000

The Hybrid Mind in Precision Neurorehabilitation: Integrating AI-Driven Neurotechnologies and Ethical Governance

Rosimar Jose de Lima Dias

Faculdade Católica de Mato Grosso (FACC-MT), Várzea Grande, Brasil
Email: rosimar.dias@faccmt.com.br

How to cite this paper: de Lima Dias, R.J. (2025) The Hybrid Mind in Precision Neurorehabilitation: Integrating AI-Driven Neurotechnologies and Ethical Governance. *World Journal of Neuroscience*, **15**, 105-125.
https://doi.org/10.4236/wjns.2025.152010

Received: January 18, 2025
Accepted: May 23, 2025
Published: May 26, 2025

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) and neurotechnologies are redefining neuropsychological rehabilitation, enabling precision-guided, real-time neuromodulation. This review introduces the *hybrid mind* paradigm—a convergence of biological and artificial cognition—operationalized through AI-enhanced brain-computer interfaces (BCIs), deep brain stimulation (DBS), and adaptive neurofeedback. These technologies integrate closed-loop modulation and neuroadaptive algorithms to optimize neuroplasticity and functional recovery. While AI-driven systems show promise in cognitive and motor domains, translational barriers persist, including algorithmic opacity, neural data governance, and fragmented regulation. We synthesize recent evidence and outline strategic priorities: implementation of explainable AI frameworks, development of non-invasive neuromodulatory alternatives, and global harmonization of ethical standards. As AI and neuroscience converge, the hybrid mind paradigm signals a pivotal shift toward individualized, ethically guided neurorehabilitation.

Keywords

Hybrid Mind, AI-Driven Neurorehabilitation, Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), Deep Brain Stimulation (DBS), Neuroadaptive Algorithms

1. Introduction

Over the past decades, neuropsychological rehabilitation has undergone a profound paradigmatic transformation, catalyzed by accelerated advancements in neurotechnology and artificial intelligence (AI). The interplay between the human brain and technological systems—often mediated by sophisticated AI algorithms—has culminated in the conceptualization of the "hybrid mind", a framework that synergistically integrates human cognitive processes with advanced computational systems to augment neurocognitive and neuromotor recovery.

The hybrid mind paradigm embodies a convergence of biological and AI, wherein AI-driven neurotechnologies enhance both cognitive and functional capabilities. This paradigm represents a departure from traditional neurorehabilitation models by incorporating real-time neurophysiological monitoring, closed-loop neurostimulation, and AI-enhanced cognitive augmentation. Initial notions of the hybrid mind emerged from early brain-computer interface (BCI) applications in the 1970s, which used electroencephalography (EEG) to decode neural signals. Contemporary models, however, leverage deep learning algorithms, adaptive neurofeedback, and non-invasive neuromodulation to create personalized, self-regulating therapeutic protocols [1] [2]. Although early BCI developments demonstrated the viability of non-invasive neural communication, substantial advancements since the 2000s—driven by device miniaturization, enhanced computational power, and AI-assisted neural decoding—have significantly enhanced system efficiency [3] [4]. These AI-enhanced models now facilitate real-time neural signal processing and enable bidirectional interfacing between the brain and external devices [5].

In contrast to conventional neuropsychological strategies that predominantly target biological and behavioral mechanisms, hybrid mind technologies employ AI and closed-loop neurofeedback to dynamically promote neuroplasticity [6] [7]. Traditional interventions such as cognitive-behavioral therapy and repetitive-task training rely on static therapeutic frameworks. Hybrid models, however, utilize AI-based adaptive learning systems that tailor interventions in real time, based on ongoing neural activity [2] [8]. Furthermore, the incorporation of robotic-assisted therapy and neuroprosthetics has expanded the potential of BCIs, offering individualized rehabilitation paradigms that surpass the constrains of conventional methodologies [9]. These developments underscore the transformative role of AI in aligning BCIs with neuroadaptive rehabilitation, thereby advancing precision in neuromodulation and cognitive restoration [7].

Recent empirical findings indicate that deep brain stimulation (DBS) and BCIs can facilitate accelerated cortical reorganization in individuals with acquired brain injuries, significantly augmenting the outcomes of standard therapeutic protocols [10] [11]. Nevertheless, the clinical translation of hybrid mind technologies remains challenged by limited clinical validation, regulatory ambiguity, and underdeveloped ethical frameworks. Despite the therapeutic promise of BCIs and DBS, persistent issues regarding neural data governance, algorithmic opacity, and equitable access continue to hinder large-scale implementation. Addressing these barriers is essential for ensuring the safe, ethical, and efficacious deployment of such technologies in real-world clinical contexts.

At its core, the hybrid mind paradigm represents a paradigm shift in neuropsychological rehabilitation by bridging biological and artificial cognition. Traditional interventions, although often effective, are constrained by inter-individual variability in treatment responsiveness. In contrast, hybrid approaches enable real-time, individualized modulation of therapeutic strategies informed by continuous neural feedback. For instance, standard stroke rehabilitation generally comprises therapist-guided motor exercises, whereas hybrid methods integrate BCIs with immersive virtual reality to enhance cortical activation and expedite motor recovery [12]. Additionally, AI-based analyses of neural patterns facilitate ongoing optimization of treatment trajectories, thereby improving clinical outcomes.

Despite these advancements, the clinical assimilation of hybrid mind technologies raises several critical ethical and regulatory issues. Chief among them are concerns regarding neural data privacy, due to the inherently sensitive nature of neurophysiological information, and the opacity of AI-driven decisions, which may compromise patient safety and undermine clinical accountability. Moreover, unequal access to cutting-edge neurotechnologies threatens to exacerbate existing healthcare disparities. These challenges highlight the urgent necessity for comprehensive regulatory infrastructures that equitably balance innovation and accessibility. Effective clinical translation will depend on the development of standardized procedural protocols and large-scale multicenter trials to rigorously evaluate the safety, efficacy, and scalability of hybrid neurotechnological interventions [13]-[16].

Beyond individual-level applications, the deployment of hybrid neurotechnologies is instigating structural transformations in the delivery of neurorehabilitation services. Hybrid models combining in-person and remote care—particularly through teleneuropsychology—have shown promise in expanding access to underserved regions [17]. Furthermore, mounting evidence suggests that digital neurorehabilitation platforms enhance patient adherence and clinical efficacy, while alleviating logistical and financial burdens [18].

Nevertheless, several pivotal methodological and ethical challenges remain unresolved. The acquisition and analysis of neural data necessitate stringent security protocols to protect patient confidentiality. Moreover, the validation of hybrid neurotechnologies depends upon a robust corpus of randomized controlled trials capable of establishing long-term safety and efficacy in diverse clinical environments [19]. The rapid pace of AI and neurotechnological innovation has revealed a significant regulatory and evidentiary void: the absence of harmonized clinical and legal standards requisite for large-scale integration. While emerging research affirms the benefits of BCIs, DBS, and AI-assisted rehabilitation, broader adoption is still constrained by the lack of unified frameworks and longitudinal outcome data.

In response to these multifaceted challenges, this review employs an exploratory horizon-scanning methodology with two primary objectives: 1) to map recent advancements in the integration of neurotechnologies within neuropsychological rehabilitation, and 2) to delineate the key methodological, ethical, and regulatory barriers inhibiting their clinical translation.

The review is anchored by the following research question: How do methodological limitations, ethical considerations, and regulatory constraints impact the clinical translation of AI-driven neurotechnologies, including BCIs and DBS, in neuropsychological rehabilitation?

To address this inquiry, we conducted an exploratory literature review to evaluate the current landscape of neurotechnological applications in neuropsychological rehabilitation. Unlike systematic reviews, which emphasize methodological reproducibility, this analysis seeks to identify emergent themes, knowledge gaps, and unresolved challenges within the field. Literature searches were conducted using databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, supplemented by domain-specific sources relevant to the clinical implementation of neurotechnologies. The search strategy was guided by rigorously defined, domain-specific descriptors—including "AI-driven neurorehabilitation," "brain-computer interfaces," "deep brain stimulation," "adaptive neurofeedback," and "precision neuropsychological rehabilitation"—to ensure both conceptual rigor and thematic comprehensiveness.

2. BCI for Precision Neurocognitive Rehabilitation

BCIs represent a paradigmatic breakthrough in neuropsychological rehabilitation, enabling direct interfacing between neural substrates and external systems to modulate and restore both cognitive and motor functions. Originally developed for motor rehabilitation in individuals with neurological impairments—such as stroke, spinal cord injury, and neurodegenerative diseases [12]—BCIs have since evolved to encompass broader applications, including cognitive enhancement and neuroadaptive therapeutic strategies.

Recent advancements have coalesced into multimodal BCI architectures that synergistically integrate cortical activity-controlled neural prosthetics, EEG-guided neurostimulation, and AI-augmented adaptive neurofeedback to enhance neuroplasticity and accelerate functional restoration [20] [21]. These closed-loop, self-optimizing platforms dynamically calibrate stimulation parameters in response to ongoing neurophysiological signals, thereby enabling real-time personalization of therapeutic inputs [22]. Clinically, the integration of such BCI systems into conventional neurorehabilitation protocols—particularly in post-stroke motor recovery—has demonstrated superior efficacy in facilitating cortical reorganization and synaptic reconnection. A randomized controlled trial by Zhao *et al.* [23] revealed that stroke patients undergoing a four-week BCI-mediated robotic training program, combined with physiotherapy, exhibited significantly enhanced lower-limb motor recovery and cognitive performance compared to a sham control group. These improvements were accompanied by elevated serum brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) levels and reduced motor-evoked potential (MEP) latency, reflecting heightened neuroplastic responsiveness. Collectively, these outcomes signify a conceptual shift toward precision neurorehabilitation, underpinned by AI-driven, patient-specific neuromodulation frameworks.

Beyond motor rehabilitation, BCIs have exhibited notable efficacy in cognitive recovery, particularly in modulating attentional processes, working memory, and executive control. Recent studies demonstrate that BCI-mediated neurocognitive training paradigms enhance functional connectivity across the frontoparietal and default mode networks, indicating accelerated neural integration in individuals with acquired brain injuries (ABI) and post-stroke aphasia [24] [25]. Furthermore, the integration of BCI-driven neurofeedback with virtual reality–enhanced rehabilitation environments has been shown to amplify user engagement and foster neuroadaptive learning, thereby improving long-term cognitive recovery trajectories [26] [27].

Despite these advances, several persistent barriers continue to hinder the clinical translation of BCI technologies. Key challenges include prohibitive device costs, the requirement for clinician-specific technical training, and cognitive fatigue arising from prolonged or high-demand BCI use—particularly in resource-constrained clinical settings [28] [29]. Additionally, inter-individual variability in neuromodulatory response—shaped by factors such as lesion severity, age, cognitive baseline, and inherent neural plasticity—has been widely acknowledged as a major impediment to protocol standardization, reinforcing the imperative for personalized intervention paradigms to optimize therapeutic efficacy [30] [31].

Emerging research has proposed hybrid BCI systems incorporating AI to dynamically modulate rehabilitation parameters in response to real-time neural feedback [32]. These AI-enhanced BCIs deploy machine learning algorithms to optimize neurostimulation profiles, potentially mitigating fatigue and enhancing adaptive neuroplasticity [23]. However, concerns related to algorithmic transparency, data privacy, and the interpretability of AI-generated decisions remain formidable. Studies emphasize that the opacity of AI-BCI systems may undermine clinical trust among practitioners and patients alike, underscoring the urgent need for Explainable AI (XAI) frameworks [33]. Notably, XAI-driven tools such as *MoveXAI* have shown promise in improving the interpretability and reliability of AI-supported neurorehabilitation models, thereby facilitating greater clinical acceptance and regulatory alignment.

While the evidence base supporting BCI efficacy continues to expand, large-scale, multicenter clinical trials remain indispensable to validate the long-term therapeutic impact of these systems across diverse patient populations [34]. Future research must prioritize the optimization of hybrid BCI-AI platforms, improvement of cost-effectiveness, and resolution of regulatory challenges to ensure widespread clinical deployment. As BCI technology evolves, its convergence with adaptive AI-driven interventions and real-time neuroplasticity monitoring represents a paradigm shift in personalized neurorehabilitation, ushering in a new era of precision-guided cognitive and motor recovery.

3. Neuromodulatory Mechanisms of DBS in Cognitive and Motor Rehabilitation

DBS has emerged as a potent neuromodulatory intervention for patients with motor and cognitive impairments arising from stroke, traumatic brain injury (TBI), and neurodegenerative disorders. By directly stimulating subcortical structures, DBS facilitates cortical reorganization, synaptic plasticity, and enhanced neurofunctional recovery. Clinical trials have demonstrated that dentate nucleus stimulation via DBS can significantly augment motor rehabilitation in chronic stroke patients, leading to notable improvements in upper limb functionality and fine motor coordination [35].

Recent investigations have underscored the role of DBS in modulating corticospinal networks, enhancing functional connectivity, and amplifying the therapeutic effects of intensive physical therapy in post-stroke rehabilitation [36]. When integrated with constraint-induced movement therapy (CIMT) and robotic-assisted rehabilitation, DBS has been shown to attenuate disuse atrophy and accelerate cortical reorganization, reinforcing the synergistic potential of multimodal neurorehabilitation strategies [37] [38].

Beyond motor recovery, DBS has demonstrated promise in cognitive restoration, particularly among patients with TBI, Alzheimer's disease, and post-stroke cognitive deficits. However, emerging longitudinal evidence suggests that DBS-induced neuroplasticity may produce both beneficial and maladaptive outcomes over time. For example, although basal ganglia stimulation enhances motor function, chronic DBS in Parkinson's disease has been associated with cognitive fluctuations and long-term neuropsychiatric side effects, including impulsivity and executive dysfunction [39].

Similarly, while DBS-induced cortical plasticity supports language recovery in post-stroke aphasia, its long-term sustainability—particularly beyond five years—remains uncertain, necessitating further investigation [40]. DBS targeting the basal nucleus of Meynert has been explored as a method for enhancing memory consolidation and attentional regulation in early-stage Alzheimer's disease, with findings indicating increased functional connectivity in executive control circuits [39]. Additionally, stimulation of the thalamus and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex has been examined in the context of post-stroke aphasia recovery, with preliminary data suggesting improvements in verbal fluency and lexical retrieval [40].

Optimizing DBS: AI-Driven Personalization and Translational Barriers

Despite its therapeutic potential, DBS efficacy remains markedly variable, influenced by patient-specific factors such as age, lesion severity, and the timing of intervention post-injury. Younger individuals generally exhibit greater neuroplastic adaptability, whereas older patients may require personalized calibration of stimulation parameters to achieve optimal therapeutic benefit [36]. The integration of AI-based neuromodulation strategies has been proposed to refine DBS precision, allowing for real-time, data-driven modulation of stimulation intensity and frequency according to individualized neural responses [35]. Adaptive DBS systems, leveraging closed-loop AI frameworks, dynamically adjust stimulation settings in response to continuous electrophysiological feedback, offering a highly individualized treatment approach [41].

Although AI-enhanced DBS represents a paradigm shift in neuropsychological rehabilitation, several obstacles impede its broader clinical implementation. These include the technical complexity of surgical implantation, elevated device costs, and the need for long-term maintenance, which collectively pose substantial challenges—particularly in resource-constrained healthcare ecosystems [42]. Accessibility is further limited by the requirement for specialized clinical expertise, restricting its use to advanced neurorehabilitation centers.

Moreover, the financial burden associated with DBS remains significant. Procedural costs frequently exceed $50,000 per patient and are further compounded by lifelong device maintenance and recalibration demands [43] [44]. These economic constraints disproportionately affect underserved populations, where access to complex neurotechnologies is already limited by healthcare workforce shortages and infrastructural deficits. Without strategic policy interventions—such as cost-reduction initiatives, insurance reimbursement frameworks, and public–private partnerships—the clinical promise of AI-optimized DBS may remain inaccessible to low-resource settings, exacerbating global disparities in neurorehabilitation outcomes [45].

4. Hybrid Neurorehabilitation Paradigms: From Cognitive Interventions to Intelligent Therapeutics

The integration of traditional neuropsychological rehabilitation strategies with emerging neurotechnologies has facilitated the development of hybrid therapeutic frameworks, combining evidence-based methodologies with AI-driven personalization, VR, neurofeedback, and BCIs [17]. These approaches leverage the synergistic capabilities of multimodal systems to optimize neurorehabilitation outcomes. The convergence of BCIs with AI and VR has demonstrated notable efficacy in post-stroke rehabilitation by enhancing cortical activation and neuroplastic responsiveness through immersive neurofeedback environments [21]. Similarly, AI-enhanced DBS has been applied to the neuromodulation of movement disorders, enabling real-time modulation of stimulation parameters based on oscillatory neural signal dynamics [29]. The integration of neurofeedback with AI-powered cognitive training has also been explored in the treatment of neurodevelopmental disorders, such as autism spectrum disorder (ASD), reinforcing targeted neural pathways via personalized, adaptive reinforcement paradigms delivered through gamified and mobile neurotechnological platforms [46]. Collectively, these multimodal constructs represent the next frontier in precision neurorehabilitation, uniting biological adaptability with computational intelligence to enable real-time, individualized therapeutic modulation.

The application of AI in neuropsychological rehabilitation has redefined therapeutic paradigms by enabling interventions to adapt dynamically in response to neural activity patterns and clinical progress [32]. Machine learning algorithms, trained on cognitive and neurophysiological biomarkers, have been used to optimize rehabilitation exercises and cognitive training protocols in real time, facilitating individualized treatment trajectories [6]. The development of XAI frameworks has further advanced clinical decision-support systems by ensuring transparent and interpretable neurorehabilitation protocols for both clinicians and patients [33]. In parallel, AI-assisted teleneuropsychology platforms have demonstrated potential in expanding access to rehabilitation services in remote and underserved regions, thereby mitigating disparities through cost reduction and enhanced therapeutic efficiency [15].

The incorporation of VR and augmented reality (AR) into neurorehabilitation has introduced novel, immersive modalities for cognitive and motor recovery by creating enriched learning environments that promote neuroplasticity [47]. VR-based interventions have proven effective in enhancing visuospatial attention and executive functioning in stroke patients with unilateral spatial neglect, offering ecologically valid, interactive environments that foster cognitive engagement [48]. Unlike VR, which fully immerses patients in simulated scenarios, AR superimposes digital elements onto real-world settings, providing a less immersive but more contextually integrated rehabilitation experience. Recent clinical trials and systematic reviews have shown that AR-based interventions improve spatial cognition and social interaction, particularly in the treatment of age-related cognitive decline [49].

EEG-based neurofeedback has gained prominence as a non-invasive technique in neuropsychological rehabilitation, empowering patients to self-modulate neural activity through real-time feedback protocols [50]. This technique has been widely implemented in managing attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), post-stroke deficits, and neurodegenerative disorders, supporting the functional reorganization of impaired cortical networks [51]. The integration of neurofeedback with digital therapeutic platforms and gamified rehabilitation environments has further increased patient adherence and engagement, reinforcing principles of neuroadaptive learning [52].

BCIs have been extensively studied in both motor and cognitive domains, enabling direct interfacing between neural activity and external assistive technologies. Clinical applications have demonstrated significant success in restoring verbal communication in individuals with post-stroke aphasia by facilitating neuroplastic changes in language-related cortical circuits [27]. Moreover, BCI-induced neuroplasticity has been associated with enhancements in executive functioning, including sustained attention and working memory [53]. Recent clinical trials show that when BCI-mediated rehabilitation is combined with conventional physiotherapy or mirror therapy, it results in synergistic improvements in both motor and cognitive recovery among post-stroke patients. Zhao and colleagues [54] reported improved lower-limb motor function and cognitive performance following a BCI-controlled robotic training protocol integrated with conventional therapy, while Mang *et al.* [55] observed amplified neuroplastic and behavioral outcomes through the incorporation of BCI-based interventions with mirror therapy—activating both motor and mirror neuron systems in a closed-loop neurorehabilitation architecture.

The rise of digital rehabilitation ecosystems, including mobile applications and web-based cognitive training platforms, has introduced scalable, flexible alternatives to traditional in-person therapies. These systems dynamically personalize cognitive tasks based on performance metrics and neurobiological biomarkers, thus optimizing individualized therapeutic protocols [51]. Teleneuropsychology has emerged as a robust model for the long-term delivery of interventions, particularly in geographically isolated or underserved areas with limited access to specialized neurological care [56]. Additionally, research indicates that incorporating adaptive feedback systems and gamification techniques into digital rehabilitation platforms markedly enhances patient engagement and clinical outcomes [57].

Despite these innovations, several persistent challenges continue to impede the widespread adoption of hybrid neurorehabilitation models. Chief among these is the absence of rigorous clinical validation through randomized multicenter trials, which limits the development of standardized intervention protocols and underscores the need for longitudinal efficacy assessments [19]. Furthermore, the high financial costs associated with advanced neurotechnologies, combined with a shortage of specialized training for clinicians, exacerbate existing accessibility inequities [43] [44]. Ethical concerns regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the opacity of AI-based therapeutic decisions further complicate the regulatory environment, raising concerns about long-term safety and equitable access to neurotechnological interventions [58].

Addressing these issues will require strategic prioritization of research and policy initiatives focused on improving the scalability, affordability, and regulatory standardization of hybrid cognitive rehabilitation models. Advances in explainable AI, real-time neurofeedback systems, and AI-guided cognitive assessment tools hold the potential to revolutionize precision neurorehabilitation, ensuring that such innovations remain both clinically viable and ethically defensible. The establishment of comprehensive international guidelines will be essential for creating coherent regulatory frameworks, fostering the safe, effective, and equitable integration of hybrid neurotechnologies into standard clinical practice. A comparative analysis of these neurotechnologies—their principal applications, therapeutic benefits, and limitations—is summarized in **Table 1**.

5. Ethical and Regulatory Frontiers in AI-Augmented Neuromodulation

The integration of neurotechnologies and AI in neuropsychological rehabilitation introduces complex and multifaceted ethical and regulatory challenges, particularly concerning the protection of neurorights. Although, existing data protection

Table 1. Functional and translational characteristics of AI-driven neurotechnologies in cognitive and motor rehabilitation.

Technology	Primary Applications	Clinical Benefits	Challenges & Limitations	Type
BCIs + AI	Motor and cognitive neurorehabilitation	AI-mediated neuroadaptive feedback enables real-time personalization	Resource-intensiveness; high training burden; limited integration in standard care	Multimodal (software + hardware)
DBS + AI	Neuromodulation in movement and cognitive disorders	Closed-loop stimulation enhances targeted neuroplasticity	Invasiveness; regulatory complexity; long-term monitoring deficits	Hardware-based implantable systems
Neurofeedback + AI	Cognitive enhancement (e.g., ADHD, stroke)	Personalized neurocognitive training based on adaptive signal decoding	Requires sustained patient engagement; limited standardization	Software-based therapeutic interface
BCI + VR	Stroke and traumatic brain injury recovery	Immersive VR-based neurofeedback enhances therapy engagement and sensorimotor integration	Accessibility limitations in low-resource settings; device standardization gaps	Hybrid (interactive software + hardware)
AI-based Cognitive Training	Memory and executive function rehabilitation	Real-time task adaptation informed by cognitive biomarkers	Algorithmic opacity; lack of longitudinal clinical validation	Software-only digital platform

statutes—such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in Europe and Brazil's General Data Protection Law (LGPD-Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados)—offer broad privacy safeguards, they fall short of addressing the intricacies associated with neural data acquisition, processing, and proprietary claims, thereby highlighting the necessity for dedicated neuroregulatory frameworks [59]. Advancements in neuroethics increasingly emphasize the critical importance of formally recognizing neurorights as fundamental protections for mental privacy, cognitive liberty, and personal identity [60]-[62].

The rapid proliferation of BCIs, DBS, and AI-enhanced neurofeedback systems has intensified demands for robust legal mechanisms to prevent unauthorized neural data collection, neurosurveillance, behavioral profiling, and cognitive manipulation. In the absence of comprehensive governance structures, neural data remain vulnerable to commercial exploitation and insufficient oversight, especially in non-clinical settings where corporate and governmental entities may deploy neurotechnologies for purposes such as neuromarketing, cognitive performance monitoring, or coercive neuromodulation [14].

5.1. Cognitive Sovereignty, Neural Data Governance, and AI Interpretability

Among the most pressing issues in neurotechnology ethics is the defense of cognitive liberty—the right to mental self-determination. As neurotechnologies are increasingly implemented in clinical, occupational, and military environments, scholars have expressed serious concerns over the potential for coercive neuromodulation and invasive cognitive surveillance, calling for legislative reforms that extend beyond conventional data privacy statutes such as the GDPR and LGPD to explicitly enshrine neurorights [62]-[64].

Equally critical is the question of neural data ownership and governance. Unlike traditional biometric identifiers, neural signals encode dynamic, deeply personal information that may reveal cognitive states, emotional patterns, and subconscious predispositions [65]. The extraordinary sensitivity of these data necessitates specialized regulatory instruments that transcend existing medical privacy frameworks to ensure individual sovereignty over neurodata and to prohibit unauthorized third-party access—particularly in commercial or non-medical contexts.

Algorithmic transparency within AI-driven neuromodulation constitutes another core ethical challenge. Closed-loop neurotechnologies—such as adaptive DBS systems that autonomously adjust stimulation parameters—pose risks of unintended cognitive alterations and diminished patient agency [32]. The opacity of black-box AI models exacerbates issues of clinical accountability, making it difficult for stakeholders to interpret or contest the computational decisions driving neuromodulatory outcomes. The implementation of XAI frameworks has been proposed to enhance transparency, clinical trust, and ethical accountability, particularly in high-risk applications such as adaptive, AI-controlled DBS, where interpretability is essential for maintaining therapeutic oversight and mitigating adverse neurocognitive effects [2] [66] [67].

5.2. Governing AI-Neurotechnology: Bridging Legal Gaps and Ethical Imperatives

Despite the accelerated evolution of AI-driven neurotechnologies, existing regulatory infrastructures remain fragmented, inconsistent, and largely inadequate in addressing the ethical, legal, and technological intricacies of AI-enhanced neuromodulation [14] [68]-[70].

A further concern is the methodological limitations of current clinical trials evaluating DBS and other AI-assisted neuromodulatory techniques. Many studies suffer from small sample sizes and short follow-up durations, thereby impeding comprehensive assessments of long-term functional, cognitive, and affective outcomes [71]-[74].

Additionally, the absence of standardized legal frameworks governing both neural data protection and AI decision-making accountability presents significant risks to patients undergoing cognitive and motor neurorehabilitation. While Chile's 2021 Constitutional Amendment on Neurorights represents a pioneering policy milestone in defending mental privacy and cognitive freedom, analogous legislative efforts remain rare in other jurisdictions. This regulatory void raises urgent concerns over data sovereignty, algorithmic opacity, and the lack of institutional mechanisms for ethical scrutiny and legal recourse in the context of AI-mediated neurointerventions [14] [68] [75]-[77]. The proposed EU AI Act introduces preliminary provisions for regulating AI-driven biometric and neural data processing; however, critics argue that these measures fail to comprehensively address the ethical and clinical ramifications of AI-enabled adaptive neuromodulation [59].

5.3. Global Governance Architectures for AI-Integrated Neurotechnologies

The global expansion of AI-driven neurotechnologies across both clinical and non-clinical spheres underscores the urgent need for an internationally coordinated regulatory framework. Although regional initiatives—such as the European Union's AI Act and Chile's constitutional amendment on neurorights—represent important precedents, the broader international legal landscape remains highly fragmented. Without harmonized global governance, the ethical deployment, clinical safety, and equitable access to AI-enhanced neuromodulation remain at risk [59] [78].

One particularly pressing concern is the lack of standardized safety protocols for the long-term monitoring of neuromodulation outcomes. Existing medical device regulations typically focus on acute physiological effects, neglecting the cumulative cognitive, emotional, and personality-related consequences associated with chronic AI-mediated neuromodulation. The growing body of evidence on maladaptive neuroplasticity induced by prolonged DBS and BCI applications calls for multinational guidelines that incorporate long-term patient assessment, adaptive AI recalibration, and robust ethical safeguards [66].

Optimizing adaptive AI-DBS architectures will require continuous neural monitoring to dynamically adjust stimulation parameters and mitigate maladaptive plasticity while preserving therapeutic efficacy [79]. Moreover, integrating ethical algorithmic constraints is imperative to prevent AI systems from exceeding optimal neuroadaptive thresholds, thus reducing the risk of cognitive overstimulation or unintended alterations in personality [80].

Concurrently, the development of non-invasive neuromodulatory approaches—such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and low-intensity focused ultrasound (LIFU)—has emerged as a strategic research direction aimed at mitigating the procedural risks of invasive DBS. When combined with AI-guided precision-targeting algorithms, these technologies offer enhanced safety and accessibility. Recent innovations in personalized TMS protocols, trained on machine learning models, have demonstrated improved outcomes in cognitive and affective disorders, while ultrasonic neuromodulation enables subcortical engagement without surgical intervention [81] [82]. Integrating these non-invasive, AI-augmented strategies into cognitive rehabilitation paradigms may optimize neuroplastic modulation, reduce patient burden, and improve adherence.

A major impediment to the validation and global adoption of AI-driven neuromodulation is the limited scope of multicenter clinical trials. Most studies are constrained by short-term evaluation windows, precluding robust analysis of the longitudinal neurocognitive and psychiatric impacts of DBS and BCI systems [83]-[85].

Given the transnational deployment of AI-based neurotechnologies, the establishment of internationally harmonized governance frameworks is imperative to mitigate regulatory discrepancies and prevent the emergence of algorithmic biases in unregulated neuromodulatory environments. The standardization of AI auditing mechanisms across jurisdictions would serve as a crucial safeguard against unintended cognitive and behavioral effects of AI-driven interventions [68] [86]. Moreover, the formation of global AI ethics consortia would support the development and enforcement of neurodata protection standards, ensuring that patient autonomy and ethical integrity are preserved irrespective of geopolitical boundaries [87] [88].

The persistent opacity of AI decision-making processes necessitates the integration of XAI frameworks into real-time clinical neuromodulation workflows. Embedding XAI tools would enable clinicians, patients, and regulators to interpret and evaluate AI-generated stimulation outputs, thus enhancing transparency, trust, and accountability in neurorehabilitative interventions [32].

Ensuring neural data privacy, enforcing AI transparency, and promoting equitable access to neurotechnological innovations must remain central pillars of the global policy agenda for AI-driven neuromodulation. Future regulatory strategies must prioritize interdisciplinary collaboration among neuroscientists, ethicists, and policymakers to ensure that AI-enhanced neuromodulation advances human well-being without compromising ethical standards or undermining individual autonomy.

6. Synthesis and Outlook: The Future of Hybrid AI-Neurotechnological Interventions

The integration of AI and neurotechnologies into neuropsychological rehabilitation has fundamentally reconfigured conventional therapeutic paradigms, enabling precision-guided, adaptively modulated interventions that enhance both cognitive and motor recovery. The hybrid mind paradigm—defined by the convergence of AI, BCIs, DBS, and neurofeedback—has demonstrated unprecedented potential to optimize neuroplasticity and expedite functional restoration. The capacity of AI-driven neurorehabilitation to deliver real-time, individualized neuromodulation represents a paradigmatic shift away from static, protocol-based approaches toward dynamic, data-driven therapeutic architectures tailored to patient-specific neural profiles.

Despite these transformational advances, several critical impediments continue to constrain the widespread clinical translation of hybrid neurotechnologies. Regulatory and ethical ambiguities—particularly regarding neural data sovereignty, algorithmic transparency, and cognitive autonomy—remain formidable barriers. Although existing data protection frameworks, such as the GDPR in Europe and the LGPD in Brazil, offer broad-spectrum privacy protections, they fail to address the singular complexities associated with neural data processing, interpretation, and ownership. Moreover, the substantial financial costs linked to DBS implantation, AI-augmented BCIs, and advanced neurofeedback platforms exacerbate socioeconomic inequities, confining access primarily to high-resource healthcare systems and thereby limiting the global reach of these innovations.

To fully realize the clinical and societal potential of hybrid neurotechnologies, future research must prioritize three core domains: 1) the optimization of closed-loop AI neuromodulatory systems, ensuring real-time adaptability while mitigating the risk of maladaptive neuroplastic outcomes; 2) the development and validation of non-invasive alternatives to invasive neuromodulation (e.g., DBS), thereby enhancing accessibility and minimizing procedural risks; and 3) the execution of longitudinal, multicenter clinical trials to generate robust, generalizable evidence on long-term neurocognitive, behavioral, and functional outcomes. Concurrently, the integration of explainable AI (XAI) frameworks will be indispensable in ensuring algorithmic interpretability, reinforcing both clinical trust and regulatory compliance.

Ultimately, the successful deployment of AI-driven neurotechnologies will depend on a harmonized approach that reconciles technological innovation with ethical stewardship. Advancing global governance infrastructures, standardizing clinical validation protocols, and fostering interdisciplinary collaboration among neuroscientists, ethicists, technologists, and policymakers will be essential to ensuring that hybrid neurorehabilitation remains both clinically efficacious and ethically tenable. By confronting these challenges proactively, AI-enhanced neurotechnologies will not only improve neurological rehabilitation outcomes but will also redefine the trajectory of personalized neurorehabilitation, catalyzing the emergence of precision medicine in cognitive and motor recovery.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] Caiado, F. and Ukolov, A. (2025) The History, Current State and Future Possibilities of the Non-Invasive Brain Computer Interfaces. *Medicine in Novel Technology and Devices*, **25**, Article 100353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medntd.2025.100353

[2] Kumar, D., Kumar, P., Pal, S. and Singh, S. (2025) AI-Enhanced Neurophysiological Assessment. In: Bansal, R., Maqableh, T., Shuklaa, G., Rabby, F. and Lathabhavan, R., Eds., *Transforming Neuropsychology and Cognitive Psychology with AI and Machine Learning*, IGI Global, 33-64. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9341-3.ch002

[3] Elashmawi, W.H., Ayman, A., Antoun, M., Mohamed, H., Mohamed, S.E., Amr, H., *et al.* (2024) A Comprehensive Review on Brain-Computer Interface (BCI)-Based Machine and Deep Learning Algorithms for Stroke Rehabilitation. *Applied Sciences*, **14**, Article 6347. https://doi.org/10.3390/app14146347

[4] Sarda, J., Shah, M., Vaghela, R., Vaishnani, D. and Patel, H. (2025) Hand Kinematics and Decoding Hindlimb Kinematics Using Local Field Potentials Using a Deep Neural Network Decoding Framework. In: Subasi, A., Qaisar, S.M., Bhoi, A.K. and Srinivasu, P.N., Eds., *Artificial Intelligence Applications for Brain-Computer Interfaces*, Elsevier, 63-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-443-33414-6.00004-6

[5] Onciul, R., Tataru, C., Dumitru, A.V., Crivoi, C., Serban, M., Covache-Busuioc, R., *et al.* (2025) Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience: Transformative Synergies in Brain Research and Clinical Applications. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, **14**, Article 550. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm14020550

[6] Medenica, V., Ivanovic, L. and Milosevic, N. (2024) Applicability of Artificial Intelligence in Neuropsychological Rehabilitation of Patients with Brain Injury. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*. https://doi.org/10.1080/23279095.2024.2364229

[7] Murthy, Y.S., Bansal, R., Chodisetty, R.S.C.M., Chakravorty, C. and Sai, K.P. (2025) Transforming Minds AI and Machine Learning Applications in Cognitive Neuroscience. In: Bansal, R., Maqableh, T., Shuklaa, G., Rabby, F. and Lathabhavan, R., Eds., *Transforming Neuropsychology and Cognitive Psychology with AI and Machine Learning*, IGI Global, 107-128. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9341-3.ch005

[8] Korade, A.G., Phulbone, M.V., Aedma, A. and Jadhav, A. (2024) Exploring Human Potential: The Integration of Neuroplasticity, Cognitive Enhancement, and Artificial Intelligence in Mental Health and Well-Being. *International Journal of Toxicological and Pharmacological Research*, **14**, 124-134.

[9] Calderone, A., Latella, D., Bonanno, M., Quartarone, A., Mojdehdehbaher, S., Celesti, A., *et al.* (2024) Towards Transforming Neurorehabilitation: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Diagnosis and Treatment of Neurological Disorders. *Biomedicines*, **12**, Article 2415. https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines12102415

[10] Soekadar, S., Chandler, J., Ienca, M. and Bublitz, C. (2021) On the Verge of the Hybrid Mind. *Morals & Machines*, **1**, 30-43. https://doi.org/10.5771/2747-5174-2021-1-30

[11] Simon, C., Bolton, D.A.E., Kennedy, N.C., Soekadar, S.R. and Ruddy, K.L. (2021) Challenges and Opportunities for the Future of Brain-Computer Interface in Neurorehabilitation. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, **15**, Article 699428. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.699428

[12] Mane, R., Wu, Z. and Wang, D. (2022) Poststroke Motor, Cognitive and Speech Rehabilitation with Brain-Computer Interface: A Perspective Review. *Stroke and Vascular Neurology*, **7**, 541-549. https://doi.org/10.1136/svn-2022-001506

[13] Yuste, R. (2023) Advocating for Neurodata Privacy and Neurotechnology Regulation. *Nature Protocols*, **18**, 2869-2875. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41596-023-00873-0

[14] George, A.S. (2024) Protecting Brain Privacy in the Age of Neurotechnology: Policy Responses and Remaining Challenges. *Public Interest Research & Policy*, **1**, 18-33. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13942131

[15] Eke, D. (2024) Ethics and Governance of Neurotechnology in Africa: Lessons from AI. *JMIR Neurotechnology*, **3**, e56665. https://doi.org/10.2196/56665

[16] Van Den Broek, S.R., Bagot, K.L., Arthurson, L., Cadilhac, D.A. and Stolwyk, R.J. (2021) Investigating Clinician Experiences of Teleneuropsychology Service Implementation within Rural Inpatient Rehabilitation Settings: A Mixed Method Approach. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, **37**, 775-788. https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acab086

[17] Singh, S. and Germine, L. (2020) Technology Meets Tradition: A Hybrid Model for Implementing Digital Tools in Neuropsychology. *International Review of Psychiatry*, **33**, 382-393. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540261.2020.1835839

[18] Mariano, M.A., Tang, K., Kurtz, M. and Kates, W.R. (2016) Examining the Durability of a Hybrid, Remote and Computer-Based Cognitive Remediation Intervention for Adolescents with 22q11.2 Deletion Syndrome. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, **12**, 686-693. https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12367

[19] Mahan, S., Rous, R. and Adlam, A. (2017) Systematic Review of Neuropsychological Rehabilitation for Prospective Memory Deficits as a Consequence of Acquired Brain Injury. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, **23**, 254-265. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1355617716001065

[20] Ho, R.T., Xue, W., See, M.K., Chan, D.Y., Tsang, A.C., Mak, C.H., *et al*. (2025) Advances in Clinical Brain-Computer Interfaces for Assistive Substitution and Rehabilitation: A Rapid Scoping Review. *Surgical Practice*, **29**, 35-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-1633.70002

[21] Drigas, A. and Sideraki, A. (2024) Brain Neuroplasticity Leveraging Virtual Reality and Brain-Computer Interface Technologies. *Sensors*, **24**, Article 5725. https://doi.org/10.3390/s24175725

[22] Cruz, M.V., Jamal, S. and Sethuraman, S.C. (2024) A Comprehensive Survey of Brain-Computer Interface Technology in Healthcare: Research Perspectives. Preprints. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202403.0082.v1

[23] Zhao, C., Ju, F., Sun, W., Jiang, S., Xi, X., Wang, H., *et al*. (2022) Effects of Training with a Brain-Computer Interface-Controlled Robot on Rehabilitation Outcome in Patients with Subacute Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Neurology and Therapy*, **11**, 679-695. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40120-022-00333-z

[24] Liu, X., Zhang, W., Li, W., Zhang, S., Lv, P. and Yin, Y. (2023) Effects of Motor Imagery Based Brain-Computer Interface on Upper Limb Function and Attention in Stroke Patients with Hemiplegia: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *BMC Neurology*, **23**, Article No. 136. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-023-03150-5

[25] Borisova, V.A., Isakova, E.V. and Kotov, S.V. (2023) Potential of a Brain-Computer Interface for Correcting Poststroke Cognitive Impairments. *Neuroscience and Behavioral Physiology*, **53**, 988-993. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11055-023-01492-8

[26] Georgiev, D., Georgieva, I., Gong, Z., Nanjappan, V. and Georgiev, G. (2021) Virtual Reality for Neurorehabilitation and Cognitive Enhancement. *Brain Sciences*, **11**, Article 221. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci11020221

[27] Carelli, L., Solca, F., Faini, A., Meriggi, P., Sangalli, D., Cipresso, P., *et al*. (2017) Brain-Computer Interface for Clinical Purposes: Cognitive Assessment and Rehabilitation. *BioMed Research International*, **2017**, Article ID: 1695290. https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/1695290

[28] Huggins, J.E., Krusienski, D., Vansteensel, M.J., Valeriani, D., Thelen, A., Stavisky, S., *et al*. (2022) Workshops of the Eighth International Brain-Computer Interface Meeting: BCIs: The Next Frontier. *Brain-Computer Interfaces*, **9**, 69-101. https://doi.org/10.1080/2326263x.2021.2009654

[29] Awuah, W.A., Ahluwalia, A., Darko, K., Sanker, V., Tan, J.K., Tenkorang, P.O., *et al*. (2024) Bridging Minds and Machines: The Recent Advances of Brain-Computer Interfaces in Neurological and Neurosurgical Applications. *World Neurosurgery*, **189**, 138-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2024.05.104

[30] Carè, M., Chiappalone, M. and Cota, V.R. (2024) Personalized Strategies of Neurostimulation: From Static Biomarkers to Dynamic Closed-Loop Assessment of Neural Function. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, **18**, Article 1363128. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2024.1363128

[31] Patrick-Krueger, K.M., Burkhart, I. and Contreras-Vidal, J.L. (2024) The State of Clinical Trials of Implantable Brain-Computer Interfaces. *Nature Reviews Bioengineering*, **3**, 50-67. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44222-024-00239-5

[32] Camargo, L. F. (2024) Estratégia de uso de inteligência artificial explicável no apoio à reabilitação neuromotora. Ph.D. Thesis, Universidade Estadual Paulista.

https://repositorio.unesp.br/bitstreams/4d999102-7f2b-4ebc-9b81-9961e2b1f065/download

[33] Voigtlaender, S., Pawelczyk, J., Geiger, M., Vaios, E.J., Karschnia, P., Cudkowicz, M., *et al.* (2024) Artificial Intelligence in Neurology: Opportunities, Challenges, and Policy Implications. *Journal of Neurology*, **271**, 2258-2273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-024-12220-8

[34] Jia, T., Li, C., Mo, L., Qian, C., Li, W., Xu, Q., *et al.* (2022) Tailoring Brain-Machine Interface Rehabilitation Training Based on Neural Reorganization: Towards Personalized Treatment for Stroke Patients. *Cerebral Cortex*, **33**, 3043-3052. https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhac259

[35] Baker, K.B., Plow, E.B., Nagel, S., Rosenfeldt, A.B., Gopalakrishnan, R., Clark, C., *et al.* (2023) Cerebellar Deep Brain Stimulation for Chronic Post-Stroke Motor Rehabilitation: A Phase I Trial. *Nature Medicine*, **29**, 2366-2374. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-023-02507-0

[36] Chen, Y., Xu, Z., Liu, T., Li, D., Tian, X., Zheng, R., *et al.* (2024) Application of Deep Brain Stimulation and Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Stroke Neurorestoration: A Review. *Journal of Neurorestoratology*, **12**, Article 100120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnrt.2024.100120

[37] Kesikburun, S. (2022) Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation in Rehabilitation. *Turkish Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, **68**, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.5606/tftrd.2022.10608

[38] Kumar, J., Patel, T., Sugandh, F., Dev, J., Kumar, U., Adeeb, M., *et al.* (2023) Innovative Approaches and Therapies to Enhance Neuroplasticity and Promote Recovery in Patients with Neurological Disorders: A Narrative Review. *Cureus*, **15**, e41914. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.41914

[39] Canesi, M., Lippi, L., Rivaroli, S., Vavassori, D., Trenti, M., Sartorio, F., *et al.* (2024) Long-Term Impact of Deep Brain Stimulation in Parkinson's Disease: Does It Affect Rehabilitation Outcomes? *Medicina*, **60**, Article 927. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina60060927

[40] Keci, A., Tani, K. and Xhema, J. (2019) Role of Rehabilitation in Neural Plasticity. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, **7**, 1540-1547. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.295

[41] Saway, B.F., Palmer, C., Hughes, C., Triano, M., Suresh, R.E., Gilmore, J., *et al.* (2024) The Evolution of Neuromodulation for Chronic Stroke: From Neuroplasticity Mechanisms to Brain-Computer Interfaces. *Neurotherapeutics*, **21**, e00337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurot.2024.e00337

[42] Cernera, S., Okun, M.S. and Gunduz, A. (2019) A Review of Cognitive Outcomes across Movement Disorder Patients Undergoing Deep Brain Stimulation. *Frontiers in Neurology*, **10**, Article 419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2019.00419

[43] Kabotyanski, K.E., Najera, R.A., Banks, G.P., Sharma, H., Provenza, N.R., Hayden, B.Y., *et al.* (2024) Cost-Effectiveness and Threshold Analysis of Deep Brain Stimulation Vs. Treatment-as-Usual for Treatment-Resistant Depression. *Translational Psychiatry*, **14**, Article No. 243. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-024-02951-7

[44] Deng, H., Yue, J.K. and Wang, D.D. (2020) Trends in Safety and Cost of Deep Brain Stimulation for Treatment of Movement Disorders in the United States: 2002-2014. *British Journal of Neurosurgery*, **35**, 57-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/02688697.2020.1759776

[45] Giansanti, D. (2025) Advancements in Ocular Neuro-Prosthetics: Bridging Neuroscience and Information and Communication Technology for Vision Restoration.

Biology, **14**, Article 134. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology14020134

[46] Lyu, Y., An, P., Xiao, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhang, H., Katsuragawa, K., *et al.* (2023) Eggly: Designing Mobile Augmented Reality Neurofeedback Training Games for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive*, *Mobile*, *Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, **7**, Article No. 67. https://doi.org/10.1145/3596251

[47] Laver, K.E., Lange, B., George, S., Deutsch, J.E., Saposnik, G. and Crotty, M. (2017) Virtual Reality for Stroke Rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, No. 11, CD008349. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.cd008349.pub4

[48] Pedroli, E., Serino, S., Cipresso, P., Pallavicini, F. and Riva, G. (2015) Assessment and Rehabilitation of Neglect Using Virtual Reality: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, **9**, Article 226. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00226

[49] Baragash, R.S., Aldowah, H. and Ghazal, S. (2022) Virtual and Augmented Reality Applications to Improve Older Adults' Quality of Life: A Systematic Mapping Review and Future Directions. *Digital Health*, **8**. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076221132099

[50] Enriquez-Geppert, S., Smit, D., Pimenta, M.G. and Arns, M. (2019) Neurofeedback as a Treatment Intervention in ADHD: Current Evidence and Practice. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, **21**, Article No. 46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-019-1021-4

[51] Cha, S. (2024) Mobile Application Applied for Cognitive Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review. *Life*, **14**, Article 891. https://doi.org/10.3390/life14070891

[52] de Alcântara Uchôa Belfort, R.-E., Lima, M.O., Mendes, A.C., Martins, R.A.B.L., Silva Júnior, H.C., de Sousa Rodrigues, H.E., *et al.* (2022) Desenvolvimento de jogos sérios para reabilitação neurológica de pacientes. *Research*, *Society and Development*, **11**, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.33448/rsd-v11i16.37437

[53] Mansour, S., Ang, K.K., Nair, K.P.S., Phua, K.S. and Arvaneh, M. (2021) Efficacy of Brain-Computer Interface and the Impact of Its Design Characteristics on Poststroke Upper-Limb Rehabilitation: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clinical EEG and Neuroscience*, **53**, 79-90. https://doi.org/10.1177/15500594211009065

[54] Zhao, C., Ju, F., Sun, W., Jiang, S., Xi, X., Wang, H., *et al.* (2022) Effects of Training with a Brain–computer Interface-Controlled Robot on Rehabilitation Outcome in Patients with Subacute Stroke: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Neurology and Therapy*, **11**, 679-695. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40120-022-00333-z

[55] Mang, J., Xu, Z., Qi, Y. and Zhang, T. (2023) Favoring the Cognitive-Motor Process in the Closed-Loop of BCI Mediated Post Stroke Motor Function Recovery: Challenges and Approaches. *Frontiers in Neurorobotics*, **17**, Article 1271967. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbot.2023.1271967

[56] Arntz, A., Weber, F., Handgraaf, M., Lällä, K., Korniloff, K., Murtonen, K., *et al.* (2023) Technologies in Home-Based Digital Rehabilitation: Scoping Review. *JMIR Rehabilitation and Assistive Technologies*, **10**, e43615. https://doi.org/10.2196/43615

[57] Formica, C., Bonanno, M., Sorbera, C., Quartarone, A., Giambò, F.M., Marra, A., *et al.* (2024) Smartphone-Based Cognitive Telerehabilitation: A Usability and Feasibility Study Focusing on Mild Cognitive Impairment. *Sensors*, **24**, Article 525. https://doi.org/10.3390/s24020525

[58] Goering, S., Klein, E., Specker Sullivan, L., Wexler, A., Agüera y Arcas, B., Bi, G., *et al.* (2021) Recommendations for Responsible Development and Application of Neurotechnologies. *Neuroethics*, **14**, 365-386.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-021-09468-6

[59] Ienca, M. and Andorno, R. (2017) Towards New Human Rights in the Age of Neuroscience and Neurotechnology. *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, **13**, Article No. 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40504-017-0050-1

[60] Ienca, M. and Ignatiadis, K. (2020) Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Neuroscience: Methodological and Ethical Challenges. *AJOB Neuroscience*, **11**, 77-87. https://doi.org/10.1080/21507740.2020.1740352

[61] Rieger, P.F.S.N. (2022) Privacidade mental e liberdade cognitiva: Perspectivas e desdobramentos para novos direitos fundamentais no contexto de desenvolvimento e aplicação de neurotecnologia. Master Thesis, Instituto Brasileiro de Ensino, Desenvolvimento e Pesquisa-IDP. https://repositorio.idp.edu.br/bitstream/123456789/4239/1/DISSERTACAO_%20POLIENE%20FERNANDA%20SOUZA%20NASCIMENTO%20RIEGER%20_%20MESTRADO_2022.pdf

[62] Kritika, M. (2024) A Comprehensive Study on Navigating Neuroethics in Cyberspace. *AI and Ethics*, **5**, 93-100. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00486-7

[63] Rastrelli, H. (2024) Beyond Faith, Power, and Pride: An Arms Race of Neurotechnology and Extremism. Master's Thesis, Georgetown University. https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/1088830/Rastrelli_georgetown_0076M_16040.pdf?sequence=1

[64] Aziz, A.Y. (2023) Neurotechnology and the Law: Legal Considerations for Privacy, Autonomy, and Liability. CyberLeninka. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/neurotechnology-and-the-law-legal-considerations-for-privacy-autonomy-and-liability

[65] Bublitz, C. (2024) Neurotechnologies and Human Rights: Restating and Reaffirming the Multi-Layered Protection of the Person. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, **28**, 782-807. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2024.2310830

[66] Chandra, P., Sharma, H. and Sachan, N. (2025) Explainable and Responsible AI in Neuroscience: Cognitive Neurostimulation. In Malviya, R. and Sundram, S., Eds., *Explainable and Responsible Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare*. Wiley, 27-63. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394302444.ch2

[67] Ienca, M., Valle, G. and Raspopovic, S. (2025) Clinical Trials for Implantable Neural Prostheses: Understanding the Ethical and Technical Requirements. *The Lancet Digital Health*, **7**, e216-e224. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2589-7500(24)00222-x

[68] McCullum, T. and Contreras Mancera, L.C. (2025) Neurotechnology Combined with Artificial Intelligence and Neurorights: A Legal Discussion. *Revista La Propiedad Inmaterial*, **39**, 145-183. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/revpropin39&section=8

[69] Federico, C.A. and Trotsyuk, A.A. (2024) Biomedical Data Science, Artificial Intelligence, and Ethics: Navigating Challenges in the Face of Explosive Growth. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science*, **7**, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biodatasci-102623-104553

[70] Garden, H., Winickoff, D.E. and Frahm, N.M. (2019) Responsible Innovation in Neurotechnology Enterprises. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Paper Series. https://doi.org/10.1787/9685e4fd-en

[71] Tröster, A.I. (2024) Developments in the Prediction of Cognitive Changes Following Deep Brain Stimulation in Persons with Parkinson's Disease. *Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics*, **24**, 643-659. https://doi.org/10.1080/14737175.2024.2360121

[72] Zuk, P., Sanchez, C.E., Kostick-Quenet, K., Muñoz, K.A., Kalwani, L., Lavingia, R., *et al.* (2022) Researcher Views on Changes in Personality, Mood, and Behavior in Next-Generation Deep Brain Stimulation. *AJOB Neuroscience*, **14**, 287-299. https://doi.org/10.1080/21507740.2022.2048724

[73] Merner, A.R., Kostick-Quenet, K., Campbell, T.A., Pham, M.T., Sanchez, C.E., Torgerson, L., *et al.* (2023) Participant Perceptions of Changes in Psychosocial Domains Following Participation in an Adaptive Deep Brain Stimulation Trial. *Brain Stimulation*, **16**, 990-998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2023.06.007

[74] Wong, J.K., Mayberg, H.S., Wang, D.D., Richardson, R.M., Halpern, C.H., Krinke, L., *et al.* (2023) Proceedings of the 10th Annual Deep Brain Stimulation Think Tank: Advances in Cutting Edge Technologies, Artificial Intelligence, Neuromodulation, Neuroethics, Interventional Psychiatry, and Women in Neuromodulation. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, **16**, Article 1084782. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2022.1084782

[75] Cornejo, Y. (2024) Neurorights, Neurotechnologies and Personal Data: Review of the Challenges of Mental Autonomy. *Journal of Digital Technologies and Law*, **2**, 711-728. https://doi.org/10.21202/jdtl.2024.36

[76] Ruiz, S., Valera, L., Ramos, P. and Sitaram, R. (2024) Neurorights in the Constitution: From Neurotechnology to Ethics and Politics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **379**, Article 20230098. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2023.0098

[77] Guerrero, F. (2024) Neurorights: A New Legal and Ethical Frontier. *Multidisciplinary & Health Education Journal*, **6**, 979-991. https://journalmhe.org/ojs3/index.php/jmhe/article/view/128

[78] Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B.A.y., Bi, G., Carmena, J.M., Carter, A., *et al.* (2017) Four Ethical Priorities for Neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature*, **551**, 159-163. https://doi.org/10.1038/551159a

[79] Takeuchi, Y. and Berényi, A. (2020) Oscillotherapeutics—Time-Targeted Interventions in Epilepsy and Beyond. *Neuroscience Research*, **152**, 87-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neures.2020.01.002

[80] Caston, R.M. (2023) High-Density Intracranial Electrodes to Investigate and Modulate the Spatiotemporal Signatures of Pain. Doctoral Dissertation, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. https://search.proquest.com/openview/551707ce8124e8df00e6d53f6e484d1c/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

[81] Fomenko, A., Neudorfer, C., Dallapiazza, R.F., Kalia, S.K. and Lozano, A.M. (2018) Low-Intensity Ultrasound Neuromodulation: An Overview of Mechanisms and Emerging Human Applications. *Brain Stimulation*, **11**, 1209-1217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.08.013

[82] Tubbs, A. and Vazquez, E.A. (2024) Engineering and Technological Advancements in Repetitive Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation (rTMS): A Five-Year Review. *Brain Sciences*, **14**, 1092. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci14111092

[83] Ho, R.T., Xue, W., See, M.K., Chan, D.Y., Tsang, A.C., Mak, C.H., *et al.* (2025) Advances in Clinical Brain-Computer Interfaces for Assistive Substitution and Rehabilitation: A Rapid Scoping Review. *Surgical Practice*, **29**, 35-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-1633.70002

[84] Michałowska, M., Kowalczyk, Ł., Marcinkowska, W. and Malicki, M. (2021) Being Outside the Decision-Loop: The Impact of Deep Brain Stimulation and Brain-Computer Interfaces on Autonomy. *Analiza i Egzystencja*, **56**, 25-52.

https://doi.org/10.18276/aie.2021.56-02

[85] Gordon, E.C. and Seth, A.K. (2024) Ethical Considerations for the Use of Brain–computer Interfaces for Cognitive Enhancement. *PLOS Biology*, **22**, e3002899. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002899

[86] Lekadir, K., Frangi, A.F., Porras, A.R., Glocker, B., Cintas, C., Langlotz, C.P., *et al*. (2025) FUTURE-AI: International Consensus Guideline for Trustworthy and Deployable Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare. *BMJ*, **388**, e081554. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2024-081554

[87] Hasanah, K.S. (2025) Exploring the Ethical Dimensions of Artificial Intelligence Development: Creating Transparent and Responsible AI Systems for Global Impact. *International Journal of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering*, **14**, 33-45. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389371517

[88] Buthut, M., Starke, G., Akmazoglu, T.B., Colucci, A., Vermehren, M., van Beinum, A., *et al*. (2024) HYBRIDMINDS—Summary and Outlook of the 2023 International Conference on the Ethics and Regulation of Intelligent Neuroprostheses. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, **18**, Article 1489307. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2024.1489307