

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF NEUROTECHNOLOGY IN HUMAN ENHANCEMENT

Dr. Ananya Kapoor

Assistant Professor

Department of Biomedical Engineering

School of Medical and Allied Sciences

University of Health Sciences and Technology

New Delhi, India

Abstract

Neurotechnology is moving beyond its established role in diagnosis, rehabilitation, and treatment. Brain-computer interfaces, neurostimulation systems, neural sensing devices, and algorithmic tools that interpret brain-related signals are increasingly discussed as ways to improve attention, memory, communication, mood regulation, physical control, and decision support. Such developments may offer meaningful benefit for people with neurological disability or disease. They also create a separate set of questions when the stated aim is to extend or optimise capacities that are already within a typical range. Human enhancement through neurotechnology therefore requires ethical evaluation that is as careful about social meaning and power as it is about technical capability.

This paper examines the ethical implications of neurotechnology in human enhancement through a conceptual and comparative approach. It considers five linked dimensions: autonomy and informed choice, mental privacy and neural-data governance, safety and long-term responsibility, equity and distributive justice, and the effects of enhancement on identity, agency, and social expectations. The discussion distinguishes therapeutic restoration from enhancement without treating that distinction as fixed or sufficient. Particular attention is given to settings in which individual choice may be shaped by employment demands, educational competition, commercial persuasion, family pressure, or unequal access to reliable information and follow-up care.

The analysis argues that responsible enhancement cannot be assessed only by asking whether a device works. Ethical acceptability depends on evidence of benefit and harm, the quality of consent, the reversibility of intervention, cybersecurity protections, the treatment of neural data, fair access, and safeguards against coercive or discriminatory use. The paper concludes that neurotechnology should be developed within a human-rights-centred framework that protects dignity while allowing carefully governed innovation. Transparent claims, independent oversight, meaningful user participation, and continuing accountability are necessary for human enhancement to remain aligned with individual well-being and social justice.

Keywords: Neurotechnology, Human Enhancement, Neuroethics, Brain-Computer Interfaces, Neural Data, Cognitive Liberty, Mental Privacy, Informed Consent, Responsible Innovation, Human Rights

1. INTRODUCTION

Neurotechnology refers to a broad family of tools that record, analyse, stimulate, or otherwise interact with the nervous system. It includes clinical systems such as deep brain stimulation and assistive brain-computer interfaces, as well as consumer wearables, neurofeedback applications, transcranial stimulation devices, and software that draws inferences from neural or behavioural signals. The ethical promise of these tools is evident when they help a person communicate after paralysis, regain motor control, manage disabling symptoms, or participate more fully in social life. At the same time, the same technical pathways may be redirected toward

improving performance, concentration, emotional regulation, or other capacities in people who do not have a clinical need for intervention.

Human enhancement is not a single activity. It covers a continuum ranging from low-risk self-tracking and training aids to invasive systems that can alter neural activity or connect a person to external algorithms. This diversity makes general claims about enhancement misleading. A non-invasive device marketed for focus differs significantly from an implanted interface designed to deliver stimulation and decode neural signals. Ethical assessment must therefore attend to the purpose of the intervention, the level of

physical and psychological risk, the reliability of advertised effects, the sensitivity of data generated, and the availability of independent support after use.

The therapeutic-enhancement distinction remains useful because it highlights differences in clinical justification, medical oversight, and the distribution of risk. However, it does not settle every ethical question. A person may seek an intervention for a condition that is not formally diagnosed but that seriously affects daily functioning. Conversely, a technology introduced in a health setting may later be marketed for occupational or educational optimisation. The moral issue is not simply whether an intervention is labelled treatment or enhancement, but whether its use respects autonomy, protects welfare, and avoids creating unjust expectations about what people must do to remain competitive or socially accepted.

This paper examines neurotechnology in human enhancement from a normative and comparative perspective. It reviews the major ethical concerns associated with neural intervention and neural-data use, compares common enhancement contexts, and develops a practical framework for responsible decision-making. The purpose is not to claim a universal answer for every technology. Instead, the study identifies the conditions under which enhancement proposals deserve cautious consideration and the conditions under which restraint, stronger safeguards, or prohibition may be ethically justified.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Neuroethics has developed as an interdisciplinary field concerned with the ethical, legal, and social implications of neuroscience and its applications. Early debates often focused on clinical intervention, research participation, and the interpretation of neuroimaging. More recent work has widened the discussion to include artificial intelligence, consumer neurotechnology, neurodata, brain-computer interfaces, and emerging proposals for cognitive or affective enhancement. Across these domains, scholars have repeatedly identified autonomy, privacy, identity, agency, justice, safety, accountability, and public trust as central concerns.

A consistent finding in the literature is that enhancement choices are rarely made in isolation. A device may be technically optional but socially difficult to refuse when it is linked to academic success, workplace performance, military service, insurance incentives, or expectations within families and peer groups. This distinction between formal choice and meaningful freedom is especially important in neurotechnology because an intervention may affect a person's cognition, emotion, behaviour, or self-understanding. Consent is ethically credible only when individuals can understand material risks, decline without penalty, and obtain independent advice that is not shaped by commercial pressure.

The literature also emphasises that neural information deserves special attention. Neural data may be linked to health status, attention, stress, motor intention, affective patterns, or other highly personal features. Even where devices do not literally read thoughts, the combination of neural signals with behavioural, biometric, and contextual information can allow sensitive inferences. Data governance must therefore address not only collection and storage, but also inference, sharing, access by employers or insurers, secondary use in product development, cybersecurity, and the practical ability of users to withdraw from ongoing data flows.

2.1 NEUROTECHNOLOGY AND THE ENHANCEMENT CONTINUUM

- Neurotechnology includes invasive neural implants, non-invasive stimulation, neural sensing, neurofeedback, brain-computer interfaces, and algorithms that interpret brain-related or behavioural signals.
- Enhancement may target attention, memory, learning, emotional self-regulation, physical control, communication speed, vigilance, or other capacities that are valued in particular social settings.
- The ethical relevance of an intervention depends on its invasiveness, reversibility, evidence base, anticipated benefit, uncertainty, and whether it changes the conditions under which people can meaningfully choose.
- A treatment-enhancement boundary can guide analysis, but it should not be used to

ignore disability rights, individual variation, or the possibility that clinical tools may migrate into consumer markets.

2.2 AUTONOMY, AGENCY, AND MENTAL INTEGRITY

- Autonomy requires more than a signed consent form; users need understandable information about benefits, burdens, uncertainty, device limitations, maintenance, data handling, and withdrawal options.
- Agency may be affected when a system predicts, prompts, stimulates, or adapts to neural activity in ways that users do not fully understand or cannot easily override.
- Mental integrity concerns protection from unwanted interference with a person's cognitive and affective life, especially when interventions are continuous, adaptive, or connected to external networks.
- Cognitive liberty highlights both the freedom to use lawful technologies and the freedom not to be pressured, monitored, modified, or disadvantaged for refusing them.

2.3 PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION, AND NEUROSECURITY

- Neural data can be sensitive even when it is incomplete or noisy because it may gain significance when combined with other digital records, biometric data, or machine-learning models.
- Privacy protections should cover collection, access, storage, inference, sale, sharing, retention, deletion, and cross-border transfer of neurodata and related metadata.
- Neurosecurity includes protection against unauthorised access, manipulation, device malfunction, ransomware, unsafe software updates, and exploitation of weak account-recovery processes.
- Users should receive clear information about what a device measures, what conclusions it can and cannot support, and which actors can access raw data, derived indicators, or model outputs.

2.4 EQUITY, SOCIAL PRESSURE, AND GOVERNANCE

- High-cost enhancement can widen existing inequalities when only affluent users can

obtain reliable devices, clinical monitoring, software updates, and professional support.

- Employment, education, sport, and military environments may create indirect coercion when enhancement becomes a signal of commitment, productivity, or eligibility.
- Commercial claims should be proportionate to evidence and should not exploit users who are seeking better performance, emotional relief, or social acceptance.
- Governance should combine product standards, research ethics, consumer protection, data safeguards, post-market surveillance, and public participation rather than relying on self-regulation alone.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The present study focuses on the ethical implications of neurotechnology when it is used or proposed for human enhancement. Its central purpose is to examine how neural intervention, neural-data processing, and enhancement-oriented design can influence autonomy, safety, privacy, identity, social opportunity, and accountability. The study treats human enhancement as a heterogeneous field in which uses vary from clinically supervised support to consumer applications that may operate outside conventional health-care pathways.

The analysis is conceptual and comparative. It does not report results from a single clinical trial, survey, or user population. Instead, it brings together established neuroethical concerns and governance principles to compare representative contexts in which enhancement can be pursued. This approach is intended to assist researchers, clinicians, developers, educators, regulators, employers, and prospective users in identifying the ethical questions that should be addressed before a technology becomes routine.

3.1 THEORETICAL BASIS AND ENHANCEMENT CONTEXTS CONSIDERED

From an ethical perspective, neurotechnology in human enhancement is shaped by the interaction between technical capability, individual vulnerability, social purpose,

institutional power, and the rules that govern data and accountability. The study considers representative contexts to compare possible

benefits, foreseeable harms, and the safeguards required for responsible use.

S.No.	Enhancement Context	Illustrative Technology	Central Ethical Question	Priority Safeguard
1	Clinical restoration with enhancement potential	Adaptive neurostimulation and implanted brain-computer interfaces	When does support for function become performance optimisation, and who decides?	Independent clinical review, proportionality, long-term follow-up
2	Cognitive performance and learning	Neurofeedback, stimulation devices, and attention-monitoring tools	Are claimed gains evidence-based, voluntary, and safe for sustained use?	Accurate claims, age-appropriate restrictions, informed choice
3	Workplace monitoring and optimisation	EEG headsets, fatigue detection, and productivity analytics	Can workers refuse monitoring or enhancement without losing opportunity?	Purpose limitation, opt-out rights, non-discrimination rules
4	Consumer wellness and self-optimisation	Wearable neurodevices and app-based mental-performance products	Are users exposed to misleading claims, weak privacy, or hidden data sharing?	Consumer protection, clear data notices, independent testing
5	AI-linked neural interfaces	Adaptive decoders, predictive models, and connected implants	Who controls model updates, neural outputs, and the security of the interface?	Neurosecurity, auditability, human override, data governance

3.2 STUDY OBJECTIVES

- To examine the ethical relationship between neurotechnology, human enhancement, and individual well-being.
- To identify major concerns involving informed consent, autonomy, agency, identity, mental privacy, data protection, and neurosecurity.
- To analyse how enhancement technologies may affect equity, social pressure, disability inclusion, employment, education, and public trust.
- To compare ethical priorities across representative enhancement contexts involving clinical, consumer, workplace, and AI-linked uses.
- To develop an integrated framework for responsible, rights-respecting, and socially accountable neurotechnology governance.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study uses a conceptual, normative, and comparative research methodology. It draws on neuroethics scholarship, responsible-innovation principles, human-rights

discussions, device-governance literature, and research-ethics guidance to identify the conditions that make enhancement ethically acceptable, ethically uncertain, or ethically unacceptable. The methodology does not treat technical advancement as a value in itself. Instead, it examines how benefits and burdens are distributed, whether choices are genuinely voluntary, and whether governance arrangements protect individuals from foreseeable harm.

A qualitative framework is used to connect enhancement goals with ethically relevant features of neurotechnology. These features include the physical invasiveness of a device, the reversibility of effects, the accuracy of claims, the sensitivity of data, the degree of algorithmic adaptation, the possibility of coercion, and the availability of clinical or technical support. The analysis recognises that the ethical significance of a tool changes across settings. A technology may be appropriate under specialist care for a person with severe disability while raising different

concerns when marketed directly to students, employees, or consumers.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

- The study follows a normative and comparative research design based on established neuroethical, human-rights, and responsible-innovation principles.
- Enhancement cases are examined through linked dimensions of purpose, benefit, harm, consent, privacy, social pressure, equity, and accountability.
- The framework compares representative settings rather than producing device-specific clinical efficacy estimates or population-level statistics.
- The analysis gives attention to both immediate use conditions and longer-term consequences, including maintenance, software change, data reuse, and responsibility after market entry.

4.2 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

- Autonomy and informed consent: whether users can understand, accept, refuse, and discontinue enhancement without unfair pressure or penalty.
- Safety and proportionality: whether expected benefit justifies physical, psychological, social, and technical risk in the relevant context.
- Mental privacy and data governance: whether neural and related data are protected from unnecessary collection, unauthorised inference, exploitation, and insecure access.
- Identity and agency: whether users retain a meaningful sense of authorship, control, and self-understanding when a system intervenes in or interprets neural activity.
- Justice and social impact: whether the technology increases inequality, discrimination, ableist expectations, or barriers for people who choose not to use it.
- Accountability and oversight: whether developers, clinicians, employers, institutions, and regulators have clear duties before, during, and after deployment.

4.3 ETHICAL INDICATORS

- Clarity of the enhancement purpose, including whether the claim is therapeutic,

performance-related, wellness-oriented, or mixed.

- Quality of information on expected benefit, uncertainty, foreseeable harm, reversibility, and requirements for continuing support.
- Capacity of the user to make a voluntary decision and to withdraw without loss of employment, educational opportunity, insurance coverage, or social standing.
- Strength of protections for neural data, derived inferences, account access, cybersecurity, software updates, and data deletion.
- Fairness of access, affordability, public benefit, and safeguards against discriminatory decisions based on device use or neural indicators.
- Availability of independent review, complaint pathways, adverse-event reporting, product recall mechanisms, and meaningful redress.

4.4 PARAMETERS OF ANALYSIS

- Nature of the intervention: invasive or non-invasive, temporary or continuous, reversible or difficult to reverse, clinical or consumer-facing.
- Evidence quality: reliability of performance claims, applicability to the intended users, transparency about uncertainty, and independent evaluation.
- User experience: practical control, ability to pause or remove the system, psychological effects, social stigma, and the burden of maintenance.
- Data lifecycle: collection, processing, storage, access, sharing, secondary use, retention, deletion, and transfer across jurisdictions.
- Institutional context: power relationships in workplaces, schools, care settings, sport, military environments, and commercial platforms.
- Governance response: standards, professional duties, ethics review, consumer protections, human-rights safeguards, and ongoing public deliberation.

4.5 PROCEDURE OF STUDY

- Review neuroethics literature, responsible-innovation guidance, human-rights

Ethical Dimension	Typical Risk	Priority Safeguard	Expected Contribution
Autonomy and consent	Incomplete understanding, commercial pressure, or inability to refuse	Plain-language information, independent advice, refusal and withdrawal rights	High - supports genuine choice
Safety and long-term responsibility	Uncertain benefit, device failure, side effects, and lack of follow-up	Evidence standards, monitoring, maintenance plans, adverse-event reporting	High - reduces avoidable harm
Mental privacy and neurodata	Sensitive inference, data sale, secondary use, or surveillance	Data minimisation, purpose limits, encryption, deletion and access controls	High - protects personal cognitive information
Identity and agency	Overreliance on automated prompts or unclear authorship of action	User control, explainability, override features, psychological support	Medium to high - preserves self-determination
Equity and social pressure	Unequal access, discrimination, or implicit requirement to enhance	Non-discrimination safeguards, public deliberation, fair-access policy	High - limits coercion and injustice

discussions, and device-governance principles relevant to enhancement.

- Identify recurring ethical issues associated with neural intervention, neural-data processing, adaptive algorithms, and performance-oriented claims.
- Organise identified concerns into autonomy, safety, privacy, identity, justice, social pressure, and accountability dimensions.
- Compare representative enhancement contexts to identify differences in vulnerability, evidence requirements, consent conditions, and institutional power.
- Interpret how ethical safeguards can be embedded in design, research, clinical practice, workplace policy, market regulation, and post-market support.
- Develop practical implications for rights-respecting neurotechnology innovation and for users who are considering enhancement-oriented products or interventions.

4.6 ANALYTICAL APPROACH

- Qualitative appraisal of ethical risks and potential benefits across varied human-enhancement settings.
- Comparison of individual choice with the social and institutional conditions that may

make a technically optional technology difficult to refuse.

- Assessment of how data practices, AI adaptation, cybersecurity, and ongoing support shape the ethical profile of a neurotechnology.
- Use of an illustrative ethical-assessment matrix to show priority safeguards without claiming numerical performance scores for particular devices.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis is based on a structured qualitative synthesis of the ethical dimensions identified in the literature. The purpose is not to assume that every device has the same effect or that all prospective users face the same level of risk. Rather, the analysis asks a sequence of practical questions: What neural or related information is being collected? What intervention is proposed? What benefit is realistically supported by evidence? Who bears the risk if performance claims fail, data are exposed, or a system changes over time? Can a user decline or withdraw without serious disadvantage? Which organisation remains responsible for harm, support, and redress?

The synthesis shows that ethical acceptability is stronger when enhancement is transparent about evidence, limited to a clearly justified purpose, compatible with voluntary choice,

and supported by enforceable privacy and safety protections. Conversely, ethical risk increases when products exaggerate benefits, rely on opaque algorithms, collect more neural data than necessary, place continuing maintenance burdens on users, or are introduced in settings where refusal may lead to stigma or lost opportunity. The key issue is not whether enhancement is always good or always wrong, but whether its design and use preserve the conditions for people to make, revise, and live with their own choices.

The comparative assessment also indicates that no single safeguard is sufficient. Informed consent cannot compensate for weak cybersecurity. Strong encryption does not address coercive workplace policy. Clinical evidence alone does not ensure fair access, and

6. DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that neurotechnology in human enhancement must be evaluated as a socio-technical practice rather than as a neutral object. A device can be designed with a benign purpose but become ethically problematic when it is deployed under conditions of unequal power or unreliable information. For example, a neural-monitoring tool may appear voluntary in a workplace, but its use may become coercive if workers believe that declining will affect promotion, job security, or access to desirable assignments. The ethical requirement is therefore not merely to offer a choice, but to create conditions in which refusal is realistic and respected.

Autonomy is especially important because neurotechnology can enter domains that are closely related to thought, emotion, memory, intention, and personal identity. Most existing technologies do not allow direct access to the full contents of a person's mind. Nevertheless, the ethical concern should not depend on dramatic claims about mind reading. A system that infers fatigue, attention, mood, or behavioural propensity may already influence how an employer, school, insurer, platform, or family member treats the individual. Protections for mental privacy should address both raw neural signals and the inferences that organisations derive from those signals.

Safety cannot be reduced to immediate physical side effects. Enhancement devices may create long-term dependencies on

access alone does not solve the problem of social pressure to enhance. Responsible governance requires a layered approach that combines technical standards, independent oversight, transparent communication, privacy-by-design, inclusion, continuing support, and pathways for accountability when something goes wrong.

5.1 ILLUSTRATIVE ETHICAL ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Table 2 provides an illustrative matrix for assessing common ethical priorities in enhancement-oriented neurotechnology. The classifications are conceptual and indicate relative importance for governance and design; they do not represent clinical ratings or regulatory approval decisions.

software, subscriptions, replacement components, clinical support, or proprietary platforms. Users can be harmed when a company changes its business model, ceases support, alters an algorithm, or stores data in ways that were not clear at the time of purchase. Responsible development should therefore include plans for maintenance, secure updates, interoperability where feasible, data portability, device discontinuation, and support for people who need to remove or deactivate a system.

The discussion also raises questions of fairness. Some enhancement technologies may be expensive and accessible only to people with resources, specialist knowledge, or proximity to advanced health-care systems. Unequal access can produce new forms of advantage in education, employment, sport, or professional life. At the same time, an exclusive focus on access can be misleading. Equal availability is not ethically sufficient if individuals are pressured to use a device to remain competitive. Justice requires both fair opportunity and protection from enhancement becoming an informal prerequisite for social participation.

Disability perspectives are essential in this debate. Technologies that improve communication or mobility can expand agency and participation, but ethical analysis should not assume that the value of a person depends on approaching a narrow standard of normal performance. User experience, accessibility,

stigma, cultural meaning, and the right to decline an intervention must be included in design and policy discussions. People with lived experience should be involved as partners in research, product development, oversight, and the definition of meaningful benefit.

Finally, governance should remain adaptive. Neurotechnology changes quickly, and fixed rules may fail to anticipate new combinations of sensing, stimulation, artificial intelligence, cloud services, and consumer marketing. However, adaptability should not mean weak accountability. Baseline protections for dignity, safety, privacy, equality, and freedom from coercion must remain stable. Regulatory bodies, professional associations, ethics committees, data-protection authorities, and civil-society organisations should work with users and developers to review evidence, update standards, and respond to emerging forms of harm before they become normalised.

7. CONCLUSION

This study presented a conceptual and comparative examination of the ethical implications of neurotechnology in human enhancement. The analysis showed that enhancement raises questions that extend beyond technical efficacy. Its ethical profile is shaped by the purpose of use, the quality of evidence, the degree of invasiveness, the reversibility of effects, the treatment of neural data, the possibility of coercion, and the distribution of benefits and burdens across society. Neural interventions and neural-data

systems deserve careful scrutiny because they can affect not only performance but also privacy, self-understanding, social opportunity, and relationships of power.

The study emphasises that responsible enhancement requires meaningful consent, transparent claims, proportionate safety standards, neurosecurity, privacy-by-design, fair treatment, and clear accountability across the technology lifecycle. These safeguards should be strongest in high-risk or high-power settings, including workplaces, educational institutions, clinical care, military contexts, and consumer markets that collect sensitive data. They should also include mechanisms for independent review, ongoing user support, adverse-event reporting, correction of misleading claims, and redress when harm occurs.

The paper concludes that neurotechnology can contribute to human flourishing only when innovation is governed in a manner that respects human dignity and preserves genuine freedom of choice. Future research can apply the proposed framework to specific devices, user communities, regulatory systems, and long-term outcomes through interviews, participatory design studies, clinical ethics consultation, policy analysis, and longitudinal assessments of user experience. Such work can help ensure that neurotechnology serves people as rights-bearing individuals rather than treating the human brain as merely another source of extractable data or competitive advantage.

8. REFERENCES

1. Bostrom, N., & Sandberg, A. (2009). Cognitive enhancement: Methods, ethics, regulatory challenges. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 15(3), 311-341. doi:10.1007/s11948-009-9142-5
2. Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E. (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: A scoping review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 18, 60. doi:10.1186/s12910-017-0220-y
3. Clausen, J. (2009). Man, machine and in between. *Nature*, 457, 1080-1081. doi:10.1038/4571080a
4. Farah, M. J. (2015). Neuroethics: The ethical, legal, and societal impact of neuroscience. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 571-591. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015250
5. Fins, J. J. (2015). *Rights Come to Mind: Brain Injury, Ethics, and the Struggle for Consciousness*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Goering, S., Klein, E., Dougherty, D. D., Wexler, A., et al. (2021). Recommendations for responsible development and application of neurotechnologies. *Neuroethics*, 14, 365-386. doi:10.1007/s12152-021-09468-6
7. Gordon, E. C., & Seth, A. K. (2024). Ethical considerations for the use of brain-computer interfaces for cognitive enhancement. *PLOS Biology*, 22(10), e3002899. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3002899

8. Hendriks, S., Grady, C., Ramos, K. M., et al. (2019). Ethical challenges of risk, informed consent, and posttrial responsibilities in human research with neural devices. *JAMA Neurology*, 76(12), 1506-1514. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2019.3523
9. Ienca, M. (2021). On neurorights. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 15, 701258. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2021.701258
10. Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, 13, 5. doi:10.1186/s40504-017-0050-1
11. Ienca, M., & Haselager, P. (2016). Hacking the brain: Brain-computer interfacing technology and the ethics of neurosecurity. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 18, 117-129. doi:10.1007/s10676-016-9398-9
12. Lavazza, A. (2018). Freedom of thought and mental integrity: The moral requirements for any neural prosthesis. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 12, 82. doi:10.3389/fnins.2018.00082
13. Maslen, H., Douglas, T., Cohen Kadosh, R., Levy, N., & Savulescu, J. (2014). Brain stimulation for treatment and enhancement in children: An ethical analysis. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8, 953. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00953
14. Muller, O., & Rotter, S. (2017). Neurotechnology: Current developments and ethical issues. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 11, 93. doi:10.3389/fnsys.2017.00093
15. National Institutes of Health. (2024). Neuroethics. BRAIN Initiative. Bethesda, MD.
16. Nuffield Council on Bioethics. (2013). *Novel Neurotechnologies: Intervening in the Brain*. Nuffield Council on Bioethics, London.
17. OECD. (2019). Recommendation of the Council on Responsible Innovation in Neurotechnology. OECD/LEGAL/0457. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
18. Racine, E., & Illes, J. (2007). Emerging ethical challenges in advanced neuroimaging research: Review, recommendations and research agenda. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 2(2), 1-10. doi:10.1525/jer.2007.2.2.1
19. Savulescu, J., ter Meulen, R., & Kahane, G. (Eds.). (2011). *Enhancing Human Capacities*. Wiley-Blackwell.
20. Schermer, M. (2009). The mind and the machine: On the conceptual and moral implications of brain-machine interaction. *NanoEthics*, 3, 217-230. doi:10.1007/s11569-009-0076-9
21. UNESCO. (2023). *The Risks and Challenges of Neurotechnologies for Human Rights*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.
22. UNESCO. (2025). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Neurotechnology*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.
23. Wexler, A. (2016). The practices of do-it-yourself brain stimulation: Implications for ethical considerations and regulatory proposals. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 42(4), 211-215. doi:10.1136/medethics-2015-102704
24. Yuste, R., Goering, S., Arcas, B. A. y., et al. (2017). Four ethical priorities for neurotechnologies and AI. *Nature*, 551, 159-163. doi:10.1038/551159a
25. Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation. *Nature Protocols*, 18(10), 2869-2875. doi:10.1038/s41596-023-00873-0
26. Friedrich, O., Racine, E., Steinert, S., Pömsl, J., & Jox, R. J. (2021). An analysis of the impact of brain-computer interfaces on autonomy. *Neuroethics*, 14(1), 17-29. doi:10.1007/s12152-018-9364-9