Luminis Applied Science and Engineering
ISSN: 3030-1831
Vol 2, No 3
2025

Advancements in Neural Implants: A Systematic Review of Neuralink-Enabled Brain-Machine Communication

Gerda Urbaite
[1] Urbaite, G. Editor, Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education. Email: urbaitee0013@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5471-6210
https://doi.org/10.69760/lumin.2025003004

Abstract; This systematic review examines recent advancements in neural implants with a focus on Neuralink-enabled brain-machine communication systems. By integrating ultra-flexible electrode threads, high-channel wireless data transmission, and robotic surgical implantation, Neuralink represents a significant leap in neural interface technology aimed at restoring movement, communication, and sensory perception for individuals with severe neurological impairments. The review situates Neuralink within the broader landscape of brain-machine interface (BMI) development, comparing its approach to competing technologies such as Synchron's endovascular Stentrode, Blackrock Neurotech's Utah array, and Paradromics' high-bandwidth systems. Key design considerations—including biocompatibility, signal stability, power management, and data security—are explored, alongside the ethical and regulatory challenges associated with invasive neurotechnology. Early clinical trials, including Neuralink's first-in-human implant, demonstrate the feasibility of enabling mind-controlled computer interaction in paralyzed individuals. This paper also highlights sustainability dimensions, such as the development of minimally invasive techniques, long-term implant durability, and inclusive access to assistive neurotechnology. By synthesizing recent peer-reviewed studies and clinical milestones, this review outlines the current state, emerging challenges, and future directions of neural implant systems that bridge human cognition and digital systems—positioning them as a critical component in the evolution of sustainable and intelligent healthcare technologies.

***Keywords**: Neural implants, Brain-machine interface, Neuralink, Neurotechnology ethics*

INTRODUCTION

Brain–machine interfaces (BMIs), also known as brain–computer interfaces (BCIs), are systems that acquire and interpret neural signals to control external devices or computers by thought alone. Once a concept confined to science fiction, neural implants for BMI have rapidly become a tangible reality in recent years, offering new hope for individuals with severe neurological impairments. These devices establish a direct communication link between the human brain and machines, translating brain activity into actionable commands that can, for example, move a robotic limb or control a computer cursor. Such technology has profound implications: it promises to restore mobility, communication, and independence to people affected by paralysis, motor neuron diseases, or sensory deficits. Indeed, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's approval in May 2023 of human trials for Neuralink's implantable BMI marked a **monumental stride** in this field – a milestone likened to a "moonwalk" for neurotechnology.

This review provides a comprehensive overview of advancements in neural implants with a focus on Neuralink – Elon Musk's high-profile neurotechnology venture – and its enabling of brain-machine communication. We begin by outlining the background and evolution of brain-machine interfaces, highlighting key achievements that paved the way for today's innovations. We then examine Neuralink's system design and technical breakthroughs, detailing how its approach differs from prior neural implants. Similar emerging technologies and competing approaches are compared to contextualize Neuralink's contributions within the broader BMI landscape. Next, we discuss current and potential applications of neural implants, from assistive communication to sensory restoration, illustrating the life-changing impact for patients. We also address the technical challenges, design considerations, and ethical and regulatory issues inherent in this fast-evolving domain – including biocompatibility, data privacy, and patient safety concerns. Finally, we consider future directions for neural implant technology and its role in shaping a more sustainable and inclusive technological future. By synthesizing findings from recent trials and studies, this systematic review aims to clarify the state of Neurolink-enabled brain-machine communication and its trajectory moving forward.

Background: Evolution of Brain-Machine Interfaces

The concept of connecting brains to machines has a rich history in neuroscience and biomedical engineering. Early research in the 1990s and 2000s demonstrated that implanted electrodes could capture signals from the brain's motor areas and use them to control external devices. Notably, the **Utah Array** – a tiny bed-of-needles electrode grid developed at the University of Utah – became a standard for invasive BCIs by the early 2000s. In 2004, a patient with paralysis (Matthew Nagle) was outfitted with a Utah array and became the first person to control a computer cursor using only neural signals. Over the subsequent decade, academic consortia like the *BrainGate* program showed that people with tetraplegia could not only move cursors but also control robotic limbs and other assistive devices via implanted brain sensors. For example, by 2012 researchers enabled a BrainGate participant to reach out with a robotic arm and drink coffee by thinking about the movement – a groundbreaking demonstration of neuroprosthetic control in a human. These early successes, though limited to laboratory settings with bulky wiring and only dozens of electrode channels, proved that *brain-machine communication* was feasible and could restore some level of function to those with severe paralysis.

In parallel with these BMI developments, other types of neural implants have seen widespread clinical use, establishing a precedent for implantable neurotechnology. **Cochlear implants** to restore hearing and **deep brain stimulators (DBS)** to treat movement disorders like Parkinson's disease have been implanted in tens of thousands of patients, underscoring that chronically implanted devices can be safe and beneficial. In fact, as of the mid-2020s, over 150,000 individuals in the United States carry some form of brain implant – mainly DBS devices – to alleviate conditions such as tremors, dystonia, and epilepsy. The long-term successes of DBS (used for decades to reduce Parkinsonian tremors) illustrate that invasive neural interfaces can dramatically improve patients' quality of life, although even these technologies come with quirks (one Parkinson's patient famously forgot how to swim after DBS implantation, highlighting the complex effects of brain interventions).

Another recent breakthrough highlighting the potential of brain-machine interfaces is the development of a so-called "**digital bridge**" between the brain and spinal cord. In 2023, researchers in Switzerland enabled a man with chronic paralysis to **walk naturally** again using a brain–spine interface. In this system, an implant in the patient's motor cortex detected the intention to walk and wirelessly transmitted signals to a stimulator implanted in the lumbar spinal cord. The spinal implant then delivered patterned electrical pulses to activate leg muscles in real time, effectively bypassing the patient's spinal injury. This achievement demonstrates the extraordinary promise of neurotechnology not just for controlling external machines, but for re-establishing lost connections within the nervous system itself – in this case, bridging a damaged spinal cord to restore volitional movement.

Together, these milestones set the stage for the current generation of high-bandwidth, wireless neural implants. Early BCIs proved that a handful of electrodes could grant basic computer control to paralyzed users, but they also revealed limitations: limited signal resolution, cumbersome wired setups, and short device lifespans due to biocompatibility issues. As we will discuss, today's innovators – most prominently Neuralink – are building on these lessons. They aim to create *scalable* brain-machine interfaces that can record from orders of magnitude more neurons, operate fully implantably (with wireless data and power), and remain stable in the brain for years. The following sections review how Neuralink's approach attempts to achieve these goals, and how it compares to other emerging neurotechnologies in this "future systems" frontier of human-machine integration.

Neuralink's Implant Design and Technology

Neuralink, founded in 2016, entered the BCI field with the ambitious goal of dramatically increasing the communication bandwidth between brains and computers. The company's philosophy is encapsulated in its mission to *"restore autonomy to those with unmet medical needs today and unlock human potential tomorrow."* In practical terms, Neuralink seeks to create a *general-purpose* BMI device – one that can be implanted into the brain to record neural activity at an unprecedented scale and transmit those signals wirelessly to external devices for real-time control or even sensory feedback. Neuralink's system, currently exemplified by the **N1 implant** (also dubbed "the Link"), integrates several state-of-the-art innovations in neural interface design: ultrathin and flexible electrode arrays, high-density on-chip signal processing, wireless communication, and robotic surgical implantation.

Device Architecture: The N1 Link is a small, coin-shaped neural implant designed to reside fully inside the skull, with no external connectors. It contains a circular biocompatible housing that encases custom electronics (signal amplifiers, digitizers, a Bluetooth wireless module, and a rechargeable battery). Emanating from this disc-like implant are **64 ultra-fine polymer threads**, each thread just a few micrometers thick, which serve as electrode carriers. Across those 64 threads, the implant hosts a total of **1,024 electrode contacts** – an order of magnitude more channels than previously common implants like the 100-electrode Utah array. These electrodes penetrate into the cortical tissue and are distributed in the regions of interest (for example, the hand and arm areas of the motor cortex for a patient with paralysis). By placing so many electrodes so close to neurons, the device can pick up high-resolution neural signals (individual action potentials and local field potentials) from a large population of cells. The implant's onboard chips amplify and preprocess these signals, then **wirelessly transmit the data via Bluetooth** to an external computer in real time. This fully wireless design represents a significant leap from earlier human BCIs that relied on percutaneous connectors or transmitter pedestals – for instance, the first BrainGate trials in the 2000s had cables running from the user's head to the computer. In contrast, Neuralink's implant is self-contained: it sends brain data out **telemetrically** and is powered by an internal battery that can be recharged inductively (through the skin) using a wireless charging pad or wearable "charging hat". As Elon Musk memorably summarized, Neuralink's implant is essentially *"a Fitbit in your skull with tiny wires"* – a description highlighting its compact, cordless nature. Figure 1 (not shown) conceptually illustrates this design: a disc-like implant seated in a skull opening, with flexible threads fanning out into the brain tissue.

Flexible Threads and Insertion Robot: The use of flexible electrode threads is one of Neuralink's core innovations. Traditional microelectrode arrays (like the Utah array) are made of rigid silicon or metal needles that are **stabbed into the cortex**, which, while effective for initial recording, cause substantial tissue damage and inflammation over time due to the brain's micromovements and the stiffness mismatch between metal and brain tissuejmir.orgjmir.org. Neuralink instead fabricates electrodes on thin polymer filaments (polyimide substrate with gold traces) that are far softer and more compliant – closer to the consistency of neural tissue itselfjmir.org. This flexibility is expected to improve biocompatibility and longevity by reducing the immune response and scar tissue that typically forms around stiffer implantsjmir.orgjmir.org. However, a thin thread (on the order of 5–50 μm in width) is too floppy to penetrate brain tissue on its ownjmir.org. Neuralink's solution is a **custom neurosurgical robot** (the R1 robot) that can accurately insert these threads into the cortex. The R1 robot resembles a small sewing machine: under optical guidance, it uses extremely fine needles to grasp each flexible thread by a tiny loop at its tip and "stitch" it into the brain at precise target locations and depthsjmir.org. This insertion process is automated and fast – the robot can place roughly **6 threads per minute**, equivalent to 192 electrodes per minute, far outpacing manual neurosurgeryjmir.orgjmir.org. Critically, the robot is programmed to perform insertions with micron-level precision while avoiding blood vessels on the brain surface, using high-resolution imaging (including **optical coherence tomography**) to prevent hemorrhage. Neuralink's 2019 technical report demonstrated the robot inserting **96 threads (3,072 electrodes)** reliably in under an hour in animal modelsjmir.orgjmir.org. The end result is an array of hairlike electrodes spread through multiple cortical layers and regions, all connected to the central implant. By employing flexible threads and robotic implantation, Neuralink achieves both **high channel counts and minimal tissue trauma**, marrying the advantages of prior "microwire" research with modern automation. Biomedical engineers have noted that Neuralink "took the best of everything… and put it all together" into a single device.

High-Density Signal Processing: Another key aspect of Neuralink's implant is the custom silicon that digitizes neural signals. The N1 device contains application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs) designed to **amplify, filter, and multiplex** the data from thousands of channels in paralleljmir.orgjmir.org. Remarkably, the entire 1024-channel system is packaged into an implant just **23 × 18.5 × 2 mm** in size, according to Neuralink's initial publicationjmir.org. In early prototypes, a single high-bandwidth wired connection (via USB-C) could stream all channels simultaneouslyjmir.org. In the current wireless incarnation, data is compressed on-board and sent out via Bluetooth at a rate sufficient to transmit neural spikes and even local field potential waveforms for all channels. An external software stack then decodes these signals into useful commands. Machine learning algorithms calibrate the system to the individual's neural firing patterns – for example, identifying the distinctive activity that corresponds to an attempt to move the right hand versus the left. Over time, the decoder can be refined to improve speed and accuracy, and can even adapt as the neural signals change or as the user gains proficiency (adaptive decoding is a feature being explored in BMI research broadly). Neuralink has reported that with its implant platform, they have achieved a **spike recording yield of ~70%** of electrodes (meaning a majority of the 1024 channels pick up stable signals from individual neurons) in long-term animal studiesjmir.org. This is a promising figure indicating many channels remain functional chronically, although it will need to be borne out in human trials.

First-in-Human Trial (PRIME Study): In July 2023, Neuralink received FDA clearance to begin its first human clinical study, officially titled **"Precise Robotically Implanted Brain-Computer Interface" (PRIME)**. The trial aims to evaluate the safety and functionality of the N1 implant in humans with paralysis. By early 2024, Neuralink announced that the **first human subject** had been implanted with the device. This first patient, a 30-year-old man named **Noland Arbaugh** who had been left quadriplegic by a spinal cord injury, underwent the Neuralink implantation surgery in January 2024. Remarkably, he was discharged from the hospital just **one day** after the procedure and reported no immediate side effects, indicating the surgery was relatively well-tolerated. By March 2024, Neuralink released a video of Mr. Arbaugh using the brain implant to play a game of chess on a computer **entirely by mind control**. He was able to move a computer cursor and click on squares of a chessboard using only his thoughts – a striking demonstration of brain-driven communication with a software application. In media interviews, Arbaugh described how the implant allowed him to reconnect with the world, regaining abilities like **independently browsing the web, sending messages, and playing video games** that he had lost due to paralysis. Within a week of his surgery, he could volitionally move a cursor on screen by two mental strategies: *"attempted movement"* (imagining moving his hand to guide the cursor) and *"imagined movement"* (simply visualizing the cursor's motion). Both methods felt intuitive to him, and he could even multitask – for instance, conversing or eating while simultaneously controlling the cursor. Neuralink reported that this first user achieved a record-high bit rate for a BCI cursor, peaking around **8 bits per second** for target selection (a measure combining speed and accuracy). This roughly translates to making a selection on a grid in well under a second, which is an impressive throughput for a first-generation device and on par with, or better than, prior BMI trials that used older tech. In short, the initial clinical results showed that a wireless, fully implanted BMI with 1024 channels can enable fast, reliable brain-driven computer control – a vindication of Neuralink's high-bandwidth approach.

User Experience and Maintenance: A critical design goal for Neuralink is to make the device *user-friendly* for daily life. Mr. Arbaugh noted that once healed from surgery, he **cannot feel the implant at all** – if he didn't remember getting it, he "wouldn't believe" there's a chip in his head, because there is no sensation or external sign of it. This speaks to the completely implantable nature (nothing protrudes from the scalp) and biocompatibility of the unit. The N1 system communicates with a phone or computer wirelessly, so the user interface is likely a combination of an app and possibly some wearable accessory when needed. The one maintenance requirement is recharging the battery: the implant must be **charged regularly (likely daily)** by inductive coupling. In practice, the patient wears a special hat or headset containing a wireless charger coil, typically for a couple of hours, to top up the implant's battery. Arbaugh mentioned that needing to stop and charge the device occasionally was an "unavoidable drawback" that interrupted his longer computer or gaming sessions. Still, compared to earlier systems that physically tethered users or required technicians to maintain, this is a significant improvement in autonomy. As wireless power technology advances, future versions might extend battery life or allow continuous trickle charging via a thin solar panel in a hat, for example. It's also worth noting that Neuralink's implant is **firmware upgradeable** – much like a smartphone, it can potentially receive software updates (e.g. improved decoding algorithms) over the air, and Elon Musk has even mused about users "upgrading" their implant hardware over years, analogous to swapping an old iPhone for a newer model. While routine brain surgeries for upgrades are not practical today, the modular and self-contained design means that if an implant ever needs replacement (due to battery depletion or technological obsolescence), it could be removed and a new one inserted in the same cavity with the assistance of the robot, minimizing additional damage.

Safety and Early Challenges: As with any pioneering clinical device, Neuralink's initial human experiences have highlighted both achievements and challenges. The surgery to implant the device – essentially a robot-assisted keyhole craniotomy – appears to have been safe in the first patient, with a quick recovery and no neurological deficits reported. However, a few weeks into use, Neuralink encountered a hardware issue: about **85% of the electrode threads in the first implant "retracted"** from their target positions in the brain, causing a significant drop in performance. In other words, the thin threads had partly backed out of the tissue, likely due to either subtle movements, tension, or other biomechanical factors, thus losing contact with many neurons. This problem aligns with one of the major concerns the FDA had initially cited (during an earlier approval attempt in 2022) – the potential for *migration of the implant's wires* over time and questions about how the device could be safely removed or adjusted if needed. Neuralink's team responded by re-calibrating the decoder algorithms to rely on the remaining stable electrodes, which restored much of the functionality for the user despite the loss of many channels. By May 2024, Neuralink publicly acknowledged the issue and indicated a plan to mitigate it in future surgeries: they would insert the threads **deeper into the brain (about 8 mm deep, vs the 3–5 mm depth in the first try)**, in hopes that a greater embedded length would resist retraction. The U.S. FDA approved this modification, and by mid-2024 Neuralink moved forward to implant its device in a second and third human participant with the updated approach. As of mid-2025, formal published results from these human trials are still pending, and it remains to be seen how well the mitigation strategies work. Nevertheless, the occurrence of thread migration emphasizes the experimental nature of the technology – kinks are still being worked out – and underscores why early trials are cautious and small in scale. It is through these iterative improvements that Neuralink and similar ventures will learn to optimize implant **placement stability, signal longevity, and overall safety** before any wider clinical use. Musk himself has admitted that it may be "*decades*" before brain implants like Neuralink's are refined and proven enough for widespread commercial availability.

Beyond Motor BCIs – Vision and More: While Neuralink's first focus is on motor restoration (enabling people with paralysis to control computers and eventually prosthetic limbs), the company has signaled broader ambitions in the neural implant space. In late 2024, Neuralink announced an experimental implant nicknamed **"Blindsight"** aimed at **restoring vision** for people with blindness. This device would implant electrode arrays into the visual cortex of the brain to directly stimulate visual perceptions, bypassing damaged eyes or optic nerves. The concept is that a camera feed could be converted into patterns of electrical stimulation in the visual cortex, potentially granting a form of artificial sight. In September 2024, the Blindsight visual prosthesis was granted **FDA Breakthrough Device** status, indicating it addresses a serious unmet need and may receive expedited review. While still in early development, it highlights that Neuralink-enabled brain-machine communication is meant to be a *two-way street*: not only reading information from the brain (as in motor BCIs) but also writing information into it (as in sensory prostheses). Moreover, Neuralink's devices are **bi-directional** by design – the hardware supports not just recording but also stimulation of brain tissue. This raises future possibilities like modulating brain circuits to treat psychiatric conditions or enhance cognitive function. Indeed, Elon Musk has often hyped long-term goals such as memory enhancement or "telepathic" communication between brains, and has framed Neuralink as a way to achieve symbiosis with AI. While such scenarios remain speculative and ethically fraught, the underlying technology (high-bandwidth implants) could in theory be software-configured for a variety of uses: e.g. *stimulating* the somatosensory cortex to provide a sense of touch from a prosthetic limb, or recording from speech-related areas to decode internal speech (as some academic groups have begun doing).

In summary, Neuralink's approach to neural implants represents a significant advancement in BMI technology. By combining **flexible high-count electrodes**, **robotic surgery**, and **wireless digital interfaces**, it has pushed the field toward devices that are more scalable, user-friendly, and integrated than ever before. The initial human use has validated the concept by enabling rapid mind-controlled computer use in a person with paralysis. At the same time, early challenges like electrode stability and the need for transparency underscore that this is still a work in progress. Neuralink stands at the forefront of BMI innovation, but it is not alone – many other players are contributing different ideas and technologies to achieve similar goals. The next section reviews some of these **similar technologies and competing approaches** in neural implants, to compare how the field at large is tackling the challenge of connecting brains and machines.

Similar Technologies and Competing Approaches

The race to develop effective brain-computer interfaces has attracted numerous companies and research teams, each with its own strategy for interfacing with the brain. While Neuralink has captured public attention with its wireless high-density implant, it joins a landscape of both well-established and up-and-coming neurotechnology efforts. Below, we outline several notable **similar technologies** and how they compare or contrast with Neuralink's design:

- **Blackrock Neurotech (Utah Array):** Blackrock Neurotech (formerly Blackrock Microsystems) is a pioneer in the BCI field, known for manufacturing the Utah array – the workhorse electrode used in many academic trials for the past 20+ years. The Utah array is a small silicon chip (about 4 mm square) studded with 100 stiff microelectrodes that penetrate the cortex. It was first implanted in humans in the early 2000s and has enabled patients with paralysis to control cursors, robotic arms, and other devices in clinical research settings. For example, participants in BrainGate studies who received one or two Utah arrays have achieved point-and-click typing, wheelchair control, and even multi-limb coordination via computer interfaces. However, the Utah array requires a percutaneous pedestal (a metal plug on the head) to connect to external electronics, and its channel count is relatively low (often 64 or 128 channels if multiple arrays are used). Blackrock Neurotech has been working on wireless versions and higher-channel variants, but as of 2025 the company has **not yet obtained FDA approval for a long-term commercial BCI device**. Blackrock's approach is considered **invasive and high-fidelity** (similar to Neuralink in that it places electrodes within brain tissue), but the rigid electrode design can cause tissue scarring, and the need for through-skull connectors is a drawback for practical use. Neuralink essentially aims to improve on Blackrock's concept by using many more electrodes (>>1000 vs. 100) that are flexible and fully implantable with no skull plug. Both companies target motor cortex for restoring movement and communication, and Blackrock has an impressive track record of human studies that laid the groundwork for what Neuralink is now attempting.

- **Synchron (Stentrode Endovascular BCI):** Synchron is a company taking a markedly different route – a **minimally invasive** BCI that does not require open brain surgery. Synchron's device, called the **Stentrode**, is a small mesh-like electrode array mounted on a stent (a metal scaffold). It is delivered into the brain's vasculature using a catheter, similar to how cardiac stents are placed. The Stentrode is guided via blood vessels (specifically, into a vein adjacent to the motor cortex) and then expanded to press the electrodes against the vessel wall, so they can pick up neural signals from the brain area nearby. The obvious advantage is avoiding a craniotomy – the procedure is much less invasive, using the vascular system as a "natural" access pathway. In 2021, Synchron announced the **first-in-human use of a fully implanted endovascular BCI**, and by 2022 they had implanted the Stentrode in a few patients with paralysis in Australia. In a clinical study (SWITCH trial), five patients with severe upper limb paralysis used the device to control computers with their thoughts – achieving functions like texting, emailing, and online shopping – all **wirelessly** and with no serious adverse events over 12 months. The signals from the Stentrode are relayed to a wireless transmitter implanted in the chest, which then communicates with external devices. This shows that even with a relatively small number of electrodes (the Stentrode has on the order of a couple dozen channels), meaningful BMI control is possible when targeting high-level intents (like attempting to move a limb to trigger a mouse click). Synchron has received FDA Breakthrough Device designation and begun U.S. trials, putting it arguably "ahead" of Neuralink in human testing progress (as of 2022-2023). However, the fidelity of an endovascular interface is inherently lower – it records from outside the brain rather than inside it. Thus, while Synchron's approach maximizes safety and ease of implantation, it currently offers less precision and bandwidth compared to Neuralink's high-density intracortical approach. Interestingly, some experts suggest that a combination of strategies might be used in the future (for example, a noninvasive or endovascular interface for broad control combined with a focal high-density implant for fine control). For now, Synchron represents the **leading less-invasive BMI** competitor, prioritizing near-term accessibility over raw information throughput.

- **Paradromics:** Paradromics is a U.S. startup also pursuing high-channel-count brain implants. Their approach is often likened to Neuralink's in that they focus on **thousands of channels and advanced electronics**. Paradromics has developed an array called the **Connexus Direct Data Interface**, which uses bundles of microwires to achieve up to 1,600 channels per module, with the goal of scaling to 10,000+ channels by combining modules. Unlike Neuralink's thread design, Paradromics initially explored a *"needle ensemble"* approach (many fine needles inserted simultaneously) and has since moved toward flexible polymer electrodes as well. They have also emphasized high-throughput data telemetry and signal processing, similar to Neuralink's fully implantable wireless strategy. As of 2023, Paradromics was preparing for initial human trials, aiming to help patients with conditions like locked-in syndrome to communicate via a direct brain-text interface. While detailed technical data are not as public, Paradromics has indicated their implant would involve an array implanted on cortical surface or shallow penetration, connected to a subcutaneous telemetry unit. In summary, Paradromics shares Neuralink's **high-bandwidth vision**, but is still in preclinical stages. It serves as another example of how multiple engineering teams are tackling the problem of scaling up neural interfaces with modern technology.

- **Precision Neuroscience (Layer 7 Cortical Interface):** Precision Neuroscience is a company co-founded by one of Neuralink's former founding team members. It takes yet another approach to neural interfacing: a **thin, flexible electrode array** that lies on the surface of the brain (under the dura mater) rather than penetrating into neural tissue. Dubbed the **"Layer 7" interface** (a nod to the cortex's layered structure), the device is likened to a piece of flexible **"scotch tape"** that can be slid under the skull and rest on the cortex. This design aims to be less invasive than penetrating electrodes like Neuralink's threads, while capturing higher-fidelity signals than external EEG. In 2023, Precision Neuroscience announced it had used this film-like array in *three patients* undergoing neurosurgery for tumors. In those cases, the Layer 7 device was temporarily placed on the brain surface to record activity (with patient consent) and then removed – demonstrating biocompatibility and signal acquisition, though not yet as a permanent implant. The eventual goal is a *fully implantable* version with a thin profile that doesn't require a big hole in the skull. Because it doesn't penetrate, it likely has less risk of injury or long-term damage, but it also may pick up less localized signals (each electrode might average signals from many neurons). Precision's strategy can be seen as **minimally invasive but moderate bandwidth**, potentially occupying a middle ground between Synchron's endovascular method and Neuralink's intracortical method. It highlights the trend of making electrodes ever thinner and more flexible to reduce harm to the brain – a principle Neuralink also champions, albeit with insertion into the tissue. If successful, a future Precision implant might be introduced via a slit in the skull, unrolled onto the cortex, and interface with hundreds of channels with no penetrations, providing a safer but still useful BMI for certain applications.

- **Academic and Other Commercial Efforts:** In addition to the above, there are numerous other efforts in the neurotech ecosystem. The **BrainGate consortium** (Massachusetts General Hospital, Brown University, etc.) continues to run clinical trials with improved versions of implanted Utah arrays, including testing **wireless transmitters** that eliminate cords while using the same arrays. Companies like **Neuralink's Science Corp (by Neuralink's ex-president)** and **Precision's competitors like Cortec and Corticale** are exploring implants for restoring vision or mapping brain activity during neurosurgery. Even non-invasive BCIs (like electrode caps and wearable devices) are improving with machine learning, though they cannot yet match the performance of implanted electrodes. Finally, military and government research (e.g. DARPA's programs) have invested in BMI innovations such as **optical BCIs** (using light to read neurons) and even **nanotechnology-based electrodes**, which could someday provide high-channel interfaces without conventional surgery.

In summary, Neuralink is part of a vibrant, competitive landscape. Each approach has trade-offs: **invasive vs. noninvasive, high bandwidth vs. high safety, penetrating vs. surface electrodes, wired vs. wireless**. Neuralink's distinctive contribution is arguably the integration of *extremely high channel count, flexibility, and wirelessness* in one implant, plus the development of a robotic surgical system to deploy it. As one article aptly noted, Neuralink has reinvigorated public interest in this field, spurring comparisons and a "race" among companies. Table 1 (hypothetical) might compare these on key metrics like channels, invasiveness, status of human trials, etc. All these efforts share the common vision of enabling direct brain-machine communication to assist people – and collectively, successes in any one approach benefit the field by demonstrating possibilities and solving problems that others can learn from. The next section will delve into the **applications** of such neural implant systems – what they can do today, and what they might enable in the near future.

Applications of Neural Implants and Brain-Machine Communication

Neural implants that facilitate brain-machine communication have predominantly been developed with **medical applications** in mind – specifically, to restore functions lost due to neurological injury or disease. We outline several major application areas below, highlighting current achievements and future potential:

- **Restoring Movement and Autonomy in Paralysis:** The flagship application for Neuralink and similar BMIs is to help people with paralysis regain control over their environment. By translating neural intentions into action, these systems effectively bypass damaged pathways (such as an injured spinal cord). In current trials, this most often means enabling computer interaction: for instance, allowing a quadriplegic person to move a cursor and click purely by thinking about moving. This capability alone can be life-changing – it opens the door to communication (via on-screen keyboards or texting), environmental control (smart home devices, wheelchair navigation), and recreation (using the internet, playing games) without needing physical movement. As described earlier, Neuralink's first human user can **browse the web, send texts, and play video games (like digital chess)** using his implant, which has given him back a sense of independence and connection. Beyond cursors, research participants in BMI studies have used brain signals to control **robotic arms and hands**. In one notable case, a paralyzed individual used a brain implant to mentally guide a robotic arm to pick up a bottle and drink from it with a straw, achieving a functional goal of self-feeding. Other studies enabled people to shake hands or even fist-bump U.S. President Barack Obama using a thought-controlled prosthetic hand. These demonstrations underscore that *motor neuroprosthetics* can restore practical actions. The ultimate goal is to reconnect brain to body – for example, drive exoskeletons or stimulate a patient's own paralyzed limbs. As mentioned, a brain-spine interface recently allowed a man to walk again by delivering his brain's commands to his legs in real time. While that approach involved bridging within the body, it shares the same principle of BMI. In the future, a Neuralink device might be able to send signals to *functional electrical stimulators* on a person's muscles, potentially enabling a paralyzed person to move their own arms or hands by will. At present, the focus is on mastering control of external devices like wheelchairs, computer cursors, and assistive robots – stepping stones toward greater mobility and autonomy.

- **Communication for Patients with Locked-In Syndrome:** For patients who cannot move or speak at all (e.g. advanced ALS or brainstem stroke patients), BCIs offer a channel to communicate with the outside world. Even a basic BMI that allows selecting letters on a screen can be a lifeline for someone who is "locked in." Existing implant systems using Utah arrays or ECoG (electrocorticography) strips have enabled some paralyzed people to type at 5–10 words per minute by mind-selection of letters. Neuralink's higher bandwidth could potentially improve communication rates. In fact, one of Neuralink's stated initial goals is to enable *speech BCIs* – Musk gave the example "imagine if Stephen Hawking could communicate faster than a speed-typist". Recent academic advances have shown it is feasible to decode intended speech directly from cortical activity: in 2021, researchers decoded whole words and sentences from the brain signals of a paralyzed man, effectively creating a **brain-to-text transcription** in real time. That study (Moses et al. 2021) used a high-density electrode grid on speech motor cortex and achieved up to 15 words per minute of decoded speech by mapping neural patterns to the patient's attempted vocalizations. Such work suggests that future neural implants could restore a voice to those who cannot speak, by directly translating their brain activity into synthesized speech or text. Neuralink has the technical capacity (with 1024+ electrodes and smart decoding) to pursue this application, and the company has indeed advertised for "speech BCI" specialists. If successful, a Neuralink user might one day silently think of words and have them output as audible sentences by a computer – a transformative ability for those with locked-in syndrome or profound speech impairment.

- **Sensory Restoration (Vision and Hearing):** Another major application is **neuroprosthetics for lost senses**. The cochlear implant, as noted, is a very successful example of a neural implant that restores hearing by stimulating the auditory nerve. Neural implants are now pushing into restoring vision for the blind. Neuralink's Blindsight project aims to implant electrodes in the visual cortex to produce phosphene patterns (dots of light) that the brain can learn to interpret as visual images. If resolution is sufficient, this could provide basic object recognition or navigation ability to those with no sight. Early cortical visual prosthesis trials (e.g. by Second Sight/Mind^VR) have shown partial successes – volunteers can perceive crude patterns or letters – but Neuralink's high channel count might drastically improve the resolution (think hundreds of pixels of "vision" vs. a few dozen previously). In the long run, a fully implemented visual BMI might allow even those who were born blind to receive visual information streamed from a camera directly into their brain, achieving a form of artificial vision. Beyond vision, there are efforts to use brain implants for restoring **touch and proprioception**. For instance, when a person controls a robotic arm with their mind, researchers have also given them a sense of touch by implanting stimulators in the brain's sensory cortex and feeding back signals from the robot's hand. Some BCI trial participants have reported feeling the touch of objects through the robotic hand this way. Such bidirectional interfaces (sometimes called *closed-loop BCIs*) are highly complex, but they illustrate the potential to *not only read* from the brain but also *write in* sensations, closing the loop to make prosthetic control more natural and dexterous.

- **Neurorehabilitation and Cognitive Enhancement:** A growing area of BMI application is in rehabilitation after stroke or brain injury. Neural implants might be used temporarily to retrain the brain by providing feedback or modulating neural circuits. For example, an implanted chip could potentially promote recovery of movement by stimulating certain brain areas in synchrony with physical therapy exercises – essentially helping the brain rewire more efficiently. There is also interest in treating psychiatric and neurological disorders: Deep brain stimulation is already used for depression and OCD in some cases, and research is ongoing into using cortical stimulation to boost memory in Alzheimer's or improve attention and mood. Musk has hinted that Neuralink could address disorders like depression, anxiety or memory loss by targeting relevant brain regions in the future. While these claims are currently speculative, the general concept is that a finer control over brain circuits via implants could correct pathological activity (similar to how DBS corrects Parkinson's tremors by stimulating basal ganglia circuits). Furthermore, **cognitive enhancement** applications – though far off and ethically charged – have been proposed. In theory, a BMI could augment human cognition by offloading memory storage to a computer or enabling direct brain-to-brain information transfer. Musk's talk of achieving *"symbiosis with AI"* reflects an aspiration that healthy individuals might one day use neural implants to interact with artificial intelligence systems or each other at the speed of thought, thereby greatly expanding human cognitive capabilities. For now, mainstream research remains focused on therapeutic uses for those in need, rather than enhancement for the general public, given the medical risks and ethical concerns. It is worth noting, however, that even current achievements can be seen as *augmenting* human ability: for a person who is paralyzed, a BCI that lets them operate a computer is enhancing their capabilities beyond what their biological condition allows. In that sense, neural implants are already "enhancements" for those who desperately need them, alleviating disability and improving quality of life.

In summary, the applications of neural implants span a spectrum from restoring lost **motor and sensory functions** (movement, communication, vision, hearing) to potentially **treating neurological disorders** (via stimulation or closed-loop modulation), and even to **future human enhancement**. At present, the most concrete applications – and the ones aligning with sustainable healthcare goals – are those addressing disability. BMIs are offering new channels for people with paralysis or sensory loss to engage with the world again, promoting inclusivity and autonomy. As these technologies mature, we can expect clinical translation in assistive devices for paralysis (perhaps within the next decade for basic computer control interfaces), and experimental treatments for blindness or speech loss to progress. The **enormous upsides** are evident in cases like a locked-in patient typing their first words in years, or a blind patient seeing a rough image. Each advancement reduces human suffering and dependence. But with these exciting possibilities come significant *technical and ethical challenges*, which we explore in the following sections.

Technical Challenges and Design Considerations

Designing and deploying neural implants for brain-machine communication is an engineering feat that must contend with the complexities of both technology and biology. Despite remarkable progress, several **technical challenges** remain before devices like Neuralink's can become routine medical solutions. Key issues include biocompatibility and safety, signal stability, data management, and practical usability.

Biocompatibility and Longevity: The human brain is delicate and not naturally amenable to having foreign objects embedded within it. A central challenge is making electrodes that can **last for years in the brain without causing damage or losing signal quality**. Traditionally, rigid implants (e.g. metal or silicon probes) trigger a foreign-body response: the immune system treats them as irritants, leading to inflammation, glial scarring around the electrodes, and eventual neuron loss or electrical insulation by scar tissuejmir.orgjmir.org. This can drastically reduce signal quality over time, often within months to a few years. Neuralink's use of *ultrathin, flexible polymer threads* is a direct attempt to mitigate this issue by matching the mechanical properties of brain tissue and causing minimal disruptionjmir.org. Initial animal studies by Neuralink showed that flexible threads can record neural spikes for many months with less scarring than traditional arrays, but **long-term human biocompatibility is still unproven**. Will the threads remain in place and functional 5, 10, 20 years post-implantation? Material selection (polyimide, gold, parylene coatings) will influence corrosion and durability. As seen with the first human implant, even flexible threads experienced an issue of **migration (retraction)** which affected their positioning. This highlights how the dynamic environment of the brain (pulsation, minor head movements, etc.) can gradually shift or stress an implant. Engineers must ensure the implant can "settle" and integrate with minimal movement relative to the brain. One consideration is anchoring: Neuralink's threads currently rely on some slack and presumably the brain's surface tension to stay put; future designs might include small barbs or branching structures to hold electrodes in place once inserted – but these must be balanced against causing damage. **Encapsulation** is another issue: the body may deposit proteins or encapsulate the device over time. Advanced coatings that are bio-neutral or even bio-active (promoting neuron growth onto electrodes) are being explored to improve long-term integration. Ultimately, proving *chronic stability* of recordings in humans is a hurdle that only time and continued trials will surmount. Regulatory bodies will likely require evidence that implants can last several years safely if they are to be approved for widespread use in patients.

Safety of Invasive Procedures: Any brain implant requires a surgical procedure, which carries risks such as infection, hemorrhage, or tissue damage. Although Neuralink's robotic implantation is designed to avoid blood vessels and be as minimally invasive as possible, it is still a form of **neurosurgery** – creating a skull opening, inserting multiple electrodes, and closing up. The company has reportedly used **5 micron precision imaging** to steer clear of surface vasculature when inserting threadspmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov, but there remains a risk of piercing a blood vessel deep in the brain, which could cause a hemorrhagic stroke. The safety profile in animal studies was acceptable for the FDA to allow human trials, but scaling to broader use means ensuring the procedure can be done consistently without complications. The design of the implant (fully under the skull) at least avoids infection-prone breakouts through the skin; this is a big safety improvement over older percutaneous connectors. Another safety factor is **failure mode**: if something goes wrong with the device, can it be safely removed or replaced? Earlier in 2022, the FDA was concerned about how the Neuralink device would be removed without injuring the brain. The company will need to demonstrate a protocol for explantation – perhaps using the robot in reverse to pull out threads – that doesn't leave pieces behind or cause bleeding. So far, no human removals have been reported, but at some point, a patient might need an implant upgrade or have an issue necessitating removal, and that will test the reversibility of the implant. Additionally, any **stimulation capability** (for future bidirectional use) will raise safety questions about tissue heating or unintended brain activity, so careful limits on current and voltage must be observed.

Signal Quality and Decoding: Even with hundreds or thousands of electrodes, a BCI only works if it can interpret the noisy neural data correctly. The brain's electrical chatter is complex – individual electrodes pick up signals from multiple neurons plus background noise. Decoding algorithms (often using machine learning) are essential to translate patterns of spikes or field potentials into clear commands (e.g. "move cursor up/right"). One technical challenge is maintaining calibration of these decoders over time. Neurons can change their firing properties, or electrodes can shift slightly (as happened with the thread retraction issue), which can degrade the decoding performance. Adaptive algorithms are being developed that continuously update the mapping as needed. Neuralink likely leverages AI techniques to improve accuracy and speed; however, this introduces complexity in validation – the system might become a "black box" if not carefully characterized. Robust decoding also typically requires a **training period**: initially, a user must imagine or attempt certain movements so the system can learn the neural signatures. In Neuralink's first case, the patient was moving a cursor within a week, suggesting a relatively quick calibration (possibly aided by the fact that he could do slight residual movements in his hand, providing some feedback). For completely locked-in users who cannot move at all, calibration might be trickier and might rely on predictive machine learning models. Researchers are actively investigating **auto-calibration** methods and transfer learning to reduce the burden on users. Another consideration is **information bandwidth**: while 1024 channels is high, the brain has billions of neurons – we are still sampling a tiny fraction of the information. There is a theoretical cap on how much detail of movement or thought can be decoded from a limited sample of neurons. Thus, there is ongoing work on feature extraction methods that maximize useful information from each electrode. In summary, achieving **fast, accurate, and robust decoding** is a challenge that spans both hardware (quality of signals) and software (quality of algorithms). It's not enough to have electrodes in the brain; the *whole chain* from signal to command must be optimized.

Data and Power Management: High-channel-count implants generate a lot of data. Neuralink's 1024 channels, each potentially sampling at e.g. 20 kHz, produce on the order of 20 million data points per second. Streaming that wirelessly requires compression and intelligent data reduction (for example, extracting spike times and waveform features rather than raw signal waveforms). The implant's electronics must balance capturing rich data with the limits of wireless bandwidth and battery power. Custom chips in the device perform on-board filtering and event detection to significantly cut down the data that needs radio transmissionjmir.org. Still, as channel counts increase (Neuralink has prototyped up to 3072 channelsjmir.org, and some envision 10k+ in the future), data management becomes an escalating challenge. Power is closely tied to this: the more channels and higher the sampling rates, the more power the device consumes. Heat dissipation is a concern – the implant cannot be allowed to heat up the brain tissue significantly. Thus, chips must be extremely power-efficient. Neuralink's engineers likely design ASICs with low-power architecture to handle thousands of channels under a few milliwatts. The wireless charging requirement (currently daily) is a practical limitation; improving battery technology or wireless power transfer could extend usage time. If an implant could hold charge for a week, for instance, that would be more convenient. Until then, users have to incorporate charging into their routine (which, as Arbaugh described, is a bit of a nuisance when it interrupts activities like gaming). Engineers must also ensure **fail-safes**: e.g. if battery dies, the implant should not emit any spurious signals or harm tissue (most likely it would just shut down gracefully). Over-the-air firmware updates pose a cybersecurity issue as well (addressed below), but from a technical standpoint, being able to update decoding algorithms or fix bugs without another surgery is a big advantage – provided it's done carefully to avoid inadvertent changes that confuse the user or render the system unsafe.

Scaling and Manufacturing: To treat large populations, these devices need to be manufacturable and the surgical process needs to be scalable. Neuralink's robot is an impressive piece of automation, but currently each implantation is a bespoke procedure. In the future, one can imagine specialized surgical centers with such robots performing multiple surgeries a day, but that requires streamlining patient selection, pre-surgical mapping of where to insert electrodes, and post-surgical support. On the device production side, making biocompatible electronics in large volume with zero defects is non-trivial. Every electrode and every wire bond must function; a single broken thread out of 64, for example, might reduce capability or require design tolerances that account for some failure. Neuralink has invested in **wafer-scale fabrication** of its thread arrays, meaning they can produce many threads at once using semiconductor techniquesjmir.org. That bodes well for reproducibility, but they will need to maintain high yield on these delicate structures. The assembly of the implant (integrating threads with chips and the housing) likely involves precision microsurgery of its own (automated bonding and laser welding, etc.). As the company moves from prototype to product, **reliability and quality control** become as important as raw performance.

In summary, technical challenges in this field span **biology (making the brain and device coexist peacefully)** and **engineering (maximizing performance under real-world constraints)**. Neuralink and its peers must solve issues of **stability, safety, and scalability**: ensuring the implant doesn't harm the brain (and vice versa), keeping signals strong and decoders accurate over long periods, and handling the massive data flow efficiently with limited power. Each challenge is an active area of research. Encouragingly, none of these appear insurmountable – they are being addressed step by step. For instance, the thread retraction problem encountered was met with a solution (deeper implantation) that will be tested. Biocompatibility concerns are being addressed by ever-improving materials and coatings. Decoding is getting better with AI techniques and larger training datasets from human trials. Nonetheless, caution is warranted: the complexity of the human brain means unforeseen issues can arise (e.g., could long-term use lead to plastic changes in the brain that need managing? Could an implant subtly affect the user's thought processes beyond the intended function?). These uncertainties overlap with ethical considerations, which we explore next.

Ethical and Regulatory Considerations

The advent of high-performance neural implants raises profound **ethical, social, and regulatory** questions. As we integrate technology directly with the human brain, considerations go beyond technical efficacy – encompassing patient rights, data privacy, research ethics, and the broader impact on society. In this section, we discuss some key ethical and regulatory issues relevant to Neuralink-enabled brain-machine communication, drawing from current debates and expert analyses.

Informed Consent and Patient Welfare: Ensuring that patients (or trial participants) fully understand the risks and unknowns of experimental brain implants is paramount. Many candidates for BCIs – such as those with locked-in syndrome or severe paralysis – are in desperate situations with limited options. This can create a **vulnerability**, where patients might consent to very risky procedures out of hope, potentially without a full grasp of implications. Ethicists emphasize the need for rigorous informed consent processes, clear communication of potential benefits *and* risks, and psychological evaluation to ensure participants are not being unduly coerced by their condition. Patients must maintain the right to withdraw from a study, and their **decision-making autonomy** must be respected at every step. There is also concern that patients may develop high expectations (fueled by media hype or company claims) and face crushing disappointment if the technology falls short or fails. The case of Neuralink's first patient having his implant's performance dip due to thread retraction, then partially restored, illustrates how emotional and stressful such trials can be. As one expert noted, the psychological impact of "getting your hopes back, then experiencing a setback" can be significant. Ongoing support and counseling for participants should thus accompany the technical aspects of trials. Additionally, since these devices become *part of the user's body and self* in a way, companies and clinicians have a duty of care that extends long-term. **What happens if an implant malfunctions or if a company goes out of business?** Patients might be left with an unsupported device in their brain. This raises questions about corporate responsibility and the need for contingency planning (e.g., ensuring devices can be safely turned off or removed, and perhaps placing devices in escrow if a firm cannot continue servicing them). Regulators might require implant-makers to have plans for long-term patient support as part of approvals.

Animal Research Ethics: Neuralink and others have relied on extensive animal testing (mice, pigs, monkeys) to develop their technology. There has been **ethical controversy** around Neuralink's animal research practices. In early 2022, public reports surfaced (via the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine) alleging that many monkeys in Neuralink's experiments at UC Davis had suffered and even died due to complications from implant surgeries. Out of 23 implanted monkeys, reportedly more than a dozen were euthanized or died, with allegations of inadequate animal care. Neuralink claimed any animal deaths were due to prior conditions or humane euthanasia for experimental endpoints, and that they adhere to animal welfare standards. Nonetheless, the USDA opened an investigation, and the issue drew scrutiny from lawmakers concerned about possible animal cruelty. This situation underscores the **ethical imperative to treat research animals humanely** and use the minimum number necessary to achieve scientific aims. It also highlights a transparency issue: as a private company, Neuralink initially kept details of its animal studies relatively private, fueling speculation. Ethically, society expects that if animals are sacrificed for research, it is done with rigorous oversight (e.g., Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees) and that the knowledge gained justifies the harm. Some ethicists argue that if Musk "cared about the health of patients, he would invest in noninvasive BCIs" rather than invasive ones that cause animal and potential human harm. However, most in the field acknowledge that a certain amount of animal research is currently indispensable to advance invasive BMI tech to a stage safe enough for human trials. Moving forward, Neuralink will need to demonstrate a commitment to **refinement and reduction** of animal experiments, perhaps by sharing data or using modern alternatives (like high-fidelity simulations or *in vitro* brain-organoid testing) when possible. The public and regulatory blowback serves as a reminder that *ethical research conduct* is under the microscope in this novel domain.

Data Privacy and Neurosecurity: One of the most distinctive ethical challenges of brain-machine interfaces is the issue of **mind data privacy**. A neural implant necessarily reads signals that are reflections of a person's thoughts, intentions, perceptions, and potentially even unconscious mental states. This raises concerns about who will have access to this data and how it will be used. In medical BMI applications, the data would be used to assist the patient (e.g., enabling control of a device) and typically handled by secure clinical software. However, as BMI tech evolves, one can imagine scenarios where brain data could be stored on cloud servers, or analyzed by AI, or even inadvertently shared. Sensitive neural data could, in theory, reveal information one might consider private – for instance, unique thought patterns, emotional responses, or other cognitive metrics. **Hacking or unauthorized access** is a serious worry: if a malicious actor gained wireless access to an implant, could they steal thoughts? Could they insert commands (for bidirectional systems) against the user's will? These scenarios, while far-fetched in the present (implants are not broadcasting raw thoughts and there are significant technical barriers to "mind-reading" beyond the specific motor/sensory signals of interest), are taken seriously by ethicists. Neuralink's wireless communication must be encrypted and authenticated to prevent any external takeover or eavesdropping. Regulators will likely enforce cybersecurity standards on such devices, similar to or stricter than those for other connected medical devices (like insulin pumps or pacemakers, which have already raised hacking concerns). Another aspect is *ownership of neural data*: Does the patient exclusively own their brain data, or can companies use it for research? Clear data governance policies and patient consent for data use are needed. Moreover, if future versions allow continuous brain monitoring (for example, tracking mood or cognitive state to adjust stimulation), it blurs lines between medical device and surveillance device. Legal frameworks (like HIPAA for medical data) might need updates to cover neural data explicitly – some have called for a new category of "neurorights" to protect the privacy of one's brain signals and to guard against unwanted intrusion into one's mental processes.

Transparency and Scientific Rigor: Neuralink has faced criticism for at times bypassing traditional scientific channels. The company famously made splashy public demos (showing a pig with an implant, a monkey playing Pong) and Elon Musk tends to announce milestones on **social media**, sometimes before details are available to the scientific community. For instance, the first human implant was tweeted in Jan 2024, but Neuralink had not initially registered the clinical trial in the public database *ClinicalTrials.gov*, nor had they published a peer-reviewed protocol. This prompted concern that they were not adhering to standard ethical practices of **transparency and peer review**. Indeed, registering trials and publishing results is crucial for independent evaluation and for building trust. Neuralink did later register the PRIME Study after starting it, and presumably will publish outcomes in time, but the initial omission was viewed as a lapse in research ethics. Companies operating in this cutting-edge space might be tempted to keep things secret for IP reasons or to control public narrative, but doing so can undermine scientific integrity and public trust. Regulators and funding agencies encourage open science practices for medical breakthroughs. In the long run, Neuralink will need to engage fully with the scientific community – publishing data, allowing independent experts to vet claims, and following norms of reporting – to legitimize its technology for medical use. The **FDA approval process** itself enforces some rigor, as safety and efficacy must be demonstrated in documented trials. But beyond regulatory filings, the broader neuroscience field benefits from shared knowledge (for example, publishing how Neuralink addressed the thread migration issue could help others avoid similar pitfalls). There's an evolving conversation about balancing corporate secrecy with ethical responsibility when the "product" is an invasive device that affects human lives. The consensus among ethicists is that **accountability** is key: companies should be held to high standards of evidence and open communication when introducing devices into humans.

Equity and Access: If and when neural implants become viable treatments, questions of **who gets access** and who can afford them will arise. Cutting-edge therapies often start expensive. There's a risk that BMI technology could create disparities – benefiting wealthy patients or those in developed regions first, while others are left behind. Over time, costs usually come down with scale and insurance coverage, but it requires proactive effort to ensure these advances are equitably accessible. Moreover, if we consider hypothetical enhancement uses, there is a social justice concern that cognitive enhancements could be available only to some, potentially widening societal gaps. Policymakers and ethicists are already calling for frameworks to prevent BMI tech from exacerbating inequality. At the current stage, with devices only in trials, the focus is on safety rather than distribution. But we should keep in mind the ultimate goal: **sustainable, inclusive technology** that benefits a broad range of people who need it, not just a privileged few. This aligns with viewing BMI through a "sustainable futures" lens – it should contribute to well-being on a large scale, and that means planning for affordability, training of clinicians to provide it, and public reimbursement if proven effective (so that a person with severe disability isn't denied a life-changing device due to cost).

Human Identity and Agency: A more philosophical consideration is how brain-machine integration affects our sense of self. When a device is reading your thoughts and potentially writing signals into your brain, the boundary between human and machine blurs. Users have reported that using a BCI can feel natural – in the best cases, the device becomes an extension of the mind, like an extra body part. But some worry about a loss of agency: if an algorithm is filtering or adding to your neural activity, are *you* fully in control? The Frontiers conceptual analysis noted the "bidirectional" nature of Neuralink-type devices raises uncertainties about enhancement of healthy individuals and extraction of information that invades privacy. If healthy people were to get BCIs to boost memory or multitasking, would that alter what it means to be human or create new social divides? While those scenarios are not immediate, the discussion of *neuroethics* urges us to tread carefully. Ensuring that any brain implant operates under the user's explicit control and consent is fundamental – e.g., devices could have **manual off-switches** that patients can activate if they ever feel uncomfortable or want a break from the interface. Furthermore, any cognitive enhancement use should be preceded by extensive ethical deliberation and probably regulation, given the societal implications (similar to how performance-enhancing drugs are controlled in sports, one might imagine cognitive enhancers being regulated).

Regulatory Landscape: Currently, neural implants are regulated as medical devices. In the US, the FDA's device approval process (including Investigational Device Exemptions for trials, and ultimately Pre-Market Approval for high-risk devices) is the gatekeeper for clinical use. The FDA will assess safety (e.g. risk of injury, infection, failures) and efficacy (does it meaningfully help patients) based on trial data. Neuralink's breakthrough designation for vision and the ongoing trials indicate the FDA is engaged. One challenge for regulators is that this tech spans multiple domains – it's a combination of implantable hardware, software/AI, and potentially cloud-connected systems. It also intersects with data regulations (like HIPAA for patient data security). There may be a need for **new guidelines specific to neurotechnology**, something ethicists and legal scholars have been advocating (including the idea of "neurorights" being enshrined in law, as some countries like Chile have started to do). Internationally, standards will need alignment, as neurotech companies operate globally. An interesting note: at least 42 people worldwide had received some form of BCI implant by 2023 in research contexts, indicating we are moving beyond isolated experiments into a larger domain that regulators must supervise consistently. It's likely that regulatory bodies will increase requirements for post-market surveillance (to monitor long-term effects on patients), cybersecurity standards, and perhaps certification of surgeons and hospitals that can perform these delicate implant procedures.

In summary, **ethical and regulatory considerations** form a crucial layer around neural implant technology. Addressing these proactively is as important as solving technical hurdles. Stakeholders – including companies like Neuralink, clinicians, ethicists, regulators, and patient representatives – must collaborate to establish frameworks that ensure the technology is developed **responsibly**. This means prioritizing patient safety and informed consent, ensuring transparency and peer oversight in research, protecting the privacy of neural data, preparing for equitable access, and guarding against potential abuses or unintended consequences (like coercive use or premature commercialization without proof of safety). The excitement around neural implants must be matched with a commitment to ethical diligence, so that public trust in these innovations can be maintained. As one ethicist noted, we should remember "the enormous upsides" of neurotechnology to alleviate suffering, while carefully managing the risks. When done responsibly, advancements in neural implants can proceed in a way that upholds human values and rights even as we integrate cutting-edge machines with our minds.

Future Directions and Conclusion

Neural implant technology for brain-machine communication is advancing rapidly, and the coming years promise both exciting developments and important ongoing challenges to overcome. Looking ahead, several **future directions** can be anticipated:

- **Expanded Clinical Trials and Indications:** In the near term, we will see the results of Neuralink's **PRIME Study** and similar trials from other companies. These early human studies will answer key questions about safety and what level of functional improvement can be reliably achieved (e.g., how fast and accurately can average users type with a BMI? Can multiple devices – such as a computer and a robotic arm – be controlled simultaneously?). Assuming safety benchmarks are met, trials will likely expand to include more participants, including those with different conditions. For instance, Neuralink or others may initiate studies for people with ALS (as already listed in Neuralink's trial criteria), spinal cord injury, stroke, or locked-in syndrome. Additionally, *feasibility trials for new indications* will progress – Neuralink's **CONVOY Study** aims to have BMI users control robotic prosthetic arms, moving beyond cursor control. The visual prosthesis (Blindsight) will also move into human testing, gauging how well artificial vision can be induced. Each new trial that demonstrates positive outcomes will build momentum and could lead to **regulatory approvals for clinical use** in specific scenarios (perhaps within a few years for a use like enabling text communication in paralysis, if results are strong). Regulatory agencies might grant humanitarian or limited approvals before full commercialization, to allow patients with urgent needs to benefit sooner under careful monitoring.
- **Technical Refinements:** On the technology front, we can expect **increases in channel counts and density** of implants. Neuralink's device with 1024 electrodes might be iterated to higher numbers (they already demonstrated 3072 in animalsjmir.org). Other groups are working on flexible electronics that could blanket larger brain areas with thousands of contact points. An important development would be achieving *greater coverage*: currently, one N1 implant covers a few millimeters of cortex with its threads. To interface with broader networks (say, both motor and sensory areas, or multiple limbs), a person might require multiple implants or a wider array. Neuralink's surgery robot and approach could theoretically allow multiple units to be installed, though surgical time and complexity increase. Future systems might use *modular implants* that snap together or communicate with each other to cover larger brain regions while still only having one point of wireless communication. **Wireless improvements** are likely as well – possibly higher bandwidth wireless links (maybe using ultra-wideband or optical telemetry) to transmit more data without draining battery, and better inductive charging methods for convenience (even exploring constant trickle-charge via a wearable, so the user doesn't have to consciously charge the device). Battery technology improvements could extend operation time and lifespan of the device (current implants might need battery replacement every few years, which would be another surgery unless rechargeable indefinitely). **Closed-loop capability** is another future refinement: integrating stimulation so that the device can not only read but also write to the brain in response to events. For example, a closed-loop BCI could detect an impending seizure and deliver a stimulus to abort it (combining BMI with a therapeutic function akin to a smart neuro-pacemaker). We will also see progress in **software**: more sophisticated decoding algorithms, perhaps using deep learning to decode more complex intentions (like imagining whole words or high-level goals rather than simple movements). Cloud-computing could offload heavy computation, though that raises latency and privacy issues – a balance will be sought between on-device processing vs. external processing. Companies might also leverage AI training on large datasets of neural activity (from trials) to pre-train decoders that generalize better, reducing calibration time for new users.

- **Improved Biocompatibility and Form Factor:** Materials science advances may yield electrodes that cause even less tissue reaction – for instance, using **bio-dissolvable support materials** that disappear after insertion, leaving only the tiny conductive traces embedded. Research is ongoing into electrodes made of carbon nanotubes or graphene, which are ultra-thin and flexible, or into **hydrogel coatings** that make electrodes "softer" once in the brain. Some teams are exploring **fully biological electrodes** (like engineered neurons that act as relays), though that's very experimental. The physical *size* of implants will also likely shrink. Neuralink's implant is already small, but an ultimate goal would be to have it entirely unobtrusive – potentially implanted through a small burr hole rather than a larger skull flap. Elon Musk has talked about aiming for a device so seamless that an incision and perhaps a laser-drilled skull hole are all that's needed, analogous to LASIK eye surgery's ease. We may see **minimally invasive delivery** for certain interfaces; for example, combining Neuralink's threads with endoscopic or catheter-based placement to avoid a full craniotomy. The synergy of different approaches might occur: maybe a device that partially goes through blood vessels and then exits into brain tissue in targeted spots (a hybrid of Synchron and Neuralink concepts). Also, there could be development of **removable interfaces** – perhaps something that sits on the dura and can be taken out if needed, to alleviate long-term implant concerns, though that typically sacrifices some signal quality.
- **Ethical Frameworks and Standards:** As the technology matures, we will likely see parallel development of **ethical guidelines, standards, and perhaps legislation** specific to neurotechnology. For instance, standards for neurodata encryption and patient consent could be issued by international bodies or national standards organizations. We may also see the emergence of **NeuroTech Ethics Boards** or inclusion of neuroethicists in trial review processes routinely, to ensure that as capabilities expand (especially towards any enhancement use-cases) there is proper oversight. If BCIs start moving beyond strictly medical indications, public discourse and legal regulation will intensify around questions like cognitive liberty and "neurorights." Some countries may move faster in adopting these technologies (for example, the US and EU are active, but also China has significant BCI research initiatives); this could lead to a need for global consensus on responsible use, perhaps via the WHO or similar institutions. On the regulatory side, if early devices prove their worth, authorities will craft guidelines for *market approval* and reimbursement. Over the next decade, we might witness the first **BMI device receiving full approval for clinical use**, maybe for a condition like severe paralysis to control computer/communication devices. That would set precedents for how such devices are evaluated and monitored (likely via patient registries to track outcomes and any adverse events long-term).
- **Integration with AI and External Systems:** Future brain-machine systems will likely integrate even more with AI-driven external software. For example, an AI could interpret a user's neural signals to not just execute a direct command, but to infer higher-level goals and assist proactively. If a user thinks "open my email" and then mentally composes a sentence, an AI agent could help auto-formulate the email once it interprets the intent. This merges BMI with the trend of AI assistants. Conversely, AI could provide sensory or analytical input to the brain via stimulation (imagine an AI detecting something important and signaling the user through a subtle neural cue). These kinds of integrations raise new scenarios – some very beneficial (streamlining the interface, adapting to the user), and some possibly concerning (could AI manipulate a user's mental state via their implant?). Research and ethical oversight will have to guide these possibilities carefully. Nonetheless, it's reasonable to foresee that BMI users will eventually harness AI to customize and optimize their device use, making the tech more powerful and user-friendly.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the field of neural implants enabling brain-machine communication is at an inflection point. Over the past two decades, foundational research demonstrated the *potential* of BCIs in isolated cases; now, companies like Neuralink are engineering that potential into integrated systems that could be deployed at scale, backed by robust data. This systematic review has examined how Neuralink's approach – with its high-bandwidth wireless implant – exemplifies the latest advancements in neural interface design, and how it compares to other cutting-edge solutions. We have seen that Neuralink's device **successfully allowed a paralyzed person to control digital devices at will**, a milestone that validates years of innovation. We have also recognized that many challenges remain, from ensuring long-term safety and stability of the implants in living brains to grappling with the ethical and societal implications of merging minds with machines.

From a broader perspective, these technologies align with the vision of a more **sustainable and inclusive future** – one where debilitating medical conditions can be ameliorated by technical means, thus improving quality of life and reducing the healthcare and economic burdens of disability. A paralyzed individual using a brain implant to work a computer or communicate effectively gains independence and can contribute more actively to society, which is a clear social good. Likewise, if blindness could be partially cured by a visual prosthesis, it would open opportunities and reduce reliance on assistance. These outcomes resonate with the goals of sustainable development in health and well-being. However, for such benefits to be realized on a broad scale, the technology must be made safe, affordable, and ethically deployed. This will require continued interdisciplinary effort – engineers, neuroscientists, clinicians, ethicists, and policymakers working hand in hand.

In the coming years, we anticipate not only engineering triumphs (more capable and user-friendly neural implants) but also the development of **comprehensive frameworks** that ensure these neurotechnologies are used to *enhance human welfare* without compromising ethical values. It is an endeavor very much in progress: as one commentary put it, *"we are living in exciting times"* with real hope that neural interfaces can "move paralyzed limbs, silence involuntary movements, and beyond". Caution and optimism must go together. With careful navigation of the challenges discussed, advancements in neural implants like Neuralink's will likely herald a new era of brain-machine symbiosis – one where people suffering from neurological limitations can reclaim abilities and perhaps even achieve feats previously unimaginable. The systematic pursuit of this vision, underpinned by rigorous science and ethics, will shape the frontier of sustainable, human-centric technology in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

Parikh, P. M., & Venniyoor, A. (2024). *Neuralink and Brain–Computer Interface—Exciting Times for Artificial Intelligence*. *South Asian Journal of Cancer, 13*(1).

Musk, E., et al. (2019). *An integrated brain-machine interface platform with thousands of channels*. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 21*(10), e16194.

Lavazza, A., et al. (2025). *Neuralink's brain-computer interfaces: medical innovations and ethical challenges*. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics, 7*. (Conceptual analysis of Neuralink's milestones, ethical and regulatory issues, and comparisons to other BCIs)

Perez, C. (2025). *The Advancements and Ethical Concerns of Neuralink*. *Princeton Medical Review*.

Leffer, L. (2024). *Neuralink's First User Describes Life with Elon Musk's Brain Chip*. *Scientific American*, May 2024.

Ables, K. (2024). *Musk's Neuralink implants brain chip in its first human subject*. *The Washington Post*, Jan 30, 2024.

Oxley, T., et al. (2021). *Motor neuroprosthesis using an endovascular stent-electrode array*. *Journal of NeuroInterventional Surgery*.

Moses, D. A., et al. (2021). *Neuroprosthesis for decoding speech in a paralyzed person with anarthria*. *New England Journal of Medicine, 385*(3), 217-227.

Mitchell, P., et al. (2023). *Safety of an endovascular BCI: The Stentrode with Thought-Controlled Digital Switch (SWITCH) study*. *JAMA Neurology, 80*(3), 270-278.

McCay, A. (2023). *Neurotechnology: balancing the ethics*.

Received: 07.15.2025
Revised: 07.20.2025
Accepted: 07.26.2025
Published: 08.04.2025