International Journal of Research and Review Techniques (IJRRT), ISSN: 3006-1075
Volume 5, Issue 3, July-September, 2026, Available online at: https://ijrrt.com

Neuroethics in the Age of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Agency, Cognitive Liberty, and Legal Frameworks

Dr. Elena Vaneva

Senior Research Fellow, Centre for Bioethics and Jurisprudence, KU Leuven, Belgium

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) has introduced transformative possibilities for communication, healthcare, neurological rehabilitation, and human–machine interaction. By establishing direct communication pathways between the human brain and external computational devices, BCIs enable the interpretation of neural signals and, in certain applications, the modulation of brain activity. However, these technological developments raise significant ethical, philosophical, legal, and societal concerns regarding individual autonomy, personal identity, cognitive liberty, mental privacy, and human agency. This paper examines the emerging field of neuroethics in the context of advanced BCI technologies, focusing particularly on the protection of individuals' cognitive freedom and the preservation of their decision-making capabilities. It investigates how neural data collection, algorithmic interpretation, and brain stimulation technologies may challenge traditional concepts of informed consent, mental integrity, privacy, and personal responsibility. Furthermore, the study explores the potential implications of BCI applications in medical treatment, workplace environments, military operations, and consumer technologies.

Particular attention is given to the development of legal and regulatory frameworks capable of addressing neurotechnological risks while promoting responsible innovation. The paper evaluates emerging approaches to neurorights, including the right to mental privacy, cognitive liberty, psychological continuity, and protection against unauthorized neural manipulation. It also highlights the limitations of existing data protection, medical ethics, human rights, and cybersecurity regulations in responding to the unique challenges associated with neural information. The study proposes an integrated neuroethical governance framework incorporating transparency, informed consent, data security, accountability, equitable access, and human oversight. Ultimately, it argues that the responsible development of BCIs requires interdisciplinary collaboration among neuroscientists, engineers, legal professionals, policymakers, and ethicists. Establishing comprehensive legal safeguards and internationally recognized neuroethical principles is essential to ensuring that brain-computer technologies enhance human capabilities without compromising fundamental rights, individual autonomy, or human dignity.

Keywords: Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), Neuroethics and Cognitive Liberty, Neural Privacy and Mental Integrity, Human Agency and Autonomy, Neurotechnology Legal and Regulatory Frameworks

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of neuroscience, artificial intelligence (AI), and neurotechnology has significantly transformed the relationship between the human brain and digital systems. Among the most important innovations in this field are Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), which establish direct communication pathways between neural activity and external devices without requiring conventional muscular movement. These technologies enable the acquisition, interpretation, and translation of brain signals into commands that can control computers, robotic systems, prosthetic limbs, and other assistive technologies. BCIs have demonstrated considerable potential in medical applications, particularly for individuals experiencing paralysis, spinal cord injuries, neurological disorders, and communication disabilities. However, alongside their medical and technological benefits, BCIs introduce complex ethical, legal, philosophical, and social challenges that require careful examination.

Neuroethics has emerged as an interdisciplinary field concerned with the ethical implications of neuroscience research and its applications. It examines questions related to personal identity, mental privacy, cognitive freedom, informed consent, responsibility, and the appropriate boundaries of technological intervention in human brain functions. Unlike conventional digital technologies, BCIs interact directly with neural processes that are closely associated with thoughts, emotions, intentions, memories, and decision-making. Consequently, the collection and processing of neural information raise concerns that extend beyond traditional data protection and cybersecurity. The possibility of accessing sensitive brain-related information creates new questions regarding who owns neural data, who has the authority to interpret it, and how individuals can maintain control over their own cognitive experiences.

PROPOSED MODELS AND METHODOLOGIES

The proposed models and methodologies for the study "Neuroethics in the Age of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Agency, Cognitive Liberty, and Legal Frameworks" are designed to examine the ethical, technological, philosophical, and legal challenges associated with the development and application of Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs). The research adopts an interdisciplinary approach integrating neuroscience, artificial intelligence, information technology, bioethics, human rights, and legal studies. The primary objective is to develop a comprehensive framework that protects individual autonomy, cognitive liberty, mental privacy, and psychological integrity while supporting responsible neurotechnological innovation.

1. Integrated Neuroethical Governance Model

The Integrated Neuroethical Governance Model provides a comprehensive structure for evaluating the ethical implications of BCI technologies. It combines technological accountability, ethical principles, individual rights, and regulatory supervision.

The model incorporates the following dimensions:

- Autonomy and Human Agency: Ensuring that individuals retain control over decisions and actions influenced by BCI technologies.
- Mental Privacy: Protecting neural information from unauthorized collection, processing, storage, and disclosure.
- Informed Consent: Establishing transparent consent procedures before collecting or interpreting neural signals.
- Psychological Integrity: Preventing unauthorized neurological manipulation or interventions that may affect personal identity.
- Accountability: Defining the responsibilities of manufacturers, researchers, healthcare providers, and technology operators.

This model establishes ethical requirements throughout the lifecycle of BCI development, from research and clinical testing to commercial deployment.

2. Cognitive Liberty Protection Model

The Cognitive Liberty Protection Model focuses on preserving an individual's freedom to control their thoughts, mental processes, and neurological information. It recognizes that neural information requires stronger protection than ordinary personal data because it may reveal sensitive cognitive and behavioural characteristics.

The proposed model includes:

1. Protection against unauthorized neural monitoring.
2. Individual control over the collection and sharing of neural information.
3. Restrictions on involuntary brain stimulation and neurological manipulation.
4. Protection against discriminatory use of neural data.
5. The right to withdraw consent from non-essential BCI applications.

The model also proposes mechanisms for ensuring that individuals can understand how their neural information is collected, interpreted, and utilized.

3. Human Agency and Autonomy Assessment Model

This model evaluates how BCI technologies influence individual decision-making, voluntary actions, and personal responsibility. It examines the relationship between human intentions, neural signals, algorithmic interpretation, and technological responses.

The proposed assessment framework considers:

- Decision-making independence: Whether individuals retain meaningful control over decisions.
- Algorithmic influence: Whether automated systems modify or influence user intentions.
- Action attribution: Whether actions can be clearly attributed to the individual or the technological system.
- User control: Whether users can interrupt, modify, or deactivate BCI operations.
- Psychological continuity: Whether long-term BCI use affects an individual's perceived identity and mental autonomy.

The model can be applied to both assistive and advanced neurostimulation systems to identify potential threats to human agency.

4. Neural Data Privacy and Cybersecurity Model

The Neural Data Privacy and Cybersecurity Model addresses the risks associated with collecting, transmitting, processing, and storing neural information. Since BCI systems frequently depend on interconnected hardware, software, cloud platforms, and AI-based analytical tools, they may be exposed to unauthorized access and cybersecurity attacks.

The proposed model incorporates:

- End-to-end encryption of neural data.
- Secure authentication and authorization mechanisms.
- Data minimization and purpose limitation.
- Privacy-preserving machine-learning techniques.
- Secure neural signal transmission.
- Continuous vulnerability assessment and security monitoring.
- Controlled data retention and deletion policies.

The model aims to establish a secure technological environment in which neural information remains protected throughout its processing lifecycle.

5. Neurotechnology Legal and Regulatory Framework Model
The proposed legal framework seeks to identify gaps in existing regulatory systems and establish appropriate legal protections for BCI users. It integrates established human rights principles, medical ethics, data protection requirements, and emerging neurorights approaches.

The framework focuses on five major legal dimensions:

Legal Dimension	Proposed Protection	Regulatory Objective
Mental Privacy	Protection of neural information	Prevent unauthorized access and disclosure
Cognitive Liberty	Freedom from involuntary cognitive intervention	Preserve individual mental autonomy
Mental Integrity	Protection against unauthorized neurological manipulation	Safeguard psychological well-being
Informed Consent	Transparent and voluntary authorization	Strengthen individual decision-making
Accountability	Defined legal responsibilities	Establish liability for technological misuse

The framework also considers the relevance of international human rights standards and national data protection legislation in regulating neurotechnological applications.

RESULTS & ANALYSIS

The results and analysis of the study "Neuroethics in the Age of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Agency, Cognitive Liberty, and Legal Frameworks" focus on evaluating the ethical, technological, philosophical, and legal implications of Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs). The analysis examines how emerging neurotechnologies influence human agency, cognitive liberty, mental privacy, psychological integrity, and individual autonomy. It also investigates the effectiveness of existing regulatory approaches and identifies the need for comprehensive legal and ethical governance. The findings presented in this section are based on conceptual analysis, existing research literature, comparative regulatory assessment, and the proposed integrated neuroethical governance framework. They represent anticipated analytical findings rather than results from a completed empirical experiment.

1. Impact of Brain-Computer Interfaces on Human Agency
The analysis indicates that BCIs can significantly enhance human capabilities by enabling individuals to interact with digital systems through neural signals. Their applications in assistive communication, prosthetic control, and neurological rehabilitation demonstrate substantial benefits for individuals with physical disabilities.

However, increasing automation and AI-assisted neural interpretation may create challenges concerning the distinction between human intentions and machine-generated actions.

The major observations include:
- BCIs can improve independence among individuals with severe motor disabilities.
- Automated neural interpretation may influence how intentions are translated into actions.
- Adaptive BCI systems may create uncertainty regarding individual control and responsibility.
- Continuous human oversight is essential for maintaining meaningful user autonomy.

The findings suggest that BCI systems should provide users with sufficient control over technological operations, including the ability to interrupt, modify, or deactivate system functions.

2. Cognitive Liberty and Mental Privacy

Cognitive liberty emerged as one of the most significant dimensions of contemporary neuroethical governance. Neural signals may contain information associated with cognitive states, intentions, emotional responses, and behavioural patterns. Consequently, unauthorized collection or interpretation of neural information may create unprecedented privacy concerns.

The analysis identifies the following major risks:

1. Unauthorized collection of neural information.
2. Continuous monitoring of neurological activity.
3. Commercial exploitation of brain-related data.
4. Potential manipulation of cognitive processes.
5. Discriminatory use of neural information by institutions or organizations.

The findings emphasize that conventional personal data protection mechanisms may require additional safeguards to address the distinctive sensitivity of neural information.

3. Analysis of Emerging Neurorights

The study examines five important dimensions of neurorights and their relevance to BCI governance.

Neuroright	Identified Challenge	Proposed Protection
Cognitive Liberty	Unauthorized interference with mental processes	Freedom of cognitive decision-making
Mental Privacy	Unauthorized neural data collection	Strict neural data protection
Mental Integrity	Potential neurological manipulation	Protection against harmful intervention
Psychological Continuity	Changes affecting personal identity	Preservation of individual identity
Equitable Access	Unequal availability of BCI technologies	Fair and inclusive access

The analysis demonstrates that neurorights provide a useful conceptual foundation for addressing ethical challenges that may not be adequately covered by traditional human rights approaches. However, their practical implementation requires clearer legal definitions, enforceable obligations, and appropriate institutional mechanisms.

4. Neural Data Privacy and Cybersecurity Analysis

The increasing connectivity of BCI systems creates additional cybersecurity challenges. Neural information may be transmitted between sensors, processing units, cloud infrastructure, and external applications. Each stage introduces potential security vulnerabilities.

The proposed cybersecurity model identifies several critical areas requiring protection.

Security Parameter	Potential Risk	Recommended Mechanism
Neural Data Confidentiality	Unauthorized disclosure	End-to-end encryption
Data Integrity	Modification of neural information	Integrity verification
User Authentication	Unauthorized device access	Multi-factor authentication
Data Storage	Unauthorized data retention	Secure storage and deletion
Network Security	Cyberattacks and interception	Secure communication protocols
AI Processing	Algorithmic manipulation or bias	Auditing and explainability

The analysis indicates that cybersecurity should be treated as a fundamental component of neuroethical responsibility rather than merely a technical requirement.

5. Comparative Analysis of Legal and Regulatory Frameworks

The study evaluates selected international regulatory approaches to determine how effectively existing legal mechanisms address emerging neuroethical challenges.

Jurisdiction	Relevant Legal or Policy Approach	Major Contribution	Identified Gap
European Union	GDPR and EU AI Act	Data protection and AI governance	Limited BCI-specific provisions
United States	HIPAA and FDA regulatory framework	Health information protection and medical device oversight	Fragmented protection outside covered healthcare contexts
Chile	Constitutional and neurorights legislation	Recognition of neurotechnology-related rights	Implementation and enforcement challenges
International Level	UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Neurotechnology (2025)	International ethical guidance	Non-binding implementation

The comparative assessment indicates that existing regulatory frameworks provide important foundations for neurotechnology governance. Nevertheless, differences in legal definitions, enforcement mechanisms, and technological coverage create challenges for comprehensive protection.

In particular, neural information collected through consumer neurodevices may not always receive the same protections as information processed within regulated healthcare environments.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN TABULAR FORM

The comparative analysis of "Neuroethics in the Age of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Agency, Cognitive Liberty, and Legal Frameworks" examines different approaches to the ethical, technological, and legal governance of Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs). It compares conventional neurotechnology practices with emerging human-centered governance approaches, focusing on human agency, cognitive liberty, neural data privacy, cybersecurity, AI accountability, and legal protection.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Neuroethical Approaches

Evaluation Criteria	Traditional Approach	Emerging Neuroethical Approach	Proposed Approach
Human Agency	Limited consideration of user autonomy	Greater focus on individual control	Human-centered decision-making
Cognitive Liberty	General personal freedom protections	Recognition of cognitive freedom	Dedicated cognitive liberty safeguards
Mental Privacy	Conventional data privacy	Neural data-specific protection	Enhanced neural privacy framework
Informed Consent	Initial consent procedures	Continuous consent mechanisms	Dynamic and revocable consent
Psychological Integrity	General medical ethics	Recognition of neurological risks	Protection against unauthorized intervention
AI Accountability	Developer-oriented responsibility	Algorithmic transparency	Independent audits and human oversight
Cybersecurity	Conventional device security	Neurotechnology-specific security	End-to-end neural data protection
Legal Protection	Existing medical and privacy laws	Emerging neurorights frameworks	Integrated legal governance

Table 2. Comparative Analysis of BCI Applications and Ethical Challenges

BCI Application	Major Benefits	Ethical Challenges	Recommended Safeguards
Medical Rehabilitation	Restoration of movement and communication	Patient autonomy and informed consent	Clinical supervision and consent
Assistive Communication	Improved communication for disabled individuals	Accurate interpretation of intentions	User-controlled communication systems
Neurostimulation	Potential treatment of neurological conditions	Unintended neurological changes	Medical monitoring and safety assessment
Consumer Neurotechnology	Personal interaction and cognitive applications	Unauthorized neural data collection	Strong privacy and data protection
Workplace Applications	Potential hands-free interaction	Employee surveillance and coercion	Voluntary participation and restrictions
Military Applications	Potential operational and assistive capabilities	Coercion and cognitive manipulation	Strict ethical and legal oversight
AI-Integrated BCIs	Adaptive and intelligent neural processing	Algorithmic bias and reduced transparency	Explainable AI and human supervision

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of International Legal Frameworks

Country / Organization	Legal or Regulatory Framework	Main Focus	Relevance to Neuroethics
European Union	General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)	Personal data privacy	Protection of sensitive personal information
European Union	EU Artificial Intelligence Act	AI risk management	Accountability and oversight of AI-based BCI applications
United States	Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)	Protected health information	Healthcare-related neural data protection
United States	Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations	Medical device safety	Safety and effectiveness of medical BCI devices
Chile	Constitutional and neuroprotection legislation	Neurotechnology and human rights	Recognition of neurotechnology-related protections
UNESCO	Recommendation on the Ethics of Neurotechnology (2025)	Global ethical governance	International guidance for responsible neurotechnology

Table 4. Comparative Assessment of Neural Data Protection Mechanisms

Protection Mechanism	Conventional Digital Systems	Advanced BCI Systems	Proposed Improvement
Data Encryption	Standard encryption	Protection of highly sensitive neural signals	End-to-end encryption
User Authentication	Passwords and biometrics	Secure access to neural devices	Multi-factor authentication
Data Ownership	Conventional personal data rights	Complex neural data ownership questions	Explicit user control and governance
Consent Management	General consent mechanisms	Consent for neural data and stimulation	Continuous and revocable consent
Data Storage	Centralized or cloud storage	Sensitive neural data repositories	Secure and minimized storage
Cybersecurity Audits	Standard security assessments	Neural device-specific vulnerability testing	Regular independent security audits
Data Sharing	Third-party data-sharing policies	Potential exposure of cognitive information	Strict purpose limitation

Table 5. Comparative Analysis of Proposed Neuroethical Governance Models

Proposed Model	Primary Objective	Major Components	Expected Outcome
Integrated Neuroethical Governance Model	Comprehensive ethical supervision	Ethics, law, technology, accountability	Responsible BCI development
Cognitive Liberty Protection Model	Preserve mental freedom	Consent, autonomy, protection against coercion	Stronger cognitive independence
Human Agency Assessment Model	Maintain individual decision-making control	User control, action attribution, oversight	Preservation of human agency
Neural Data Privacy Model	Protect sensitive neural information	Encryption, access control, data minimization	Improved mental privacy
Legal and Regulatory Framework Model	Strengthen legal protections	Neurorights, liability, compliance	Effective regulatory governance
AI-Assisted Ethical Risk Model	Reduce algorithmic risks	Explainability, fairness, ethical audits	Transparent and accountable AI systems

Overall Comparative Interpretation

The comparative analysis demonstrates that traditional medical ethics, conventional data protection laws, and existing AI governance mechanisms provide an important foundation for regulating Brain-Computer Interfaces. However, these approaches do not always adequately address the distinctive ethical implications of direct interaction with human neural activity.

The emerging neuroethical approach offers a broader perspective by recognizing cognitive liberty, mental privacy, psychological integrity, and human agency as essential areas of protection. The proposed integrated governance model further combines these principles with technological safeguards, legal accountability, informed consent, and independent ethical assessment.

The analysis suggests that future BCI governance should move beyond conventional data protection and medical device regulation toward a comprehensive, rights-based framework. Such an approach can support technological innovation while ensuring that individuals retain meaningful control over their neural information, cognitive processes, and personal decisions.

LIMITATIONS & DRAWBACKS

Despite the significant technological opportunities offered by Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), their development and implementation involve several ethical, legal, technical, and social limitations. The study "Neuroethics in the Age of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Agency, Cognitive Liberty, and Legal Frameworks" identifies important challenges that may affect the effectiveness, reliability, safety, and responsible governance of neurotechnology. These limitations highlight the need for further scientific investigation, regulatory development, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

1. Limitations of Existing Legal Frameworks

One of the major limitations is the absence of comprehensive and universally accepted legal frameworks specifically designed to regulate all BCI applications. Existing data protection, medical ethics, and human rights regulations provide partial protection but may not adequately address the unique characteristics of neural information.

Different countries adopt different regulatory approaches, creating inconsistencies in the protection of cognitive liberty, mental privacy, and psychological integrity. Furthermore, the enforcement of emerging neurorights remains challenging because of differences in national legislation and institutional capabilities.

2. Challenges in Protecting Cognitive Liberty

Cognitive liberty is a relatively emerging concept in neuroethical and legal discussions. Although it emphasizes an individual's freedom to control their own mental processes, its practical and legal interpretation remains under development.

Major limitations include:

- Lack of universally accepted definitions of cognitive liberty.
- Difficulty distinguishing permissible neurological intervention from unauthorized manipulation.
- Challenges in protecting individuals against involuntary neural monitoring.
- Limited legal recognition of cognitive freedom in certain jurisdictions.
- Difficulties in establishing effective remedies for violations.

Consequently, translating cognitive liberty into enforceable legal protections remains a significant challenge.

3. Limitations in Maintaining Human Agency

BCI technologies frequently depend on machine-learning algorithms to interpret neural signals and generate responses. In certain applications, automated processing may influence the relationship between human intention and technological action.

This creates difficulties in determining whether an action originates entirely from an individual or is partially influenced by an algorithmic system. Furthermore, users may experience reduced control when systems operate through adaptive or automated mechanisms.

Maintaining meaningful human oversight and clearly defining responsibility for unintended outcomes remain important research challenges.

4. Neural Data Privacy and Security Risks

Neural information is highly sensitive because it may reveal information associated with cognitive activity, intentions, emotional responses, and neurological conditions. However, complete protection of neural information is difficult to guarantee.

Important limitations include:

1. Vulnerability to unauthorized access and cyberattacks.
2. Potential misuse of neural information by commercial organizations.
3. Insufficient transparency in third-party data processing.
4. Challenges associated with secure cloud-based neural data storage.
5. Difficulty ensuring complete deletion of previously shared information.
6. Risks associated with data breaches and unauthorized neural signal interpretation.

Even advanced encryption and authentication mechanisms cannot eliminate every cybersecurity vulnerability.

5. Technical Limitations of Brain-Computer Interfaces

The technical performance of BCI systems varies depending on device architecture, signal acquisition methods, individual neurological characteristics, and environmental conditions.

Some important technical limitations include:

- Signal variability: Neural signals may differ between individuals and across different operating conditions.
- Signal interference: External noise and physiological changes may affect signal quality.

- Accuracy limitations: Neural signal classification may produce incorrect interpretations.
- Device compatibility: Different BCI systems may lack interoperability.
- Long-term reliability: Continuous device usage may introduce maintenance and performance challenges.
- Invasive procedure risks: Certain implanted BCI systems require surgical procedures and long-term clinical monitoring.

These limitations may affect the reliability and accessibility of BCI technologies.

CONCLUSION

The rapid advancement of Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) represents a significant transformation in neuroscience, artificial intelligence, healthcare, and human–machine interaction. These technologies have created new opportunities for restoring communication, improving neurological rehabilitation, supporting individuals with physical disabilities, and expanding human capabilities. However, their increasing integration into medical, commercial, educational, workplace, and other social environments raises important ethical, legal, philosophical, and technological concerns. The present study, titled "Neuroethics in the Age of Brain-Computer Interfaces: Agency, Cognitive Liberty, and Legal Frameworks," examines these emerging challenges, emphasizing the importance of protecting human agency, cognitive liberty, mental privacy, and psychological integrity.

The study highlights that human agency must remain a fundamental principle in the design and implementation of BCI technologies. Although AI-powered neural systems can interpret brain signals and generate automated responses, technological advancement should not undermine an individual's ability to make independent decisions and maintain control over personal actions. Preserving meaningful human oversight, informed consent, and transparency is therefore essential for ensuring that BCI technologies remain supportive instruments rather than mechanisms of unintended cognitive interference.

Furthermore, cognitive liberty and mental privacy emerge as critical areas requiring stronger ethical and legal recognition. Neural information is particularly sensitive because it may provide insights into an individual's cognitive processes, intentions, emotional responses, and neurological characteristics. Unauthorized collection, interpretation, manipulation, or commercial exploitation of such information could create serious threats to personal freedom and human dignity. Consequently, the development of specialized neural data protection mechanisms, secure information-processing systems, and enforceable consent requirements is increasingly important.

The comparative assessment of international legal and regulatory approaches demonstrates that existing frameworks, including data protection legislation, medical device regulations, AI governance mechanisms, and emerging neurorights initiatives, provide valuable foundations for responsible neurotechnology development. Nevertheless, regulatory fragmentation and the absence of universally accepted BCI-specific protections create challenges for comprehensive governance. Greater international cooperation is necessary to establish consistent standards for neural data privacy, cognitive liberty, psychological integrity, and institutional accountability.

REFERENCES

1. Alpert, S. (2008). Brain-computer interface devices: Risks and Canadian regulations. Accountability in Research, 15(2), 63–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989620701783774
2. Blumenthal-Barby, J., & Ubel, P. (2024). Neurorights in question: Rethinking the concept of mental integrity. Journal of Medical Ethics, 50(10), 670–675. https://doi.org/10.1136/jme-2023-109683
3. Burwell, S., Sample, M., & Racine, E. (2017). Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: A scoping review. BMC Medical Ethics, 18, Article 60. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-017-0220-y
4. Clausen, J. (2008). Moving minds: Ethical aspects of neural motor prostheses. Biotechnology Journal, 3(12), 1493–1501. https://doi.org/10.1002/biot.200800244
5. Clausen, J. (2011). Conceptual and ethical issues with brain-hardware interfaces. Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 24(6), 495–501. https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0b013e32834bb8ca
6. Council of Europe. (1997). Convention for the protection of human rights and dignity of the human being with regard to the application of biology and medicine: Convention on human rights and biomedicine. https://www.coe.int/en/web/bioethics/oviedo-convention
7. Demetriades, A. K., Demetriades, C. K., Watts, C., & Ashkan, K. (2010). Brain-machine interface: The challenge of neuroethics. The Surgeon, 8(5), 267–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surge.2010.05.006
8. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation). Official Journal of the European Union, L 119, 1–88. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj

9. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj
10. Haselager, P., Vlek, R., Hill, J., & Nijboer, F. (2009). A note on ethical aspects of BCI. Neural Networks, 22(9), 1352–1357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2009.06.046
11. Ienca, M. (2021). On neurorights. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 15, Article 701258. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.701258
12. Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. Life Sciences, Society and Policy, 13, Article 5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40504-017-0050-1
13. Kellmeyer, P. (2021). Big brain data: On the responsible use of brain data from clinical and consumer-directed neurotechnological devices. Neuroethics, 14, 83–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-018-9371-x
14. Lavazza, A. (2018). Freedom of thought and mental integrity: The moral requirements for any neural prosthesis. Frontiers in Neuroscience, 12, Article 82. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2018.00082
15. Lebedev, M. A., & Nicolelis, M. A. L. (2006). Brain-machine interfaces: Past, present and future. Trends in Neurosciences, 29(9), 536–546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2006.07.004
16. Ligthart, S., Ienca, M., Meynen, G., Molnar-Gabor, F., Andorno, R., Bublitz, C., Catley, P., Claydon, L., Douglas, T., Farahany, N., Fins, J. J., Goering, S., Haselager, P., Jotterand, F., Lavazza, A., McCay, A., Wajnerman Paz, A., Rainey, S., Ryberg, J., ... Kellmeyer, P. (2023). Minding rights: Mapping ethical and legal foundations of "neurorights." Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 32(4), 461–481.
17. Mak, J. N., & Wolpaw, J. R. (2009). Clinical applications of brain-computer interfaces: Current state and future prospects. IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering, 2, 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1109/RBME.2009.2035356
18. Nijboer, F., Clausen, J., Allison, B. Z., & Haselager, P. (2013). The Asilomar survey: Stakeholders' opinions on ethical issues related to brain-computer interfacing. Neuroethics, 6, 541–578. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12152-011-9132-6
19. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). Recommendation of the Council on responsible innovation in neurotechnology (OECD/LEGAL/0457). https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0457
20. Shih, J. J., Krusienski, D. J., & Wolpaw, J. R. (2012). Brain-computer interfaces in medicine. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 87(3), 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2011.12.008