Viewpoint on Invasive Brain-Computer Interfaces: A Critical Assessment of Current Developments and Future Prospects

Pieter Kubben

Submitted to: JMIR Neurotechnology
on: May 03, 2024

Table of Contents

Viewpoint on Invasive Brain-Computer Interfaces: A Critical Assessment of Current Developments and Future Prospects

Pieter Kubben[1]

[1]Maastricht University Medical Center Dept of Neurosurgery Maastricht NL

Corresponding Author:
Pieter Kubben
Maastricht University Medical Center
Dept of Neurosurgery
PO Box 5800
Maastricht
NL

Abstract

none

(JMIR Preprints 03/05/2024:60151)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.60151

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?
✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**
Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.
Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.
No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.
2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?
✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**
Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain v
Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in <a href="http

Original Manuscript

Viewpoint on Invasive Brain-Computer Interfaces: A Critical Assessment of Current Developments and Future Prospects

Invasive brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) have recently attracted significant attention due to their potential to revolutionize the interaction between humans and machines. By directly interfacing with the brain, these devices offer profound implications for medical therapies and augmentative technologies. This viewpoint discusses the latest advancements, evaluates the benefits against the potential risks, and considers the ethical and regulatory landscapes shaping the future of invasive BCIs.

Brain-computer interfaces that involve invasive techniques, such as surgically implanted electrodes, are not new concepts but have seen rapid development in recent years. These devices provide a direct pathway for decoding and modulating neural activity, thereby offering unprecedented opportunities for patients with severe neurological deficits to interact with their environments in ways previously deemed unfeasible.

The progress in microfabrication technology, neural decoding algorithms, and materials science has substantially increased the capabilities of invasive BCIs. Modern electrodes can now be manufactured at scales small enough to minimize damage while maintaining high fidelity in signal recording. Techniques like endovascular BCI approaches propose minimally invasive methods to place electrodes closer to relevant neural tissues without traditional open-brain surgery (1). Their clinical potential still has to be demonstrated.

Invasive BCIs are primarily aimed at restoring lost functions such as mobility, speech, and even cognitive faculties in patients with disabilities resulting from conditions like stroke, spinal cord injuries, and neurodegenerative diseases. For example, devices have been developed to enable individuals with paralysis to control robotic limbs or computer cursors with their thoughts alone (2)(3). Beyond therapeutic applications, there is also exploratory research into the use of BCIs for enhancing human memory and cognitive speed, suggesting a potential expansion into augmentation uses in the future (4).

The capability of BCIs to read and potentially write to the human brain raises significant ethical questions. Issues such as consent, autonomy, and the potential for influencing voluntary choices or privacy violations are of paramount concern. The privacy of neural data, akin to digital and genetic information, requires stringent safeguards to prevent unauthorized access and misuse (4)(5). To some extent such concerns are already applicable with e.g. Deep Brain Stimulation devices but BCIs will take them to the next level.

The implantation of BCI devices involves invasive procedures that carry inherent risks such as infection, inflammation, and the potential for long-term immune responses. Moreover, the permanency of these implants poses challenges in device maintenance and updates, complicating their management over a patient's lifetime (5)(6). Regulatory bodies are currently grappling with these issues, striving to develop guidelines that ensure patient safety without stifling innovation. Another area of concern is post-explantation care, in particular in research settings, when ending study participation which has resulted in improved functioning in patients during trial time.

As BCIs advance, they could significantly alter many aspects of society, from healthcare to employment, potentially leading to new forms of inequality. Access to and control of such powerful technologies could exacerbate social divides if not carefully managed. Public discussion and policy development must therefore keep pace with technological advancements to address these societal impacts comprehensively.

Conclusion

Invasive BCIs hold tremendous promise for transforming lives, particularly for those with severe disabilities. However, the rapid pace of development in this field necessitates careful consideration of the ethical, safety, and societal issues that accompany such transformative technologies. Balancing innovation with responsible development will be key to realizing the full potential of BCIs while minimizing potential harms.

References

1. Oxley TJ, Opie NL, John SE, et al. Minimally invasive endovascular stent-electrode array for high-fidelity, chronic recordings of cortical neural activity. Nat Biotechnol. 2016;34(3):320-327. doi:10.1038/nbt.3428
2. Collinger JL, Wodlinger B, Downey JE, et al. High-performance neuroprosthetic control by an individual with tetraplegia. Lancet. 2013;381(9866):557-564. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61816-9.
3. Hochberg LR, Bacher D, Jarosiewicz B, et al. Reach and grasp by people with tetraplegia using a neurally controlled robotic arm. Nature. 2012;485(7398):372-375. doi:10.1038/nature11076.
4. Lebedev MA, Nicolelis MAL. Brain-machine interfaces: past, present and future. Trends Neurosci. 2006;29(9):536-546. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2006.07.004.
5. Haselager P, Vlek R, Hill J, Nijboer F. A note on ethical aspects of BCI. Neural Netw. 2009;22(9):1352-1357. doi:10.1016/j.neunet.2009.06.046.
6. Clausen J. Man, machine and in between. Nature. 2009;457(7233):1080-1.