# Brain-Computer Interfaces at the Crossroads: Navigating Ethical Issues in Clinical Application

Chongjing Wang

{chongjing.25@intl.zju.edu.cn}

ZJU-UoE Institute, Zhejiang University, Haining, 314400,China

**Abstract**: Recently, brain–computer interfaces (BCIs) have developed rapidly. They are increasingly used to treat patients with severe neurological disorders. This paper analysed the ethical issues raised during the real-world applications of BCIs, including mental privacy, user autonomy, safety, responsibility, and social justice. BCIs raise unique ethical risks because they directly interact with the cognition and intention process of neurons. These issues put BCIs into the limelight. However, the analysis has shown that the risks do not outweigh the medical value of BCIs when ethical frameworks, appropriate procedures, and strict regulations are applied. The paper emphasized that the benefits of BCIs are irreplaceable for targeted patients. This study also indicates that the ethical issues should guide, rather than prevent, the further development and real-world applications of brain–computer interfaces.

**Keywords**:Biomedical Science; Neuroscience; Brain-computer Interfaces; Ethical Issues

## 1 Introduction

Brain–computer interfaces (BCIs) work by recording and decoding neural activity. It allows communication between the human brain and external devices through this process. Currently, the practical use of BCIs has been accelerated by the progress in neuroscience and biomedical engineering. They have been increasingly applied to patients with neurological disorders, which enables them to communicate and move.

However, the practical use of BCIs has raised some significant ethical concerns. The BCIs are directly linked to neural processes associated with cognition and intention. So, they have risks unlike those of traditional medical devices. Recent studies have shown its ethical challenges related to neural data security, informed consent, and unequal access to emerging neurotechnology [1]. It's also shown that current ethical and legal frameworks are not fully prepared for the clinical and commercial applications of BCIs, especially for the responsibility, governance, and social fairness beyond therapeutic contexts [2]. Previously, there have been concerns about possible effects on personal autonomy and social justice when BCIs are employed beyond strictly therapeutic purposes [3]. Although BCIs raise serious ethical concerns, these risks do not outweigh their medical value when appropriate regulation and ethical frameworks are used.

ICIAAI 2026, May 22-24, Singapore, Singapore

DOI 10.4108/eai.22-5-2026.2365108

By analyzing current applications and ethical concerns, this essay argues that although BCIs show serious ethical risks, these risks do not outweigh their medical value when appropriate ethical frameworks and regulations are demonstrated. The paper is structured as follows: first, introduce how BCIs work and their main clinical applications; then, analyze major ethical concerns in real-world use; finally, discuss why ethical risks should guide, rather than prevent, the responsible development of BCIs.

## 2 BCIs and Their Applications

### 2.1 BCIs' Working Mechanisms

Brain–computer interfaces (BCIs) work by translating brain activity into commands for external devices. First, neural signals are recorded in the brain, commonly using electroencephalography (EEG) or implanted electrodes [4]. These signals are then amplified and filtered to remove noise. Then signal processing and machine-learning algorithms are used to extract meaningful patterns associated with the intention of the user [5]. The decoded signals are transformed into demands that manage other systems like a cursor, robotic limb, or communication device. This process enables users to interact with the environment without muscle movement, creating a direct link between brain activity and action.

### 2.2 Real-world Applications of BCIs

BCIs have been developed in laboratory studies and are now used in medical practice. They are used in neural treatment and motor control to help stroke or paralysis patients regain movement through robotic prostheses or exoskeletons [6]. The language decoding BCIs show great potential to translate neural signals into context that can restore communication capabilities among individuals with neural disease [7]. The EEG-based BCIs support real-time cognitive monitoring and adaptive neurofeedback for diagnosis. All these applications demonstrate how BCIs can be used to link the neural activities with external action. However, while these applications demonstrate the significant medical value of BCIs, they also raise important ethical concerns, which will be discussed in the next part.

## 3 The Ethical Issues in the Real-world Use of BCIs

### 3.1 Mental Privacy and Neural Data

One major ethical issue of brain–computer interfaces is mental privacy. BCIs can capture and interpret neural signals that can expose the thoughts, intentions, or even emotional condition of users. Compared to other personal data, neural data is highly associated with the mental life of individuals. Recent research suggests that the practical use of BCIs may lead to "mind reading," which seriously threatens psychological privacy [8]. A simple EEG signal may have a lot of information about the users' identities and experiences [9]. Due to ethical sensitivity, this makes mental privacy one of the most significant issues in the medical use of BCIs. Therefore, compared to the conventional biomedical data, stricter regulations should be applied to protect the neural data.

### 3.2 Autonomy and User Agency

BCIs also raise concerns about the users' autonomy and agency. These systems convert the brain activity into external actions. So, whether the users have 100% control over those actions draws great attention. Some ethical analyses identify the challenges about responsibility and agency, especially when the device's behavior may not fully reflect the user's intention [10]. This uncertainty about agency suggests the need for ethical evaluation and appropriate procedure for complex interaction between users' intentions and BCIs' action.

### 3.3 Safety, Responsibility, and Consent

For invasive BCIs that require surgery or long-term implantation, the safety is another major ethical issue. Existing ethical regulations cannot fully supervise the use of BCIs, especially in terms of consent and effects on users' health in the long term [11]. Some scholars argue that the responsibility should be shared by the developers, clinicians, and users, and clearer ethical and regulatory standards are required [2]. Without clear standards, the protection for patients will be insufficient when BCIs are increasingly used.

### 3.4 Social Justice and Governance

At the social level, BCIs raise ethical issues of justice and access. High costs and technical requirements may limit its access to people, which will increase the inequality in healthcare. Ethical discussions emphasize that unequal access may put vulnerable groups into worse situations [12]. Also, the regulations of different countries may vary the standards of ethics. Recent political analysis has shown the significance of governance systems that deal with the fairness, risk management, and public trust in neurotechnology's development [13]. To fully address this issue, ethical governance should ensure the distribution of BCIs is relatively fair.

## 4 Ethical Risks Do Not Outweigh the Medical Value of BCIs

Though the ethical issues of BCIs require people's attention, they should not be regarded as reasons to reject their benefits. Brain–computer interfaces (BCIs)'s benefits in medical practice are remarkable. They allow communication and interaction with individuals who have serious motor impairments or neurological disorders. For example, people who cannot move or speak can control external devices through BCIs to communicate, which can significantly improve their quality of life. By restoring motor function through adaptive therapy, BCIs also hold promise for the treatment of stroke or spinal cord injury. Their therapeutic value is universally acknowledged across clinical research and ethical reviews [14].

However, this doesn't mean the ethical issues of BCIs can be ignored. The issue of mental privacy, autonomy, long-term safety, and responsibility will be raised when the technology directly connects to neural activity [15]. Ethical governance should always prioritize users' safety and privacy. Strict regulations are needed to manage risk-benefit trade-offs in clinical studies and treatment [15]. Strict ethical evaluation should always be done before the use of BCIs.

BCIs provide irreplaceable benefits for patients with serious neural diseases. The ethical issues should be regarded as reference and guidance to boost the development and application of BCIs.

With clear regulation, informed approval and data protection, the risks can be managed well. The therapeutic value of the technology should be acknowledged and preserved.

## 5 Conclusion

Brain–computer interfaces are moving from experimental settings to real-world use. As the essay has shown, BCIs offer significant medical benefits for patients with severe neurological disorders. It can help patients restore communication abilities and motor functions.

Different from traditional medical devices, they are invasive technologies related to cognition and intention. So, they have more significant ethical issues compared to the traditional ones. This essay has shown that BCIs can raise serious concerns for mental privacy, autonomy, safety, and social justice. These issues cannot be ignored as BCIs become more widely applied.

Despite these ethical challenges, this essay argues that the risks of BCIs do not outweigh their medical value. When supported by strict ethical evaluation and regulation, the potential risks of BCIs can be reduced or avoided. Instead of rejecting BCIs for the ethical concerns, these challenges should guide their future development and use. For patients with severe neurological impairments, BCIs offer benefits that cannot be replaced by existing technologies. BCIs should be used in ways that prioritize patient safety and privacy. In conclusion, brain–computer interfaces represent an important medical advancement whose benefits should be well preserved, and their ethical issues must be supervised and solved.

## Reference


[1] Sun, X. & Ye, B.: The functional differentiation of brain–computer interfaces and its ethical implications. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 10, p. 878 (2023)

[2] Wexler, A. & Feinsinger, A.: Ethical challenges in translating brain–computer interfaces. Nature Human Behaviour. 8, pp. 1831–1833 (2024)

[3] Ienca, M. & Andorno, R.: Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. Life Sciences, Society and Policy. 13(1), p. 5 (2017)

[4] Wang, Y., Jiang, C. & Li, C.: A review of brain-computer interface technologies: signal acquisition methods and interaction paradigms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16471 (2025)

[5] Oliveira, I., Russo, M., Almeida, A.I., Vourvopoulos, A. & Mendes Pereira, C.: Recommendations for combining brain-computer interface, motor imagery, and virtual reality in upper limb stroke rehabilitation: qualitative participatory design study. JMIR Rehabilitation and Assistive Technologies. 12, p. e71789 (2025)

[6] Chen, S., Chen, M., Wang, X., Liu, X., Liu, B. & Ming, D.: Brain-computer interfaces in 2023–2024. BRAIN-X. 3(1), p. brx2.70024 (2025)

[7] Qiu, Y., Liu, H. & Zhao, M.: A review of brain-computer interface-based language decoding: from signal interpretation to intelligent communication. Applied Sciences. 15(1), p. 392 (2025)

[8] Han, F. & Chen, H.: Does brain-computer interface-based mind reading threaten mental privacy? Ethical reflections from interviews with Chinese experts. BMC Medical Ethics. 26, p. 134 (2025)

[9] Meng, L., Jiang, X., Jia, T. & Wu, D.: Protecting multiple types of privacy simultaneously in EEG-based brain-computer interfaces. arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.19498 (2024)

[10] Davidoff, E.J.: Agency and accountability: ethical considerations for brain‐computer interfaces. Rutgers Journal of Bioethics. 11(1), pp. 9‐20 (2020)
[11] Burwell, S., Sample, M. & Racine, E.: Ethical aspects of brain computer interfaces: a scoping review. BMC Medical Ethics. 18, p. 60 (2017)
[12] Gordon, E.C. & Seth, A.K.: Ethical considerations for the use of brain‐computer interfaces for cognitive enhancement. PLOS Biology. 22(2), p. e3002899 (2024)
[13] Poo, M.-m.: China’s new ethical guidelines for the use of brain‐computer interfaces. National Science Review. 11(4), p. nwae154 (2024)
[14] Sirbu, R., Morley, J., Schroder, T., Taddeo, M., Pothukuchi, R.P., Ugur, M., Bhattacharjee, A. & Floridi, L.: Regulating next-generation implantable brain-computer interfaces: recommendations for ethical development and implementation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.12540 (2025)
[15] Zhang, Q., Zhang, C., Ji, H., Chen, J., Wang, X., Zhang, T. et al.: Ethical governance of clinical research on the brain‐computer interface for mental disorders: a modified Delphi study. General Psychiatry. 38, p. e101755 (2025)