Collegiate Research Journals

OPEN ACCESS

Archives of Modern Natural Sciences
Vol 6(10) pp. 008-014 October, 2026.
https://collegiatejournals.us/amns
Copyright © 2026 Collegiate Research Journals

Full Length Manuscript

Neural Interfaces, Brain–Computer Interfaces, Neuroprosthetics, Neuromodulation and the Future of Brain–Machine Communication

Emeka Nzeogwu

Accepted 18th August 2026

Abstract

Neural implants are transforming neuroscience by creating direct interfaces between neural tissue and electronic systems. These devices can record electrical activity, deliver stimulation, or combine both functions to restore or modulate neurological function. This narrative review examines neural implants from a neuroscience perspective, with emphasis on implant architecture, neural signal acquisition, brain–computer interfaces (BCIs), neuroprosthetics, neuromodulation, neuroplasticity, biocompatibility, clinical translation and emerging closed-loop systems. Intracortical implants can provide high-spatial-resolution recordings and have enabled experimental restoration of movement and communication in people with severe paralysis. Recent speech neuroprosthesis studies have demonstrated increasingly rapid decoding of attempted speech, while other implantable systems have enabled control of robotic devices and digital interfaces. However, long-term performance remains constrained by tissue responses, electrode degradation, signal instability, surgical risk, power and telemetry requirements, and variability in neural representations. The review further considers ethical and regulatory issues, including safety, privacy, autonomy, cybersecurity and informed consent. Overall, neural implants represent both experimental tools for investigating human brain function and emerging therapeutic technologies. Progress toward clinically sustainable systems will depend on improved materials, stable interfaces, adaptive decoding, closed-loop stimulation, rigorous clinical trials and multidisciplinary collaboration among neuroscientists, engineers, clinicians and ethicists.

Keywords: neural implants; neuroscience; brain–computer interface; neuroprosthetics; intracortical recording; neuromodulation

1. Introduction

Neural implants are medical or experimental devices designed to establish an electrical, chemical or optical interface with the nervous system. Depending on their purpose, implants may record neural activity, stimulate neural circuits, or perform both functions. Examples include deep brain stimulation systems, cochlear implants, retinal prostheses, spinal and peripheral nerve interfaces, and experimental intracortical BCIs [5,9]. Modern neural-interface research increasingly seeks not merely to replace lost function but to establish bidirectional communication between nervous tissue and external machines.

Implantable BCIs are particularly important in contemporary neuroscience because they provide a direct pathway from neural activity to computers, robotic limbs, communication systems or other assistive devices. Reviews of clinical trials indicate that implanted BCIs have been investigated for motor control, communication and sensory restoration for more than two decades, although they remain primarily investigational rather than routine medical products [1,8]. The field therefore sits at the intersection of basic neuroscience, neuroengineering, clinical neurology, rehabilitation and medical-device science.

2. Objectives

- To explain the neuroscience principles underlying neural implants.
- To review major categories of implantable neural interfaces and their mechanisms.
- To examine neural recording, stimulation and decoding technologies.
- To summarize evidence for motor, sensory and communication neuroprostheses.
- To analyze biocompatibility, neural plasticity, safety and long-term stability.
- To identify research priorities for translation of neural implants into durable clinical systems.

3. Method

This manuscript was prepared as a narrative review of contemporary neuroscience and neural-engineering literature. Targeted searches were conducted across PubMed/PMC-indexed literature and authoritative regulatory/scientific sources, emphasizing implanted BCIs, intracortical neural interfaces, neuroprostheses, speech decoding, motor restoration, neuromodulation, biocompatibility and clinical translation. Priority was given to peer-reviewed primary research, systematic reviews, major neuroscience reviews and regulatory guidance [1–12]. The evidence was synthesized thematically around neural recording, stimulation, signal decoding, clinical applications, biological responses and translational challenges. This is not a systematic review or meta-analysis; consequently, no pooled effect sizes are reported.

4. Results

4.1 Major Classes of Neural Implants

Neural implants can be broadly classified by anatomical target and primary function. Intracortical implants place electrodes within cortical tissue and can record action potentials or local field potentials with high spatial and temporal resolution. Surface cortical interfaces, including electrocorticography, place electrodes on or near the cortical surface and can provide broader spatial coverage with different signal characteristics [1,10]. Deep brain stimulation systems deliver electrical stimulation to subcortical structures and are established treatments for selected neurological disorders, particularly movement disorders. Peripheral nerve interfaces target nerves

outside the brain and spinal cord, while sensory prostheses such as cochlear implants translate environmental information into neural stimulation.

Table 1. Major categories of neural implants

Category	Typical target	Primary function	Neuroscience relevance
Intracortical electrode arrays	Motor/speech cortex	Record and/or stimulate neurons	High-resolution neural coding and BCI
ECoG/subdural interfaces	Cortical surface	Record cortical population activity	Motor and speech decoding
Deep brain stimulation	Basal ganglia and other nuclei	Electrical stimulation	Circuit modulation and symptom control
Peripheral nerve interfaces	Peripheral nerves	Record/stimulate nerve activity	Sensory and motor restoration
Cochlear implant	Auditory pathway	Electrical sensory stimulation	Auditory neuroprosthesis
Retinal/visual prosthesis	Retina/visual pathways	Electrical stimulation	Experimental/clinical visual restoration
Spinal interfaces	Spinal cord	Record/stimulate spinal circuits	Motor and sensory restoration

4.2 Neural Recording

Neural recording seeks to capture electrical signatures generated by populations of neurons. Intracortical microelectrodes can record action-potential activity from individual or small groups of neurons, while local field potentials reflect summed synaptic and network activity. The principal advantage of intracortical recording is high spatial and temporal resolution, allowing experimental systems to relate neural activity to movement intention, speech planning or other behavior [1,2]. However, the recorded signal depends on electrode geometry, distance from neurons, tissue impedance, noise, movement artifacts and the biological response to implantation.

4.3 Neural Stimulation

Neural stimulation uses electrical or other physical energy to modify neural activity. Deep brain stimulation is the most established implantable neuromodulation approach in routine clinical neuroscience, whereas cortical and peripheral stimulation are being investigated for restoration of movement and sensation [9,11]. Stimulation parameters—including amplitude, pulse width, frequency, electrode configuration and timing—determine the neural response. Closed-loop systems seek to adjust stimulation according to measured neural or physiological signals rather than applying a fixed stimulation pattern.

4.4 Brain–Computer Interfaces and Motor Restoration

Implanted BCIs can translate neural activity associated with intended movement into commands for robotic limbs, computer cursors or other assistive devices. Clinical research has demonstrated control of robotic arms and digital interfaces by people with severe paralysis [1,12]. These experiments provide evidence that motor-related cortical activity can remain informative despite long periods of paralysis and that machine-learning decoders can transform this activity into useful control signals.

From a neuroscience perspective, these systems also provide experimental access to the organization of motor representations. Changes in decoder performance over time may reflect both algorithmic adaptation and biological plasticity. Therefore, BCI performance should not be interpreted solely as an engineering outcome; it can also reveal how neural populations adapt when their natural motor pathways are interrupted.

4.5 Speech Neuroprostheses

Speech neuroprostheses have become a major area of neural-implant research. Intracortical recordings from speech-related cortical regions have been used to decode attempted speech into text. Willett and colleagues demonstrated a high-performance speech-to-text BCI using intracortical microelectrode arrays, while related work using high-density cortical surface recordings achieved rapid text decoding and speech/avatar outputs [2,3]. These results demonstrate that neural representations of intended speech contain sufficient information for machine learning systems to generate meaningful communication even when the peripheral speech pathway is severely impaired.

4.6 Neuroplasticity and Adaptation

Neural implants operate within a nervous system that is continuously adapting. Training, feedback and repeated use can change both neural representations and behavioral strategies. BCI research therefore involves a reciprocal adaptation: the decoder learns from neural signals while the user learns to generate activity that produces useful device outputs [1,4]. Understanding this plasticity is important for developing systems that remain effective over long periods rather than relying on static mappings between neurons and device commands.

4.7 Biocompatibility and the Brain–Electrode Interface

Long-term implantation produces a biological response at the electrode–tissue interface. Inflammation, microglial activation, astrocytic responses, tissue remodeling and glial scar formation can alter electrode impedance and reduce signal quality [6,7]. Mechanical mismatch between rigid electrodes and soft brain tissue can also contribute to chronic tissue responses. Recent biomaterials research therefore emphasizes flexible or mechanically compliant interfaces, improved electrode coatings and materials designed to reduce inflammatory responses [7].

Table 2. Major biological and engineering determinants of implant performance

Factor	Mechanism	Potential consequence	Research direction
Tissue inflammation	Immune/glial response	Signal degradation	Biocompatible materials
Glial encapsulation	Increased electrode-tissue distance	Lower signal amplitude	Surface engineering
Mechanical mismatch	Micromotion and tissue stress	Chronic instability	Flexible interfaces
Electrode corrosion	Material degradation	Impedance/noise changes	Stable conductive materials
Signal drift	Changing neural/environmental conditions	Decoder performance loss	Adaptive decoders
Power/telemetry	Energy and data constraints	Limited device autonomy	Wireless/low-power systems
Surgical risk	Implantation-related complications	Clinical risk	Less invasive approaches

4.8 Closed-Loop Neural Interfaces

Closed-loop systems combine recording and stimulation so that neural activity or physiological state can influence subsequent stimulation. This approach is particularly relevant to neuromodulation, where fixed stimulation may not account for changes in symptoms or network state. The convergence of BCIs and

neuromodulation is creating systems capable of sensing neural activity, estimating a physiological state and adapting stimulation in response [11].

Table 3. Applications of neural implants in neuroscience

Application	Target	Potential benefit	Current status
Motor neuroprosthesis	Motor cortex / peripheral pathways	Control robotic or digital devices	Clinical research
Speech neuroprosthesis	Speech-related cortex	Communication after paralysis	Clinical research
Deep brain stimulation	Deep nuclei	Circuit modulation and symptom reduction	Established clinical therapy for selected disorders
Sensory feedback	Peripheral/cortical pathways	Artificial tactile or sensory information	Experimental/early clinical research
Closed-loop neuromodulation	Disease-related circuits	Adaptive stimulation	Emerging clinical/research field
Neuroscience research	Multiple regions	Study neural coding and plasticity	Experimental

5. Discussion

The evidence reviewed indicates that neural implants have moved from proof-of-concept demonstrations toward increasingly capable experimental neuroprostheses. Intracortical systems can extract information from cortical activity at high resolution, while advances in machine learning have improved the decoding of movement and speech [1–4]. At the same time, clinical translation remains constrained by the biological interface and by the practical requirements of long-term implantation.

A major neuroscience question is how stable neural representations are over time. If the relationship between neural activity and intended behavior changes, decoders may require recalibration. This can reflect biological plasticity, electrode movement, tissue responses or changes in behavioral strategy. Adaptive algorithms may compensate for some forms of drift, but reliable long-term systems will probably require simultaneous progress in device materials, surgical methods and computational neuroscience.

Another important issue is bidirectionality. Recording-only systems translate neural activity into commands, whereas bidirectional systems also provide stimulation. Sensory feedback could make motor prostheses more natural and may improve control by restoring part of the sensorimotor loop. The convergence of neuromodulation and BCI technology therefore represents a major direction for future neuroscience [11].

6. Safety, Ethics and Regulation

Implantable neural devices require careful evaluation because implantation introduces surgical and biological risks. Regulatory guidance for implanted BCIs emphasizes nonclinical testing, clinical study design and assessment of device safety and performance [8]. Important ethical questions include informed consent, long-term device maintenance, ownership and protection of neural data, cybersecurity, autonomy, psychological effects and equitable access. These concerns become particularly important when systems record information from the brain or provide direct stimulation.

Neural data should not automatically be treated as equivalent to ordinary biomedical measurements. Although current BCIs generally decode narrowly defined tasks, future systems may extract increasingly complex information. Governance frameworks should therefore develop alongside technical capabilities rather than after widespread deployment.

Table 4. Key research challenges and proposed priorities

Challenge	Scientific question	Potential strategy	Desired outcome
Long-term stability	Why do signals drift?	Flexible electrodes + adaptive decoding	Durable performance
Biocompatibility	How can inflammation be reduced?	Advanced coatings/materials	Stable neural interface
Decoder robustness	How can systems generalize across days?	Self-calibrating models	Lower user burden
Sensory feedback	How can natural sensation be restored?	Bidirectional stimulation	More functional prostheses
Safety	How can implantation risk be minimized?	Less invasive interfaces	Broader clinical applicability
Ethics/privacy	How should neural data be governed?	Technical and policy safeguards	Trustworthy neurotechnology

7. Limitations

This manuscript is a narrative review and does not constitute a systematic review, meta-analysis, clinical guideline or device-specific regulatory assessment. Neural implant studies are heterogeneous in participant characteristics, anatomical targets, electrode technologies, outcome measures and follow-up duration. Many high-profile demonstrations involve small numbers of participants, which limits generalization. The distinction between experimental feasibility and established clinical effectiveness should therefore be maintained when interpreting the literature.

8. Future Directions

- Development of mechanically compliant, highly biocompatible electrode materials.
- Long-term stable recording and stimulation with lower surgical burden.
- Adaptive and self-calibrating neural decoders capable of handling signal drift.
- Integration of motor decoding with artificial sensory feedback.
- Closed-loop systems that combine neural sensing with targeted neuromodulation.
- More representative multicenter clinical trials with longer follow-up.
- Standardized outcome measures for device performance, safety and quality of life.
- Robust frameworks for neural-data privacy, cybersecurity and informed consent.

9. Conclusion

Neural implants are becoming an important platform for both neuroscience research and neuroprosthetic medicine. Their ability to record and modulate neural activity has generated new insights into brain organization while enabling experimental restoration of movement and communication. The most significant advances have emerged from the integration of high-resolution neural interfaces, machine learning,

neurophysiology and rehabilitation. Nevertheless, durable clinical translation requires solutions to biocompatibility, signal stability, surgical risk, power, data security and ethical governance. Future neural implants are likely to become increasingly bidirectional and adaptive, linking neural recording, stimulation and computational models in closed-loop systems. Progress in this direction will depend on multidisciplinary research that treats the implant not as an isolated device, but as a long-term component of a living neural system.

References

1. Mokienko OA. Brain–computer interfaces with intracortical implants for motor and communication functions compensation: review of recent developments. Sovrem Technol Med. 2024;16(1):78–89. doi:10.17691/stm2024.16.1.08.

2. Willett FR, Kunz EM, Fan C, et al. A high-performance speech neuroprosthesis. Nature. 2023;620:1031–1036. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06377-x.

3. Metzger SL, Littlejohn KT, Silva AB, et al. A high-performance neuroprosthesis for speech decoding and avatar control. Nature. 2023;620:1037–1046. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-06443-4.

4. Silva AB, Littlejohn KT, Liu JR, et al. The speech neuroprosthesis. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2024;25:473–492. doi:10.1038/s41583-024-00819-9.

5. Patrick-Krueger KM, Burkhart I, Contreras-Vidal JL. The state of clinical trials of implantable brain–computer interfaces. Nat Rev Bioeng. 2025;3:50–67. doi:10.1038/s44222-024-00239-5.

6. Jorfi M, Skousen JL, Weder C, Capadona JR. Progress towards biocompatible intracortical microelectrodes for neural interfacing applications. J Neural Eng. 2015;12:011001.

7. Enhancing biocompatibility of the brain-machine interface: a review. Bioact Mater. 2024;42:531–549. doi:10.1016/j.bioactmat.2024.08.034.

8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Implanted Brain-Computer Interface (BCI) Devices for Patients with Paralysis or Amputation—Non-clinical Testing and Clinical Considerations. FDA Guidance. 2021.

9. Herron J, Kremen V, Simeral JD, et al. The convergence of neuromodulation and brain–computer interfaces. Nat Rev Bioeng. 2024;2:628–630.

10. Holt MW, Robinson EC, Shlobin NA, et al. Intracortical brain-computer interfaces for improved motor function: a systematic review. Rev Neurosci. 2024;35(2):213–223. doi:10.1515/revneuro-2023-0077.

11. Oganesian LL, Shanechi MM. Brain–computer interfaces for neuropsychiatric disorders. Nat Rev Bioeng. 2024;2:653–670.

12. Muirhead WR, Horsfall LL, Aicardi C, et al. Implanted cortical neuroprosthetics for speech and movement restoration. J Neurol. 2024;271:7156–7168.