GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights
a joint centre of
GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

IN BRIEF ...

THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: IMPACT OF NEUROTECHNOLOGIES DEVELOPMENTS

DECEMBER 2025 | JONATHAN ANDREW

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of neurotechnologies represents one of the most significant developments in modern medical science, offering unprecedented opportunities to address neurological disabilities while simultaneously raising complex ethical, social, and practical concerns. Neurotechnologies encompass a broad spectrum of interventions, from brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) and deep brain stimulation to neural prosthetics, all designed to interact with the human nervous system.[1]

For the global community of persons with disabilities—estimated at over one billion individuals worldwide[2]—these technologies may present a paradigmatic shift in how we conceptualize disability, treatment, and human enhancement. The promise of restored mobility, improved communication capabilities and cognitive enhancement for individuals represents transformative potential that could fundamentally alter their lived experiences. However, the development and implementation of neurotechnologies occur within a complex landscape of competing interests, values, and priorities.[3] While these technologies offer remarkable therapeutic possibilities, they also introduce novel risks including surgical complications, long-term safety concerns, questions of autonomy and identity, and potential exacerbation of existing social inequalities.[4] Furthermore, the intersection of neurotechnology with disability raises profound questions about the social model of disability, the ethics of enhancement versus treatment, and the risk of technological solutions overshadowing necessary social and environmental accommodations.[5]

This analysis examines the current state of neurotechnologies development, evaluates both the transformative benefits and significant risks these technologies present for persons with disabilities, and addresses the critical questions that must guide responsible innovation and implementation in this rapidly evolving field.

CURRENT LANDSCAPE OF NEUROTECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

BRAIN-COMPUTER INTERFACES AND NEURAL PROSTHETICS

Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs) research have achieved notable successes recently in translating neural signals into actionable outputs, enabling individuals with paralysis to control computer cursors, robotic arms, and communication devices.[6] Studies have demonstrated successful implementations of both invasive and non-invasive BCIs, with recent trials showing individuals with tetraplegia achieving typing speeds comparable to smartphone users and controlling prosthetic limbs with remarkable dexterity.[7]

The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms has significantly improved the accuracy and responsiveness of these systems, while miniaturization has made implantable devices more practical for long-term use.[8]

THERAPEUTIC NEUROSTIMULATION TECHNOLOGIES

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has expanded beyond initial applications for diseases such as Parkinson's to treat a broader range of conditions including essential tremor, dystonia, epilepsy, and emerging applications for depression and obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD).[9] Transcranial stimulation techniques offer non-invasive alternatives for treating various neurological and psychiatric conditions, with growing evidence for applications in stroke rehabilitation and depression treatment.[10]

BENEFITS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: REALISING THE HUMAN RIGHT TO HEALTH

RESTORATION OF IMPAIRED FUNCTIONS

Neurotechnologies offer direct pathways to restore lost or impaired functions. For individuals with spinal cord injuries, BCIs can bypass damaged motor pathways to restore communication between the brain and paralyzed limbs and empowering patients.[11] Research in motor restoration now extends beyond only limb control to include restoration of speech for individuals with conditions like ALS or stroke-related aphasia, where neurotechnologies are being developed to interpret neural signals and convert them to synthesised voice outputs.[12] These technologies may provide not just functional restoration but also psychological benefits through a renewed sense of agency, autonomy and independence.[13]

ENHANCEMENT OF EXISTING MENTAL AND PHYSICAL CAPABILITIES

Beyond restoration, neurotechnologies may be used to enhance residual capabilities in individuals with partial disabilities. Sensory substitution devices can provide alternative sensory inputs for individuals with visual or auditory impairments,[14] while cognitive enhancement neurotechnologies show promise for certain individuals with memory impairments or executive function disorders.[15]

IMPROVED QUALITY OF LIFE AND SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

The functional improvements enabled by neurotechnologies translate directly into enhanced quality of life through increased independence, expanded employment opportunities, and greater social participation.[16] The ability to communicate, control one's interactions with the surrounding environment and engage in previously inaccessible activities can improve psychological well-being whilst also potentially reducing caregiver burden and healthcare needs.[17] These technologies may also offer the potential for an individual's more seamless integration into digital environments, potentially reducing certain barriers to participation in an increasingly connected world.[18]

HUMAN RIGHTS RISKS AND CHALLENGES

SAFETY AND MEDICAL RISKS

Invasive neurotechnologies (such as BCIs) carry inherent surgical risks including infection, bleeding, and device malfunction.[19] Long-term safety data remains limited; concerns regarding chronic immune responses, tissue damage, and device degradation over time all remain significant.[20] The complexity of

the nervous system means that interventions may have unintended consequences that may potentially only manifest many years after neurotechnologies are implemented as therapeutic interventions.[21]

Either software or hardware failures in critical life-supporting neurotechnologies could potentially have serious medical consequences, while the need for periodic surgical revisions may expose patients to repeated risks.[22] The challenge of balancing the desire to encourage innovation while meeting safety and ethical concerns constitutes an ongoing tension in research.[23]

ETHICAL AND PRIVACY CONCERNS

Neurotechnologies raise fundamental questions with regard to notions of personal identity, autonomy, and what constitutes the "self." Persons using neurotechnologies may question whether their enhanced capabilities represent their own abilities or are otherwise technological artifacts. The potential for external control of neural devices raises concerns relating to personal autonomy, particularly regarding data privacy, device modification, and the possibility of remote manipulation.[24]

SOCIETAL AND CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS

The emphasis on technological solutions to disability may inadvertently reinforce perspectives that view disability primarily as individual pathology requiring fixing, potentially undermining social model approaches that emphasise environmental and attitudinal barriers.[25] This technological focus might possibly reduce investment in universal design, accessibility improvements, and social inclusion initiatives.

Neurotechnologies may contribute to the stigmatisation of individuals who choose not to use available technologies or for whom these technologies are ineffective, creating pressure for technological adoption and marginalising those who rely on other accommodations, assistive technologies or treatments.

In addition, the financial costs of neurotechnologies risk creating or exacerbating existing inequalities in healthcare access, potentially creating a two-tier system where advanced treatments are available only to the wealthy. This economic barrier could paradoxically increase rather than decrease disability-related disadvantages.[26]

KEY QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF NEUROTECHNOLOGIES

REGULATORY AND GOVERNANCE QUESTIONS

- How can legislation, oversight and regulatory frameworks evolve to keep pace with rapidly advancing neurotechnologies while ensuring adequate safety and efficacy standards?
- What mechanisms are needed to ensure long-term post-market surveillance and adverse event reporting for neurotechnologies devices? How can international coordination be achieved to prevent regulatory arbitrage and ensure consistent safety standards across jurisdictions?
- What role should persons with disabilities play in regulatory decision-making processes, and how can their voices be meaningfully incorporated into technology development and approval processes?

EQUITY AND ACCESS QUESTIONS

- What strategies can be developed to best ensure equitable access to neurotechnologies while considering socioeconomic, geographic, and demographic factors?
- How should healthcare systems prioritize resource allocation between neurotechnological interventions and traditional health services for persons with disabilities? What role should public funding play in neurotechnologies development and access?
- How can global disparities in neurotechnologies access be addressed, particularly given the concentration of research and development in more developed economies? What models of technology transfer and capacity building could make these technologies more available in low- and middle-income countries?

PRIVACY, IDENTITY AND AUTONOMY QUESTIONS

- How do neurotechnologies affect personal identity, privacy concerns and the sense of self. Are additional systems of support needed to help individuals navigate these changes with the advent of neurotechnologies therapeutics?
- What constitutes meaningful informed consent for technologies that may fundamentally alter cognitive or other physiological capabilities? How should decisions be made regarding neurotechnological interventions for individuals with cognitive disabilities who may lack capacity for informed consent?
- What safeguards are necessary to protect user autonomy and prevent coercion or undue influence in neurotechnologies adoption/treatment decisions? How should conflicts between individual choice and clinical, family or caregiver preferences be resolved?

INTEGRATION OF NEUROTECHNOLOGIES WITHIN HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS

- How can neurotechnologies be integrated within existing healthcare services and support systems for persons with disabilities? What training and support will be needed for healthcare providers, disability service professionals, and informal caregivers? How might neurotechnologies-based solutions complement rather than compete with social and environmental accessibility improvements?
- What further research is needed to understand the long-term interactions between neurotechnologies and other disability-related interventions? How should success be measured and evaluated across different neurotechnologies treatments for disabilities?

CONCLUSION

- Neurotechnologies represent both tremendous opportunities and significant challenges for persons with disabilities. The potential for restored function, enhanced health, and improved quality of life is unprecedented. However, the realisation of this great potential requires careful attention to human rights, medical safety, equity, autonomy, and broader social implications.
- The path forward requires inclusive development processes for neurotechnologies that centre the voices and experiences of persons with disabilities, robust regulatory frameworks that balance innovation with protection, and sustained commitment to ensuring equitable access to therapies. Critically, neurotechnology advancement must occur alongside continued investment in social inclusion, environmental accessibility, and the full spectrum of supports that enable participation and dignity for all persons with disabilities.
- The questions raised by the advancement of neurotechnologies development are not merely technical or medical but also fundamentally human rights-based, social and ethical. Development of neurotechnologies will determine whether they become tools of empowerment that assist the realisation of the right to health or are otherwise instruments that inadvertently reinforce existing inequalities and limitations. Ultimately, success will be measured not just by technological sophistication, but rather by the extent to which innovations contribute to a more inclusive and equitable society for all persons with disabilities.
- The future of neurotechnologies and disability lies not in choosing between either technological or social approaches, but in meaningfully integrating both to create an environment where all individuals can participate fully in society, whether through medical intervention or technological enhancement, environmental modification, social support, or—most likely—some combination of all these approaches tailored to individual needs and preferences.

END NOTES

1 See further: Goering, S., Klein, E., Specker Sullivan, L., Wexler, A., Agüera Y Arcas, B., Bi, G., ... & Yuste, R. (2021). Recommendations for responsible development and application of neurotechnologies. *Neuroethics*, *14*(3), 365-386; Thota, A. K., & Jung, R. (2024). Accelerating neurotechnology development using an Agile methodology. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *18*, 1328540; Bublitz, C. (2024). Neurotechnologies and human rights: restating and reaffirming the multi-layered protection of the person. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, *28*(5), 782-807.

2 WHO, Disability - What countries can do to make health systems better for people with disabilities, 25 February 2025, Available at: https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/what-countries-can-do-to-make-health-systems-better-for-people-with-disabilities

3 Wolbring, G. (2024). Neuro-Abilities and a Good Life. *Journal of Neurology Research*, *14*(1), 16-36.

4 See further: Stieglitz, T. (2021). Why Neurotechnologies? about the purposes, opportunities and limitations of neurotechnologies in clinical applications. *Neuroethics*, *14*(1), 5-16;

5 See, for example: Gaudry, K. S., Ayaz, H., Bedows, A., Celnik, P., Eagleman, D., Grover, P., ... & Snyder, J. (2021). Projections and the potential societal impact of the future of neurotechnologies. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 15, 658930.

6 Chaudhary, U. (2025). Neuroethics for Neurotechnology. In *Expanding Senses using Neurotechnology: Volume 2–Brain Computer Interfaces and their Applications* (pp. 381-404). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

7 Robinson, N., Mane, R., Chouhan, T., & Guan, C. (2021). Emerging trends in BCI-robotics for motor control and rehabilitation. *Current Opinion in Biomedical Engineering*, *20*, 100354.

8 Shoaran, M., Shin, U., & Shaeri, M. (2024, April). Intelligent neural interfaces: An emerging era in neurotechnology. In *2024 IEEE Custom Integrated Circuits Conference (CICC)* (pp. 1-7). IEEE.

9 See further: Gouveia, F. V., Warsi, N. M., Suresh, H., Matin, R., & Ibrahim, G. M. (2024). Neurostimulation treatments for epilepsy: Deep brain stimulation, responsive neurostimulation and vagus nerve stimulation. *Neurotherapeutics*, *21*(3), e00308; Johnson, K. A., Okun, M. S., Scangos, K. W., Mayberg, H. S., & de Hemptinne, C. (2024). Deep brain stimulation for refractory major depressive disorder: a comprehensive review. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *29*(4), 1075-1087.

10 See: Johnson, K. A., Okun, M. S., Scangos, K. W., Mayberg, H. S., & de Hemptinne, C. (2024). Deep brain stimulation for refractory major depressive disorder: a comprehensive review. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *29*(4), 1075-1087; Reddy, S., Kabotyanski, K. E., Hirani, S., Liu, T., Naqvi, Z., Giridharan, N., ... & Sheth, S. A. (2024). Efficacy of deep brain stimulation for treatment-resistant depression: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*.

11 Awuah WA, Ahluwalia A, Darko K, Sanker V, Tan JK, Tenkorang PO, Ben-Jaafar A, Ranganathan S, Aderinto N, Mehta A, Shah MH, Lee Boon Chun K, Abdul-Rahman T, Atallah O. Bridging Minds and Machines: The Recent Advances of Brain-Computer Interfaces in Neurological and Neurosurgical Applications. World Neurosurg. 2024 Sep;189:138-153. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2024.05.104. Epub 2024 May 22. PMID: 38789029.

12 Shawki, N., Napoli, A., Vargas-Irwin, C. E., Thompson, C. K., Donoghue, J. P., & Serruya, M. D. (2025). Neural signal analysis in chronic stroke: advancing intracortical brain-computer interface design. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *19*, 1544397. See also: Wang, Y., Tang, Y., Wang, Q., Ge, M., Wang, J., Cui, X., ... & Xu, S. (2025). Advances in brain computer interface for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis communication. *Brain- X*, *3*(1), e70023.

13 Goering, S., Brown, T., & Klein, E. (2021). Neurotechnology ethics and relational agency. *Philosophy Compass*, *16*(4), e12734.

14 See: Putrino, D., & Krakauer, J. W. (2023). Neurotechnology's prospects for bringing about meaningful reductions in neurological impairment. *Neurorehabilitation and neural repair*, *37*(6), 356-366; Chandler, J. A., Van der Loos, K. I., Boehnke, S., Beaudry, J. S., Buchman, D. Z., & Illes, J. (2022). Brain Computer Interfaces and Communication Disabilities: Ethical, legal, and social aspects of decoding speech from the brain. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, *16*, 841035.

15 Beck, A., Schönau, A., MacDuffie, K., Dasgupta, I., Flynn, G., Song, D., ... & Klein, E. (2024). " In the spectrum of people who are healthy": Views of individuals at risk of dementia on using neurotechnology for cognitive enhancement. *Neuroethics*, *17*(2), 24.

16 See further: Haston, S., Gill, S., Agbeleye, O., Twentyman, K., Green, B., Eastaugh, C., ... & Mkwashi, A. (2024). Horizon Scanning Report: Neurotechnology for Mental Health, Healthy Ageing and Physical Disability. *National Institute for Health Research Innovation Observatory, the University of Newcastle upon Tyne*; Goering, S., Brown, T., & Klein, E. (2021). Neurotechnology ethics and relational agency. *Philosophy Compass*, *16*(4), e12734; van Beinum, A. (2024). Rethinking human–technology relations: exploring the sociopolitical dimensions of invasive brain stimulation. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1), 1-11.

17 Gaudry, K. S., Ayaz, H., Bedows, A., Celnik, P., Eagleman, D., Grover, P., ... & Snyder, J. (2021). Projections and the potential societal impact of the future of neurotechnologies. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, *15*, 658930.

18 See further: Güemes, A., da Silva Costa, T., & Makin, T. R. (2025). Foundational guidelines for enhancing neurotechnology research and development through end-user involvement. *Journal of Neural Engineering*, *22*(1), 012001; Doya, K., Ema, A., Kitano, H., Sakagami, M., & Russell, S. (2022). Social impact and governance of AI and neurotechnologies. *Neural Networks*, *152*, 542-554.

19 Collins, B., & Klein, E. (2023). Invasive Neurotechnology: A study of the concept of Invasiveness in Neuroethics. *Neuroethics*, *16*(1), 11. See also: Desai, P., Shook, J. R., & Giordano, J. (2025). Assessing systemic benefit and risk in the development of BCI neurotechnology. In *Brain-Computer Interfaces* (pp. 431-443). Academic Press.

20 Desai, P., Shook, J. R., & Giordano, J. (2025). Assessing systemic benefit and risk in the development of BCI neurotechnology. In *Brain-Computer Interfaces* (pp. 431-443). Academic Press.

21 Gaudry, K. S., Ayaz, H., Bedows, A., Celnik, P., Eagleman, D., Grover, P., ... & Snyder, J. (2021). Projections and the potential societal impact of the future of neurotechnologies. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, *15*, 658930.

22 See further: Ugur, M., Pothukuchi, R. P., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2024). Towards Forever Access for Implanted Brain-Computer Interfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.17496*. See also: Nature – Editorial: Reality check for brain–machine interfaces. *Nat Rev Bioeng* 2, 627 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s44222-024-00230-0

23 See: Bublitz, C., & Ligthart, S. (2024). The new regulation of non-medical neurotechnologies in the European Union: overview and reflection. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, *11*(2), lsae021; Schalk, G., Brunner, P., Allison, B. Z., Soekadar, S. R., Guan, C., Denison, T., ... & Miller, K. J. (2024). Translation of neurotechnologies. *Nature Reviews Bioengineering*, *2*(8), 637-652.

24 See, for example: Yuste, R. (2023). Advocating for neurodata privacy and neurotechnology regulation. *Nature protocols*, *18*(10), 2869-2875; Lavazza, A. (2022). Free will and autonomy in the age of neurotechnologies. In *Protecting the mind: Challenges in Law, Neuroprotection, and neurorights* (pp. 41-58). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

25 van Beinum, A. (2024). Rethinking human–technology relations: exploring the sociopolitical dimensions of invasive brain stimulation. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1), 1-11. See also: Sample, M., Sattler, S., Boehlen, W., & Racine, E. (2023). Brain-computer interfaces, disability, and the stigma of refusal: A factorial vignette study. *Public Understanding of Science*, *32*(4), 522-542.

26 Wolbring, G. (2021). Auditing the impact of neuro-advancements on health equity. *Journal of Neurology Research*, *12*(2), 54-68. See also: Herrera-Ferrá, K. (2021). Bioculture and the global regulatory gap in neuroscience, neurotechnology, and neuroethics. In *Developments in neuroethics and bioethics* (Vol. 4, pp. 41-61). Academic Press.

THE GENEVA ACADEMY

The Geneva Academy provides post-graduate education, conducts academic legal research and policy studies, and organizes training courses and expert meetings. We concentrate on branches of international law that relate to situations of armed conflict, protracted violence, and protection of human rights.

DISCLAIMER

The Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights is an independent academic centre. Our publications seek to provide insights, analysis and recommendations, based on open and primary sources, to policymakers, researchers, media, the private sector and the interested public. The designations and presentation of materials used, including their respective citations, do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Geneva Academy concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its boundaries. The views expressed in this publication represent those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Geneva Academy, its donors, parent institutions, the board or those who have provided input or participated in peer review. The Geneva Academy welcomes the consideration of a wide range of perspectives in pursuing a well-informed debate on critical policies, issues and developments in international human rights and humanitarian law.

GENEVA ACADEMY
of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights

a joint centre of

GENEVA GRADUATE INSTITUTE

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE

Villa Moynier
Rue de Lausanne 120B
CP 1063 - 1211 Geneva 1 - Switzerland

Phone: +41 (22) 908 44 83
Email: info@geneva-academy.ch
www.geneva-academy.ch