Neuro-AI Fusion: Integrating Nervous System Functions with Intelligent Technologies for Pain, Sensory, and Motor Control

Authors:

Mehrdad Farrokhi
ERIS Research Institute

Masih Kavian
Islamic Azad University, Tehran

Najmeh Tavousi
Isfahan University of Medical Sciences

Pegah Hosseini
Tabriz University of Medical Sciences

Ashkan Divanbeigi
Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Pouya Kalantari
Tarbiat Modares University

Negin Atashi
Kerman University of Medical Sciences

Azam Darvishi
Queensland University of Technology

Soroush Shahraki Zahedani
Zahedan University of Medical Sciences

Rojan Javaheri
Shiraz University of Medical Sciences

Sara Yazdani
Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Amir Golparian
Bu-Ali Sina

Sepideh Aminafshari
Azad University of Hamadan

Zahra Bayat
Bushehr University of Medical Sciences

Meisam Sargazi
Zahedan University of Medical Sciences

Hooman Esfahani
Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Yasaman Behmanesh
Islamic Azad University of Mashhad

William Dashtmiani
University of New South Wales

Sorour Sarihi
University of Connecticut

Kimia Feiz
Independent Researcher

Babak Ehsani Zonuz
Iran University of Medical Sciences

Dina Seyedi
Tehran University of Medical Sciences

Amir Hakimjavadi
Universitat Rovira I Virgili

Details:

Publisher: PreferPub (eBook Version) and Kindle (Paperback Version)

Publication Date: October 2026

Language: English

Dimensions: 5 x 0.39 x 8 inches

© PreferPub and Kindle 2026

ISBN-13: 979-8166282941

This peer-reviewed book is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specially the rights of translation, reprinting, result of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

Contents

Chapter

1. Integrating Brain Function with Intelligent Technologies for Cognitive Assessment, Neural Decoding, and Clinical Decision Support

2. Integrating Pain Mechanisms with Intelligent Technologies for Precision Diagnosis, Personalized Pain Management, and Neuromodulation

3. Integrating Sensory Processing with Intelligent Technologies for Vision, Somatosensation, and Multisensory Integration

4. Integrating Auditory Function with Intelligent Technologies for Hearing Assessment, Audiometry, and Auditory Rehabilitation

5. Integrating Motor Control with Intelligent Technologies for Movement Analysis, Brain–Computer Interfaces, and Robotic Assistance

6. Integrating Neuroimaging with Intelligent Technologies for Radiology, Image Analysis, and Precision Neurological Diagnosis

7. Integrating Neural Plasticity with Intelligent Technologies for Neurorehabilitation, Functional Recovery, and Adaptive Therapeutics

8. Integrating Orofacial Neuroscience with Intelligent Technologies for Dental Pain, Temporomandibular Disorders, and Neurodentistry

9. Integrating Peripheral and Autonomic Nervous

System Functions with Intelligent Technologies for Neuromodulation, Prosthetics, and Physiological Monitoring

10. Integrating Nervous System Functions with Intelligent Technologies for Other Pain, Sensory, and Motor Disorders

1. INTEGRATING BRAIN FUNCTION WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR COGNITIVE ASSESSMENT, NEURAL DECODING, AND CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT

Background

As a leading cause of disability, neurological deficits pose a significant health burden worldwide, demanding more effective and sustainable strategies to improve the prognosis and treatment of these disorders and address brain health. Cognitive decline is a primary characteristic of most neurological disorders, and assessing cognition largely relies on clinical evaluation, primarily through conventional methods. Infrequent and prolonged data collection during interventional periods of conventional cognitive evaluation tests is a common limitation of these methods, as daily fluctuations in patients' conditions can be better captured through more frequent data collection. Other limitations of traditional methods include time-consuming patient evaluation processes, investigator bias in data collection, recall bias, and non-validated questionnaires tailored to specific populations. Emerging technologies, including digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI) models and tools, enable the integrated and continuous evaluation of behavioral and mental health-related parameters involved in cognitive

assessment, neural decoding, and clinical diagnosis across diverse populations.

Machine learning (ML) facilitates the classification and early detection of cognitive decline and the assessment of brain health, focusing on supervised learning algorithms and behavioral datasets with predefined output labels. The most common supervised models used in neurological studies include prediction models such as logistic regression (LR), neural networks (NN), and decision trees (DT), as well as classification models such as support vector machines (SVMs), each with specific limitations. The classification and early detection of neurodegenerative disorders accompanied by cognitive deficits, such as Alzheimer's disease (AD), are feasible using state-of-the-art AI tools, significantly affecting the health burden of these diseases. The integration of random forests, decision trees, and logistic regression as prediction models with neuroimaging, wearable devices, and sensor data has paved the way for the classification and early detection of AD and mild cognitive impairment (MCI). The 15% conversion rate from MCI to AD highlights the importance of early detection in improving patient care and enabling effective interventions. The evaluation of disease onset encompasses monitoring changes in multiple factors, including plasma and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) biomarkers, genomic data, and neuroimaging, with high prognostic accuracy.

Integrating clinical data with ML-trained prediction models could increase the accuracy of AD prognosis to 84.7%, representing a promising result. Data collection for neurological assessment through clinical evaluation, biosensors, medical imaging, novel biomarkers, and brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) is an essential step in assessing neurological deficits, supporting clinical decision-making, risk assessment, disease and behavioral prognosis, and the selection and effective implementation of intervention or prevention strategies. The integration of AI techniques and tools could pave the way for more efficient, low-risk clinical approaches that directly affect patients' quality of life. Despite the high diagnostic accuracy of these hybrid models, translating the findings into clinical practice, validating the models, assessing their generalizability, and ensuring data privacy must be considered before clinical diagnosis, representing major challenges.

Beyond cognitive evaluation, neural decoding to predict associations between neuronal activity and sensory or environmental stimuli has been developed using AI and recently applied to brain-machine interfaces. Notable factors underlying the complexity of decoding and recoding include dataset quality and scale for training supervised AI models, as well as the complexity of the human brain and the number of neurons involved in each brain-related process. Decoding models can pre-

dict behaviors associated with specific neuronal activity, enabling targeted movements of a robotic arm or cursor in patients with physical disabilities. The process begins with raw data, followed by mapping to predict behavior-associated stimuli, such as speech, movement, or vision, using deep learning with a flexible, nonlinear approach to improve predictive accuracy. However, accuracy can be challenged by multiple factors, particularly daily variations in the neuronal activity used to train the model, which can be addressed using recurrent autoencoders or multiplicative recurrent neural networks. Despite the limitations of using ML in neuronal decoding, such as limited datasets, these models have still outperformed traditional methods. Overall, future directions for using ML in neuronal decoding should focus on optimizing decoding methods, enabling online decoding, and improving dataset quality to overcome existing challenges associated with the translational application of AI in this research area.

ML can be trained to assist in classifying and predicting multiple outcomes from large-scale datasets, supporting clinical decision-making in neurology and neurosurgery, improving healthcare processes, and enhancing patients' quality of life. LR, NN, and SVM are widely used in the decision-making process in neurosurgery, particularly spine surgery, followed by epilepsy surgery, with NN outperforming the other models in a post

hoc analysis of accuracy. However, safety concerns must be considered when using these models in clinical centers, with an emphasis on the complementary role of trained models in decision-making rather than relying solely on their predictions. Furthermore, validating each model across multiple centers is essential for monitoring performance and evaluating surgical safety in clinical decision-making, as only a few models have been tested and validated. Incorporating AI models to support decision-making in stroke diagnosis raises similar concerns regarding generalizability in real-world settings, where dataset inputs vary considerably. AI algorithms based on machine learning, including deep learning, reinforcement learning, natural language processing, and image processing, are continuously evolving. However, it should be noted that the accuracy of AI-driven decision-making depends on dataset sample size, dataset quality, and the selection of parameters used in the algorithm, which enable complex, integrative analyses of large-scale data.

AI algorithms using ML for cognitive deficits, neuronal decoding, and decision-making support are primarily used to generate efficient predictive models that encompass multiple categorical and continuous variables across datasets with variations in genomic characteristics, demographics, perceived understanding, and expertise levels. The integration of AI, particularly for early diagnosis,

clinical decision-making, and surgical risk assessment, could improve healthcare efficiency while optimizing treatment protocols and reducing the disease burden. However, the success of prediction models using a multimodal approach depends on factors such as variability among the model's target users, data quality, and model validation in both specialized and non-specialized clinical settings.

Neurobiological Foundations of Intelligent Brain Assessment

The development of intelligent technologies for cognitive assessment and neural decoding depends on an understanding of the biological mechanisms that generate measurable brain signals. Cognitive functions do not arise from isolated anatomical structures operating independently. Instead, they emerge through interactions among distributed neural networks, including systems associated with attention, memory, executive control, sensory processing, emotion, and motor coordination. The prefrontal cortex contributes to planning, working memory, behavioral inhibition, and goal-directed decision-making, while medial temporal structures, including the hippocampus, play essential roles in memory formation and consolidation. Parietal regions participate in attention and multisensory integration, and temporal and frontal language networks support different aspects of linguistic processing. These functions

depend on coordinated communication across brain regions, making network-level analysis an important component of contemporary neuroscience.

Neural activity can be investigated through several complementary measurement techniques, each providing different information about brain function. EEG records electrical potentials generated by synchronized neural activity through electrodes placed on the scalp. Its high temporal resolution makes it useful for studying rapid cognitive processes, sleep, seizures, attention, and changes in brain states. MEG measures magnetic fields associated with neural currents and provides complementary information about the timing and localization of brain activity. Functional MRI estimates changes in blood oxygenation associated with neural activity, enabling researchers to investigate functional organization and connectivity across distributed brain regions. Although fMRI offers valuable spatial information, its hemodynamic measurements are indirect indicators of neural activity and operate on a slower timescale than electrophysiological recordings. Functional near-infrared spectroscopy measures changes in oxygenated and deoxygenated hemoglobin, offering a portable alternative for selected applications involving cortical activity. PET provides information about metabolic processes, molecular targets, and neurotransmitter systems, depending on the radiotracer employed.

The biological complexity of these signals creates substantial analytical challenges. Neural recordings contain mixtures of task-related activity, spontaneous fluctuations, physiological artifacts, environmental noise, and individual differences. For example, EEG measurements may be affected by eye movements, muscle activity, electrode impedance, and electrical interference. Neuroimaging data may be influenced by motion, scanner characteristics, preprocessing decisions, and differences in acquisition protocols. Moreover, neural representations vary across individuals because of differences in anatomy, developmental history, learning, disease, medication exposure, and compensatory mechanisms. Intelligent analytical systems must therefore distinguish meaningful physiological patterns from irrelevant variability without removing information that may be clinically important.

Computational neuroscience contributes to this objective by developing mathematical models of neural activity, information processing, connectivity, and learning. Statistical models can characterize relationships between physiological measurements and cognitive performance, while network analysis can investigate the organization and communication of interconnected brain regions. Machine learning extends these approaches by identifying predictive patterns within high-dimensional datasets, and deep learning can model complex relationships that may be difficult to

represent through predefined statistical features. Nevertheless, greater model complexity does not automatically imply greater biological validity. A highly accurate classifier may rely on indirect correlates, technical artifacts, or demographic characteristics rather than disease-specific neural mechanisms. Consequently, intelligent brain assessment should combine predictive performance with biological plausibility, appropriate validation, and careful interpretation of the features driving model outputs.

Intelligent Technologies for Cognitive Assessment

Cognitive assessment is essential for identifying and characterizing impairments affecting memory, attention, executive function, language, visuospatial processing, and information-processing speed. These domains are relevant to a broad range of clinical conditions, including neurodegenerative diseases, stroke, traumatic brain injury, epilepsy, psychiatric disorders, sleep disturbances, and developmental conditions. Conventional cognitive assessments provide standardized procedures for evaluating performance and comparing results with appropriate reference populations. However, traditional tests generally capture performance during a limited period and may provide incomplete information about fluctuations in cognitive function, everyday behavior, or subtle changes that occur before clinically signifi-

cant impairment becomes apparent. Intelligent technologies offer opportunities to complement these assessments with more detailed, objective, and longitudinal measurements.

Machine learning algorithms can analyze cognitive test scores, response times, error patterns, and task-related behavioral measurements to identify combinations of features associated with specific cognitive profiles. Rather than relying exclusively on a total score, computational models can examine the relationships among different task components and identify patterns that distinguish particular forms of impairment. For example, two individuals with similar overall screening scores may demonstrate different profiles of memory retention, attentional control, processing speed, and executive function. Multidimensional analysis can help characterize these differences and potentially support more targeted clinical evaluations. However, the resulting classifications should be treated as supplementary evidence because similar behavioral patterns may arise from different underlying conditions.

Digital cognitive assessments extend these capabilities by incorporating computerized tasks, touchscreen interfaces, speech recordings, eye tracking, and other behavioral measurements. Automated systems can measure response latency, variability in performance, error correction, task completion time, and changes in accuracy across repeated trials. These measurements may

provide useful information about sustained attention, psychomotor speed, working memory, and executive control. Digital platforms can also facilitate standardized administration and automated scoring, potentially reducing some sources of examiner-related variability. Nevertheless, device familiarity, accessibility, language, educational background, visual or motor impairment, and environmental distractions can influence performance. Appropriate validation is therefore necessary before digital measures are used to guide clinical decisions.

Natural language processing and speech analysis provide additional opportunities for assessing cognitive function. Speech production involves several interacting processes, including semantic retrieval, lexical selection, syntactic organization, motor planning, and auditory feedback. Changes in word-finding ability, speech fluency, semantic coherence, naming performance, or discourse organization may be associated with neurological and psychiatric conditions. Computational systems can extract linguistic and acoustic features from recorded speech and evaluate their relationships with cognitive performance or disease status. Such approaches may support the assessment of language-related changes and facilitate repeated monitoring outside specialist clinics. However, linguistic characteristics vary considerably across languages, dialects, educational backgrounds, and cultural contexts. Models developed

using one language or population may not generalize adequately to another, and speech-based classifications must account for hearing impairment, speech disorders, fatigue, and emotional state.

Wearable devices and mobile technologies may further extend cognitive assessment into everyday environments. Depending on the device and measurement method, these systems can collect information about sleep patterns, physical activity, movement variability, heart rate, and other physiological indicators that may be associated with cognitive performance. Repeated observations can help distinguish temporary changes from persistent deviations and may identify relationships between sleep disruption, physical inactivity, stress, and cognitive functioning. However, wearable measurements are generally indirect indicators of cognition and cannot independently establish the presence of a neurological disorder. Their value depends on whether the collected signals provide validated information beyond established clinical assessments.

A major objective is to integrate cognitive testing, neuroimaging, electrophysiology, behavioral observations, and longitudinal information into comprehensive assessment frameworks. Multimodal models may capture complementary dimensions of brain function and improve characterization when individual data sources are incomplete. However, the absence of certain modalities in routine practice, differences in measurement quality, and variation in data availability can complicate implementation. Models should therefore be evaluated under realistic clinical conditions, including missing data, imperfect measurements, and diverse patient characteristics. The ultimate objective is not simply to automate cognitive testing but to produce clinically meaningful information that improves early identification, differential assessment, individualized monitoring, and patient care.

Neural Decoding and Brain-Computer Interfaces

Neural decoding translates measurable patterns of neural activity into estimates of information about a person's sensory processing, intended movements, communication-related activity, or cognitive state. This field has developed through advances in electrophysiology, neuroimaging, signal processing, statistical learning, and computational modeling. Its importance is particularly evident in brain-computer interfaces (BCIs), which establish communication pathways between neural activity and external devices. BCIs may enable individuals with severe motor impairments to control cursors, select letters, operate assistive technologies, or interact with digital environments through neural signals. They may also support rehabilitation and research into the neural mechanisms underlying perception, movement, and communication.

Different neural recording techniques support different decoding objectives. Noninvasive EEG-based systems can detect patterns associated with motor imagery, event-related potentials, and selected cognitive or sensory processes. These systems are relatively accessible and can be used without surgical implantation, although scalp recordings have limited spatial specificity and may be vulnerable to noise. Invasive systems record neural activity using electrodes placed on or within neural tissue, potentially providing more detailed information about movement intention or communication-related processes. Their use, however, introduces surgical risks, technical constraints, and long-term considerations involving device stability and tissue responses. The choice of recording method depends on the intended application, expected clinical benefit, acceptable risk, and available technological infrastructure.

Machine learning provides the computational foundation for many neural decoding systems. Conventional algorithms can classify predefined signal features, while deep learning approaches can learn complex representations directly from neural recordings or minimally processed inputs. Recurrent neural networks, convolutional architectures, and transformer-based models have been investigated for different types of sequential or spatially organized data. These models may identify temporal dependencies, distinguish task-related patterns, and map neural signals to predicted movements, symbols, or linguistic outputs. Nevertheless, the ability to decode information depends on the specific experimental conditions and the quality of the relationship between the recorded signals and the target outcome. A model trained on carefully controlled tasks may perform poorly when the user's cognitive state, electrode placement, environment, or intended behavior changes.

One of the major challenges is the variability of neural signals within and between individuals. Neural representations can change through learning, fatigue, medication, disease progression, electrode displacement, and adaptation to the interface. A decoder that performs well during initial calibration may gradually lose accuracy if the underlying signal distribution changes. Adaptive learning methods can update model parameters in response to new observations, potentially improving stability and reducing the need for repeated calibration. However, adaptation must be carefully controlled to prevent unintended outputs or deterioration in performance. Systems used for communication or assistive control require reliable mechanisms for detecting uncertainty, managing errors, and allowing users to correct or interrupt predictions.

Neural decoding also raises important conceptual and ethical questions. Decoding a signal associated with a predefined task is not equivalent to directly reading unrestricted thoughts. In most

applications, the model estimates a constrained set of outputs under particular experimental conditions, and performance depends on extensive training and calibration. Claims about the interpretation of private mental content should therefore be evaluated cautiously. Privacy protection is especially important when neural recordings may contain information about health, behavior, or cognitive states. Appropriate consent, secure data storage, transparent governance, and limitations on secondary data use are essential.

Clinical translation requires more than demonstrating that a decoder can perform a laboratory task. Systems must be evaluated for usability, reliability, accessibility, durability, and meaningful improvements in communication or functional independence. Clinical studies should assess performance across relevant patient groups and examine whether the technology offers advantages over existing assistive methods. For rehabilitation applications, outcomes should include functional recovery, participation, quality of life, and sustained engagement rather than relying exclusively on technical measures of decoding accuracy. Integrating neural decoding with clinical assessment and decision support may ultimately allow more individualized interventions, provided that technological capabilities remain aligned with patient needs and established safety standards.

Multimodal Brain Data Integration and Computational Modeling

The integration of multiple data modalities is a central strategy for improving the characterization of brain function. Brain-related measurements differ in their temporal resolution, spatial specificity, biological interpretation, and susceptibility to noise. EEG captures rapid electrical changes, fMRI provides information about hemodynamic responses and functional organization, structural MRI characterizes anatomical features, and PET can reveal selected metabolic or molecular processes. Cognitive tests, clinical observations, speech recordings, and wearable measurements provide additional information about behavior and everyday functioning. Because no single modality captures every relevant dimension of brain activity, combining complementary sources may provide a more comprehensive representation of neurological status.

Multimodal integration can be performed at several analytical levels. Early integration combines features extracted from different data sources into a common representation before model training. This strategy can capture relationships across modalities but may be sensitive to differences in scale, measurement quality, and missing observations. Intermediate integration uses modality-specific representations that are combined within a shared computational architecture. Late integration com-

bines predictions from separately trained models, allowing each modality to be analyzed using an appropriate method before the results are integrated. The most suitable approach depends on the data structure, sample size, clinical objective, and availability of synchronized measurements.

For example, a model designed to characterize cognitive impairment could combine structural brain measurements, functional connectivity, EEG-derived features, standardized cognitive scores, and clinical risk factors. Structural measurements may reflect anatomical changes, functional measures may characterize patterns of coordinated activity, and cognitive scores may indicate the behavioral consequences of these changes. The integrated model could identify patterns associated with different levels of impairment or estimate the probability of subsequent decline. However, predictive associations should not be interpreted as proof of a specific biological mechanism. Clinical outcomes may be influenced by age, vascular risk, medication, education, mood, sleep, and other factors that are not fully represented in the available dataset.

Computational modeling can also help characterize brain networks. Functional connectivity analysis estimates statistical relationships between activity recorded from different regions, while graph theory provides methods for examining network organization, centrality, modularity, and communication pathways. Machine learning

can evaluate whether combinations of these features are associated with cognitive performance or disease outcomes. Yet functional connectivity is not necessarily equivalent to direct anatomical connectivity, and observed associations may be affected by preprocessing, motion, signal leakage, and methodological choices. Standardized analytical procedures and sensitivity analyses are therefore essential for ensuring that network-based findings are robust.

The successful integration of multimodal data also requires careful management of missingness and technical heterogeneity. In real clinical settings, patients may undergo different imaging protocols, have incomplete cognitive records, or lack access to specialized investigations. Requiring every input modality can make an otherwise accurate model impractical. Approaches capable of operating with partially available data may improve applicability, but their performance must be assessed under the missing-data patterns expected in practice. Similarly, differences between scanners, institutions, acquisition protocols, and patient populations can produce distribution shifts that reduce predictive reliability. External validation, harmonization procedures, and ongoing monitoring can help identify these problems.

Finally, multimodal models should be developed with explicit attention to interpretability and clinical relevance. Clinicians need to understand what

information contributes to a prediction, how uncertain the estimate is, and whether the result is consistent with the patient's presentation. Feature attribution methods, uncertainty estimation, calibration analysis, and comparisons with simpler statistical models can provide useful evidence. Nevertheless, interpretability techniques do not automatically establish causal validity or eliminate bias. Multimodal integration should therefore be viewed as a means of improving the quality of clinical evidence rather than as a guarantee of superior diagnosis.

Clinical Decision Support and Personalized Neurological Care

Clinical decision support connects computational analysis with practical healthcare decisions. In neurology and cognitive medicine, decisions frequently involve interpreting uncertain symptoms, selecting diagnostic investigations, estimating disease progression, determining treatment eligibility, and planning follow-up. These decisions may require the integration of information from different specialties and measurement systems. Intelligent decision-support tools can assist by synthesizing relevant clinical variables, identifying patterns associated with increased risk, and presenting estimates that complement established diagnostic procedures. Their potential value lies in helping clinicians manage complex information while maintaining the clinical con-

text necessary for appropriate interpretation.

Diagnostic support systems can combine cognitive assessments, neurological examination findings, neuroimaging, electrophysiological recordings, laboratory results, medication histories, and relevant comorbidities. For instance, a system evaluating suspected cognitive impairment might integrate memory performance, executive function, functional status, structural imaging findings, and vascular risk factors. It could estimate the likelihood of different diagnostic categories or identify findings that warrant additional investigation. Such outputs should not be regarded as definitive diagnoses because several neurological, psychiatric, metabolic, and medication-related conditions can produce overlapping symptoms. Instead, the system should provide evidence that helps clinicians determine which explanations are most plausible and which additional assessments may be necessary.

Prognostic models offer another important application. Predicting future cognitive decline, functional deterioration, recurrent neurological events, or rehabilitation outcomes can support individualized care planning. Longitudinal data may be particularly useful because changes over time can provide information that a single assessment cannot capture. Models can examine trajectories in cognitive performance, imaging measurements, neural signals, and functional status to estimate future outcomes. However, prognostic

accuracy depends on appropriate outcome definitions, adequate follow-up, representative patient populations, and validation in settings where the predictions will be used. A model that predicts an outcome accurately at the population level may still produce substantial uncertainty for an individual patient.

Intelligent technologies may also support treatment selection and monitoring. In selected contexts, models could help identify patients who are more likely to benefit from a particular rehabilitation strategy, neurostimulation approach, or monitoring schedule. Repeated physiological and behavioral measurements could reveal changes in treatment response and help clinicians determine whether reassessment is warranted. However, treatment recommendations require evidence that the proposed intervention improves outcomes for the relevant patient group. Observational associations between a neural pattern and treatment response are not sufficient to establish that selecting therapy according to that pattern will produce better results. Prospective clinical evaluation and, where appropriate, randomized studies are needed to establish clinical utility.

Effective implementation depends on integrating decision-support systems into existing clinical workflows. A technically sophisticated tool may have limited value if it requires excessive data entry, produces difficult-to-interpret outputs, generates frequent false alarms, or disrupts clinical

responsibilities. Systems should present concise, actionable information and clearly communicate uncertainty. Clinicians should be able to review the evidence underlying a recommendation, identify missing information, and override algorithmic suggestions when the clinical circumstances justify doing so. Human oversight is particularly important when decisions involve invasive procedures, high-risk treatments, or substantial consequences for patient autonomy.

Evaluation should extend beyond discrimination metrics such as sensitivity, specificity, and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve. Calibration, predictive values in the target population, clinical decision thresholds, workflow effects, resource utilization, and patient-centered outcomes are also important. Decision-curve analysis may help assess whether a model provides net benefit across clinically relevant thresholds. Prospective implementation studies can determine whether the tool changes clinical behavior and whether those changes improve care. Ultimately, clinical decision support should be judged by its contribution to safer, more effective, equitable, and patient-centered neurological care, rather than by predictive accuracy alone.

Ethical Considerations, Data Governance, and Clinical Translation

The integration of intelligent technologies with brain function raises distinctive ethical and regu-

latory challenges because neural data may reveal sensitive information about health, cognition, behavior, and potentially aspects of an individual's mental state. Brain recordings and derived computational representations should therefore be handled according to appropriate standards for confidentiality, informed consent, secure storage, and responsible secondary use. Individuals should understand the purpose of data collection, the intended applications of analytical models, the limitations of the resulting predictions, and the circumstances under which their information may be shared. These safeguards are particularly important for longitudinal datasets and brain-computer interfaces that may continuously collect information during daily activities.

Algorithmic bias is another important concern. Cognitive performance and neural measurements are influenced by age, sex, education, language, culture, socioeconomic circumstances, health status, and environmental conditions. If training datasets disproportionately represent particular populations, models may produce less reliable estimates for underrepresented groups. Such disparities can lead to inaccurate risk classifications, delayed diagnoses, inappropriate referrals, or unequal access to technological benefits. Developers should therefore evaluate model performance across clinically relevant subgroups, investigate differences in calibration and error rates, and document the populations for which the system

has been validated. When evidence is insufficient for a particular population, the model's limitations should be communicated clearly rather than assuming universal applicability.

Transparency and interpretability are essential for responsible clinical implementation. Clinicians need information about the intended use of a model, the data on which it was developed, its validation procedures, its known limitations, and the uncertainty associated with individual predictions. Complex models may identify useful patterns without providing straightforward explanations of their internal decision processes. Although interpretability techniques can help characterize influential features, they do not necessarily establish that a model has learned a biologically meaningful relationship. Independent validation and comparison with established clinical approaches remain necessary. Developers should also assess whether model outputs remain reliable when data quality, acquisition conditions, or patient characteristics differ from those encountered during training.

Clinical translation requires coordinated work among neuroscientists, clinicians, engineers, statisticians, ethicists, patients, and healthcare organizations. Development should begin with a clearly defined clinical problem and a justified explanation of how the proposed technology could improve existing practice. Appropriate reference standards, reproducible analytical pipelines, rep-

resentative datasets, and prespecified evaluation procedures are necessary to reduce bias and over-optimistic performance estimates. External validation should precede widespread implementation, while prospective studies should examine safety, usability, effectiveness, and resource requirements. After deployment, continuous monitoring is important because patient populations, clinical workflows, recording technologies, and model performance can change over time.

Regulatory requirements depend on the intended use, jurisdiction, and level of clinical risk associated with a particular system. Technologies used for research exploration may be subject to different requirements from software intended to diagnose disease, recommend treatment, or control a medical device. Developers must therefore establish appropriate evidence for the intended application and ensure that software updates, data processing procedures, and changes in model behavior are managed responsibly. Cybersecurity is especially important for connected neurotechnology because unauthorized access or manipulation could compromise sensitive information or interfere with device operation.

The future of intelligent brain assessment will depend on balancing innovation with scientific validity, clinical responsibility, and respect for human autonomy. Advances in neural decoding, multimodal modeling, digital cognitive assessment, and clinical decision support may improve

the characterization of neurological function and expand opportunities for individualized care. However, these benefits will not arise automatically from increasingly complex algorithms. They require robust validation, meaningful clinical outcomes, equitable performance, secure data governance, and transparent communication of uncertainty. By integrating computational methods with established neuroscience and clinical expertise, intelligent technologies can contribute to a more precise and responsive approach to understanding brain function while preserving the central role of patients and healthcare professionals in clinical decision-making.

2. INTEGRATING PAIN MECHANISMS WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR PRECISION DIAGNOSIS, PERSONALIZED PAIN MANAGEMENT, AND NEUROMODULATION

Background

The International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) revised its definition of pain in 2020 to "an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with, or resembling that associated with, actual or potential tissue damage." Pain perception is highly individual and can profoundly affect daily functioning and overall quality of life. Pain is an inherently subjective experience, making it difficult to assess accurately, particularly in individuals who cannot communicate their pain or whose pain-related behaviors are difficult to interpret. Determining the true prevalence of pain is challenging because of its subjective nature and the absence of standardized diagnostic criteria and definitions for many pain conditions. Despite these challenges, pain is believed to affect billions of individuals globally every day.

Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to the ability of computer systems to simulate human intelligence, enabling them to perform tasks that typically require human reasoning, learning, and decision-making. AI and machine learning (ML)

are particularly well suited to analyzing large, heterogeneous datasets and identifying complex nonlinear patterns that may not be detected using conventional analytical methods. A range of AI-based approaches, including machine learning, natural language processing, computer vision, and wearable sensor technologies, can support pain assessment, monitoring, and treatment, as well as the prediction of clinical outcomes. These tools can help quantify pain severity, distinguish between different types of pain, enable continuous monitoring over time, and predict how patients will respond to treatment. Interest in AI-based pain assessment has grown substantially, largely because of the accuracy and efficiency these approaches offer compared with conventional evaluation methods.

Nociplastic pain describes pain arising from altered nociception when tissue damage or a somatosensory lesion does not adequately explain the clinical presentation. It is a mechanistic descriptor, not a disease label or biomarker-confirmed diagnosis, and nociceptive, neuropathic, and nociplastic processes may coexist. Precision care should therefore estimate their relative contributions rather than assign mutually exclusive categories. The IASP criteria recognize possible or probable nociplastic pain based on duration, distribution, evoked hypersensitivity, symptom history, and comorbid features, but do not establish a “definite” category. Computational complex-

ity cannot transform a clinically graded construct into biological certainty.

Current evidence supports clinical phenotypes and candidate mechanism profiles more strongly than validated endotypes. An endotype should be reproducible, linked to a distinct pathophysiological process, and ideally predict differential treatment responses. Sensory amplification, impaired endogenous modulation, neuroimmune signaling, autonomic dysregulation, disturbed sleep, and cognitive-affective burden are plausible components, but none is sufficiently specific or stable to function alone as an endotype. Pain is also a personal experience, and individual differences in reported intensity do not reliably correspond to fMRI activation alone. Accordingly, the defensible computational task is not the objective detection of pain, but the estimation of probabilistic, potentially dynamic mechanism profiles for clinician interpretation alongside patient reports. A mechanism-informed multimodal system should keep complementary signals distinct before learning their interactions. Neural and sensory data may include quantitative sensory testing, descending modulation, pain distribution, and functional imaging. Neuroimmune inputs may include peripheral cytokines, cerebrospinal fluid proteins, or glial-sensitive PET measures, but these should not be compressed into a single “neuroinflammation” score. A fibromyalgia meta-analysis, for example, found elevated levels of pro-inflammatory

mediators and the anti-inflammatory cytokine IL-10, with substantial heterogeneity in several estimates. Autonomic information can be collected through heart rate variability (HRV), although this signal varies with respiration, posture, medication, fitness, and acquisition methods. Interoceptive and contextual variations can also be tracked through sleep, activity, and ecological momentary assessment. In chronic low-back pain, combined hemodynamic brain measures and finger-pulse-derived high-frequency HRV discriminated experimentally modulated pain states within individuals much better than the model generalized across individuals. Tracking changes within one person and classifying different people are separate prediction problems.

Psychosocial and experiential data must be treated as constitutive signals rather than nuisance covariates. In large UK Biobank analyses, biological markers predicted medically confirmed pain conditions more successfully than self-reported chronic pain, whereas combining biological and psychosocial features improved performance for both outcome types. A separate longitudinal model showed that sleeplessness, affective burden, stressful life events, and body mass index contributed strongly to the subsequent development and spread of chronic pain. These findings support a biopsychosocial representation while remaining predictive rather than causal. Longitudinal fusion could update a patient's profile as sleep, stress,

autonomic regulation, activity, hypersensitivity, and symptom distribution change, rather than fixing the person in a permanent cluster.

Prediction alone does not personalize treatment. A model trained to forecast outcomes under one care pathway is prognostic, whereas treatment selection requires comparative data, preferably randomized contrasts, and explicit modeling of treatment-effect heterogeneity. Outputs should be treatment-specific probabilities with calibrated uncertainty, not causal labels inferred from feature importance. The same caution applies to neuromodulation: a small EEG study predicting spinal cord stimulation outcomes illustrates technical feasibility but does not establish nociplastic endotypes. Similarly, a closed-loop device does not automatically constitute AI unless its learning rule, feedback variable, adaptation logic, and safety limits are specified. Translation also requires a clearly defined intended use, robust internal and external validation, calibration, explicit handling of missing modalities and dataset shift, subgroup analyses, and prospective evidence of benefit. TRIPOD+AI and PROBAST+AI provide relevant frameworks. For now, the most credible clinical endpoint is a clinician-supervised system that keeps the patient's narrative central and converts multimodal observations into revisable hypotheses about mechanisms and treatments, rather than issuing automated diagnoses or biomarker-defined prescriptions.

AI and Automatic Pain Assessment (APA)

Multimodal approaches provide a more accurate and comprehensive evaluation of pain than reliance on subjective self-report alone. Consequently, automatic pain assessment (APA) has emerged as a research and clinical framework that uses objective, quantifiable indicators of pain to reduce dependence on self-reported measures. APA techniques are generally categorized into two complementary domains: behavioral and neurophysiological assessment. Behavioral approaches infer pain from externally observable features, including facial expressions, speech and language characteristics, and body movements, whereas neurophysiological approaches quantify pain using biosignals such as electrodermal activity (EDA), electroencephalography (EEG), electrocardiography (ECG), electromyography (EMG), and photoplethysmography (PPG), together with neuroimaging modalities, most notably functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), and related imaging techniques.

Personalized and Precision Pain Management

According to Margo McCaffery, pain is defined by the individual's own experience, as reflected in the statement, “pain is whatever the person experiencing it says it is, existing whenever he or she says

it does.” This concept highlights the subjective nature of pain and supports the adoption of personalized approaches to chronic pain management that address each patient's specific circumstances and therapeutic needs. AI models can integrate patient-specific characteristics, genetic information, clinical records, and medical imaging to enable personalized pain assessment. By tailoring therapeutic strategies to individual patients, these approaches have the potential to improve clinical outcomes and enhance patient satisfaction. Furthermore, ML facilitates more adaptive and effective personalized treatments by combining individual health data with predictive analytics. Pain is one of the most frequent and burdensome symptoms associated with cancer, significantly compromising patients' quality of life and complicating effective clinical management.

As highlighted by Ma et al., pain medicine is transitioning from experience- and symptom-based treatments toward precision subtyping and mechanism-driven medicine by integrating inflammatory biomarkers, neuroimaging, and metabolomics to develop individualized predictive models for pain and its comorbidities, including depression.

Intelligent technologies, such as multi-omics data, computational modeling, and multimodal imaging, facilitate the development of closed-loop neuromodulation systems, such as functional MRI feedback to optimize repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) parameters. These

systems enable stimulation parameters to be adjusted according to ongoing neural activity and individual biological feedback. For example, EcoAI is an AI-enabled neuromodulation platform that illustrates how AI and ML algorithms can be used to refine stimulation parameters according to patient-specific feedback, thereby supporting more tailored pain relief.

A pilot observational study demonstrated how machine learning can combine imaging biomarkers and clinical features to develop a classification system for selecting the best candidates for spinal cord stimulation therapy among patients with chronic pain.

In a recent study published in 2026, De Martino et al. applied a supervised machine learning approach to predict clinical responses to rTMS therapy and stratify patients according to their likelihood of benefiting from this therapeutic approach, thereby facilitating more personalized pain management. In a machine learning study on neck pain, Gao et al. demonstrated that pretreatment neuroimaging features could predict responsiveness to acupuncture. In another recent study, Wei et al. combined resting-state fMRI, baseline clinical measures, and AI techniques to identify right superior parietal lobule activity as a potential predictor of treatment response to acupuncture in patients with chronic sciatica (neuropathic pain).

Zhang et al. developed a reproducible fMRI-based machine learning indicator of pain sensitivity and

treatment-related analgesic effects, suggesting the potential role of AI in transforming subjective pain ratings into mechanistically informed estimates relevant to personalized pain management.

Additionally, wearable devices and digital applications incorporating AI algorithms play a pivotal role in identifying pain triggers, thereby facilitating preventive measures. Wearable technologies offer a forward-looking vision for developing digital twin models by transforming data collection.

Medical digital twins provide dynamic representations of patients, enabling real-time predictions of their responses to specific pharmacological agents. This predictive capacity supports data-driven, personalized treatment plans by enabling virtual trials. Additionally, digital twins allow treatment strategies to be modified by detecting patients' responses earlier.

Gopal et al. applied machine learning algorithms to intraoperative EEG recordings and patient-reported outcome measures to identify neural signatures associated with responses to spinal cord stimulation as a treatment option for refractory chronic pain. They suggested that ML and DL tools hold potential for patient selection and treatment prediction.

By integrating clinical data, pain scores, and treatment history, AI-based systems can assist in predicting analgesic responses to opioids and identifying patients at risk of opioid misuse. This highlights the potential of AI to improve opioid

stewardship and reduce unnecessary opioid exposure in pain management.

AI in Cancer Pain

Based on the IASP classification, cancer pain can be categorized into nociceptive, neuropathic, and nociplastic subtypes, which frequently coexist within the same patient and differ substantially in their pathophysiology and responsiveness to treatment. For instance, opioids are often less effective against neuropathic pain. This clinical heterogeneity is further underpinned by molecular and genetic variability, including polymorphisms such as Nav1.7 and ENPP2 variants, tumor microenvironment interactions involving neuron-like macrophages and pronociceptive mediators, and epigenetic and inflammatory mechanisms that contribute to the development and persistence of chronic pain. To address this complexity, Wang et al. proposed a conceptual "digital twin" framework that integrates multimodal data, including genomic, radiological, and digital pathology data, electronic health record text, and patient-reported outcomes. The framework uses AI approaches ranging from traditional machine learning to deep learning and multimodal foundation models, with the goal of simultaneously achieving precise pain subtyping and individualized prediction of treatment response. However, the authors emphasize that substantial translational barriers remain, including limited model interpretability, poor gen-

eralizability across institutions due to dataset shift, the predominance of retrospective rather than prospective validation, the risk of mistaking correlation for causation, and concerns regarding cost, equity, and data privacy. To move this framework toward clinical application, a three-phase research roadmap spanning federated data networks, benchmarking challenges, and prospective AI-guided trials, together with a "Hybrid Telemedicine and On-Site Expert" implementation model, has been proposed to support the scalable and equitable deployment of AI-driven precision cancer pain management.

AI-Enhanced Neuromodulation: TENS and EMS

Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) and electrical muscle stimulation (EMS) are noninvasive electrotherapeutic modalities that deliver controlled electrical impulses to achieve specific clinical outcomes. Typically portable and battery-powered, these devices can be used independently by patients or under professional supervision. Despite employing similar electrical stimulation principles, their therapeutic objectives differ. TENS is primarily intended to relieve pain by modulating nociceptive signaling, whereas EMS induces skeletal muscle contractions to enhance neuromuscular function, improve muscle performance, and support rehabilitation.

Despite its widespread clinical use, TENS con-

tinues to exhibit inconsistent efficacy and poorly understood mechanisms, reflecting a broader gap in personalized pain care. This limitation arises largely because conventional TENS protocols are based on fixed, one-size-fits-all parameters that treat pain as a simple peripheral phenomenon, whereas mounting evidence indicates that pain is instead a fluctuating, brain-wide state shaped by attentional, emotional, and contextual influences. Advances in multimodal neuroimaging, spanning the spatial precision of fMRI, the millisecond-level temporal resolution of EEG, and the ecologically valid, wearable-compatible measurements offered by functional near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS), now make it possible to characterize the distributed cortical and subcortical circuits engaged during neuromodulation with unprecedented granularity. When coupled with modern machine learning and brain-state decoding techniques, these imaging modalities offer the possibility of reframing TENS from a passive, open-loop device into an intelligent, closed-loop system that senses, interprets, and responds to fluctuating brain states to deliver individually tailored stimulation. This convergence of neuroimaging, computational modeling, and adaptive control marks a conceptual shift in neuromodulation research, positioning TENS as a scalable and clinically tractable platform for advancing precision-based, brain-informed pain management strategies.

A retrospective real-world study by Green et al.

evaluated the 24-month effectiveness of EcoAI™, an artificial intelligence-driven wearable platform that delivers adaptive transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) and electrical muscle stimulation (EMS) for chronic pain management. An analysis of data from more than 2,000 adults in the United States demonstrated sustained improvements across multiple symptom domains, highlighting the potential of AI-guided TENS/EMS as a scalable, safe, and personalized adjunct to conventional pharmacological pain management.

AI in Spinal Cord Stimulation (SCS)

Spinal cord stimulation (SCS) is an implantable neuromodulation modality used to treat pain that is resistant to conventional therapies. Although SCS offers significant therapeutic advantages, reported success rates vary considerably, with a substantial proportion of patients experiencing inadequate pain relief. Patient selection for SCS has traditionally relied on temporary trial stimulation and subjective pain assessment. While these approaches may help evaluate short-term analgesic efficacy and tolerability, they often lack sufficient predictive value for long-term therapeutic success. Incorporating AI into patient selection for SCS may improve therapeutic success by reducing implant failure, enhancing patient quality of life, and optimizing healthcare resource utilization. By enabling more precise risk stratification and adaptive learning from longitudinal patient outcomes,

AI has the potential to support more personalized and effective neuromodulation strategies.
Mounting evidence supports the translation of AI-driven methodologies into clinical SCS practice. Gopal et al. used ML algorithms to analyze EEG recordings obtained during SCS procedures. By combining principal component analysis, recursive feature elimination, and patient-reported outcomes, they established predictive models capable of forecasting therapeutic response while identifying potential neurophysiological biomarkers for patient selection. Prunskis et al. highlighted the transformative potential of AI in SCS by demonstrating that its integration throughout the clinical workflow, from predictive patient selection to adaptive, real-time stimulation optimization, may improve treatment efficacy and reduce suboptimal clinical outcomes.

3. INTEGRATING SENSORY PROCESSING WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR VISION, SOMATOSENSATION, AND MULTISENSORY INTEGRATION

Background

Sensory processing is fundamental to human perception, cognition, movement, communication, and interaction with the surrounding environment. The nervous system continuously receives, transforms, and integrates information from multiple sensory modalities to construct meaningful representations of the external world and the body's internal state. Vision provides information about objects, spatial relationships, motion, color, and environmental structure, whereas somatosensation conveys information about touch, pressure, vibration, temperature, pain, and body position. Other sensory systems, including hearing, vestibular sensation, and olfaction, contribute complementary information that supports orientation, balance, recognition, and adaptive behavior. Although these sensory modalities can be studied independently, everyday perception generally depends on their coordinated activity. The brain must combine signals arriving through different pathways, resolve conflicting information, distinguish relevant stimuli from background noise, and adjust perceptual processing according to context, prior experience, attention, and behavioral objectives. Understanding these mechanisms is essential for developing intelligent technologies that can assess sensory function, improve diagnostic accuracy, support rehabilitation, and facilitate interactions between humans and computational systems.

Sensory processing begins with specialized receptors that convert environmental stimuli into neural signals. In the visual system, photoreceptors in the retina respond to light and initiate a cascade of neural processing that ultimately contributes to visual perception. In the somatosensory system, mechanoreceptors, thermoreceptors, and nociceptors respond to different forms of physical stimulation, while proprioceptive receptors provide information about muscle length, joint position, and movement. These signals travel through organized neural pathways and undergo successive transformations involving the spinal cord, brainstem, thalamus, and cortical networks. Sensory information is not transmitted passively from receptors to higher brain regions. Instead, it is continuously modified by attention, expectation, adaptation, learning, and interactions between ascending sensory inputs and descending neural influences. Consequently, perceptual experience reflects both incoming sensory information and the brain's interpretation of that information within a particular behavioral and

environmental context.

Intelligent technologies are increasingly being developed to investigate and support these complex processes. Artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, deep learning, computer vision, wearable sensors, robotics, computational modeling, and neuroimaging analysis provide new methods for examining sensory function at multiple levels. Computer vision systems can identify objects, detect visual abnormalities, and quantify changes in retinal or optic nerve structures. Machine learning algorithms can analyze sensory thresholds, electrophysiological measurements, and behavioral responses to identify patterns associated with neurological or ophthalmic disorders. Wearable devices and tactile sensors can measure movement, pressure, and physiological signals, potentially enabling more continuous assessment of somatosensory function. Multimodal computational systems can combine visual, tactile, auditory, and proprioceptive information to improve environmental understanding and support assistive technologies.

The integration of sensory processing with intelligent systems has important implications for clinical medicine. Visual impairment, peripheral neuropathy, chronic pain, sensory processing abnormalities, vestibular dysfunction, and neurological diseases can substantially affect independence and quality of life. Conventional clinical examinations remain indispensable, but they may

not fully characterize subtle sensory abnormalities, dynamic changes, or interactions between different modalities. Quantitative computational methods may complement established assessments by identifying patterns that are difficult to detect through routine examination, supporting longitudinal monitoring, and facilitating personalized rehabilitation. Nevertheless, algorithmic predictions require rigorous validation, appropriate reference standards, representative datasets, and careful interpretation within the clinical context. Sensory measurements are influenced by age, attention, fatigue, medication, environmental conditions, and individual variability, which may complicate automated assessment.

Multisensory integration represents a particularly important area of investigation because perception depends on the brain's ability to combine complementary or partially conflicting sensory signals. For example, visual and proprioceptive information jointly contribute to the perception of body position, while visual and tactile inputs support object recognition and manipulation. Intelligent systems that reproduce or augment these processes may improve robotic interaction, prosthetic control, assistive communication, virtual reality, and rehabilitation. However, successful integration requires more than combining multiple data streams. Computational systems must account for differences in timing, reliability, spatial resolution, and meaning across

sensory modalities. They must also identify situations in which information should be combined and circumstances in which contradictory inputs should remain distinguishable. Integrating sensory neuroscience with intelligent technologies therefore offers opportunities to improve both the scientific understanding of human perception and the development of clinically useful, adaptive, and accessible technological systems.

Neurobiological Foundations of Sensory Processing

Sensory processing depends on specialized receptors, neural pathways, and distributed brain networks that transform physical stimuli into perceptual representations. Each sensory modality possesses distinct anatomical and physiological characteristics, yet several general principles are shared across sensory systems. These include stimulus transduction, selective transmission, neural coding, receptive field organization, adaptation, and hierarchical processing. Sensory neurons encode different aspects of stimulation through variations in firing rates, temporal patterns, and population activity. The resulting signals are transmitted through pathways that preserve certain features while transforming others, allowing the nervous system to extract information relevant to recognition, localization, discrimination, and action.

The visual system provides a well-characterized

example of hierarchical sensory processing. Light entering the eye is focused onto the retina, where rods and cones convert optical energy into electrical signals. Retinal circuits process aspects of contrast, luminance, spatial structure, and temporal change before information is transmitted through the optic nerve. The lateral geniculate nucleus of the thalamus relays and modulates visual information reaching the primary visual cortex. Subsequent processing involves distributed cortical regions that contribute to object recognition, motion perception, spatial awareness, and visually guided behavior. Although the distinction between ventral pathways associated with object recognition and dorsal pathways associated with spatial processing and action is useful, these systems interact extensively rather than operating as completely independent channels. Visual perception is also influenced by attention, expectations, eye movements, and information from other sensory modalities.

Somatosensation encompasses several distinct but interacting systems. Discriminative touch supports the identification of texture, shape, vibration, and surface characteristics, while proprioception provides information about limb position and movement. Thermosensation contributes to the perception of temperature, and nociception detects potentially tissue-damaging stimuli. Mechanoreceptors in the skin respond to different patterns of pressure, displacement, and vibration,

while receptors in muscles, tendons, and joints contribute to estimates of body configuration. Many forms of somatosensory information travel through the dorsal column and medial lemniscal pathway, whereas pain and temperature signals are transmitted predominantly through anterolateral pathways. These signals are processed across the spinal cord, brainstem, thalamus, and somatosensory cortex, with additional contributions from insular, cingulate, parietal, and other regions depending on the sensory function under investigation.

Sensory processing is dynamic rather than purely feedforward. Neural responses can change according to stimulus intensity, previous exposure, attention, learning, and behavioral goals. Sensory adaptation can reduce responses to sustained or repetitive stimulation, while selective attention can enhance the processing of behaviorally relevant information. Feedback connections from higher brain regions also influence how sensory signals are interpreted. These mechanisms allow the nervous system to respond efficiently to changing conditions, but they introduce variability that must be considered when interpreting sensory measurements. For example, a behavioral response may reflect both the integrity of a sensory pathway and the individual's attention, motivation, expectations, or ability to understand the task.

Computational models can help characterize

these processes by linking sensory inputs to neural responses and perceptual outcomes. Statistical learning can identify relationships between stimulus characteristics and behavioral performance, while neural network models can approximate selected aspects of sensory representation. However, artificial systems do not necessarily reproduce the biological mechanisms underlying human perception. Their outputs may be influenced by different computational principles, training procedures, and environmental assumptions. A comprehensive approach should therefore distinguish between models that predict sensory outcomes effectively and models that provide evidence about biological mechanisms. Integrating neurophysiology, behavioral testing, imaging, and computational analysis can strengthen this distinction and improve the development of technologies designed to assess or augment human sensory function.

Artificial Intelligence in Visual Assessment and Computer Vision

Artificial intelligence has substantially expanded the possibilities for quantitative visual assessment by enabling computational analysis of images, videos, and complex patterns that may be difficult to evaluate consistently through manual inspection. Computer vision systems use algorithms to identify objects, extract image features, classify patterns, and estimate spatial relationships. In

medicine, these methods are increasingly relevant to ophthalmology, neurology, radiology, dermatology, and rehabilitation. Their potential applications include the detection of retinal abnormalities, assessment of optic nerve changes, analysis of visual fields, measurement of eye movements, and evaluation of functional vision. By processing large volumes of data, AI systems can support reproducible measurements and identify features associated with disease, potentially improving screening and clinical monitoring.

Ophthalmic imaging represents an important application of intelligent visual analysis. Fundus photography provides images of the retina and optic disc, while optical coherence tomography (OCT) generates cross-sectional representations of retinal and optic nerve structures. Deep learning models can identify image patterns associated with diabetic retinopathy, glaucoma, age-related macular degeneration, and other ophthalmic conditions. Automated segmentation can quantify retinal layers, measure anatomical structures, and facilitate comparisons across repeated examinations. Such measurements may support the identification of structural changes and improve the efficiency of image interpretation. However, model performance can be affected by image quality, device characteristics, disease prevalence, demographic differences, and variation in acquisition protocols. External validation is therefore necessary before a model developed in one clinical

environment is used in another.

Visual field testing and eye movement analysis provide additional opportunities for intelligent assessment. Visual field measurements can identify areas of reduced sensitivity that may be associated with retinal disease, optic neuropathy, or neurological lesions. Computational methods can examine the spatial distribution of visual deficits, evaluate reliability indicators, and support longitudinal comparisons. Eye tracking can measure fixation stability, saccadic movements, smooth pursuit, and gaze patterns during visual tasks. These measurements may be relevant to disorders affecting ocular motor control, attention, and visual processing. Nevertheless, abnormal eye movement patterns are not specific to a single disease, and their interpretation requires consideration of age, medications, fatigue, and task characteristics.

Beyond clinical imaging, computer vision supports the development of assistive technologies for people with visual impairment. Wearable cameras and mobile devices can identify objects, recognize text, detect obstacles, and provide environmental descriptions through speech or other feedback mechanisms. These systems may improve access to information and facilitate independent navigation. Real-world performance, however, depends on lighting, camera positioning, environmental complexity, object visibility, and the reliability of recognition algorithms. Incorrect identification of hazards or failure to de-

tect important obstacles can create safety risks. Assistive systems should therefore communicate uncertainty appropriately and avoid presenting uncertain interpretations as verified facts.

Another emerging application involves assessing visual function through interactive digital tasks. Computational platforms can measure contrast sensitivity, visual attention, motion perception, reaction time, and selected aspects of visuospatial performance. Repeated assessments may help characterize functional changes that are not fully captured by structural imaging alone. Integration with clinical records and physiological measurements could further improve individualized monitoring. However, digital testing requires validation against established procedures and careful consideration of device specifications, viewing distance, ambient illumination, and accessibility.

The most effective applications of AI in visual assessment are those that address clearly defined clinical needs and demonstrate measurable benefits beyond conventional approaches. High classification accuracy alone does not establish that a system improves patient outcomes or reduces diagnostic errors. Evaluation should include calibration, sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, performance across demographic groups, and the consequences of false-positive and false-negative results. When integrated responsibly into clinical workflows, intelligent visual technologies can complement professional expertise, improve

measurement consistency, and support earlier recognition of conditions affecting visual function.

Intelligent Technologies for Somatosensory Assessment

Somatosensory function is essential for object manipulation, posture, locomotion, protective responses, and the perception of bodily states. Abnormalities in touch, vibration, temperature, proprioception, or pain can arise from peripheral nerve injury, diabetes, spinal cord lesions, stroke, neurodegenerative disorders, and other neurological or systemic conditions. Conventional assessment includes sensory examination, quantitative sensory testing, nerve conduction studies, and selected electrophysiological procedures. Although these methods provide important information, the results may depend on examiner technique, patient cooperation, stimulus characteristics, and the specific sensory domain being assessed. Intelligent technologies can complement established methods by standardizing stimulus delivery, quantifying responses, and integrating measurements across different sensory systems.

Wearable sensors provide opportunities to measure physical interactions between the body and its environment. Pressure sensors, accelerometers, gyroscopes, and flexible electronic devices can capture information about contact force, movement, limb orientation, and repetitive activity. When combined with computational models,

these signals may help identify abnormalities in motor behavior that are associated with impaired sensation or proprioception. For example, changes in movement smoothness, grip force, or corrective adjustments during object manipulation may provide indirect information about sensorimotor performance. However, these measures are not specific to sensory dysfunction because motor weakness, joint disease, fatigue, and cognitive impairment can produce similar patterns. Interpretation requires an integrated assessment of sensory and motor function.

Quantitative sensory testing can also benefit from automated stimulus presentation and response analysis. Computer-controlled devices can deliver standardized mechanical, thermal, or vibratory stimuli and record detection thresholds, pain ratings, and response consistency. Machine learning algorithms may identify combinations of sensory measurements that characterize particular patterns of sensory dysfunction. Such approaches could support more detailed phenotyping of patients with peripheral neuropathy, chronic pain, or altered sensory sensitivity. Nevertheless, sensory thresholds are influenced by attention, expectations, psychological factors, and the testing environment. Automated systems should therefore be evaluated for test-retest reliability, reproducibility, and agreement with established assessment procedures.

Intelligent tactile systems are particularly relevant

to prosthetics and assistive robotics. Artificial skin and tactile sensors can detect pressure, contact location, vibration, and selected mechanical properties. Computational models can convert these measurements into signals that control robotic actions or provide feedback to a user. In prosthetic systems, tactile feedback may help users regulate grip force and distinguish contact conditions, potentially improving object manipulation. Some approaches deliver information through vibration or electrical stimulation of the skin, while more advanced research investigates interfaces that interact with peripheral nerves. The effectiveness of these systems depends on feedback precision, user training, sensory discrimination, comfort, and long-term stability.

Somatosensory technologies may also contribute to rehabilitation following neurological injury. Sensor-equipped devices can record limb movement and task performance during repetitive training, allowing therapists to quantify progress and adjust interventions. Haptic systems can provide controlled tactile or force feedback during rehabilitation tasks, potentially encouraging active participation and improving task-specific learning. Intelligent algorithms may adapt task difficulty according to observed performance, although adaptation must be designed to maintain appropriate challenge without increasing discomfort or risk. Clinical effectiveness should be assessed through functional outcomes, patient-re-

ported measures, and sustained improvements rather than relying exclusively on device-generated performance scores.

Pain assessment is another important but complex application. Pain is a subjective experience influenced by sensory input, emotional state, attention, prior experience, and contextual factors. Physiological signals, facial movements, activity patterns, and behavioral responses may provide supplementary information when self-report is limited. Machine learning can identify associations between these measurements and pain-related outcomes, but such associations do not provide direct access to subjective experience. Systems should not be used to dismiss a patient's report or infer the absence of pain from a low algorithmic score. Responsible somatosensory assessment requires combining objective measurements with patient communication, clinical examination, and an understanding of the biological and psychosocial dimensions of sensory experience.

Multisensory Integration and Cross-Modal Perception

Multisensory integration refers to the neural processes through which information from different sensory modalities is combined to support perception, learning, decision-making, and action. In natural environments, the brain rarely relies on a single source of information. Visual observations may be combined with auditory cues to identify

an event, tactile signals may be integrated with vision to recognize an object, and proprioceptive information may be combined with visual input to estimate body position. The integration of these signals can improve perceptual accuracy when the modalities provide complementary information. However, combining sensory inputs is not always beneficial. When signals conflict, arrive at different times, or originate from different events, the nervous system must determine whether they should be treated as evidence about a common cause.

One influential computational perspective proposes that sensory integration depends partly on the reliability of available information. When two signals provide compatible information about the same event, the brain may assign greater weight to the more reliable signal while incorporating the contribution of the other modality. For example, visual information can influence estimates of object position when proprioceptive information is uncertain. Conversely, tactile or proprioceptive cues may become more influential when vision is unavailable or unreliable. This flexible weighting supports adaptation to changing environments and allows the nervous system to maintain useful estimates despite incomplete information. Nevertheless, sensory weighting varies across tasks, individuals, and contexts, and simple reliability-based models do not capture every aspect of multisensory perception.

Temporal and spatial correspondence are also important. Signals that occur close together in time and space are generally more likely to be interpreted as arising from the same event, although the relevant boundaries depend on the sensory modalities and task. A visual event and a tactile sensation may be integrated when they correspond in timing and location, but their combination may be reduced when the relationship becomes implausible. These processes are relevant to body ownership, spatial localization, and the perception of actions. They also explain why poorly synchronized sensory feedback can interfere with the operation of prosthetic devices, virtual environments, and other interactive technologies.

Intelligent systems can use computational approaches to approximate selected principles of multisensory integration. Sensor fusion algorithms combine information from cameras, microphones, inertial sensors, tactile arrays, and other sources to estimate environmental conditions. In robotics, combining visual and tactile measurements can improve object recognition and manipulation, particularly when objects are partially obscured or their physical properties cannot be determined from appearance alone. In assistive technologies, integrating camera-based scene analysis with distance sensors and auditory feedback can support environmental awareness. The effectiveness of these systems depends on accurate synchronization, appropriate uncertainty

estimates, and the ability to distinguish complementary signals from contradictory or irrelevant information.

Multisensory integration is also relevant to virtual and augmented reality. Visual displays, spatial audio, tactile feedback, and motion tracking can create interactive experiences that simulate aspects of real-world perception. Such technologies are being investigated for rehabilitation, motor training, clinical education, and the management of selected sensory or neurological conditions. However, discrepancies between visual motion and vestibular information can contribute to discomfort or motion sickness, while inconsistent tactile feedback may reduce immersion or impair task performance. Intelligent systems can potentially reduce these problems by monitoring movement, adjusting sensory feedback, and maintaining temporal consistency across modalities.

Clinical applications require careful distinction between normal multisensory variation and clinically meaningful dysfunction. Changes in sensory integration may occur in neurological disorders, aging, developmental conditions, vestibular disease, and following sensory loss. Yet abnormalities in laboratory tasks do not necessarily translate directly into everyday disability. Assessment should therefore incorporate functional measures, relevant clinical findings, and validated procedures. Integrating neuroscience with computational sensor fusion may improve understand-

ing of how sensory information is weighted and combined, while providing practical methods for designing systems that respond more effectively to human perceptual needs.

Personalized Rehabilitation and Assistive Sensory Technologies

Sensory impairment can restrict mobility, communication, self-care, occupational participation, and social engagement. Rehabilitation seeks to restore function where possible, develop compensatory strategies, and improve independence when complete recovery is unlikely. Intelligent technologies can support these objectives by quantifying functional limitations, adapting training tasks, and delivering sensory information through alternative pathways. Their potential applications include visual rehabilitation, tactile feedback systems, sensory substitution, prosthetic control, balance training, and digital interventions designed to improve perceptual or sensorimotor performance. Personalized approaches are particularly important because sensory impairments vary in their underlying mechanisms, severity, progression, and functional consequences.

Visual rehabilitation can incorporate eye tracking, digital exercises, adaptive displays, and computer-based assessments. Depending on the clinical condition, technologies may support compensatory scanning strategies, visual attention training, or access to information through enlarged text, con-

trast enhancement, and speech output. Intelligent systems can monitor performance and adjust selected task parameters according to predefined criteria. However, rehabilitation programs must be matched to the underlying impairment, and improvements on trained exercises should not automatically be interpreted as generalized functional recovery. Controlled studies are needed to determine whether specific interventions produce meaningful benefits in everyday activities.

Sensory substitution provides another approach by translating information from one modality into a different sensory format. For example, visual scene information can be converted into auditory descriptions or tactile patterns, allowing users to access selected environmental features through hearing or touch. Camera-based systems may identify obstacles, text, or objects and communicate the results through structured feedback. These systems can potentially improve environmental awareness, but they require learning and may impose additional cognitive demands. Their effectiveness depends on the relevance of the transmitted information, the complexity of the environment, the user's sensory abilities, and the reliability of the recognition system. Sensory substitution should therefore be considered a complementary tool rather than an automatic replacement for biological vision.

In prosthetic and robotic applications, intelligent control can integrate residual sensory informa-

tion with artificial tactile feedback. Sensorized prostheses may detect contact forces and convert them into visual, auditory, or tactile cues that help users regulate movement. More advanced approaches investigate direct stimulation of peripheral nerves to create sensations associated with the prosthetic limb. Such systems may improve control and embodiment, although the results depend on the stability of stimulation, the quality of sensory encoding, and individual differences in neural responses. Clinical implementation requires attention to comfort, safety, durability, user preferences, and long-term functional outcomes.

Rehabilitation can also benefit from technologies that combine movement tracking with sensory feedback. Virtual environments can provide visual and auditory cues during balance or coordination exercises, while wearable sensors record body movement and task performance. Algorithms may adapt the difficulty of exercises according to observed progress, potentially supporting individualized training. However, excessive automation may reduce therapist oversight or introduce inappropriate challenges if measurements are inaccurate. Rehabilitation professionals should retain control over treatment goals, progression, and responses to adverse events.

The evaluation of intelligent rehabilitation technologies should extend beyond technical performance. Relevant outcomes include independence in daily activities, participation, comfort, adherence,

quality of life, and sustained functional improvement. Studies should compare new systems with appropriate standard care, identify which patient groups are most likely to benefit, and assess cost-effectiveness and accessibility. Technologies that require expensive equipment, reliable internet access, or extensive technical support may be difficult to implement in underserved settings. Designing systems around user needs, affordability, and clinical evidence will be essential for translating sensory technology research into equitable and meaningful improvements in patient care.

AI-Enhanced Optical Coherence Tomography and OCT Angiography for Quantitative Assessment of Retinal and Choroidal Structure and Perfusion

The retina is a highly organised neural tissue in which structural integrity and vascular supply are closely linked to visual function. Optical coherence tomography (OCT) has transformed the assessment of this tissue by enabling non-invasive, cross-sectional visualisation of retinal and choroidal structures at micrometre-scale resolution. The subsequent development of OCT angiography (OCTA) extended this capability by providing depth-resolved visualisation of retinal and choroidal microvasculature without the need for intravenous contrast. Together, these modalities provide a growing range of quantita-

tive biomarkers, including retinal layer thickness, choroidal thickness, vessel and perfusion density, foveal avascular zone characteristics, and features of the choroidal vasculature.

Extracting reliable information from these increasingly complex datasets, however, remains challenging. Conventional analysis depends heavily on automated or semi-automated segmentation, and errors become more frequent when image quality is reduced or normal retinal anatomy is disrupted by pathology. OCTA introduces additional problems, including motion and projection artefacts, segmentation-dependent variability, and differences in image processing between devices. These limitations are particularly important when relatively small structural or vascular changes are being investigated, as measurement errors can obscure genuine biological effects.

Artificial intelligence (AI), particularly deep learning, offers an alternative approach to several of these analytical problems. Rather than relying exclusively on predefined image-processing rules, deep neural networks can learn complex image features directly from annotated data. In OCT, these methods have been used to segment retinal layers and pathological features and support disease classification and referral decisions. For example, a two-stage deep-learning framework was developed that first generated tissue segmentation maps from three-dimensional OCT volumes

and subsequently used these representations to provide diagnostic and referral recommendations across a range of retinal disorders. More recent approaches have expanded automated segmentation to increasingly complex retinal structures and pathological features, although performance remains sensitive to image quality, pathology, and the characteristics of the training dataset.

AI has potential in OCTA, where vascular networks contain spatial information that may not be adequately represented by a small number of conventional summary measures. Algorithms have been developed for image quality assessment, vascular segmentation, artefact reduction, perfusion quantification, and the identification of pathological vascular patterns. Automated analysis may therefore allow vascular information to be characterised more consistently across retinal plexuses and, potentially, at a level of complexity that is difficult to achieve through manual assessment alone. Similar developments are emerging in choroidal OCT analysis, including automated delineation of choroidal boundaries, vascular segmentation, and quantification of choroidal structural biomarkers.

Importantly, strong algorithmic performance does not necessarily translate into clinical reliability. Many existing models have been developed using relatively small or homogeneous datasets, and external validation across populations,

devices, and clinical settings remains limited. Differences in acquisition protocols, segmentation definitions, and reference standards further complicate comparisons between studies. Explainability is another concern, particularly when an algorithm produces a diagnostic output without indicating which anatomical or vascular features influenced the decision.

The next stage of development is therefore likely to involve more than improving classification accuracy. Integrating structural OCT, OCTA-derived vascular information, and other functional or clinical measures could provide a more complete representation of retinal and choroidal responses in health and disease. With robust external validation and greater standardisation, intelligent image analysis has the potential to move OCT and OCTA from predominantly descriptive imaging tools towards more reproducible, quantitative approaches for investigating retinal and choroidal structure, perfusion, and their relationships with visual function.

Challenges in Validation, Ethics, and Clinical Implementation

Despite rapid technological progress, integrating intelligent systems with sensory processing presents substantial methodological and clinical challenges. One major limitation is the variability of sensory data across individuals, devices, and environments. Visual images may differ accord-

ing to camera specifications, illumination, image compression, and acquisition protocols. Somatosensory measurements can vary with stimulus intensity, electrode placement, skin characteristics, patient attention, and examiner procedures. Multisensory systems introduce further complexity because signals must be synchronized and interpreted according to their reliability and relevance. These sources of variability can reduce model performance when algorithms are transferred from controlled research environments to routine clinical practice.

Dataset quality and representativeness are central to reliable model development. If training datasets contain mostly individuals from a limited demographic group or a single clinical center, the resulting algorithms may perform less effectively in other populations. This concern is particularly important for sensory assessment because age, language, education, disability, and cultural experience can influence behavioral responses and technology use. Developers should evaluate performance across relevant groups, examine the distribution of errors, and report limitations transparently. External validation using independent datasets is essential for determining whether observed performance generalizes beyond the original development setting.

Another challenge is distinguishing prediction from biological explanation. An algorithm may identify visual or tactile patterns associated with

a clinical outcome without revealing the mechanisms responsible for that association. For example, a model could classify patients partly through differences in image acquisition or behavioral response patterns rather than through the intended disease-related features. Explainability methods can help identify influential variables, but they do not automatically establish causality or guarantee that a model's reasoning is clinically appropriate. Robust evaluation should include comparisons with established methods, sensitivity analyses, calibration, and examination of potential confounding factors.

Ethical considerations include privacy, informed consent, data security, accessibility, and the responsible use of sensitive physiological information. Cameras, wearable sensors, and neural recording systems may collect information about individuals and their environments beyond the immediate purpose of an assessment. Data collection should be proportionate to the clinical objective, and users should receive understandable information about how their data will be stored, analyzed, and shared. Assistive systems must also be designed to avoid increasing existing inequalities. People with disabilities should be involved in development and evaluation to ensure that technologies address practical needs rather than relying exclusively on technical performance metrics.

Clinical integration requires attention to workflow, training, accountability, and regulatory re-

quirements. Healthcare professionals need clear information about the intended use of a system, the populations in which it has been validated, its limitations, and the uncertainty of its outputs. Systems should support clinical judgment rather than encourage uncritical acceptance of algorithmic recommendations. Prospective studies should examine whether implementation improves diagnostic accuracy, rehabilitation outcomes, patient experience, or healthcare efficiency. Post-deployment monitoring is also necessary to identify performance deterioration, unexpected errors, and changes in the population or environment.

Future progress will depend on collaboration among sensory neuroscientists, clinicians, engineers, data scientists, rehabilitation specialists, ethicists, and technology users. Research priorities include developing standardized assessment protocols, improving multimodal data integration, establishing clinically meaningful endpoints, and evaluating performance in diverse real-world settings. By combining biological understanding with responsible computational development, intelligent technologies can contribute to more accurate sensory assessment, improved rehabilitation, and better human interaction with digital and physical environments.

Future Directions and Conclusion

The integration of sensory processing with intelligent technologies is creating new opportunities to

investigate perception, quantify sensory dysfunction, and develop systems that adapt to human capabilities. Advances in AI, computer vision, wearable electronics, tactile sensing, robotics, and multimodal modeling are enabling more detailed analysis of visual and somatosensory information. These developments may improve early identification of sensory abnormalities, support individualized monitoring, and expand access to assistive technologies. Nevertheless, meaningful progress will require a shift from demonstrating technical feasibility toward establishing clinical value, biological relevance, usability, and long-term effectiveness.

One promising direction is the development of personalized sensory models that incorporate an individual's baseline measurements, clinical history, environmental conditions, and changes over time. Rather than applying a single reference threshold to every patient, such models could help identify deviations from an individual's usual functioning. Longitudinal measurements may be particularly useful for detecting gradual changes in visual performance, sensory thresholds, or sensorimotor behavior. However, individualized approaches must be validated against clinically meaningful outcomes and designed to distinguish genuine deterioration from normal measurement variability.

Another priority is improving the integration of complementary sensory modalities. Systems that

combine vision, touch, proprioception, hearing, and movement information may provide more reliable estimates of environmental conditions and human behavior than systems relying on a single input source. These capabilities could support adaptive prostheses, assistive navigation, rehabilitation, and advanced human-robot interaction. Future systems should explicitly represent uncertainty, recognize when sensory inputs conflict, and avoid producing confident outputs when the available evidence is insufficient. Improved synchronization and robust sensor fusion will be essential for safe operation in dynamic environments.

Advances in computational neuroscience may also help bridge the gap between artificial prediction and biological understanding. Models that incorporate established principles of sensory coding, adaptation, attention, and multisensory integration could provide testable hypotheses about how neural systems process information. Combining these models with neurophysiological recordings and behavioral experiments may improve the interpretation of computational findings. However, biological plausibility should be evaluated empirically rather than assumed from architectural similarities between artificial and biological neural networks.

Clinical translation should remain a central objective. Future research should prioritize prospective validation, transparent reporting, representative

populations, and comparisons with established standards of care. Studies should assess not only sensitivity, specificity, and predictive accuracy but also functional independence, quality of life, accessibility, cost-effectiveness, and patient satisfaction. Ethical governance, data protection, and meaningful participation by individuals with sensory impairments should be incorporated throughout the development process.

In conclusion, integrating sensory processing with intelligent technologies offers substantial opportunities to advance visual assessment, somatosensory evaluation, multisensory integration, and personalized rehabilitation. These approaches can improve the measurement and interpretation of complex sensory information while supporting the development of more adaptive and accessible assistive systems. Their success, however, will depend on scientific rigor, clinical validation, equitable implementation, and appropriate human oversight. By integrating neuroscience, medicine, engineering, and computational intelligence, researchers can develop technologies that not only process sensory data more effectively but also contribute to safer, more independent, and higher-quality lives for individuals with sensory and neurological impairments.

4. INTEGRATING AUDITORY FUNCTION WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR HEARING ASSESSMENT, AUDIOMETRY, AND AUDITORY REHABILITATION

Background

Hearing is one of the primary channels through which people connect with language, relationships, and the surrounding environment, yet it is also one of the most commonly impaired senses. According to the World Health Organization, roughly one in five people worldwide currently lives with some degree of hearing loss, and more than 430 million people have disabling hearing loss severe enough to require rehabilitation.

For decades, the core tools of audiology have depended on trained specialists working through largely manual, time-consuming protocols, including pure-tone audiometry, speech-in-noise testing, otoscopic examination, and the manual programming of hearing aids or cochlear implants. Interpreting an audiogram, choosing appropriate masking levels, and fine-tuning a device all rely on clinical judgment, which can vary from one practitioner to another. These limitations have encouraged the development of technologies designed to expand access to hearing care, improve consistency in testing, and reduce the bur-

den on a limited specialist workforce while maintaining diagnostic accuracy.

Over the past decade, machine learning and deep learning methods have progressed beyond proof-of-concept studies and are increasingly being incorporated into hearing assessment. In a scoping review covering 104 studies published between 1990 and 2024, Frosolini et al. found that more than 87% of this body of literature had appeared in just the preceding four years, highlighting how quickly the field has advanced. Their review mapped a broad range of applications: statistical and machine learning models, including support vector machines, random forests, and neural networks, are now being used to automate pure-tone and bone-conduction audiometry and predict clinical outcomes, while convolutional neural networks trained on radiological and otoscopic images are being evaluated as aids for detecting ear disease. Shim et al. provide a concrete example of the latter: after training several convolutional neural network architectures on more than a thousand pediatric otoscopic images, their best-performing model correctly classified otitis media with effusion at a substantially higher rate than the seven otolaryngologists who reviewed the same image set. A growing number of smartphone- and web-based hearing tests, some incorporating machine learning to score results, have been developed to enable screening without

an in-person visit, although Irace et al. caution that only a small fraction of the many available applications have undergone rigorous validation against standard audiometric testing. Beyond automating existing tests, these developments are expanding the settings in which hearing assessment can be performed and increasing access to screening outside traditional clinics.

AI is also influencing auditory rehabilitation after hearing loss has been identified. Modern cochlear implants and hearing aids increasingly rely on adaptive, data-driven signal processing rather than fixed factory settings. Zhang et al. describe how AI-enabled cochlear implant systems can adjust their sound-processing strategies in real time, using algorithms trained to separate speech from competing background noise and estimate high-frequency information that would otherwise be lost. These capabilities improve speech intelligibility in crowded, multi-talker environments, which conventional processors often handle poorly. Similar advances have been reported for hearing aids. Tasnim describes a range of machine learning techniques, from Bayesian and reinforcement learning methods to deep neural networks, that allow a device's amplification and noise-reduction settings to be tailored to an individual listener's environment and preferences, often refined remotely through ongoing usage data rather than through a single in-clinic fitting appointment.

Varshney et al. extend this picture further by describing adaptive auditory training programs, immersive simulation-based rehabilitation, and remote monitoring platforms that allow clinicians to track patients' real-world listening performance over time and adjust rehabilitation plans accordingly. Together, these developments reflect a transition from one-time device fitting toward continuous, data-informed rehabilitation that can be adapted as patients' listening needs change. Despite these advances, several challenges continue to limit the clinical adoption of AI in audiology. Varshney et al. identify several as central to the field. Many of the models described above were trained on datasets that are neither large nor demographically diverse, raising important questions about whether their performance will remain consistent across different populations, ear anatomies, and recording conditions outside the original study settings. Deep learning models, particularly the neural networks used for image-based diagnosis, are also notoriously difficult to interpret, complicating their use in settings where clinicians need to understand and justify diagnostic decisions rather than simply defer to an algorithm's output. Regulatory pathways for AI-based medical devices are still being established in most jurisdictions, and questions about algorithmic bias and the privacy of sensitive audiological and health data remain largely unresolved. Although these challenges are shared across many areas of AI-enabled

healthcare, they are particularly important in audiology, where diagnostic errors or suboptimal device programming can have immediate consequences for communication and quality of life.

Neurobiological Foundations of Auditory Function

Auditory function begins when sound waves enter the external ear and travel through the ear canal toward the tympanic membrane. Vibrations of the tympanic membrane are transmitted through the ossicles of the middle ear to the oval window of the cochlea. Within the cochlea, mechanical energy produces fluid movements that displace the basilar membrane and stimulate sensory hair cells. Inner hair cells convert mechanical stimulation into electrical signals that activate auditory nerve fibers, while outer hair cells contribute to cochlear amplification and frequency selectivity. This process allows the auditory system to encode important acoustic characteristics, including frequency, intensity, and temporal structure. Damage to the sensory hair cells, auditory nerve, or other components of the peripheral auditory system can disrupt sound detection and discrimination, resulting in different forms and degrees of hearing impairment.

Auditory information travels through the cochlear nuclei, superior olivary complex, lateral lemniscus, inferior colliculus, and medial geniculate

body before reaching the auditory cortex. These interconnected structures participate in the analysis of sound timing, intensity, frequency, spatial location, and complex acoustic patterns. The auditory cortex contributes to higher-level processes involved in speech perception, auditory object recognition, and the interpretation of meaningful sounds. Auditory processing also involves interactions with attention, memory, language, and executive function. Consequently, the ability to understand speech depends not only on the audibility of individual sounds but also on the brain's capacity to organize acoustic information, distinguish relevant signals from competing sounds, and interpret linguistic content.

Several physiological mechanisms are particularly important for understanding auditory function. Tonotopic organization refers to the systematic representation of sound frequencies along the basilar membrane and within central auditory pathways. Temporal coding enables the auditory system to represent changes in sound amplitude and timing, which are important for speech perception and sound localization. Binaural processing combines information from both ears to support spatial hearing and improve the detection of relevant sounds in complex environments. Auditory adaptation and selective attention further influence how the nervous system responds to repeated stimulation and prioritizes behavior-

ally important signals. These mechanisms provide biological foundations for computational models designed to analyze auditory signals or reproduce aspects of human hearing.

Auditory dysfunction can occur at different levels of the auditory pathway. Conductive hearing loss generally results from abnormalities affecting sound transmission through the external or middle ear, whereas sensorineural hearing loss commonly involves cochlear or auditory neural dysfunction. Mixed hearing loss contains both conductive and sensorineural components. Central auditory processing difficulties can affect the interpretation of auditory information even when peripheral hearing sensitivity does not fully explain the reported problems. Tinnitus involves the perception of sound without a corresponding external acoustic source and may be associated with multiple auditory, neural, and psychological mechanisms. Because these conditions have different underlying causes and clinical implications, intelligent diagnostic systems must distinguish between measurable auditory features and the broader clinical processes that generate them.

Computational auditory models can represent selected aspects of cochlear filtering, auditory nerve responses, binaural processing, and speech perception. These models can be combined with statistical learning to examine relationships between acoustic characteristics, physiological measure-

ments, and clinical outcomes. However, biological plausibility and predictive accuracy are distinct objectives. A model may accurately classify an audiological condition without reproducing its underlying neural mechanisms. Conversely, a biologically informed model may offer useful explanatory insights but insufficient predictive performance for individual diagnosis. Integrating physiological knowledge with empirical validation is therefore essential for developing intelligent systems that are both scientifically informative and clinically useful.

Artificial Intelligence in Hearing Assessment and Diagnostic Audiology

Artificial intelligence offers opportunities to improve hearing assessment by analyzing complex audiological measurements and supporting the identification of auditory abnormalities. Traditional diagnostic procedures provide standardized information about hearing thresholds, middle ear function, cochlear activity, neural conduction, and speech recognition. AI systems can complement these methods by identifying combinations of findings that may be difficult to evaluate consistently through manual interpretation. Applications include automated classification of audiograms, analysis of speech recognition patterns, interpretation of otoacoustic emissions, and support for selected electrophysiological in-

vestigations. These systems may help standardize reporting, reduce repetitive analytical tasks, and facilitate clinical prioritization when large numbers of patients require assessment.

Pure-tone audiometry remains a central method for measuring hearing sensitivity across selected frequencies. An audiogram summarizes the minimum sound levels at which a person responds to tones under specified testing conditions. Computational systems can analyze audiometric configurations, examine asymmetry between ears, and identify patterns that warrant further investigation. Machine learning models may classify audiograms into broad categories associated with different hearing profiles, potentially supporting clinical triage and decision-making. However, audiogram classification alone cannot establish the underlying cause of hearing loss. Similar patterns can arise from different diseases, and accurate diagnosis may require otoscopy, tympanometry, clinical history, imaging, laboratory investigations, or specialist assessment. AI-based interpretation should therefore complement rather than replace comprehensive audiological evaluation.

Otoacoustic emissions provide information about cochlear outer hair cell function and are widely used in newborn hearing screening and selected diagnostic settings. Automated algorithms can evaluate emission amplitude, signal-

to-noise ratios, frequency-specific characteristics, and measurement quality. These methods may support consistent interpretation and facilitate the identification of recordings requiring repeat testing or further assessment. Nevertheless, otoacoustic emissions can be affected by middle ear conditions, environmental noise, probe placement, and recording quality. An absent emission does not independently establish the degree or type of hearing loss, while a present emission does not exclude every form of auditory dysfunction. Intelligent systems must incorporate these limitations into their outputs.

Auditory brainstem response testing and related electrophysiological methods provide information about neural responses to sound. Recorded waveforms contain time-dependent components that reflect activity along portions of the auditory pathway. Machine learning can be used to classify waveform patterns, estimate selected response characteristics, and assist with the identification of recordings that require expert review. Such approaches may be particularly useful when behavioral testing is difficult, including assessments involving infants or individuals unable to provide reliable responses. However, electrophysiological interpretation requires attention to stimulus parameters, electrode configuration, noise, physiological variability, and clinical context. Algorithms should be validated against appropriate

reference standards before they influence diagnostic decisions.

AI can also support differential assessment by combining multiple sources of information. A system could integrate audiometric thresholds, speech recognition scores, tympanometric findings, otoacoustic emissions, electrophysiological results, age, symptoms, and relevant medical history to identify patterns associated with particular auditory conditions. Multimodal models may provide a more comprehensive representation than approaches based on individual measurements. However, combining more variables does not automatically improve clinical performance. Poor-quality data, correlated predictors, missing observations, and differences between clinical populations can reduce reliability. Transparent model development and independent validation are therefore necessary.

The clinical value of intelligent hearing assessment should be evaluated using measures that extend beyond classification accuracy. Sensitivity, specificity, calibration, predictive values, reproducibility, and performance across demographic groups are important. Studies should also examine whether AI improves referral decisions, reduces unnecessary testing, accelerates diagnosis, or increases access to appropriate care. By integrating computational analysis with established audiological procedures, intelligent assessment

systems may help improve efficiency and consistency while maintaining the diagnostic expertise required for safe and effective hearing healthcare.

Intelligent Audiometry and Automated Hearing Testing

Audiometry is essential for determining hearing sensitivity, characterizing hearing loss, and guiding decisions about further investigations and rehabilitation. Conventional pure-tone audiometry typically requires specialized equipment, a suitable testing environment, trained personnel, and active participation from the person being assessed. These requirements can restrict access in rural communities, resource-limited settings, and situations where specialist services are unavailable. Intelligent audiometry aims to address some of these limitations through automated testing protocols, adaptive algorithms, digital interfaces, and remote assessment technologies. When appropriately validated, these approaches may increase the accessibility and efficiency of hearing screening and selected forms of diagnostic testing.

Automated audiometry systems can use predefined algorithms to adjust stimulus intensity according to the individual's responses. Depending on the testing protocol, these procedures can estimate hearing thresholds without requiring an examiner to manually control every stimulus. Adaptive methods may reduce testing time by

concentrating measurements around levels that are informative for threshold estimation. Computerized systems can also record responses automatically, apply standardized procedures, and generate preliminary audiograms. Nevertheless, threshold estimates remain sensitive to environmental noise, equipment calibration, patient understanding, response consistency, and the specific algorithm employed. Automated results must therefore be interpreted according to the validation evidence and intended use of the system.

Machine learning may support adaptive audiometry by identifying testing conditions that improve efficiency while preserving measurement accuracy. Algorithms can evaluate response patterns, estimate uncertainty, and determine when additional measurements are necessary. Some approaches may use prior information to guide the sequence of frequencies or stimulus levels tested, although such strategies must avoid introducing systematic bias into threshold estimation. A key requirement is that the testing procedure remains sufficiently standardized to permit comparison with established audiometric methods. Any reduction in testing time should be evaluated alongside agreement with reference measurements, repeatability, and the frequency of unreliable results.

Smartphone-based and web-based audiometry offer additional opportunities to expand access to hearing assessment. Depending on the system,

testing may be performed using calibrated headphones, compatible devices, or specialized accessories. Results can be transmitted to clinicians for review, supporting screening and remote monitoring. However, ordinary consumer headphones and uncontrolled environments may produce unreliable measurements if device output levels are not adequately calibrated. Background noise can mask test tones, and differences in hardware can alter stimulus presentation. Remote audiometry should therefore incorporate appropriate calibration procedures, environmental checks, clear instructions, and mechanisms for identifying invalid or uncertain results.

Automated audiometry may be particularly valuable for population-level screening, workplace hearing conservation, and preliminary assessment in primary care. Digital systems can facilitate standardized data collection and identify individuals who may benefit from comprehensive diagnostic evaluation. In pediatric settings, engaging interfaces may improve participation, although children's developmental stage, attention, and comprehension must be considered. In older adults, visual, motor, cognitive, or technological limitations may influence usability. Systems should therefore be designed with accessible interfaces and alternative testing pathways for individuals who cannot complete automated procedures reliably.

Clinical implementation requires a clear distinction between screening and diagnostic audiometry. Screening tools identify individuals who may have hearing impairment and generally require confirmatory assessment when results are abnormal or uncertain. Diagnostic procedures provide more detailed information to support clinical characterization and management. An automated system should communicate which purpose it serves and avoid presenting a screening result as a definitive diagnosis. Validation studies should compare the system with appropriate reference methods across relevant populations and settings. With these safeguards, intelligent audiometry can contribute to earlier identification, broader access to hearing assessment, and more efficient allocation of audiological services.

Deep Learning for Speech Perception and Auditory Signal Processing

Speech perception involves the extraction of meaningful linguistic information from rapidly changing acoustic signals. The auditory system must identify speech sounds, track temporal and spectral patterns, distinguish speakers, and interpret words and sentences despite variation in accent, speaking rate, background noise, and recording conditions. These challenges become more pronounced for individuals with hearing impairment, particularly in environments containing competing voices or other distracting sounds. Intelligent signal-processing systems can support speech perception by enhancing relevant acoustic information, suppressing noise, and adapting sound presentation to different listening conditions. Their development draws on digital signal processing, machine learning, deep neural networks, and computational models of auditory perception.

Traditional noise-reduction techniques often rely on statistical assumptions about speech and background noise. These methods can improve intelligibility under some conditions but may introduce distortions when the acoustic environment differs from the assumptions used by the algorithm. Deep learning models can learn complex relationships between noisy and cleaner speech signals using representative training data. Depending on their design, these systems may estimate clean speech waveforms, separate target speakers from competing sources, or identify time-frequency regions associated with relevant speech. Their performance depends on the quality and diversity of training data, the acoustic characteristics of the environment, and the computational resources available for real-time processing.

Speech enhancement is particularly relevant to hearing aids and other assistive listening devices. Conventional hearing aids amplify sound according to an individual's audiological profile,

while advanced systems may incorporate directional microphones, feedback cancellation, adaptive noise reduction, and scene classification. AI-enabled hearing devices can potentially distinguish speech from background sounds and adjust processing according to the estimated listening environment. However, aggressive noise suppression may remove useful speech information or distort environmental cues. A system optimized for a narrow range of acoustic conditions may perform poorly in unfamiliar settings, making real-world testing essential.

Speaker separation and auditory scene analysis represent related challenges. In crowded environments, listeners must identify a target voice while suppressing competing speech, a task often described as the cocktail party problem. Computational systems can use spatial information, speaker characteristics, and temporal patterns to isolate selected sound sources. These capabilities may improve access to conversation for people with hearing impairment, although errors can occur when speakers overlap, move, or share similar acoustic characteristics. In clinical applications, the ability to separate a target speaker must be balanced against the need to preserve natural sound quality and awareness of other relevant environmental sounds.

Automatic speech recognition and natural language processing may provide additional support

for individuals with hearing difficulties. Real-time captioning, speech-to-text conversion, and conversational transcription can improve access to spoken communication in educational, professional, and healthcare settings. Such technologies may also support clinical documentation and communication when speech perception is limited. However, recognition errors can arise from accents, low-quality recordings, technical terminology, rapid speech, and overlapping speakers. In medical contexts, incorrect transcription of medication names, symptoms, or instructions may have serious consequences. Systems should therefore communicate uncertainty and allow users to review or correct important information.

Evaluation of intelligent auditory processing requires metrics that reflect both acoustic and perceptual performance. Signal-to-noise ratio improvement and waveform-based measures can provide useful technical information, but they do not always correspond closely to speech intelligibility or listening effort. Subjective assessments, speech recognition tests, patient-reported outcomes, and real-world communication measures are also important. Studies should include listeners with different degrees and types of hearing loss because algorithms may affect these groups differently. The objective is not simply to produce a cleaner acoustic signal but to improve meaningful

communication while preserving comfort, sound quality, environmental awareness, and user control.

Intelligent Hearing Aids and Cochlear Implant Technologies

Hearing aids and cochlear implants are important interventions for individuals with hearing impairment, although they operate through different mechanisms. Hearing aids amplify and process acoustic signals to make sounds more accessible to the residual auditory system. Cochlear implants bypass damaged cochlear sensory structures by converting acoustic information into electrical stimulation patterns delivered to the auditory nerve through an implanted electrode array. Both technologies require careful fitting, programming, and follow-up, and their effectiveness varies according to auditory status, anatomy, duration of hearing loss, neural integrity, prior experience, and rehabilitation. Intelligent technologies are increasingly being investigated to improve device configuration, sound processing, adaptation, and monitoring of outcomes.

Modern hearing aids may incorporate directional microphones, multichannel amplification, feedback control, adaptive noise reduction, and wireless connectivity. AI-based systems can potentially classify acoustic scenes and adjust processing to improve access to speech under different listening

conditions. For example, a device may estimate whether a user is participating in a conversation, listening to a single speaker, or moving through a noisy environment. These estimates can inform changes in microphone directionality, gain, or noise-reduction settings. However, automatic adjustments may not always match the user's preferences or communication goals. Systems should allow appropriate user control and avoid reducing awareness of alarms, traffic, or other important environmental sounds.

Personalized hearing aid fitting can also benefit from computational analysis. Traditional fitting procedures use audiometric thresholds, prescriptive targets, real-ear measurements, and patient feedback to guide amplification. Intelligent systems may help identify settings associated with improved speech recognition or reduced listening effort, potentially supporting more efficient fine-tuning. Nevertheless, algorithmic recommendations should be evaluated against established fitting standards and verified using objective and subjective measurements. A model that predicts preferred settings in one group may not generalize to individuals with different auditory profiles or listening needs.

Cochlear implant programming involves selecting parameters that determine how acoustic information is translated into electrical stimulation. These parameters can influence loudness perception,

frequency representation, speech understanding, and comfort. Computational methods may assist clinicians in analyzing electrode responses, estimating useful stimulation ranges, and identifying patterns associated with performance. Machine learning may also help investigate relationships between clinical characteristics, programming choices, and speech recognition outcomes. However, implant programming remains individualized, and current evidence must support any proposed automation before it is used to guide clinical decisions. Biological variability and the complexity of auditory neural responses limit the extent to which a single predictive model can determine optimal settings for every recipient.

Remote connectivity and device telemetry offer further opportunities for personalized hearing care. Compatible devices may provide information about wearing time, environmental sound exposure, program use, or selected performance indicators. These data can help clinicians understand device use outside the clinic and identify situations in which additional support may be useful. Remote adjustment may also reduce the need for travel in some circumstances. However, device-generated indicators should not be treated as complete measures of hearing ability or communication success. Privacy, data security, connectivity, and access to technical support must be considered.

The success of hearing technologies depends on more than signal processing or device performance. Appropriate counseling, auditory training, communication strategies, maintenance, and ongoing clinical follow-up are important components of care. Intelligent systems should therefore be integrated into broader rehabilitation pathways rather than viewed as isolated technological solutions. Evaluation should include speech understanding, listening effort, patient satisfaction, participation, and quality of life. Combining adaptive sound processing with individualized clinical care may improve outcomes, provided that device recommendations are supported by reliable evidence and remain responsive to patient preferences.

Auditory Rehabilitation and Personalized Listening Training

Auditory rehabilitation aims to improve communication, functional listening, and participation among individuals experiencing hearing difficulties. It may include hearing technology fitting, auditory training, communication strategies, counseling, environmental modification, and support for family members or communication partners. Rehabilitation needs differ according to age, hearing status, cognitive abilities, language background, personal goals, and the listening environments encountered in daily life. Intelligent

technologies can support personalized rehabilitation by adapting exercises, tracking performance, providing immediate feedback, and facilitating access to training outside conventional clinical appointments.

Computer-based auditory training can target sound discrimination, speech recognition, temporal processing, speaker identification, and understanding speech in noise. Exercises may vary in difficulty according to the individual's performance, allowing repeated practice at an appropriate level. Machine learning algorithms can potentially identify patterns of errors and select subsequent tasks that address specific difficulties. For example, a program may adjust speech rate, background noise, or acoustic contrast according to performance during training. Such adaptation may improve engagement and make exercises more relevant to individual needs, although its effectiveness depends on the quality of the training design and the relationship between trained tasks and everyday communication.

Auditory training may be relevant to adults using hearing aids or cochlear implants, children developing auditory and language skills, and individuals with selected central auditory processing difficulties. However, evidence of improvement on a trained exercise does not necessarily demonstrate broader functional benefit. Transfer to unfamiliar speakers, different accents, natural

conversations, and noisy real-world environments must be assessed. Rehabilitation studies should therefore include validated speech perception measures, patient-reported outcomes, and follow-up assessments to determine whether improvements persist over time.

Teleaudiology and mobile rehabilitation platforms can improve access to follow-up care and structured training. Digital tools may deliver exercises, collect performance data, provide educational resources, and facilitate communication with clinicians. These approaches can be particularly useful for individuals who live far from specialist services or face mobility and transportation barriers. However, access to reliable devices, internet connectivity, technical literacy, and suitable training environments varies. Digital programs should offer accessible interfaces, clear instructions, and alternatives for individuals who cannot use remote technologies independently.

Personalized rehabilitation should also address the cognitive and psychosocial demands associated with hearing impairment. Difficulties understanding speech may increase listening effort, contribute to fatigue, and affect social participation. Counseling can help individuals develop realistic expectations, use communication strategies, and manage challenging listening environments. Family members and communication partners may benefit from guidance on speaking clearly, redu-

cing background noise, and maintaining effective conversational interaction. Intelligent technologies can support these activities through educational applications and contextual feedback, but they cannot replace the interpersonal components of rehabilitation.

Clinical evaluation should examine whether intelligent rehabilitation produces meaningful benefits compared with usual care or alternative interventions. Relevant outcomes include speech recognition, communication confidence, adherence, listening effort, participation, and quality of life. Cost, accessibility, and long-term engagement should also be considered. A technically sophisticated program may have limited value if users find it burdensome or if the exercises do not address their priorities. The most promising systems are likely to combine adaptive digital training with professional guidance, individualized goals, and regular evaluation of functional outcomes.

Challenges in Clinical Translation, Ethics, and Future Directions

The integration of intelligent technologies into auditory healthcare presents methodological, clinical, and ethical challenges. One major issue is the variability of acoustic and audiological data. Speech recordings differ according to language, accent, speaker characteristics, microphone quality, room acoustics, and background noise. Audio-

logical measurements vary with equipment calibration, testing protocols, patient cooperation, and clinical characteristics. Algorithms trained on limited datasets may therefore perform poorly when applied to unfamiliar populations or environments. Robust development requires representative datasets, standardized measurement procedures, independent validation, and evaluation under realistic conditions.

Algorithmic bias is particularly important in speech-related technologies. Speech recognition and enhancement systems may perform differently across languages, dialects, age groups, and patterns of speech impairment. Individuals with hearing loss may also have distinctive listening requirements that are inadequately represented in general-purpose audio datasets. If these differences are not addressed, intelligent systems may provide less accurate support to the people who could benefit most from them. Developers should evaluate performance across relevant populations and communicate limitations clearly. Accessibility and equitable performance should be considered throughout design rather than only after a system has been developed.

Interpretability and clinical accountability are equally important. Audiologists need to understand the intended use of a system, the evidence supporting its recommendations, and the circumstances in which its predictions may be unreliable.

AI outputs should not be presented as definitive diagnoses when the available data support only screening or risk estimation. Clinical decision-making should incorporate patient history, examination findings, established audiological tests, and individual preferences. Systems should also provide mechanisms for identifying poor-quality data, expressing uncertainty, and referring patients for further assessment when results are inconclusive.

Privacy and data governance require particular attention because auditory technologies may collect speech recordings, conversations, device usage patterns, and other sensitive information. Such data may contain personal or third-party information unrelated to the clinical purpose. Data collection should be limited to what is necessary, appropriately secured, and governed by informed consent and applicable privacy requirements. Hearing devices connected to mobile applications and cloud services also require safeguards against unauthorized access and inappropriate secondary use. Users should be able to understand how their information is processed and what controls are available.

Future research should prioritize prospective clinical studies that determine whether intelligent auditory systems improve outcomes beyond established care. Technical performance should be assessed alongside speech intelligibility, hearing-

related quality of life, functional communication, rehabilitation adherence, and cost-effectiveness. Longitudinal evaluation is needed to determine whether benefits persist and whether models remain reliable as devices, environments, and patient needs change. Collaboration among audiologists, otologists, neuroscientists, engineers, speech-language professionals, data scientists, and patients will be essential for developing clinically meaningful solutions.

In conclusion, integrating auditory function with intelligent technologies offers substantial opportunities to improve hearing assessment, automated audiometry, speech processing, hearing device optimization, and auditory rehabilitation. AI can support the analysis of complex audiological measurements, while adaptive systems may improve access to assessment and personalize selected aspects of hearing care. However, technological innovation must be accompanied by rigorous validation, equitable performance, responsible data governance, and meaningful clinical evaluation. The ultimate objective is not merely to automate hearing-related tasks but to improve communication, participation, independence, and quality of life. By combining advances in auditory neuroscience and computational intelligence with professional expertise and patient-centered care, intelligent technologies can contribute to more accessible, precise, and effective hearing healthcare.

5. INTEGRATING MOTOR CONTROL WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR MOVEMENT ANALYSIS, BRAIN–COMPUTER INTERFACES, AND ROBOTIC ASSISTANCE

Background

Motor impairment is among the most prevalent and disabling outcomes of neurological and musculoskeletal conditions worldwide. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that 1.3 billion individuals, or 16% of the world's population, have a disability. Stroke remains one of the most common causes of disability worldwide, affecting around 15 million people annually and leaving more than two-thirds of survivors with long-term motor deficits. Beyond stroke, motor disability resulting from spinal cord injury, cerebral palsy, and other neurological conditions poses profound challenges to independence and daily functioning. This growing burden, compounded by an ageing global population, has intensified the demand for rehabilitation approaches capable of delivering intensive, personalized, and repeatable therapy beyond the constraints of conventional, therapist-dependent methods, which are often limited by reduced adaptability and lower training intensity tailored to individual patient profiles.

Wearable inertial and biomechanical sensing sys-

tems now allow motion data to be captured continuously in ecological, non-laboratory settings, supporting telerehabilitation, fall-risk assessment, and gait characterization. When combined with machine learning and deep learning architectures, these sensor data enable increasingly precise estimation of joint kinematics, muscle activity, and hand-motion patterns.

In parallel, brain-computer interface (BCI) technology has emerged as a distinct rehabilitation approach for patients whose severe motor impairment prevents them from participating in movement-dependent conventional therapies. By translating neural activity, most commonly recorded through non-invasive electroencephalography, into control commands, BCIs can pair detected motor intention with sensory feedback to promote Hebbian-based neuroplasticity, even in the absence of observable movement. Motor imagery and steady-state visually evoked potential paradigms remain the dominant non-invasive approaches, and bibliometric analyses document a sustained increase in BCI-rehabilitation publications, from an average of approximately two studies per year before 2009 to nearly 54 per year between 2020 and 2024. Clinical evidence synthesized in an umbrella review of 18 systematic reviews and meta-analyses supports meaningful gains in upper-limb motor function, particularly during the subacute post-stroke phase, although

the methodological quality of the underlying literature remains moderate. BCIs combined with functional electrical stimulation, robotic exoskeletons, or virtual reality further extend therapeutic applications, while deep-learning classifiers increasingly outperform traditional machine-learning decoders in signal classification accuracy.

Robotic assistance constitutes the third pillar of this convergence, encompassing upper- and lower-limb exoskeletons developed for stroke, cerebral palsy, and postoperative neurological recovery. Artificial intelligence increasingly contributes to robot control, intention detection, locomotion classification, and joint-trajectory prediction through reinforcement learning, neural networks, and classical classifiers. However, clinical evidence remains mixed: while several device-specific trials report meaningful functional improvements, the large-scale RATULS (Robot-Assisted Training for the Upper Limb after Stroke) trial involving 770 participants found no significant advantage of robotic therapy over conventional care.

Despite substantial technological progress, movement analysis, BCIs, and robotic assistance have largely developed as parallel, imperfectly integrated fields, constrained by small sample sizes, heterogeneous protocols, and limited real-world validation. This narrative review synthesizes recent advances across these three domains, examining how intelligent technologies are reshaping

motor control assessment and rehabilitation and identifying the methodological gaps that must be addressed to translate laboratory progress into routine clinical practice.

Methodology

This chapter synthesizes recent literature on the integration of motor control with intelligent technologies across three domains: movement analysis, brain-computer interfaces (BCIs), and robotic assistance. Searches were conducted between June 2026 and July 2026 across PubMed/PMC, Frontiers, MDPI journals, including Sensors, Applied Sciences, and Biosensors, Wiley, and Cambridge University Press platforms, using combinations of keywords such as "brain-computer interface," "motor rehabilitation," "exoskeleton," "artificial intelligence," "wearable sensors," and "movement analysis." The search prioritized publications from 2020 to 2026, with a small number of earlier foundational studies included when cited in more recent reviews. Non-English articles, conference abstracts, and non-peer-reviewed sources were excluded.

Given the narrative rather than systematic design of this chapter, no formal protocol, such as PRISMA, was registered, and no predefined statistical criteria for study inclusion or quality scoring were applied. Instead, articles were selected based on their thematic relevance to the three focus

areas, recency, and publication in peer-reviewed journals. Priority was given to systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and bibliometric analyses, as these provide broader evidence synthesis than individual primary studies. A total of 16 articles were included based on the following criteria: thematic relevance to movement analysis, brain-computer interfaces, or robotic assistance; publication in a peer-reviewed journal; availability of the full text in English; and, when multiple studies addressed a similar topic, priority was given to the most recent and methodologically comprehensive source. These articles were then extracted and organized according to their contributions to movement analysis, BCI applications, or robotic assistance, allowing thematic synthesis across the three domains rather than quantitative pooling of results.

Movement Analysis Technologies

Wearable inertial measurement units (IMUs) have become a central tool for movement analysis, offering ease of use, low cost, and the ability to capture motion continuously in ecological, non-laboratory environments, an advantage that traditional optoelectronic motion-capture systems generally lack. Beyond gait, which remains the most extensively studied movement because of its centrality to daily functioning, IMU-based systems have been applied to the angular kinematics of dynamic upper- and lower-body movements, with relevance to telerehabilitation, athletic perform-

ance monitoring, and human-robot interaction safety.

The integration of artificial intelligence with movement sensing has expanded the range of parameters that can be measured non-invasively. Convolutional neural networks applied to video footage have estimated upper-limb muscle forces with strong-to-excellent correlations (r = 0.72 to 0.97) against gold-standard laboratory methods, while Echo State Networks have achieved over 95% accuracy in predicting ground reaction forces using wearable accelerometer data alone. Deep-learning-based hand-motion recognition systems, developed using materials ranging from conductive polymers to graphene-based sensors, similarly employ convolutional and recurrent architectures, including long short-term memory (LSTM) networks, to decode complex hand-gesture signals, with reported accuracies exceeding 90% for finger and wrist movements. Although many such systems were originally developed for human-machine interface and virtual reality applications, their underlying sensing principles are transferable to hand-function assessment in rehabilitation settings.

Within neurological populations, IMU-derived trunk-acceleration patterns have characterized gait complexity in Parkinson's disease independently of age or walking speed, while gait-analysis metrics such as speed, stride length, and

knee-extension angle have served as standardized outcomes in cerebral palsy, with reported improvements of up to 0.51 m/s in speed and 13.8° in knee extension. Stroke represents the most extensively studied condition in sensor- and machine-learning-based rehabilitation monitoring. In a systematic review of 32 studies, stroke accounted for the largest share of included research, exceeding 25%, with IMUs, accelerometers, electromyography (EMG), and support vector machines among the most frequently applied tools and upper-limb assessment representing the dominant clinical focus. In spinal cord injury (SCI), research has more often targeted activity recognition than gait analysis. A wrist-worn accelerometer system tested on healthy volunteers performing physiotherapist-designed SCI rehabilitation exercises achieved 96.86% accuracy with a random forest classifier. However, as a feasibility study involving healthy participants rather than a patient-validated trial, it should be interpreted as proof of concept for future telerehabilitation monitoring rather than clinical evidence. Beyond disease-specific applications, AI-augmented wearable systems combining accelerometers, gyroscopes, and barometers have demonstrated strong performance in fall detection among older adults, with late-fusion convolutional neural network architectures achieving up to 94.83% accuracy.

Taken together, sensor- and AI-based movement

analysis is now being applied across the major neuromotor conditions addressed elsewhere in this chapter, although the maturity of the evidence varies. Stroke-related applications are the most extensively validated, while spinal cord injury systems remain, in some cases, at an earlier feasibility stage.

Brain-Computer Interfaces

Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) establish a direct communication pathway between neural activity and external devices, enabling motor-intention recognition without requiring muscular activation. This capability is particularly relevant for patients with severe motor impairment who cannot participate in conventional movement-dependent therapies. Non-invasive BCIs predominantly rely on electroencephalography and operate through several signal paradigms: motor imagery (MI), in which patients mentally rehearse movements without physically executing them; steady-state visually evoked potentials (SSVEPs), which use rhythmic visual stimuli to elicit detectable cortical responses; and movement-related cortical potentials (MRCPs), low-frequency signals that emerge approximately two seconds before intended movement. The therapeutic rationale for BCI-based rehabilitation rests on Hebbian plasticity: pairing detected motor intention with sensory feedback within a closed-loop system is thought to strengthen synaptic connections and

support the functional reorganization of damaged neural circuits.

Bibliometric analyses indicate that BCI-rehabilitation research has expanded substantially over the past two decades, with publication output rising markedly after 2020 and thematic emphasis increasingly shifting toward deep-learning approaches. In signal processing, classification methods have progressed from linear discriminant analysis and support vector machines toward convolutional and recurrent neural network architectures, which have demonstrated an improved capacity to handle the non-stationary and highly variable nature of electroencephalography signals.

Several BCI configurations have been applied in rehabilitation settings, including MI-based systems, MRCP-based approaches combined with robotic or virtual reality feedback, and BCIs paired with functional electrical stimulation. Consistent with this, evidence from BCI-exoskeleton control systems indicates that transfer-learning approaches applied to electroencephalography data can reduce the need for repeated patient-specific calibration, improving the practicality of BCI-driven rehabilitation.

Despite these advances, several limitations constrain clinical translation. Reported classification accuracies vary widely across studies, no standardized framework for BCI-rehabilitation system design has been established, and sample sizes in

individual trials remain small. The evidence base for BCI efficacy beyond upper-limb motor recovery, including lower-limb function and long-term outcomes, remains comparatively limited, underscoring the need for larger, methodologically rigorous, multicenter studies.

Robotic Assistance

Robotic exoskeletons have progressively shifted from rigid, tethered laboratory devices toward lightweight, modular, and portable configurations designed for both clinical and real-world use. This evolution has been accompanied by more sophisticated sensor integration, including force-sensitive resistors and inertial measurement units, and by control strategies ranging from finite-state machines to impedance-based and assist-as-needed schemes.

Artificial intelligence has become increasingly embedded in exoskeleton-assisted rehabilitation, contributing to four principal functional tasks: robot control, locomotion classification, intention detection, and human joint-trajectory prediction. Reinforcement learning has been most frequently applied to robot control because of its capacity to adapt to human-exoskeleton interaction forces through iterative feedback. In contrast, neural networks have shown particular strength in trajectory prediction, given their ability to model complex spatiotemporal patterns in joint

movement. Support vector machines and decision trees remain relevant for locomotion classification and intention detection, particularly when interpretability or lower computational costs are prioritized.

Clinical evidence for robotic rehabilitation, however, remains heterogeneous. A systematic review of portable upper-limb exoskeletons, including devices targeting the wrist, shoulder, and forearm, reported improvements in motor function, range of motion, and spasticity reduction, although the evidence base consists largely of small case series. At a larger scale, findings across the broader robotic-rehabilitation literature are similarly mixed. While several device-specific trials, such as those evaluating the ARMin and Bi-Manu-Track exoskeletons, have reported statistically significant gains in Fugl-Meyer scores relative to conventional therapy, the large-scale RATULS trial involving 770 participants found no significant advantage of robotic therapy over standard care. This divergence suggests that the benefits of robotic assistance may depend on device-specific design, dosage, and patient selection rather than representing a uniform effect of robotic intervention as a category.

Beyond device design and control architecture, practical barriers continue to limit widespread clinical adoption. These include the high acquisition and maintenance costs of robotic systems, the need for specialized staff training, and limited

accessibility in resource-constrained settings. A persistent gap remains between short-term functional improvements observed in controlled trials and their translation into sustained gains in activities of daily living, highlighting the need for longer follow-up periods and more standardized outcome reporting across studies.

Integration of Motor Control, BCIs, and Robotics

The convergence of movement analysis, BCIs, and robotic assistance is most evident in closed-loop systems, in which neural or kinematic signals are continuously acquired, processed, and translated into device-driven feedback. In BCI-controlled robotic systems, detected motor intention is converted into exoskeleton- or orthosis-driven movement, after which the resulting proprioceptive and visual feedback is returned to the user, reinforcing the neural pathways associated with the intended action.

Multimodal hybrid systems extend this principle further by combining complementary sensing modalities, such as electroencephalography with functional near-infrared spectroscopy, or by pairing BCIs with neuromodulation techniques, including transcranial direct current stimulation, to enhance signal reliability and support neuroplasticity. Within robotic platforms, artificial intelligence functions as the interpretive layer

connecting raw sensor inputs to device behavior, whether by classifying gait phases, decoding user intention, or predicting joint trajectories in real time.

Nonetheless, the current literature suggests that these three domains remain more loosely coupled than fully integrated. Most reported systems combine only two of the three components at a time, and standardized frameworks for integrating movement analysis, BCIs, and robotic control within a single validated platform remain uncommon.

Clinical and Practical Applications

Beyond general disease categories, BCI- and robot-assisted interventions have been applied to specific clinical subgroups with distinct rehabilitation needs. In severe post-stroke upper-limb paresis, operationally defined as a Fugl-Meyer Assessment score below 20 or the complete absence of active wrist and finger extension, BCI-based training has been proposed as one of the few available options because conventional therapies require residual voluntary movement that these patients lack. In pediatric cerebral palsy, robotic exoskeletons have been evaluated across knee, ankle, and full-gait configurations, with outcomes assessed using standardized measures such as the Gross Motor Function Classification System. Robotic assistance has also been extended to

postoperative neurological complications, including shoulder-exoskeleton training following acute C5 nerve palsy, in which early mobilization was feasible and associated with functional gains. Together, these applications illustrate that clinical benefits are often population-specific rather than uniformly generalizable across neuromotor conditions.

Challenges and Future Directions

Several cross-cutting challenges limit the translation of these technologies from research settings into routine clinical practice. A recurring technical limitation is the lack of external validation in actual patient populations: many AI-based control and classification algorithms for robotic exoskeletons have been tested only in simulations or on healthy participants, leaving their performance under genuine neuromuscular impairment largely unconfirmed. Related to this, deep-learning classifiers, while often outperforming conventional algorithms, remain difficult to interpret, complicating clinical validation and limiting clinician trust in automated decision-making. At the sensor level, calibration procedures for wearable and hand-motion recognition systems often need to be repeated for each user, and signal decoupling across simultaneous mechanical inputs remains only partially resolved.

Beyond technical constraints, structural barriers

persist. No consensus currently exists regarding optimal treatment dosage, session frequency, or intervention timing across the acute, subacute, and chronic phases, complicating comparisons across studies and the development of clinical guidelines. The involvement of clinicians and end users in designing AI-driven rehabilitation devices has also been limited, raising concerns about alignment between technological capabilities and patient-centered care. Ethical considerations, including data privacy, algorithmic bias, and equitable access to costly technologies, require ongoing interdisciplinary oversight.

Looking forward, several directions appear promising: closed-loop adaptive systems capable of adjusting assistance in real time based on patient performance; portable and wireless platforms that reduce dependence on specialized laboratory infrastructure; and multimodal integration combining neural, kinematic, and physiological signals to better accommodate the heterogeneity of motor impairment. Realizing these directions will likely require sustained collaboration among neuroscientists, engineers, and rehabilitation clinicians, alongside larger, methodologically rigorous multicenter trials.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined how intelligent technologies are reshaping motor control assessment

across three related but not fully integrated domains. Wearable sensing combined with machine learning has extended movement analysis beyond laboratory settings. At the same time, BCI systems offer a viable rehabilitation pathway for patients unable to participate in movement-dependent therapies, while robotic exoskeletons provide structured, repeatable assistance across diverse neuromotor conditions. However, the evidence supporting these technologies remains uneven: clinical validation is strongest for stroke-related applications, while findings for other populations are comparatively preliminary, and at least one large-scale trial found no advantage of robotic therapy over conventional care. Rather than converging into unified platforms, movement analysis, BCIs, and robotic assistance largely continue to develop along separate trajectories, constrained by small sample sizes, inconsistent protocols, and limited testing in real-world clinical environments. Advancing this field will depend less on isolated technical innovation than on rigorous, adequately powered clinical trials and closer collaboration between engineers and rehabilitation clinicians to ensure that technological capabilities translate into meaningful, evidence-based patient benefits.

6. INTEGRATING NEUROIMAGING WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR RADIOLOGY, IMAGE ANALYSIS, AND PRECISION NEUROLOGICAL DIAGNOSIS

Background

Neurological disorders are considered major causes of disability and mortality worldwide. By affecting a large number of people, they impose a significant social and economic burden on healthcare systems. Diseases such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, stroke, and primary brain tumors present significant challenges for early diagnosis and precise disease characterization owing to their complex pathophysiological mechanisms and the high variability of clinical manifestations among patients. Although advancements in neuroimaging technologies have enabled considerably more precise examinations of structural, functional, metabolic, and molecular changes in the nervous system, the analysis and interpretation of these complex data remain heavily dependent on the expertise and experience of specialists. Therefore, the development of advanced computational methods capable of increasing diagnostic accuracy, improving efficiency, enhancing reproducibility, and supporting the clinical decision-making process has become a significant necessity in the field of neurology.

Over the past three decades, the field of neuroimaging has shifted from traditional techniques based on anatomical imaging toward advanced multimodal technologies that enable the simultaneous examination of various dimensions of brain biology. Techniques such as structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), computed tomography (CT), positron emission tomography (PET), and single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) each provide valuable information regarding structural brain characteristics, neural communication networks, perfusion status, metabolic processes, and the activity of neurotransmitter systems. Today, these imaging technologies have become integral to the diagnosis of neurological disorders, the assessment of disease progression, the planning of surgical interventions, and the evaluation of treatment responses. However, the dramatic increase in data volume, driven by enhanced image resolution, the development of imaging protocols, and the generation of multimodal data, has posed challenges for traditional methods that rely on qualitative assessment. Indeed, analyzing such vast amounts of information often exceeds the capabilities of conventional approaches. This limitation has further underscored the necessity of integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into neuroimaging data processing and interpretation workflows.

Artificial intelligence (AI), comprising a suite of technologies such as machine learning, deep learning, computer vision, and, in recent years, foundation models and explainable AI, has revolutionized the way medical images are analyzed and interpreted. Unlike traditional computer-aided diagnostic systems, which relied primarily on the extraction of predefined, handcrafted features, modern deep learning algorithms can automatically learn and extract hierarchical, multilayered features from large-scale image datasets. This capability has led to significant performance improvements in areas such as image classification, lesion detection, tissue structure segmentation, image reconstruction, and disease progression prediction. Architectures such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs), vision transformers (ViTs), and hybrid models have demonstrated substantial capabilities in performing a wide range of neuroimaging-related tasks while simultaneously reducing the time required for image analysis and enhancing the consistency, reproducibility, and uniformity of diagnostic processes. Beyond the analysis of visual patterns, applications of AI have evolved in recent years toward integrating imaging data with clinical information, genetic data, and laboratory results, an approach that enables more comprehensive support for clinical decision-making.

Clinical applications of AI-based neuroimaging are

developing at a remarkable pace and are currently influencing various fields of neuroscience. In neurodegenerative disorders, the use of AI algorithms to analyze data from MRI, PET, and dopamine transporter imaging has enabled early disease diagnosis, more accurate differentiation between similar disorders, prediction of disease progression, and identification of imaging biomarkers associated with cognitive decline or movement disorders. In cerebrovascular diseases, AI-based systems have accelerated the automated detection of intracranial hemorrhages and large vessel occlusions, a capability that facilitates faster treatment decisions in time-critical emergency situations by reducing diagnostic delays. Furthermore, in neuro-oncology, radiomics and radiogenomics methods that utilize AI have enhanced the accuracy of tumor diagnosis, the determination of molecular characteristics, the design of therapeutic strategies, and the prediction of treatment responses, thereby highlighting the growing importance of computational imaging in advancing precision medicine.

Despite the significant achievements of AI in neuroimaging, numerous challenges continue to hinder the widespread adoption of these technologies in clinical settings. A substantial proportion of AI models introduced to date have been developed using limited, small-scale datasets derived from a single medical center, which often fail to

fully reflect the diversity and complexity of real-world patient populations. Consequently, many of these models face limitations regarding external validity and their ability to generalize to different populations and healthcare facilities. In addition to data limitations, issues such as algorithmic bias, insufficient transparency in model decision-making processes, the need for explainability, reproducibility challenges, the protection of patient data privacy, legal and regulatory requirements, and the determination of clinical accountability are among the most significant obstacles to the practical application of this technology. Recent systematic reviews have also shown that only a limited number of AI systems developed for neuroimaging have undergone rigorous prospective validation or demonstrated measurable improvements in clinical patient outcomes. This underscores the importance of designing more transparent models, conducting multicenter validation studies, establishing appropriate standards for reporting results, and fostering collaboration among specialists across various disciplines, including radiologists, neurologists, data scientists, and regulatory bodies.

With the simultaneous advancement of AI and technologies such as multimodal neuroimaging, radiomics, digital biomarkers, and precision neurology, the role of this technology is gradually shifting from that of a purely assistive

tool for image processing and analysis to that of a key, integrated component in delivering personalized care to patients with neurological disorders. In the future, clinical systems are expected to increasingly rely on trustworthy, transparent, and multimodal AI models capable of integrating neuroimaging data with genomic, proteomic, electrophysiological, and clinical information. Such systems could pave the way for earlier disease diagnosis, more accurate prediction of disease progression, the selection of treatment strategies tailored to individual patient characteristics, and continuous monitoring of disease-related changes.

Recent work is organized around three points: multimodal neuroimaging improves diagnostic precision, artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing radiologic image analysis, and clinical translation still depends on robustness and interpretability. The field is moving from visual assessment alone toward the algorithmic integration of structure, function, metabolism, and clinical variability.

Diagnostic Precision

Neurological and neuropsychiatric disorders are difficult to characterize using a single imaging modality because significant signals span anatomy, connectivity, perfusion, and metabolism. Multimodal AI models, therefore, aim to synthesize

magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), positron emission tomography (PET), and single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) so that complementary structural, functional, and molecular features contribute to personalized clinical predictions.

MRI remains the main platform because it is noninvasive, provides high resolution, and is widely used in neurological imaging. However, it can be augmented through fusion with PET and functional modalities when pathological signatures require further characterization. In Alzheimer's disease (AD), AI-driven neuroimaging is especially oriented toward early-stage identification, since preclinical MRI, CT, and PET findings generate large datasets that are difficult to analyze manually. Reported applications include forecasting progression from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer's disease with accuracies approaching 85% to 90% and detecting intracranial aneurysms with sensitivities above 90%.

Image Analysis

AI is revolutionizing neuroimaging analysis not only by classifying scans but also by influencing various processes, including streamlining reconstruction, registration, segmentation, and quantification, and improving overall efficiency. In radiology more broadly, these tools are most valuable

for pattern detection and automated feature extraction across high-demand modalities such as CT and MRI.

Segmentation and volumetry now achieve very high accuracy in brain and optic pathway analysis. Deep learning can reduce scan times and improve the signal-to-noise ratio and lesion detection in MRI and PET/CT. AI-assisted CT pipelines support dose adjustment and even synthetic CT generation from MRI for planning tasks.

Such progress drives the field toward precision neurology, enabling the conversion of visual imaging data into objective, quantifiable biomarkers and thereby moving beyond the limitations of subjective descriptive analysis. Radiomic and transformer-based approaches are also being used to distinguish age-related from disease-specific imaging changes and improve interpretability across multisite MRI and PET datasets.

Representative Evidence

Alzheimer's disease prediction involves AI-based neuroimaging prognosis, with reported accuracy of 85% to 90% for predicting progression from mild cognitive impairment to Alzheimer's disease.

Multimodal fusion using a convolutional neural network, gated recurrent unit, and attention-based framework has achieved a reported accuracy of 96.79%.

Early disorder detection using a spatial-temporal graph convolutional network and vision transformer MRI model has achieved a reported accuracy of 93.56% to 94.52%.

Neurodegeneration management can benefit from AI-based approaches that reduce variability and improve diagnostic precision.

Precision neuromodulation uses imaging-guided transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) targeting to support more individualized treatment.

Translation Challenges

Clinical implementation is hampered because many models are trained on limited-scale datasets and do not transfer reliably across heterogeneous clinical environments, different scanner hardware, and varying acquisition protocols. These approaches address significant obstacles, including data shift, domain variability, and the need to improve model robustness and ensure consistent performance across diverse clinical settings.

Interpretability is a second major bottleneck. Explainable AI methods such as SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP), Local Interpretable Model-Agnostic Explanations (LIME), Gradient-weighted Class Activation Mapping (Grad-CAM), and layer-wise relevance propagation (LRP) can highlight the regions that drive predictions. However, current systems still emphasize visual explanations over clinically useful reasoning. Translating AI

from benchmark success to clinical utility requires navigating strict regulatory, ethical, and workflow integration challenges while ensuring that models deliver measurable clinical benefits without disrupting routine practice.

Overall, integrating neuroimaging with intelligent technologies is emerging as a strong framework for radiology-driven precision neurology, especially when multimodal imaging is paired with powerful AI methods and clinically interpretable outputs. For individual diagnostic decisions, imaging findings and any AI-derived results should still be explained by a qualified clinician within the full clinical context.

7. INTEGRATING NEURAL PLASTICITY WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR NEUROREHABILITATION, FUNCTIONAL RECOVERY, AND ADAPTIVE THERAPEUTICS

Background

The classical view of the human brain held that its ability to change neural pathways and adapt was limited to the early stages of development and childhood, and that once adulthood was reached, the brain became inflexible. Nonetheless, recent theories of brain function highlight interconnectivity and collaboration among various regions of the brain, particularly in response to aging and injuries. This phenomenon is known as neural plasticity. Neuroplasticity is a crucial capability of the human brain, allowing it to rewire and reorganize its structure in response to internal and external stimuli throughout the lifespan. This adaptive feature leads to changes, including the formation of new synaptic connections or the reinforcement of existing ones, alterations in molecular and cellular features, and changes in chemical properties. This compensatory strategy is primarily addressed in the context of neurodegenerative and neurological disorders such as Parkinson's disease, stroke, and multiple sclerosis. Understanding these structural and functional modifications in the damaged

brain is a contributing factor in enhancing rehabilitation approaches and improving the quality of life.

In this regard, neurorehabilitation is a complex process aimed at restructuring adaptable neuronal networks. It is an evolving field that prioritizes patients' overall well-being through medical treatment and physical, cognitive, and psychological therapies. Typically, neurorehabilitation involves repetitive, task-specific training sessions for patients. Nevertheless, there is a shift towards optimizing recovery outcomes through the use of artificial intelligence (AI). AI, a branch of computer science, focuses on developing systems that can perform functions resembling human cognition. Its main objective is to train machines to interpret their environment, process natural language, learn from experience, reason logically, solve complex problems, and adapt effectively to various tasks and conditions. Using AI algorithms applied to data from wearable sensors, virtual reality (VR) systems, robotic devices, brain-computer interfaces (BCIs), and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS), we can gain a deeper understanding of patients' functions and clinical status. This approach facilitates pattern modeling and tracks subtle changes, allowing exercises to be simplified or increased in complexity according to patients' needs, which was not possible with conventional therapy methods.

The integration of AI into neurorehabilitation would be profoundly beneficial from multiple perspectives. An AI-assisted neurorehabilitation mechanism has the potential to: (1) provide faster and more accurate analyses of large volumes of data, (2) recognize patterns and improve the diagnosis of inflammatory diseases with similar presentations that make precise detection difficult, such as multiple sclerosis (MS), and (3) offer personalized treatments and necessary adjustments to therapeutic interventions by incorporating patients' medical histories, clinical guidelines, and scientific evidence from research. For instance, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) are a type of AI used in deep learning for image processing and are currently being applied in rehabilitation programs for stroke patients. By using large volumes of clinical data, trained CNN models can more accurately predict motor function recovery.

Taken together, AI facilitates the identification of diagnostic patterns and the development of therapeutic plans, creating better opportunities for clinicians to make precise decisions. Indeed, the integration of AI has fundamentally changed the interaction between technological devices and patients during medical treatment, shifting the focus from teaching patients to cope with their conditions to reconstructing and restoring the neural architecture underlying lost functions, thereby enhancing patients' quality of life.

Neurobiological Mechanisms of Neural Plasticity

Neural plasticity involves multiple interacting biological mechanisms operating at molecular, cellular, synaptic, and systems levels. Synaptic plasticity, including long term potentiation and long term depression, contributes to the strengthening or weakening of communication between neurons according to patterns of activity and experience. These mechanisms support learning, memory formation, motor skill acquisition, and adaptation following neurological injury. Changes in neurotransmitter signaling, receptor expression, dendritic spine structure, and synaptic connectivity can modify the efficiency of existing neural circuits. Neurotrophic factors, particularly brain derived neurotrophic factor, contribute to neuronal survival, synaptic modification, and activity dependent learning. Additional processes, including axonal sprouting, remyelination, neurogenesis in selected contexts, and alterations in inhibitory and excitatory signaling, may influence recovery after injury. The relative contribution of these mechanisms depends on the neurological condition, the affected neural structures, and the stage of recovery.

Following a stroke or traumatic brain injury, surviving neural networks may undergo substantial reorganization as they adapt to disrupted pathways. Recovery can involve the restoration of

function within partially preserved tissue, recruitment of alternative networks, strengthening of residual connections, and changes in the relationship between cortical and subcortical structures. Some reorganizational processes are beneficial, whereas others may contribute to compensatory movement patterns, chronic pain, spasticity, or persistent functional limitations. Rehabilitation aims to encourage adaptive changes through repeated, task specific practice and meaningful sensory feedback. The timing of intervention is also important because the biological environment of the injured nervous system changes during acute, subacute, and chronic stages. Early interventions may capitalize on heightened plasticity in selected conditions, but treatment intensity must be balanced against medical stability, fatigue, and the risk of excessive physiological stress.

Intelligent technologies can help characterize these mechanisms by integrating behavioral assessments with electrophysiological recordings, neuroimaging, and physiological measurements. Functional magnetic resonance imaging can reveal changes in the recruitment and connectivity of neural networks, whereas electroencephalography can provide information about the temporal organization of brain activity. Transcranial magnetic stimulation can be used to investigate cortical excitability and selected aspects of corticospinal function. Diffusion magnetic resonance

imaging can characterize white matter microstructure, although its measures are indirect and cannot independently establish specific cellular mechanisms. When these data are combined with repeated assessments of motor performance, cognitive function, and daily activity, researchers can investigate whether changes in neural organization are associated with clinically meaningful improvements. Computational approaches may further help distinguish recovery arising from restoration of function from compensation through alternative strategies.

Despite these opportunities, neural plasticity cannot be adequately represented by a single biomarker or computational score. Physiological changes may occur without corresponding improvements in daily functioning, and similar behavioral outcomes may arise through different neural mechanisms. Intelligent systems must therefore account for the multidimensional nature of recovery and avoid treating surrogate measures as definitive evidence of therapeutic success. Integrating neurobiological knowledge with longitudinal clinical data provides a stronger foundation for interpreting plasticity and identifying interventions that support durable, meaningful functional recovery.

Artificial Intelligence For Personalized Neurorehabilitation

Artificial intelligence provides computational methods for analyzing complex patient information and adapting rehabilitation interventions to individual needs. Machine learning models can integrate demographic characteristics, neurological diagnoses, lesion features, baseline functional assessments, comorbidities, medication exposure, and treatment history to identify patterns associated with recovery. Rather than relying exclusively on population averages, these systems can estimate the probability of different outcomes for individual patients and help clinicians identify factors that may influence treatment response. For example, predictive models may investigate whether baseline motor impairment, corticospinal tract integrity, cognitive status, or early performance during therapy is associated with subsequent improvement after stroke. Similar approaches may support rehabilitation planning for people with spinal cord injury, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and acquired brain injury.

Personalization requires more than classifying patients according to diagnostic categories. Individuals with the same diagnosis may differ substantially in their residual neural function, movement strategies, sensory processing, fatigue, motivation, and capacity to learn new skills. Artificial intelligence can support dynamic treatment planning by continuously incorporating information from rehabilitation sessions and adjusting thera-

peutic goals according to observed performance. If a patient consistently completes a task with minimal assistance, the system may recommend increasing its complexity. If movement quality deteriorates or fatigue increases, it may suggest shorter sessions, additional rest, or a modified task. These adjustments can help maintain an appropriate level of challenge while reducing the likelihood that repeated practice reinforces ineffective movement patterns.

Reinforcement learning offers a potential framework for selecting interventions through iterative interaction between a computational agent and a rehabilitation environment. A system can evaluate how different treatment options influence outcomes and gradually improve its recommendations. However, rehabilitation differs from many conventional optimization problems because treatment effects may be delayed, patients may respond unpredictably, and inappropriate interventions can cause harm. Consequently, reinforcement learning should initially operate within clinically approved boundaries, using explicit safety constraints and professional oversight. Retrospective data alone may also be insufficient to establish that a particular intervention caused an improvement, because treatment allocation, disease severity, and adherence can influence observed outcomes. Prospective validation is therefore essential before autonomous treatment selection can be considered.

The usefulness of predictive systems also depends on interpretability, calibration, and external validity. Clinicians need to understand which variables influence a recommendation, how uncertain the prediction is, and whether the model performs adequately in populations different from the development cohort. Algorithms trained predominantly on patients from well resourced urban hospitals may perform less effectively in rural settings or among populations with different demographic and clinical characteristics. In addition, models should be evaluated against clinically meaningful endpoints, including independence in activities of daily living, participation in community life, return to work, and sustained functional improvement. Artificial intelligence is most valuable when it strengthens clinical reasoning, supports shared decision making, and enables rehabilitation to respond to individual progress without replacing the therapeutic relationship or professional judgment.

Robotics, Wearable Sensors, And Intelligent Movement Training

Robotic rehabilitation systems can provide controlled, repetitive, and measurable movement training for patients with neurological impairments. These systems include upper limb exoskeletons, end effector devices, robotic gait trainers,

balance platforms, and assistive systems designed to support selected daily activities. By regulating movement trajectories, applied forces, assistance levels, and repetition frequency, robotic devices can deliver standardized training while documenting performance across sessions. This precision is particularly useful for patients who cannot initially complete movements independently or who require substantial physical assistance. Robotic systems may also enable therapists to focus on movement quality, task selection, and patient engagement while devices provide mechanical support during repetitive exercises.

The relationship between robotic assistance and neural plasticity is complex. Excessive assistance may reduce the patient's active contribution, whereas insufficient support may produce compensatory movements, frustration, or fatigue. Assist as needed approaches attempt to provide only the assistance required to complete a task, encouraging patients to generate voluntary movement whenever possible. Intelligent control algorithms can estimate movement intention, detect deviations from desired trajectories, and modify assistance in response to performance. Electromyography, inertial measurement units, force sensors, and joint angle sensors can provide complementary information about muscle activation, movement speed, range of motion, coordination, and exertion. These measurements allow rehabili-

tation systems to quantify changes that may be difficult to assess reliably through occasional visual observation alone.

Wearable technologies extend movement assessment beyond specialized rehabilitation facilities. Accelerometers, gyroscopes, pressure sensors, instrumented insoles, and smart garments can monitor gait, balance, upper limb activity, posture, and daily movement patterns. Such devices may reveal whether improvements observed during supervised therapy translate into greater activity at home and in the community. For example, a patient may demonstrate improved walking speed during a clinical assessment while continuing to avoid walking outdoors because of fear of falling or environmental barriers. Continuous monitoring can help identify this discrepancy and guide interventions targeting confidence, endurance, and participation.

Artificial intelligence can transform wearable data into clinically interpretable indicators by distinguishing purposeful movement from incidental activity and identifying changes in movement patterns over time. Nevertheless, measurements collected in real environments are influenced by device placement, sensor quality, clothing, environmental conditions, and individual movement strategies. Algorithms may also perform differently in people with severe impairments or atypical gait patterns. Privacy and informed consent

are important because continuous monitoring can reveal sensitive information about daily routines and behavior. Accordingly, wearable and robotic rehabilitation systems should be evaluated not only for measurement accuracy but also for usability, comfort, safety, accessibility, and their capacity to improve meaningful functional outcomes. Their ultimate purpose is to facilitate active participation and independence rather than simply increase the number of recorded movements or completed exercises.

Brain Computer Interfaces And Neurofeedback

Brain computer interfaces establish communication between neural activity and external devices, potentially enabling individuals with severe motor impairments to interact with rehabilitation systems despite limited voluntary movement. These interfaces typically acquire signals through electroencephalography, electrocorticography, or implanted neural recording systems, process the signals using computational algorithms, and translate selected patterns into commands. In neurorehabilitation, a brain computer interface may detect an intention to move an affected limb and use this information to activate a robotic orthosis, stimulate peripheral nerves, or provide visual and tactile feedback. By linking attempted movement with relevant sensory consequences, these systems aim to strengthen associations between motor intention, neural activity, and task related feedback.

The underlying rationale is that motor recovery may be facilitated when patients repeatedly engage neural processes associated with movement while receiving meaningful feedback about their performance. For example, a person recovering from stroke may attempt to extend the wrist while an interface detects a corresponding neural pattern and triggers a device that assists wrist extension. This arrangement can provide an opportunity for active engagement even when the resulting movement is initially limited. However, the degree to which these interventions induce beneficial plasticity depends on factors such as the accuracy of intention detection, the timing of feedback, the patient's residual neural function, and the consistency of training. A device that repeatedly provides feedback unrelated to the patient's intention could weaken the intended association and reduce therapeutic value.

Neurofeedback represents a related approach in which individuals receive information about selected aspects of their own brain activity and learn to modify these patterns through practice. Electroencephalography based neurofeedback may target sensorimotor rhythms, attention related activity, or other predefined neural signals. Functional magnetic resonance imaging neurofeedback can investigate the regulation of activity

in selected brain regions, although its cost and limited accessibility constrain routine use. Neurofeedback has been explored in motor rehabilitation, cognitive training, pain management, and selected psychiatric and neurological applications. Nevertheless, evidence varies considerably across indications, and improvements in the trained signal do not necessarily translate into generalized clinical benefits.

Machine learning can improve brain computer interface performance by adapting signal classification to changing neural patterns, individual variability, and fluctuations in attention or fatigue. Calibration procedures may be reduced through transfer learning and subject specific adaptation, although robust operation across different sessions remains challenging. Technical issues include movement artifacts, electrical interference, signal drift, and substantial differences between users. Invasive interfaces introduce additional considerations related to surgery, infection, device durability, and long term neural recording stability. Noninvasive systems are generally easier to deploy but often provide less spatially specific information. Clinical trials must establish whether these technologies offer meaningful advantages over conventional rehabilitation, identify the patients most likely to benefit, and determine whether improvements persist after treatment ends. Brain computer interfaces should

therefore be considered promising tools for targeted rehabilitation rather than universal solutions for neurological disability.

Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, And Immersive Therapeutic Environments

Virtual reality and augmented reality technologies can create interactive environments in which patients practice functional activities under controlled conditions. Virtual reality presents computer generated environments, whereas augmented reality integrates digital information with the physical surroundings. Both approaches can support rehabilitation by providing repetitive tasks, immediate feedback, adjustable difficulty, and opportunities to practice activities that may be difficult to reproduce in conventional clinical settings. Examples include reaching for virtual objects, navigating simulated streets, maintaining balance during interactive games, performing activities of daily living, and practicing cognitive tasks in environments resembling home or workplace settings.

These technologies may influence neural plasticity by increasing task engagement, directing attention toward relevant sensory information, and providing repeated opportunities for motor learning. Visual feedback can help patients evaluate movement accuracy, while auditory cues and

haptic interfaces can provide additional information about performance. The ability to manipulate environmental complexity also allows therapists to gradually increase task demands as patients improve. For example, gait training may begin in a relatively simple virtual environment and progress toward scenarios involving obstacles, directional changes, or divided attention. This structure can help assess and train the interaction between motor control and cognitive processes that are important for independent mobility.

Intelligent virtual rehabilitation systems can analyze movement trajectories, reaction times, task completion, error frequency, and engagement patterns to adjust training difficulty. Algorithms may identify when a patient repeatedly succeeds at a task and introduce more challenging conditions, or reduce complexity when performance deteriorates. Such adaptation can help maintain an appropriate balance between achievable goals and meaningful challenge. Remote delivery may also allow selected rehabilitation activities to continue at home, reducing travel requirements and increasing opportunities for practice. When combined with therapist supervision and appropriate monitoring, these systems may support continuity of care between clinical visits.

However, immersive rehabilitation presents important practical and clinical limitations. Some users experience dizziness, nausea, visual dis-

comfort, or disorientation, particularly during prolonged sessions or when visual movement conflicts with vestibular information. Patients with severe cognitive impairment, visual deficits, neglect, or substantial balance problems may require modified interfaces and close supervision. Equipment costs, technical support, accessibility, and digital literacy can also affect adoption. Furthermore, performance within a simulated environment may not reflect the ability to complete the same activity in an unpredictable real world setting. Trials should therefore evaluate transfer of learning, sustained participation, and everyday function rather than relying exclusively on improvements within the virtual task. Virtual and augmented reality are most likely to provide value when they complement established rehabilitation methods and are designed around specific functional goals.

Adaptive Neuromodulation And Closed Loop Therapeutics

Neuromodulation techniques aim to influence nervous system activity through electrical, magnetic, or other forms of stimulation. Approaches relevant to rehabilitation include repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation, transcranial direct current stimulation, vagus nerve stimulation, spinal cord stimulation, and functional electrical stimulation. Depending on the technique and clinical indication, these interventions may modify

excitability, alter the balance between interacting neural networks, facilitate movement, or support activity dependent plasticity. Their therapeutic effects depend on stimulation parameters, anatomical targets, timing, concurrent training, and individual characteristics. Neuromodulation should therefore be integrated with an understanding of the patient's neurological condition rather than applied as a uniform intervention across all forms of disability.

Intelligent technologies offer opportunities to move from fixed stimulation schedules toward adaptive systems that respond to measured physiological or behavioral states. In a closed loop approach, sensors collect information about neural activity, muscle activation, movement intention, or task performance. A computational controller interprets these measurements and adjusts stimulation according to predefined therapeutic objectives. For example, functional electrical stimulation may be synchronized with detected movement intention or a specific phase of gait, helping activate muscles at a relevant point in the movement cycle. Similarly, a brain computer interface may trigger peripheral stimulation when neural signals indicate an attempted movement, thereby connecting motor intention with sensory feedback from the resulting action.

Closed loop systems may offer advantages over open loop approaches because they can ac-

count for fluctuations in attention, fatigue, motor performance, and physiological responsiveness. However, their effectiveness depends on reliable signal detection, suitable stimulation parameters, and appropriate control algorithms. Physiological signals can be noisy, and a system may incorrectly interpret artifacts or unrelated movements as evidence that stimulation is needed. Safety mechanisms must prevent inappropriate stimulation, excessive exposure, and operation outside clinically acceptable limits. Clinicians should be able to review system behavior, modify treatment boundaries, and intervene when unexpected responses occur.

Adaptive neuromodulation also raises questions about how best to define treatment targets. Changes in cortical excitability or electrophysiological activity may provide useful mechanistic information, but these outcomes are not equivalent to functional recovery. Clinical evaluation should include motor performance, activities of daily living, pain, participation, and other outcomes relevant to the condition being treated. Longitudinal studies are needed to determine whether benefits persist after stimulation is discontinued and whether repeated treatment produces durable improvements. Research should also distinguish the independent effect of stimulation from the effects of accompanying rehabilitation, therapist attention, and additional practice. By combining mech-

anistic measurements with clinically meaningful endpoints, intelligent neuromodulation may help refine therapeutic timing and improve the precision of interventions intended to promote adaptive neural change.

Cognitive Rehabilitation And Multimodal Functional Assessment

Neural plasticity supports cognitive functions such as attention, memory, executive control, language, and social communication. Neurological injuries and diseases can disrupt these functions, affecting the ability to plan activities, regulate behavior, learn new information, and participate independently in everyday life. Cognitive rehabilitation traditionally uses structured exercises, compensatory strategies, environmental modifications, and functional practice to address these difficulties. Intelligent technologies can extend these approaches through computerized training, adaptive learning platforms, speech recognition, eye tracking, digital assessments, and virtual simulations of everyday activities. These tools may enable more frequent assessment and individualized practice while documenting performance over time.

Artificial intelligence can analyze patterns across multiple cognitive tasks to identify specific areas of difficulty and adapt the level of support accordingly. A digital rehabilitation system might ad-

just the complexity of memory exercises, provide prompts when attention declines, or introduce realistic tasks that require planning and problem solving. Speech recognition and language processing can support assessment of naming, fluency, comprehension, and conversational performance, although accuracy may be affected by accents, dysarthria, hearing impairment, and linguistic diversity. Eye tracking may provide information about visual attention and search behavior, while interaction data can help characterize task completion and response consistency.

Multimodal assessment is particularly valuable because cognitive performance is influenced by interacting sensory, motor, emotional, and environmental factors. A slow response may reflect impaired processing speed, but it may also result from fatigue, medication effects, visual difficulties, or motor limitations. Systems that combine cognitive task performance with physiological measurements and contextual information may help identify these influences more accurately. However, inferred mental states should not be treated as direct measurements of cognition without appropriate validation. Algorithms may also reproduce biases associated with the populations used to develop them, especially when evaluating individuals with different educational backgrounds, languages, or cultural experiences.

The principal objective of intelligent cognitive

rehabilitation is to improve the ability to function in meaningful real life situations. Gains on computerized exercises may not automatically generalize to managing medication, returning to employment, maintaining social relationships, or completing household activities. Interventions should therefore incorporate functional goals and measure changes beyond the training environment. Therapists remain essential for interpreting assessment results, identifying barriers to participation, and selecting strategies that fit the patient's circumstances. Intelligent tools can support this process by increasing measurement precision and enabling adaptive practice, but their value ultimately depends on whether they produce sustained and meaningful improvements in cognitive functioning and independence.

Clinical Translation, Ethical Considerations, And Future Directions

The integration of intelligent technologies into neurorehabilitation requires rigorous evaluation of safety, effectiveness, usability, and cost effectiveness. Many emerging systems demonstrate technical feasibility or improvements in selected performance measures, but evidence of superiority over established rehabilitation remains variable across devices, patient populations, and clinical indications. Small sample sizes, heterogeneous treatment protocols, short follow up periods, and inconsistent outcome definitions can limit the reliability and generalizability of research findings. Studies may also differ in therapist involvement, training intensity, and access to additional rehabilitation, making comparisons difficult. Well designed randomized controlled trials, pragmatic clinical studies, and longer term follow up are needed to establish which technologies provide meaningful additional benefits and under what circumstances.

Implementation also depends on workforce training, equipment availability, reimbursement, technical support, and integration with existing clinical workflows. Advanced robotic systems and invasive neural interfaces may be inaccessible in many health care settings, whereas mobile applications and wearable sensors may offer more scalable alternatives. Nevertheless, lower cost technologies must still meet appropriate standards for reliability, accessibility, and clinical utility. Rehabilitation programs should avoid creating digital inequalities in which patients with limited internet access, lower digital literacy, language barriers, or physical disabilities receive fewer opportunities to benefit. Inclusive design and community based implementation are essential for ensuring that technological advances improve access rather than widen existing disparities.

Data governance is another central concern. Intelligent rehabilitation systems may collect sensitive information about movement, cognition, neural

activity, daily routines, and interactions with caregivers. Secure storage, appropriate access controls, transparent consent procedures, and clear policies regarding secondary data use are necessary to protect patient privacy. Developers should also address algorithmic bias, explainability, and accountability for errors. Patients and clinicians need understandable information about how recommendations are generated, what uncertainties remain, and when human review is required. Automated systems should not make consequential treatment decisions without suitable clinical oversight, especially when predictions are uncertain or when the consequences of incorrect recommendations could be substantial.

Future research may benefit from digital twins, which are computational representations of individual patients that can be updated using clinical, physiological, and behavioral data. In principle, these models could simulate potential recovery trajectories and compare alternative rehabilitation strategies before interventions are implemented. However, their reliability depends on high quality data, validated assumptions, and the ability to represent complex biological processes. Digital twins should therefore be regarded as developing research tools rather than established substitutes for clinical trials or professional judgment. Combining longitudinal monitoring, adaptive algorithms, mechanistic neuroscience, and

patient reported outcomes may eventually support more precise rehabilitation planning. The central challenge is to demonstrate that these technologies improve durable functional recovery, participation, and quality of life while remaining safe, transparent, equitable, and clinically practical.

8. INTEGRATING OROFACIAL NEUROSCIENCE WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR DENTAL PAIN, TEMPOROMANDIBULAR DISORDERS, AND NEURODENTISTRY

Background

Orofacial neuroscience investigates the neural mechanisms underlying sensation, pain, movement, and functional interactions within the oral cavity, jaws, facial structures, and associated neurological pathways. It provides an essential foundation for understanding dental pain, temporomandibular disorders (TMDs), trigeminal neuropathies, oral sensory dysfunction, and other conditions affecting the orofacial region. The complex innervation of dental tissues, periodontal structures, oral mucosa, masticatory muscles, and temporomandibular joints enables the nervous system to detect mechanical, thermal, chemical, and inflammatory stimuli. However, the same complexity can contribute to diagnostic uncertainty when pain arises from multiple anatomical structures, involves overlapping neural pathways, or persists after the original tissue injury has resolved. Dental pain is therefore not exclusively a consequence of local tissue pathology. It may also reflect peripheral sensitization, central nervous system processing, altered descending pain

modulation, and interactions between biological, psychological, and behavioral factors.

The trigeminal nervous system plays a central role in orofacial sensation. Primary sensory neurons located in the trigeminal ganglion transmit information from peripheral tissues to brainstem nuclei, particularly the trigeminal sensory nuclear complex. Subsequent processing involves ascending pathways to thalamic and cortical regions responsible for sensory discrimination, emotional responses, attention, and the interpretation of pain. Nociceptive information may also interact with brainstem networks involved in autonomic regulation and motor control. These interactions help explain why orofacial pain can be accompanied by changes in jaw movement, muscle activity, sleep, concentration, and emotional well-being. Furthermore, persistent nociceptive input may contribute to changes in neuronal excitability and synaptic connectivity, potentially sustaining pain beyond the expected period of tissue healing.

Temporomandibular disorders represent a particularly important application of orofacial neuroscience because they encompass heterogeneous conditions involving the temporomandibular joints, masticatory muscles, and associated structures. Patients may experience jaw pain, restricted movement, joint sounds, muscle tenderness, headaches, and difficulties during chewing or speaking. These manifestations can arise from different mechanisms, including joint degener-

ation, mechanical dysfunction, muscle overactivity, inflammatory processes, and altered pain processing. Distinguishing among these mechanisms is essential because similar symptoms may require different management strategies. Conventional assessment relies on patient history, physical examination, standardized diagnostic criteria, and selected imaging investigations. Nevertheless, symptom variability, overlapping conditions, and differences in individual pain sensitivity can complicate diagnostic decisions.

Intelligent technologies provide opportunities to improve the assessment and management of these conditions by integrating clinical findings with imaging, physiological measurements, behavioral information, and patient reported outcomes. Artificial intelligence, machine learning, digital dentistry, wearable sensors, computer assisted image analysis, and computational pain models may help identify clinically relevant patterns and support individualized treatment planning. Automated systems can potentially improve the reproducibility of dental radiographic interpretation, quantify jaw movement, characterize masticatory muscle activity, and monitor changes in pain over time. However, technological performance must be distinguished from demonstrated clinical benefit. Accurate image classification or reliable movement tracking does not necessarily establish the underlying cause of pain or guarantee improved patient outcomes. Integrating intelligent technologies

with established neurobiological knowledge may provide a more comprehensive approach to dental pain, temporomandibular disorders, and neurodentistry, while maintaining the importance of clinical examination, professional judgment, and patient centered care.

Neurobiological Foundations Of Orofacial Pain

Orofacial pain arises through interactions between peripheral sensory receptors, trigeminal pathways, central pain processing networks, and endogenous mechanisms that regulate nociception. Dental pulp contains sensory nerve fibers that respond to tissue injury, inflammatory mediators, and changes in the local environment. A-delta fibers are generally associated with relatively rapid, sharp pain, whereas C fibers contribute to slower, dull, burning, or persistent pain. These distinctions are useful for understanding dental symptoms, although the subjective experience of pain cannot be attributed to a single nerve fiber type. Inflammation may increase the responsiveness of peripheral nociceptors, lowering their activation thresholds and amplifying responses to otherwise tolerable stimuli. This process, known as peripheral sensitization, contributes to the pain associated with pulpitis, periodontal inflammation, and other painful dental conditions.

When nociceptive activity persists, changes may also occur within the central nervous system. Central sensitization refers to increased responsiveness of central nociceptive neurons, potentially resulting in enhanced pain responses, expanded areas of sensitivity, and pain elicited by normally nonpainful stimulation. These mechanisms are relevant to some patients with persistent dentoalveolar pain and temporomandibular disorders. Nevertheless, central sensitization cannot be diagnosed solely from the presence of chronic pain, and its clinical assessment requires careful consideration of symptoms, examination findings, and alternative explanations. Pain may also be influenced by descending inhibitory and facilitatory pathways involving brainstem structures, cortical networks, and neurotransmitter systems. Differences in these mechanisms can contribute to substantial variability in pain intensity among individuals with similar tissue abnormalities.

The trigeminal system also participates in reflexive and voluntary motor activities. Sensory information from teeth, oral mucosa, muscles, and joints interacts with brainstem motor networks controlling jaw closure, opening, chewing, and protective responses. Pain can alter these motor patterns, leading to guarded movement, reduced jaw excursion, or changes in muscle recruitment. Conversely, sustained muscle activity, altered movement coordination, and repeated mechanical loading may aggravate symptoms in susceptible individuals. These relationships are bidirectional and do not imply that every painful condition is

caused by abnormal muscle activity. Instead, they demonstrate why assessment of orofacial pain should consider sensory, motor, and functional dimensions together.

Intelligent technologies can help investigate these interactions through the integration of electromyography, jaw tracking, quantitative sensory testing, clinical examinations, and patient reported outcomes. Machine learning may identify combinations of features associated with particular symptom patterns, while longitudinal analysis can reveal whether changes in muscle activity precede, accompany, or follow changes in pain. Neuroimaging and electrophysiological techniques may provide additional information about neural processing in selected research settings. However, many neural mechanisms cannot be inferred reliably from indirect measurements alone. A clinically useful model must therefore distinguish between observable associations and demonstrated causal mechanisms. Combining neurobiological knowledge with validated measurements may help clarify the mechanisms underlying orofacial pain and support more precise, mechanism informed treatment decisions.

Artificial Intelligence For Dental Pain Diagnosis

Dental pain is among the most common reasons for seeking oral health care, yet identifying its source can be challenging when symptoms

are poorly localized, multiple teeth are affected, or clinical findings are inconsistent. Pulpal inflammation, apical periodontitis, cracked teeth, periodontal disease, postoperative sensitivity, and nonodontogenic pain may produce overlapping complaints. Pain referred from masticatory muscles or other orofacial structures can also be mistakenly attributed to a tooth, potentially resulting in unnecessary dental procedures. Accurate diagnosis therefore requires integration of symptom history, clinical examination, pulp sensibility testing, percussion, palpation, periodontal assessment, and appropriate imaging. No single test reliably identifies every cause of dental pain.

Artificial intelligence may support diagnostic reasoning by combining these information sources into structured assessments. Machine learning models can analyze clinical variables such as pain duration, triggering factors, spontaneous symptoms, thermal responses, tenderness, and associated functional limitations. Natural language processing can extract relevant information from clinical notes, helping organize symptom descriptions and identify missing diagnostic information. Decision support systems may then present possible diagnoses and recommend additional examinations when findings are incomplete or contradictory. Such tools could be particularly useful in settings where clinicians manage high patient volumes or have limited access to specialist consultation. However, their rec-

ommendations must remain conditional on the quality of the input data and the clinical context.

Dental radiographs and cone beam computed tomography provide information about selected anatomical and pathological features, but they do not directly measure the subjective experience of pain. Artificial intelligence systems trained on dental images may identify periapical radiolucencies, changes in bone structure, caries, or other abnormalities that contribute to diagnostic assessment. Nonetheless, a radiographic lesion does not necessarily establish that the associated tooth is responsible for a patient's symptoms. Conversely, clinically significant pulp inflammation may occur without conspicuous radiographic changes. An intelligent diagnostic system should therefore combine imaging findings with examination results rather than interpreting radiographic abnormalities in isolation.

A further opportunity involves identifying patients whose symptoms may have a neuropathic or nonodontogenic origin. Persistent pain following dental treatment, altered sensation, burning discomfort, or pain extending beyond the expected anatomical distribution may warrant evaluation for trigeminal neuropathic pain or other conditions. Artificial intelligence could help flag atypical presentations and prompt additional assessment, but it should not automatically assign a neuropathic diagnosis based on symptom patterns alone. Appropriate evaluation may require

specialist examination, neurological assessment, and exclusion of alternative causes.

Clinical validation remains essential before automated diagnostic tools are incorporated into routine dental practice. Models should be tested in independent populations, across different imaging systems, and among patients with diverse clinical presentations. Their performance should be assessed using measures of sensitivity, specificity, calibration, and decision utility, alongside their effects on diagnostic errors and treatment decisions. Researchers should also examine whether these systems reduce unnecessary procedures without delaying necessary treatment. Ultimately, intelligent dental pain diagnosis should improve the integration of clinical evidence, reduce uncertainty, and support appropriate care rather than replace the reasoning required to distinguish tissue related pain from complex orofacial pain conditions.

Temporomandibular Disorders And Intelligent Clinical Assessment

Temporomandibular disorders comprise a heterogeneous group of conditions affecting the temporomandibular joints, masticatory muscles, and related structures. Clinical presentations include myalgia, arthralgia, disc displacement, degenerative joint changes, movement restriction, and combinations of these conditions. Patients may report pain during chewing, jaw stiffness,

clicking, locking, or headaches associated with jaw function. The relationship between anatomical abnormalities and symptoms is not always straightforward. Some individuals have structural changes without substantial pain, whereas others experience severe symptoms despite relatively limited findings on conventional imaging. This variability highlights the importance of integrating structural, functional, and psychosocial information when assessing TMDs.

Established diagnostic frameworks, including the Diagnostic Criteria for Temporomandibular Disorders, provide standardized approaches to clinical examination and diagnosis. These frameworks help distinguish muscle related pain from joint related conditions and support more consistent classification across clinical settings and research studies. However, assessment can still be affected by examiner experience, variations in palpation technique, differences in pain reporting, and fluctuations in symptoms. Intelligent technologies may improve measurement consistency by supplementing clinical assessment with quantitative data on jaw movement, muscle activation, joint morphology, and functional performance.

Computer vision and motion tracking can quantify mandibular opening, lateral excursion, movement trajectories, and deviations during repeated jaw movements. These measurements may help characterize functional limitations and monitor treatment response. Surface electromyography

can record electrical activity associated with masticatory muscle activation, while wearable or portable sensors may support repeated measurements during selected daily activities. Nevertheless, electromyographic amplitude is influenced by electrode placement, tissue characteristics, signal processing, and task performance. Elevated muscle activity cannot independently establish a diagnosis of TMD or prove that muscle overactivity is the primary cause of pain. These measurements should be interpreted alongside symptoms and standardized clinical findings.

Artificial intelligence may integrate these diverse features to identify clinically relevant subgroups and investigate patterns associated with different TMD presentations. For example, models could examine whether combinations of pain distribution, jaw mobility, muscle tenderness, sleep disturbances, and psychosocial variables distinguish patients who respond differently to conservative treatments. Clustering methods may identify groups with similar clinical profiles, although the resulting clusters require independent validation and should not automatically be considered biologically distinct disorders. Predictive models may also estimate the likelihood of persistent symptoms, provided that their predictions are evaluated prospectively and do not encourage deterministic interpretations of an individual's prognosis.

The practical value of intelligent assessment lies in

improving the consistency and usefulness of clinical decisions. A system may help document baseline function, identify changes over time, and alert clinicians when symptoms worsen or treatment goals are not being achieved. However, the presence of joint sounds, movement asymmetry, or imaging abnormalities should not automatically trigger invasive treatment. Management decisions must reflect the patient's symptoms, functional limitations, preferences, and the balance between potential benefits and harms. Intelligent technologies should strengthen standardized assessment and facilitate individualized care while preserving the distinction between measurable abnormalities and clinically meaningful disease.

Digital Imaging And Computational Modeling In Neurodentistry

Neurodentistry explores the relationships between the nervous system and oral health, including sensory function, pain processing, neural injury, motor control, and neurological influences on dental treatment. Digital imaging and computational modeling can contribute to this field by improving the visualization of anatomical structures and supporting quantitative analysis of dental and orofacial conditions. Conventional dental radiography, cone beam computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, and selected neuroimaging techniques provide complementary information about hard tissues, joints, soft tissues,

and neural structures. The appropriate modality depends on the clinical question, and imaging should be selected according to established indications while minimizing unnecessary radiation exposure.

Artificial intelligence has demonstrated potential for identifying anatomical landmarks, segmenting teeth and surrounding structures, and detecting selected pathological findings in dental images. In neurodentistry, computational analysis may help characterize the relationship between dental procedures and nearby neural structures, particularly when assessing the mandibular canal, mental foramen, and other anatomically important regions. Improved visualization may assist treatment planning and help identify situations in which additional evaluation is warranted. However, radiographic proximity to a nerve does not establish that nerve injury has occurred, and image analysis alone cannot determine the functional status of a sensory pathway.

Computational models can also investigate the mechanical and physiological factors that influence orofacial function. Finite element analysis may estimate stress distributions in teeth, bone, restorations, and temporomandibular joint structures under specified loading conditions. Such models can support biomechanical research and the design of dental restorations or prosthetic components. When combined with experimentally measured data, they may help explain how

changes in tissue properties or loading patterns influence mechanical behavior. Nevertheless, model outputs depend on assumptions about geometry, material properties, boundary conditions, and applied forces. They should not be interpreted as direct measurements of pain or neural activity.

Multimodal computational approaches may eventually integrate anatomical imaging, movement analysis, sensory testing, and clinical records into more comprehensive representations of orofacial function. For example, a model of temporomandibular dysfunction could combine joint morphology with jaw kinematics and patient reported symptoms to examine relationships between structure and function. A model of trigeminal nerve injury could incorporate sensory examination and anatomical information to support research into injury patterns and recovery. These approaches may be especially useful for generating testable hypotheses and identifying patients who require further evaluation.

Despite their potential, computational models require careful clinical validation before they can guide treatment independently. Data from different imaging devices may vary in resolution, acquisition protocols, and reconstruction methods, potentially affecting algorithm performance. Training datasets may also underrepresent uncommon anatomical variants and complex neurological conditions. Researchers should establish reproducibility, quantify uncertainty, and compare model predictions with appropriate clinical reference standards. Digital imaging and computational modeling are most useful when they complement clinical assessment and provide information that meaningfully improves diagnostic accuracy, treatment planning, or patient outcomes.

Neuropathic Orofacial Pain And Trigeminal Nerve Dysfunction

Neuropathic orofacial pain results from a lesion or disease affecting the somatosensory nervous system. It may occur after dental procedures, facial trauma, infection, nerve compression, or neurological disease. Clinical manifestations include burning pain, electric shock like sensations, tingling, numbness, altered temperature perception, and pain elicited by normally nonpainful stimulation. Trigeminal neuralgia is characterized by recurrent, typically brief episodes of severe facial pain that follow the distribution of one or more trigeminal divisions. Painful post-traumatic trigeminal neuropathy may develop after injury to a trigeminal nerve branch and can involve persistent pain accompanied by sensory abnormalities. Distinguishing these conditions from odontogenic pain is important because repeated dental interventions may fail to address the underlying neurological mechanism and can sometimes cause additional harm.

Diagnosis requires a detailed history, neurological

and orofacial examination, and appropriate investigation of suspected causes. Clinicians should document the location and quality of pain, provoking factors, sensory changes, temporal characteristics, and relationships with previous procedures. In selected cases, imaging or specialist assessment may be required to investigate structural lesions, nerve compression, or other neurological disorders. Quantitative sensory testing can characterize thresholds for selected stimuli and help describe patterns of sensory gain or loss. However, these measurements do not independently identify the cause of neuropathic pain and must be interpreted in the broader clinical context.

Intelligent technologies may support neuropathic pain assessment by combining symptom descriptions, sensory examination findings, treatment history, and anatomical information. Natural language processing could help identify features suggesting neuropathic pain within clinical records, while decision support systems may prompt clinicians to consider neurological explanations when routine dental investigations do not adequately explain symptoms. Machine learning may also help researchers identify patterns associated with different trajectories of pain persistence or treatment response. Nevertheless, the rarity and clinical heterogeneity of some neuropathic conditions can limit the size and representativeness of available training datasets. A model developed from highly selected specialist populations may not perform reliably in general dental practice.

Digital monitoring may provide additional information about symptom fluctuations, medication use, sleep, and functional limitations. Patient reported assessments delivered through secure applications can document pain intensity, triggers, and changes in daily activities over time. Such information may help clinicians evaluate whether treatment is producing meaningful improvement and whether additional assessment is needed. However, frequent monitoring can increase the burden of reporting, and automated interpretation may overlook important contextual factors.

Treatment for neuropathic orofacial pain depends on the underlying condition and may involve pharmacological therapy, specialist neurological care, selected procedures, psychological support, and rehabilitation strategies. Intelligent systems could support treatment monitoring and identify patterns requiring clinical review, but they should not independently initiate or modify high risk interventions. Their development should prioritize diagnostic safety, transparent uncertainty estimates, and appropriate referral pathways. By helping clinicians recognize atypical symptoms and organize longitudinal information, intelligent technologies may reduce diagnostic delays and support more appropriate management of trigeminal nerve dysfunction.

Adaptive Therapeutics And Person-

alized Orofacial Pain Management

The management of dental pain and temporomandibular disorders increasingly emphasizes the identification of contributing mechanisms, preservation of function, and selection of interventions according to individual needs. Treatment may include restorative procedures, management of pulpal or periodontal disease, physical therapy, education, behavioral interventions, pharmacological treatment, and selected surgical approaches when indicated. For many patients with painful TMDs, conservative and reversible strategies are preferred initially. These may include jaw exercises, manual therapy, habit modification, education about pain and movement, and approaches addressing sleep or stress when relevant. Treatment selection should reflect the clinical diagnosis, severity of symptoms, functional impairment, patient preferences, and response to previous care.

Intelligent technologies may support adaptive therapeutics by tracking symptoms and modifying treatment recommendations in response to progress. A digital monitoring platform could record pain intensity, jaw mobility, chewing limitations, sleep quality, and adherence to prescribed exercises. Changes in these measures could help clinicians identify whether the current approach is producing improvement or whether reassessment is needed. Wearable sensors may document jaw movement or muscle activity in

selected applications, while mobile rehabilitation platforms can provide reminders and guide patients through individualized exercises. However, automated feedback should be designed carefully because excessive monitoring or poorly calibrated recommendations may increase anxiety, encourage unnecessary activity restriction, or reinforce unhelpful attention to symptoms.

Machine learning could help estimate which patients are more likely to benefit from particular conservative interventions by analyzing baseline clinical characteristics and subsequent outcomes. For example, models may investigate whether initial movement restriction, symptom duration, pain distribution, sleep disturbances, or psychosocial factors are associated with differential responses to exercise based therapy or behavioral approaches. Such predictions require prospective validation because associations in retrospective data may reflect treatment selection, confounding, and differences in adherence. A model that predicts poor outcomes should not be used to deny treatment or imply that recovery is impossible. Instead, predictions should help identify patients who may benefit from closer follow up, additional assessment, or alternative therapeutic strategies.

Adaptive systems must also incorporate patient preferences and meaningful functional goals. Reducing pain intensity is important, but successful treatment may additionally involve improved chewing, greater jaw mobility, better sleep, re-

duced medication burden, and increased participation in work or social activities. Patient reported outcomes can help capture these dimensions, while standardized clinical measurements provide complementary evidence. Clinicians should interpret changes in context and consider whether observed improvements are sustained rather than relying on isolated measurements.

Safety is particularly important when technologies influence therapeutic decisions. Digital recommendations should remain within validated treatment protocols, and systems should identify warning signs that require prompt professional evaluation. Patients with new neurological deficits, significant trauma, infection, rapidly progressive symptoms, or other concerning findings should not be managed solely through automated self care programs. Adaptive therapeutics should therefore combine digital monitoring with clear escalation pathways and clinician oversight. When appropriately designed, intelligent systems may improve continuity of care, facilitate individualized rehabilitation, and support treatment decisions that respond to the changing needs of patients with orofacial pain.

Clinical Translation, Ethical Challenges, And Future Directions

Translating intelligent technologies into routine neurodentistry requires evidence that they improve clinical decisions and patient outcomes

beyond what can be achieved through existing methods. Technical accuracy is an important starting point, but it does not establish clinical effectiveness. A model may classify dental images accurately without reducing diagnostic errors, or measure jaw movement precisely without improving pain or function. Evaluation should therefore include clinically relevant outcomes such as diagnostic accuracy, time to appropriate treatment, avoidance of unnecessary procedures, pain related disability, functional recovery, patient satisfaction, and cost effectiveness. Studies should also examine adverse consequences, including false reassurance, inappropriate referrals, overdiagnosis, and unnecessary treatment resulting from incorrect algorithmic recommendations.

External validation is essential because dental practices differ in equipment, patient populations, diagnostic routines, and available specialist services. Algorithms trained using data from a limited number of institutions may not generalize to other settings. Differences in age, anatomical variation, language, cultural expressions of pain, and prevalence of specific conditions can affect model performance. Research should include diverse populations and evaluate performance across clinically important subgroups. Transparent reporting of training data, model limitations, missing information, and uncertainty can help clinicians judge whether a recommendation is appropriate for a particular patient.

Ethical and privacy considerations are equally important. Dental records, facial images, movement recordings, and neurological measurements may contain sensitive personal information. Secure data storage, appropriate access controls, informed consent, and clear policies governing secondary use are necessary. Facial analysis technologies require particular care because images may be identifiable even when conventional personal identifiers are removed. Patients should understand how their information is processed and whether it is used to train or improve algorithms. Healthcare professionals and developers must also establish accountability when automated recommendations contribute to diagnostic or treatment errors.

Future research may benefit from multimodal artificial intelligence systems that integrate clinical examination, dental imaging, jaw kinematics, electromyography, quantitative sensory testing, and longitudinal patient reported outcomes. Such systems could support more comprehensive characterization of orofacial pain and help investigate the relationships between peripheral pathology, neural processing, and functional impairment. Digital twins of selected orofacial structures may eventually enable researchers to simulate biomechanical changes or compare potential treatment strategies, although their reliability will depend on validated models and high quality individual data. Integration with electronic dental

records may further improve documentation and continuity of care, provided that interoperability and privacy requirements are addressed.

The long term objective is not to replace dentists, neurologists, or orofacial pain specialists with automated systems. Rather, it is to provide clinicians with reliable tools for interpreting complex information, recognizing atypical presentations, monitoring treatment response, and selecting interventions that reflect individual patient needs. Intelligent technologies should remain grounded in established neuroscience, standardized diagnostic criteria, and rigorous clinical evaluation. By combining computational methods with clinical expertise and patient centered decision making, neurodentistry may advance toward more precise diagnosis, safer treatment, and improved functional outcomes for individuals experiencing dental pain, temporomandibular disorders, and trigeminal sensory dysfunction.

9. INTEGRATING PERIPHERAL AND AUTONOMIC NERVOUS SYSTEM FUNCTIONS WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR NEUROMODULATION, PROSTHETICS, AND PHYSIOLOGICAL MONITORING

Background

The peripheral and autonomic nervous systems play essential roles in maintaining physiological stability, coordinating movement, processing sensory information, and regulating the internal environment of the human body. The peripheral nervous system comprises cranial nerves, spinal nerves, sensory receptors, peripheral ganglia, and neuromuscular connections that facilitate communication between the central nervous system and peripheral tissues. Through these pathways, the brain and spinal cord receive information about touch, temperature, pain, body position, and internal physiological conditions while controlling skeletal muscle activity and numerous organ functions. The autonomic nervous system regulates involuntary processes, including heart rate, blood pressure, gastrointestinal motility, thermoregulation, pupil responses, and glandular secretion. Its sympathetic, parasympathetic, and enteric components interact with one another and with endocrine, immune, and central neural

systems to maintain homeostasis and coordinate adaptive responses to environmental and physiological demands.

Disorders affecting peripheral nerves and autonomic pathways can produce substantial disability and may compromise multiple organ systems. Peripheral neuropathies can cause sensory loss, neuropathic pain, weakness, impaired balance, and reduced functional independence. Traumatic nerve injuries may interrupt motor and sensory communication, limiting movement and protective sensation. Spinal cord injuries and amputations can disrupt the pathways required for voluntary movement and sensory feedback, creating a need for advanced prosthetic and assistive technologies. Autonomic dysfunction can manifest as orthostatic hypotension, abnormal heart rate regulation, impaired sweating, gastrointestinal disturbances, bladder dysfunction, or altered thermoregulatory responses. These conditions may occur in diabetes, neurodegenerative diseases, autoimmune disorders, spinal cord injuries, and other neurological or systemic conditions. Their clinical manifestations are often heterogeneous, making accurate assessment and individualized treatment particularly important.

Conventional approaches to peripheral nerve disorders and autonomic dysfunction include pharmacological treatment, physical rehabilitation, electrical stimulation, prosthetic devices, surgical reconstruction, and physiological monitoring.

Although these interventions can improve symptoms and function, their effectiveness may be limited by incomplete nerve regeneration, variable treatment responses, insufficient sensory feedback, device discomfort, and difficulties in continuously assessing physiological changes. Many traditional systems operate according to fixed stimulation parameters or predefined control rules, even though neural activity and physiological demands fluctuate considerably over time. These limitations have encouraged the development of intelligent technologies that combine artificial intelligence, wearable sensors, bioelectronic medicine, advanced prosthetics, computational modeling, and adaptive control systems.

Integrating intelligent technologies with peripheral and autonomic nervous system functions creates opportunities for more precise neuromodulation, responsive prosthetic control, and continuous physiological assessment. Wearable devices can monitor movement, muscle activation, cardiovascular variables, and selected autonomic indicators, while machine learning algorithms can identify patterns associated with changing physiological states. Neural interfaces can connect peripheral nerves with external devices, potentially restoring aspects of motor function or sensory feedback. Closed loop neuromodulation systems can adjust stimulation according to measured neural or physiological responses rather than relying exclusively on fixed treatment schedules.

However, these innovations introduce important challenges involving signal reliability, biological variability, device safety, privacy, and clinical validation. Their success depends on demonstrating meaningful improvements in functional independence, symptom control, and health outcomes. A comprehensive approach that combines neurophysiology, intelligent computation, biomedical engineering, and clinical expertise may therefore provide a foundation for advancing personalized therapies and monitoring strategies for disorders affecting peripheral and autonomic neural systems.

Neurophysiological Foundations Of Peripheral And Autonomic Function

Peripheral neural communication depends on specialized sensory neurons, motor neurons, autonomic neurons, and supporting glial cells that transmit information between the central nervous system and peripheral tissues. Sensory neurons detect mechanical, thermal, chemical, and potentially damaging stimuli, converting them into electrical signals that travel toward the spinal cord and brain. Motor neurons transmit commands to skeletal muscles through neuromuscular junctions, where acetylcholine initiates muscle fiber activation. These processes depend on the integrity of axons, myelin, ion channels, synaptic transmission, and local tissue environments. Peripheral nerve injury can disrupt signal conduction

and produce changes in sensation, movement, and reflex activity. The extent of recovery depends on factors such as injury severity, the distance between the injury and target tissue, the preservation of connective tissue structures, and the effectiveness of axonal regeneration.

The autonomic nervous system regulates internal physiological conditions through interconnected neural pathways and peripheral ganglia. Sympathetic pathways generally support responses associated with increased physiological demand, including changes in heart rate, vascular tone, and energy mobilization. Parasympathetic pathways contribute to functions such as gastrointestinal activity, selected aspects of cardiac regulation, and glandular secretion. The enteric nervous system coordinates many gastrointestinal processes through local neural circuits that can operate with substantial autonomy while remaining influenced by sympathetic, parasympathetic, and central signals. These divisions do not function independently. Their interactions allow the body to adapt cardiovascular, metabolic, digestive, and other processes to changing circumstances.

Autonomic regulation involves continuous feedback between physiological sensors, neural control networks, and peripheral organs. Baroreceptors detect changes in arterial pressure, while chemoreceptors respond to changes in oxygen, carbon dioxide, and related physiological variables. Visceral sensory pathways convey informa-

tion about organ distension, chemical conditions, and tissue status. Central networks integrate these signals with behavioral and environmental information, adjusting autonomic output to maintain appropriate physiological responses. Heart rate variability, blood pressure patterns, skin conductance, and other measurements can provide indirect information about aspects of autonomic function. Nevertheless, these indicators are influenced by respiration, posture, physical activity, medication, age, and underlying disease. No single measurement fully characterizes autonomic regulation.

Intelligent technologies can investigate these complex relationships by combining electrophysiological recordings, physiological measurements, and computational analysis. Machine learning may identify patterns that distinguish selected physiological states or detect changes that precede clinically apparent deterioration. Computational models can help researchers investigate interactions between neural signaling and organ function, while wearable sensors support repeated measurements under real world conditions. However, physiological correlations should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of a specific neural mechanism. For example, a change in heart rate variability may reflect several interacting influences rather than a unique change in parasympathetic activity. Effective intelligent monitoring therefore requires careful attention

to signal quality, physiological context, and validated interpretations. A detailed understanding of peripheral and autonomic neurophysiology is essential for designing technologies that produce meaningful information and support safe, individualized interventions.

Artificial Intelligence For Peripheral Neuropathy Assessment

Peripheral neuropathies encompass a broad range of disorders affecting sensory, motor, or autonomic nerve fibers. Their causes include diabetes, nutritional deficiencies, toxic exposures, inherited conditions, autoimmune diseases, infections, nerve compression, and traumatic injury. Clinical manifestations vary according to the affected nerve populations and anatomical distribution. Patients may experience numbness, tingling, burning pain, weakness, reduced reflexes, impaired coordination, or autonomic disturbances. Conventional diagnostic assessment combines medical history, neurological examination, laboratory investigations, nerve conduction studies, electromyography, and selected imaging or specialized testing. Although these approaches are clinically valuable, early disease detection and precise characterization can remain challenging, particularly when symptoms are subtle or multiple conditions coexist.

Artificial intelligence can support neuropathy assessment by integrating clinical characteristics

with electrophysiological, imaging, and laboratory data. Machine learning algorithms may identify patterns associated with particular neuropathy subtypes, estimate the probability of disease progression, or help distinguish different causes of similar symptoms. Nerve conduction studies provide measurements of response amplitudes, conduction velocities, and latencies that can be analyzed alongside demographic and clinical variables. Electromyographic signals may offer information about motor unit recruitment and muscle denervation. In selected research settings, high resolution ultrasound and magnetic resonance neurography can provide additional anatomical information about nerve structure and surrounding tissues.

Automated analysis may improve the consistency of electrophysiological interpretation by identifying waveform characteristics, detecting potential abnormalities, and reducing repetitive measurement tasks. Models could also combine serial assessments to identify changes in nerve function over time. For example, longitudinal analysis may help investigate whether electrophysiological deterioration is associated with changes in muscle strength, sensory loss, or functional independence. However, different neuropathies can produce overlapping electrophysiological patterns, and the same disease may affect individuals differently. Automated classifications should therefore support rather than replace clinical interpretation.

A particularly important opportunity is the identification of early diabetic peripheral neuropathy and other conditions in which timely intervention may reduce complications. Wearable sensors and digital functional assessments could monitor gait stability, plantar pressure, balance, and daily activity, potentially revealing changes that are not captured during occasional clinical visits. Intelligent systems may identify patients who require additional evaluation, including those at increased risk of falls or foot injury. Nevertheless, sensor derived abnormalities are not sufficient to establish a neuropathy diagnosis, and screening systems must be validated against appropriate clinical reference standards.

Model development should account for differences in age, sex, body composition, comorbidities, medication use, and the prevalence of specific neuropathies across populations. Data from specialist centers may not represent individuals receiving care in primary settings. External validation, transparent reporting, and prospective evaluation are therefore essential. Clinical utility should be assessed through outcomes such as earlier diagnosis, fewer missed cases, improved treatment selection, and reduced disability rather than classification accuracy alone. When appropriately developed, artificial intelligence can help organize complex diagnostic information, identify patterns of disease progression, and support more individualized management of peripheral nerve dis-

orders.

Intelligent Neuromodulation And Bioelectronic Medicine

Neuromodulation involves the modification of neural activity through electrical, magnetic, or other forms of stimulation. In peripheral and autonomic disorders, electrical stimulation may target peripheral nerves, muscles, or neural pathways involved in pain, movement, organ regulation, and sensory processing. Functional electrical stimulation can activate muscles whose voluntary control has been impaired, while peripheral nerve stimulation may be used for selected pain conditions. Vagus nerve stimulation has established clinical applications in particular neurological conditions and is also being investigated for other indications. Sacral neuromodulation can be used for selected bladder and bowel disorders, while other bioelectronic approaches are being explored for cardiovascular, inflammatory, and metabolic applications. The evidence and regulatory status vary considerably across these applications.

Traditional stimulation systems often use predefined parameters, including amplitude, pulse width, frequency, and stimulation duration. Although these settings can be adjusted during clinical programming, they may not respond automatically to rapid changes in neural activity or physiological demand. Intelligent neuromodulation aims to address this limitation by incorporating sensors and computational controllers that adapt stimulation according to measured responses. For example, a system may modify stimulation intensity based on detected muscle activation, movement phase, or a predefined physiological signal. This approach can potentially improve precision while reducing unnecessary stimulation and accommodating changes in patient condition.

Closed loop neuromodulation depends on reliable measurement, appropriate interpretation, and safe control of stimulation. Sensors may record neural activity, electromyography, movement, cardiovascular signals, or other variables relevant to the therapeutic objective. Algorithms then determine whether stimulation should be initiated, modified, or suspended. The choice of control signal is crucial because physiological measurements can be affected by noise, movement artifacts, and unrelated processes. A heart rate change, for instance, may reflect physical exertion, emotional arousal, medication, or autonomic dysfunction. An intelligent controller must distinguish clinically relevant changes from ordinary physiological variability as reliably as possible.

Adaptive systems also need explicit safety boundaries. Stimulation outside approved parameters may cause discomfort, unintended muscle activation, tissue irritation, or other adverse effects depending on the device and application. Algorithms should be tested under realistic operating

conditions and include mechanisms for detecting faults, limiting output, and returning to a safe state. Clinicians must retain appropriate control over treatment settings, especially when evidence supporting automated adaptation is limited.

Bioelectronic medicine also presents an opportunity to investigate the interactions between peripheral neural activity and physiological regulation. Research into targeted autonomic stimulation may help clarify how selected neural pathways influence cardiovascular function, gastrointestinal activity, and inflammatory signaling. However, these biological relationships are complex, and findings from experimental models cannot automatically be generalized to routine clinical practice. Intelligent neuromodulation should therefore progress through carefully controlled studies that evaluate both mechanistic outcomes and clinically meaningful benefits. The long term objective is to develop responsive systems that deliver appropriate stimulation when needed, reduce treatment burden, and improve outcomes while maintaining predictable safety and transparent clinical oversight.

Neural Interfaces And Intelligent Prosthetic Control

Neural interfaces provide communication between the nervous system and external devices, creating opportunities to restore or augment movement, sensory feedback, and functional in-

dependence. Prosthetic technologies have traditionally relied on mechanical controls, switches, or surface electromyography to detect residual muscle activity. These systems can be effective, but users may experience difficulties when muscle signals are weak, inconsistent, or affected by fatigue. More advanced interfaces can combine electromyography, peripheral nerve recordings, inertial sensors, and machine learning algorithms to interpret movement intention and translate it into device commands. This approach can improve the responsiveness and adaptability of prosthetic systems when the underlying signals are sufficiently reliable.

Myoelectric prostheses use electrical activity generated by residual muscles to control artificial limbs. Machine learning can classify patterns of muscle activation associated with different intended movements, such as opening and closing a prosthetic hand or rotating the wrist. Pattern recognition methods may reduce the need for repeated manual switching and enable more natural control of multiple degrees of freedom. However, muscle signals vary with electrode placement, skin impedance, limb position, fatigue, and changes in residual tissue. Adaptive algorithms may help compensate for some of these variations, but they must avoid interpreting unintended muscle activity as a deliberate command.

Peripheral nerve interfaces may provide access to neural signals or deliver stimulation that evokes

sensations associated with an artificial limb. When combined with suitable prosthetic hardware, these approaches can potentially improve the relationship between intended movement and perceived sensory feedback. For example, stimulation of selected nerve pathways may produce sensations related to touch or pressure, helping users regulate grip force. Sensory feedback is particularly important for delicate manipulation because visual monitoring alone may be insufficient for precise control. Nevertheless, the quality and stability of artificially evoked sensations depend on electrode design, nerve anatomy, stimulation parameters, and individual physiological responses.

Robotic prostheses can also incorporate force sensors, joint encoders, tactile sensors, and inertial measurement units. Artificial intelligence can integrate these inputs to estimate object properties, detect slippage, and adjust grip force. A prosthetic hand might automatically increase grip force when an object begins to slip while limiting excessive pressure on fragile objects. Such assistance can reduce cognitive demands and support functional performance, although the user must retain appropriate control and understand how the device responds.

Clinical evaluation should consider more than laboratory performance. Relevant outcomes include comfort, reliability, ease of learning, battery life, maintenance requirements, user satisfaction,

and the ability to complete everyday activities. Advanced systems may be expensive and require specialized fitting and rehabilitation, limiting access for some populations. Long term studies should determine whether improvements persist with regular use and whether users can adapt to changing environments. Intelligent prosthetic control is most valuable when it combines reliable signal interpretation, intuitive interaction, useful sensory feedback, and practical accessibility to improve independence in daily life.

Wearable Technologies For Continuous Physiological Monitoring

Wearable technologies enable repeated or continuous measurement of physiological variables outside conventional clinical environments. Devices may incorporate electrocardiography, photoplethysmography, accelerometry, skin temperature sensors, electrodermal activity sensors, pressure sensors, and surface electromyography. Depending on their design, these systems can monitor heart rate, selected aspects of heart rhythm, movement, sleep patterns, skin conductance, peripheral temperature, and muscle activation. Such measurements can help characterize physiological responses during exercise, rest, sleep, and everyday activities, offering information that may be unavailable from isolated clinical assessments.

Intelligent analysis can transform these data streams into patterns relevant to clinical moni-

toring. Algorithms may detect irregular heart rhythms, identify unusual changes in activity, estimate sleep and wake periods, or recognize patterns associated with falls. In individuals with autonomic dysfunction, longitudinal monitoring may help characterize variations in heart rate and blood pressure responses, particularly when combined with validated clinical assessments. Wearable sensors can also support rehabilitation by measuring activity levels, movement symmetry, and adherence to prescribed exercises. However, the availability of continuous measurements does not automatically make a device suitable for diagnosis. Clinical use depends on measurement accuracy, validation, and the specific intended application.

Autonomic monitoring presents particular interpretive challenges because physiological variables are influenced by multiple interacting factors. Heart rate variability can provide information about cardiac autonomic modulation under appropriate recording and analysis conditions, but it is affected by breathing, age, posture, physical activity, medications, and cardiac disease. Skin conductance reflects changes in sweat gland activity and may be associated with sympathetic arousal, but it cannot independently identify a particular emotional state or disease. Peripheral skin temperature may vary with ambient conditions, circulation, and sensor placement. Intelligent algorithms must account for these influences rather

than interpreting every deviation as evidence of pathology.

Data quality is a major determinant of monitoring performance. Motion artifacts, poor sensor contact, low battery levels, and intermittent connectivity can generate missing or misleading information. Machine learning systems should incorporate signal quality assessment and communicate uncertainty when data are insufficient for reliable interpretation. Alerts should be designed to minimize unnecessary notifications while ensuring that clinically important events are not overlooked. Excessive false alarms may create anxiety and reduce adherence, whereas missed events may provide false reassurance.

Continuous monitoring also raises questions about privacy, data ownership, and the burden of surveillance. Patients should understand what information is collected, how it is interpreted, who can access it, and whether it is transmitted to healthcare professionals. Secure data handling and transparent consent procedures are essential, especially when physiological information is combined with location or behavioral records. When integrated into well designed clinical pathways, wearable technologies can support earlier recognition of physiological changes, more informed follow up, and individualized management. Their benefits depend on converting measurements into actionable information rather than simply increasing the volume of collected data.

Intelligent Autonomic Regulation And Organ Specific Therapeutics

Autonomic dysfunction can affect cardiovascular stability, gastrointestinal function, bladder control, sweating, temperature regulation, and other physiological processes. Its causes include diabetes, neurodegenerative disorders, spinal cord injury, autoimmune conditions, and selected medication effects. Clinical manifestations may range from relatively mild symptoms to severe impairment of daily activities and physiological stability. Orthostatic hypotension, for example, can cause dizziness or fainting when a person stands, while autonomic neuropathy may impair gastrointestinal motility or bladder emptying. Because autonomic pathways regulate multiple organ systems, assessment often requires a combination of symptom evaluation, physiological testing, and investigation of underlying disease.

Intelligent technologies may support the identification and management of autonomic dysfunction by integrating measurements across different physiological domains. Wearable electrocardiography, blood pressure monitors, activity trackers, and selected temperature sensors can provide information about changes occurring during daily life. Machine learning models may help characterize patterns associated with posture changes, exertion, sleep, or symptom episodes. In patients with suspected orthostatic intolerance, for example,

combining heart rate, blood pressure, posture, and symptom information may provide a more complete picture than heart rate alone. However, automated assessment must not replace standardized diagnostic procedures when these are clinically indicated.

Adaptive interventions may use physiological feedback to modify stimulation or provide personalized recommendations within clinically validated boundaries. In selected applications, neuromodulation may influence pathways involved in bladder function, bowel regulation, or other autonomic processes. Intelligent controllers could potentially adjust treatment according to measured responses, reducing the need for fixed stimulation schedules. Nevertheless, the safety and effectiveness of such systems depend on the specific disorder, device, and physiological target. An algorithm developed for one autonomic condition cannot be assumed to work for another because the underlying mechanisms and treatment objectives may differ substantially.

Research into vagal and other autonomic stimulation has also generated interest in bioelectronic approaches to inflammatory and metabolic conditions. Experimental findings suggest that selected neural pathways can influence immune signaling and organ function, but translating these mechanisms into reliable clinical treatments remains challenging. Physiological responses may vary according to disease state, stimulation location, and

individual neural anatomy. Clinical trials must establish appropriate treatment parameters, identify patients most likely to benefit, and determine whether observed physiological changes translate into improved symptoms or reduced complications.

Digital decision support may additionally help coordinate care by identifying patterns that warrant medication review, further investigation, or specialist referral. However, recommendations must account for comorbidities and contraindications, particularly in patients with cardiovascular disease or multiple medications. Intelligent autonomic therapeutics should be developed as condition specific systems that combine validated measurements, individualized treatment goals, and appropriate professional oversight. This approach may improve the precision of physiological management while reducing the risks associated with interpreting complex biological signals in isolation.

Peripheral Nerve Regeneration And Intelligent Rehabilitation

Peripheral nerve injuries can occur through trauma, compression, surgical complications, or disease. Depending on the severity and location of the injury, patients may experience weakness, sensory loss, neuropathic pain, and impaired coordination. Peripheral nerves possess some capacity for regeneration, particularly when the supporting

connective tissue structures remain sufficiently intact. Nevertheless, recovery may be incomplete because axonal regrowth is slow, regenerating fibers may not reconnect with their original targets, and prolonged denervation can lead to muscle atrophy. The distance between an injury and the target tissue is an important determinant of recovery, while age, comorbidities, and the local biological environment may further influence outcomes.

Rehabilitation following peripheral nerve injury aims to preserve joint mobility, prevent secondary complications, support motor relearning, and improve functional use of the affected limb. Depending on the injury, treatment may involve sensory retraining, strengthening, task specific practice, orthotic support, and electrical stimulation in selected circumstances. However, conventional assessment may not fully capture the gradual and sometimes uneven changes associated with nerve recovery. Intelligent technologies can provide more detailed monitoring by combining muscle activation, movement quality, sensory testing, and functional performance over time.

Surface electromyography can help characterize changes in muscle activation, while wearable sensors can quantify movement range, speed, and coordination. Machine learning may identify patterns associated with improving motor control or persistent dysfunction, potentially supporting more individualized rehabilitation planning. Ro-

botic assistance can enable repetitive movement practice when weakness limits independent performance. Adaptive electrical stimulation may also support selected rehabilitation goals, although its effectiveness depends on the condition and the integrity of the relevant motor pathways. These technologies should complement established clinical assessment rather than serve as independent evidence of nerve regeneration.

Computational modeling may help investigate the relationship between nerve injury characteristics and functional recovery. Models could incorporate injury location, electrophysiological measurements, muscle condition, and repeated functional assessments to estimate recovery trajectories. However, prediction is difficult because nerve regeneration is influenced by biological processes that may not be fully captured by available measurements. A model may identify statistical associations without establishing the mechanism responsible for an outcome. Prospective validation is therefore required before predictions can guide major treatment decisions.

Future approaches may combine intelligent rehabilitation systems with advanced nerve interfaces, bioengineered nerve conduits, and other regenerative strategies. Closed loop systems could potentially adjust stimulation according to measured muscle responses or task performance, while digital monitoring could help determine when rehabilitation goals need modification. Neverthe-

less, technological complexity should not obscure the primary objectives of treatment: useful movement, protective sensation, reduced pain, and improved independence. Successful translation requires accessible devices, appropriate therapist training, and evidence that the combined intervention improves outcomes beyond standard care. By linking objective monitoring with adaptive rehabilitation, intelligent technologies may help clinicians characterize recovery more precisely and tailor support to the changing needs of individuals with peripheral nerve injuries.

Clinical Translation, Ethical Challenges, And Future Directions

The integration of intelligent technologies into peripheral and autonomic nervous system care requires careful evaluation of technical reliability, clinical effectiveness, safety, and practical feasibility. Many emerging systems demonstrate promising performance in controlled environments, but their effectiveness may decrease when used across diverse patients, healthcare settings, and everyday conditions. Electrophysiological signals can vary substantially between individuals, wearable sensors may produce artifacts during movement, and neural interfaces may change their performance over time. Clinical studies should therefore assess robustness under realistic conditions and determine whether technological improvements lead to meaningful benefits in symptoms, function, qual-

ity of life, or healthcare utilization.

Validation should include appropriate reference standards and clinically relevant endpoints. A model that detects an abnormal physiological pattern must be evaluated to determine whether that pattern identifies a clinically important condition and whether acting on the result improves care. Similarly, an adaptive prosthesis should be assessed through functional performance, user experience, and long term reliability rather than laboratory accuracy alone. Randomized controlled trials, pragmatic studies, and longitudinal observational research can provide complementary evidence about effectiveness, safety, and implementation. Independent validation is especially important when developers have a commercial interest in the technology.

Ethical considerations include privacy, informed consent, algorithmic bias, and accountability. Neural signals, physiological recordings, and behavioral data can reveal sensitive information about an individual's health and daily activities. Systems should use appropriate data protection measures and provide clear explanations of how information is collected, stored, shared, and used. Algorithms trained on unrepresentative populations may perform poorly in particular groups, potentially leading to unequal access or inaccurate clinical recommendations. Developers should evaluate performance across demographic and clinical subgroups and establish mechanisms for

monitoring errors after deployment.

Access and affordability also influence the potential impact of intelligent neurotechnology. Advanced neural interfaces and robotic prostheses may require specialized facilities, trained professionals, and substantial financial resources. Wearable systems may be more scalable, but they still require validation, technical support, and appropriate pathways for responding to alerts. Healthcare organizations should consider whether the benefits justify the costs and whether simpler interventions can achieve comparable outcomes. Patient preferences, comfort, usability, and willingness to use a device over time are critical determinants of real world effectiveness.

Future research may increasingly combine multimodal physiological monitoring, artificial intelligence, neural interfaces, and individualized computational models. Digital representations of peripheral neural function could potentially support hypothesis testing and the simulation of selected treatment strategies, although their accuracy will depend on biological validity and high quality data. Advances in flexible electrodes, low power electronics, edge computing, and wireless communication may also improve device comfort and reduce dependence on continuous cloud connectivity. Nevertheless, greater technological sophistication does not guarantee superior clinical outcomes.

The long term objective is to establish safe, effect-

ive, and accessible systems that enhance communication between neural pathways, assistive devices, and physiological monitoring platforms. Intelligent technologies should support clinical expertise, preserve patient autonomy, and provide transparent information about uncertainty. Their success should ultimately be measured by improved mobility, sensory function, physiological stability, symptom control, and participation in daily life. By integrating peripheral and autonomic neuroscience with adaptive engineering and rigorous clinical research, healthcare may move toward more personalized approaches to neuromodulation, prosthetic control, and physiological monitoring while maintaining the essential principles of evidence based and patient centered care.

10. INTEGRATING NERVOUS SYSTEM FUNCTIONS WITH INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGIES FOR OTHER PAIN, SENSORY, AND MOTOR DISORDERS

Integrating Nervous System Functions with Intelligent Technologies for Traumatic Brain Injury

Background

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) encompasses a wide range of injuries, ranging from mild concussions to severe penetrating injuries, and affects more than 50 million people annually. The condition causes initial mechanical damage, followed by secondary cascades involving excitotoxicity, inflammation, oxidative stress, and axonal degeneration. These processes profoundly disrupt nervous system functions, including synaptic plasticity, oscillatory network activity, and sensorimotor integration.

Smart technologies, broadly defined as systems based on artificial intelligence, machine learning algorithms, Internet of Things (IoT) sensors, and biologically inspired hardware, are increasingly being integrated with neuroscience principles to address these deficits. This convergence is creating neural-intelligent hybrids capable of real-time monitoring, predictive modeling, and adaptive

intervention.

A coherent narrative of progress in this field is needed, emphasizing conceptual connections between basic neuroscience and engineering innovation.

Pathophysiology of Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI): Targets for Intelligent Intervention

The vulnerability of the nervous system in traumatic brain injury (TBI) manifests at multiple scales. At the cellular level, diffuse axonal injury (DAI) disrupts forward signal transmission and leads to Wallerian degeneration. Synaptic dysfunction is associated with an imbalance in glutamatergic and GABAergic signaling, contributing to hyperexcitability or reduced network connectivity. Glial activation exacerbates chronic neuroinflammation, while vascular injury compromises the blood-brain barrier.

Advanced neuroimaging and electrophysiology reveal these changes dynamically. Functional MRI and high-density EEG demonstrate altered default mode network connectivity and impaired theta-gamma coupling in chronic TBI. These insights provide rich datasets for AI integration. Graph neural networks (GNNs) and transformer architectures can model brain connectomes as dynamic graphs, predict regions at risk of secondary injury, and identify compensatory pathways. Research

has shown that multimodal AI models integrating EEG, fMRI, and clinical variables have achieved over 80% accuracy in prognostic classification, outperforming traditional scoring systems such as the Glasgow Outcome Scale (GOS).

Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs): Directly Linking Neural Signals and Technology

Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs) are central to the direct integration of nervous system functions with intelligent systems. Noninvasive BCIs using EEG or functional near-infrared spectroscopy (fNIRS) enable imagery-based motor control for patients with post-TBI motor deficits. Invasive approaches, such as microelectrode arrays, provide higher-resolution access to cortical regions.

Recent closed-loop BCIs incorporate reinforcement learning to decode intention and provide sensory feedback. In rehabilitation, these systems promote Hebbian plasticity by coupling voluntary neural activity with assisted robotic movement. Studies have reported significant improvements in upper limb function, based on Fugl-Meyer Assessment scores, among patients with moderate to severe TBI using EEG-based BCIs.

For post-TBI disorders of consciousness, BCIs facilitate communication and cognitive assessment. Machine learning classifiers applied to event-related potentials have enabled the detection of covert consciousness with sensitivity exceeding 80%. Emerging fully implantable systems, inspired by next-generation neural prostheses, combine recording, stimulation, and on-device AI processing to minimize latency and power consumption.

Neuromorphic Computing and Biologically Inspired Neural Modeling

Traditional von Neumann architectures struggle to match the parallelism and energy efficiency of biological neural systems. Neuromorphic hardware, using spiking neural networks (SNNs) and memristive devices, simulates neural dynamics more accurately. These platforms are particularly well suited to TBI applications because they can tolerate the noisy and scattered signals characteristic of damaged neural tissue.

Digital twins of injured brain networks, built using SNNs, allow researchers to simulate therapeutic interventions. Researchers have described a memristor-based neuromorphic processor that performed spike sorting and adaptive stimulation in rodent TBI models in real time and accelerated recovery in hippocampal-dependent memory tasks. When integrated with edge computing, such devices enable implantable closed-loop systems that automatically detect pathological oscillations and deliver targeted neural modulation, reducing dependence on external computational resources.

Hybrid neuromorphic AI systems further improve

the modeling of neural resilience. By combining rules derived from long-term potentiation (LTP) and long-term depression (LTD), algorithms can optimize rehabilitation protocols in real time and personalize stimulation parameters according to individual recovery pathways.

AI in Personalized Diagnosis, Prognosis, and Management

AI excels at processing heterogeneous streams of TBI data. Convolutional neural networks applied to CT and MRI scans can achieve high accuracy in detecting intracranial hemorrhage, midline shift, and contusions within seconds. Radiomic features combined with deep learning further facilitate the classification of injury severity and the prediction of complications such as cerebral edema.

Predictive modeling also extends to long-term outcomes. Cohort models incorporating demographic, genetic, proteomic, and longitudinal physiological data have improved the prediction of post-traumatic epilepsy and cognitive decline. Intelligent helmet-based wearable systems with embedded EEG and inertial sensors provide continuous monitoring during the acute and subacute phases and generate alerts for increased intracranial pressure or impaired autoregulation.

In rehabilitation, AI-based platforms integrate computer vision, natural language processing, and adaptive gamification. Virtual reality environ-

ments, adjusted using reinforcement learning algorithms, maintain optimal challenge levels and maximize engagement and neural plasticity. Some studies have documented rapid gait recovery and a reduced risk of falls among patients with TBI using such systems.

Intelligent Neural Modulation Strategies

Neural modulation techniques can move beyond open-loop stimulation when combined with intelligent control. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS), transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS), and focused ultrasound are increasingly being guided by real-time neurofeedback. Closed-loop systems adjust parameters according to the brain's current state, optimizing treatment windows while minimizing side effects.

Responsive neurostimulation (RNS) devices, approved for epilepsy, show promise for managing seizures after TBI. Advanced AI-based versions can predict seizure propensity from multichannel recordings and deliver preemptive stimulation.

Optogenetic and magnetogenetic tools, although primarily used in preclinical research, show future potential for cell-type-specific modulation guided by computational models. Nanotechnology is further refining delivery strategies. Intelligent nanoparticles responsive to neural activity or external fields enable targeted drug or gene therapy

delivery in conjunction with intelligent monitoring systems.

Challenges, Ethical Considerations, and Translational Barriers

Despite their promise, significant barriers remain. The biocompatibility and long-term stability of implants, data privacy in neural interfaces, and algorithmic bias across diverse populations are important concerns. Ethical frameworks must address the capacity to provide informed consent, changes in identity resulting from neural augmentation, and equitable access.

Technical challenges include scaling AI models across injury subgroups and integrating them into existing clinical workflows. Regulatory pathways for adaptive AI systems require new validation methods beyond traditional randomized trials. International collaboration, standardized datasets, and open-source neurotechnology platforms will be essential for progress.

Future Vision: Toward Autonomous Neuro-Intelligent Ecosystems

This vision encompasses fully integrated ecosystems in which nervous system signals interact seamlessly with distributed intelligent agents. Generative AI can synthesize personalized recovery pathways, while quantum computing may accelerate large-scale brain simulations. Regenera-

tive approaches, such as AI-guided stem cell transplantation or three-dimensional bioprinted neural scaffolds, will complement functional restoration. Global initiatives, such as the BRAIN Initiative and its successor programs, will continue to generate fundamental data and support next-generation models. Hybrid biosynthetic systems capable of self-healing and self-adaptation could transform TBI from a chronic condition into a manageable and potentially recoverable condition for many patients.

AI-Driven Neuronutrition for Brain Health and Alzheimer's Disease Prevention

AI-driven neuronutrition is an emerging multidisciplinary area of research that encompasses the interaction between nutritional sciences and brain function, integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into precision medicine. Nutrition neuroscience encompasses the relationships between neuronal and brain health; neuronutrients, such as omega-3 fatty acids, polyphenols, and vitamins; the adoption of dietary patterns, such as the Mediterranean and Mediterranean-DASH Intervention for Neurodegenerative Delay (MIND) diets; and microbiome modulation through fiber sources to support brain health. Increased adherence to high-quality dietary patterns is directly correlated with brain health and cognitive resilience. The food-as-medicine framework has recently shifted toward

dietary strategies for protecting and maintaining human health, including brain and cognitive health. Exploring the emerging, pivotal connection between the gut and the brain through various pathways, known as the gut-brain axis, and the ability of nutrients to cross the blood-brain barrier (BBB) opens a new interdisciplinary research area for brain health. Multiple signaling pathways modulate the gut-brain axis, primarily through antioxidant defense pathways, highlighting the crucial role of nutrition in cognitive disorders affecting memory, brain aging, and executive function.

Alzheimer's disease (AD), the most prevalent form of dementia, is associated with cognitive and memory loss and poses a significant burden on healthcare systems and caregivers, affecting approximately 50 million people worldwide. Targeting underlying modifiable risk factors for AD onset is a promising strategy for mitigating the disease burden, as 40% of AD cases could potentially be prevented by addressing 12 targeted risk factors, including nutritional interventions to preserve cognitive function. Thus, exploring the interaction between neuronutrients and adherence to dietary patterns through the gut-brain axis could elucidate the underlying protective mechanisms supporting dietary recommendations for AD prevention. However, these large-scale, multivariable datasets cannot be adequately analyzed

using conventional linear regression alone, necessitating the use of machine learning (ML) and deep learning to develop predictive models that estimate dementia risk and explore how specific dietary pattern modifications may contribute to dementia prevention. The most common supervised models used in neurological studies include prediction models such as logistic regression (LR), neural networks (NNs), and decision trees (DTs), as well as classification models such as support vector machines (SVMs), each with specific limitations.

Using predictive algorithms without accounting for their specific limitations could affect model validity. Therefore, the mean absolute error across different ML models must be examined in terms of its clinical implications. Research investigating the interactions between health biomarkers, including body mass index (BMI), blood pressure, and dietary indices, and cognitive performance using different supervised ML approaches showed that the random forest regressor outperformed other prediction models, such as decision trees and gradient boosting.

Integrating AI algorithms with multi-omics and neuroimaging data and validating the proposed algorithms across multiple clinical settings and datasets provide robust evidence supporting the application of these models in real-world settings. However, few studies have used these multi-

modal approaches. A cohort study investigating smart neuronutrition confirmed the relationship between the gut-brain axis and cognitive impairment using supervised ML, specifically gradient boosting, to identify a novel composite score called Machine Learning-Assisted Optimizing Dietary Intervention Against Dementia Risk (MODERN) and examine its association with dementia onset in older adults. The model was validated in three US-based cohort datasets comprising 33,752 individuals. Adherence to the MODERN dietary pattern, which consists of seven food groups, was associated with a 36% lower risk of developing dementia compared with conventional MIND diet scores. The gradient-boosting algorithm optimized the AI-based MODERN framework, which was also neurobiologically associated with increased mean cortical thickness and plasma proteomic markers, including glial fibrillary acidic protein and neurofilament light chain, indicating potential neuroprotective effects.

Beyond guiding food choices and developing robust predictive models for brain health in patients with AD, AI tools could improve patients' quality of life by preparing to-do lists for physical activity and food purchases tailored to their diagnoses, thereby facilitating daily activities. Preserving cognitive performance through specific dietary patterns requires adherence, which trained multimodal graph-based AI systems can monitor

by analyzing food images to verify adherence to a given brain-health dietary pattern.

Despite the established role of AI tools and algorithms in monitoring patients with neurodegenerative diseases and preserving brain function, several challenges and concerns remain regarding their use in clinical settings. The multimodal approach provides holistic insights into nutrition and cognitive impairment as they relate to memory maintenance. However, disconnected and non-harmonized datasets could introduce biases and raise concerns about the quality of the integrated datasets used in predictive models. These models are often trained on small populations with limited demographic variation, potentially restricting their generalizability to populations with diverse socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. A significant concern when detecting cognitive performance through nutritional parameters is that models may not provide an explainable rationale for their decision-making processes, limiting the clinical application, credibility, and ethical approval of such tools. Therefore, further studies are needed to evaluate the smart nutrition paradigm, improve the accuracy of AI tools, and better understand the interplay between the gut-brain axis and cognitive health.

Conclusion

The integration of nervous system functions with

smart technologies represents a paradigm shift in traumatic brain injury (TBI) care. From accurate diagnosis and predictive analytics to adaptive interfaces and neuromodulation, these innovations are helping restore lost capabilities and harness residual neural plasticity. Sustained interdisciplinary efforts, ethical vigilance, and rigorous clinical validation will determine the extent to which this potential is realized. This narrative review highlights both the significant progress made in recent years and the substantial work that remains.

REFERENCES

1. Abdel Razek AAK, Alksas A, Shehata M, AbdelKhalek A, Abdel Baky K, El-Baz A, et al. Clinical applications of artificial intelligence and radiomics in neuro-oncology imaging. Insights Imaging. 2021;12(1):152.
2. Abdollahifard S, Farrokhi A, Mowla A, Liebeskind DS. Performance Metrics, Algorithms, and Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Vascular and Interventional Neurology: A Review of Basic Elements. Neurol Clin. 2024;42(3):633–50.
3. Abesadze N, Fernandes A, Rubin E. Conversational Artificial Intelligence and Neuropsychiatric Risk: A Narrative Review and Case-Based Synthesis Proposing a Delusional Feedback Loop. Cureus. 2026;18(7):e112306.
4. AbuAlrob MA, Mesraoua B. Harnessing artificial intelligence for the diagnosis and treatment of neurological emergencies: a comprehensive review of recent advances and future directions. Front Neurol. 2024;15:1485799.
5. Achacoso TB, Yamamoto WS. Artificial ethology and computational neuroethology: a scientific discipline and its subset by sharpening and extending the definition of artificial intelligence. Perspect Biol Med. 1990;33(3):379–89.
6. Agadi K, Dominari A, Tebha SS, Mohammadi A, Zahid S. Neurosurgical Management of Cerebrospinal Tumors in the Era of Artificial Intelligence : A Scoping Review. J Korean Neurosurg Soc. 2023;66(6):632–41.
7. Agaram Sundaram V, Saravanan B, Sowndharya Balamurugan B, Muthu Chinnakannu Marimuthu M, Munjal K, Chopra H. The impact of artificial intelligence on drug discovery for neuropsychiatric disorders. Excli j. 2025;24:728–48.
8. Agarwal S, Wood D, Grzeda M, Suresh C, Din M, Cole J, et al. Systematic Review of Artificial Intelligence for Abnormality Detection in High-volume Neuroimaging and Subgroup Meta-analysis for Intracranial Hemorrhage Detection. Clin Neuroradiol. 2023;33(4):943–56.
9. Agkatsev S, Templeton M, Lazaridis L, Nowak H, Kebir S, Seliger C. Artificial intelligence in neuro-oncology: Current advances and legal considerations in the European Union. Neurooncol Adv. 2026;8(1):vdag083.
10. Ahuja AS, Paredes Iii AA, Eisel MLS, Miller C, Truong N, Falardeau J. Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Ophthalmology for Optic Disc Pathologies and Neurodegenerative Disease. Eye Brain. 2026;18:555894.
11. Aimé X, Charlet J, Maillet D, Belin C. [Artificial intelligence meeting neuropsychology. Semantic memory in normal and pathological aging]. Geriatr Psychol Neuropsychiatr Vieil. 2015;13(1):88–96.
12. Ajibade VM, Madu CS. The Integration of Artificial Intelligence Into Precision Medicine for Neuro-Oncology: Ethical, Clinical, and Nurs-

ing Implications in Immunotherapy Care. Cureus. 2025;17(5):e85024.
13. Akras Z, Limbania D, Touray J, Darko K, Djigo RS, Nawabi DI, et al. Artificial intelligence and robotics in global neurosurgery: A scoping review. J Clin Neurosci. 2026;148:111978.
14. Al-Mufti F, Kim M, Dodson V, Sursal T, Bowers C, Cole C, et al. Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence in Neurocritical Care: a Specialty-Wide Disruptive Transformation or a Strategy for Success. Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep. 2019;19(11):89.
15. Al-Rahbi A, Al-Habsi T, Al-Saadi T. Review Article | Artificial Intelligence Applications in Prognosis and Treatment of Neuro-oncology: A review. Gulf J Oncolog. 2026;1(50):70–86.
16. Alberca-González A, Fernández-Jiménez E. Artificial intelligence support for diagnosis of neurodevelopmental disorders during childhood: an umbrella review. Front Psychiatry. 2026;17:1697185.
17. Alqadi MM, Vidal SGM. Artificial Intelligence in Vascular Neurology: Applications, Challenges, and a Review of AI Tools for Stroke Imaging, Clinical Decision Making, and Outcome Prediction Models. Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep. 2025;25(1):34.
18. Alsaleh H. The impact of artificial intelligence in the diagnosis and management of acoustic neuroma: A systematic review. Technol Health Care. 2024;32(6):3801–13.

19. AlShawabkeh M, Khalaf RA, Fakhouri SRI, Alshammari TO. Artificial Intelligence in Neurology and Neuro-Ophthalmology: Current Applications and Future Directions. Neurol Clin. 2026;44(2):239–54.
20. Alshehri ZS. Integrating artificial intelligence with small molecule therapeutics and precision medicine for neurochemical understanding of Alzheimer's diseases. Neuroscience. 2025;586:44–57.
21. Alvani MS, Mohammadzadeh I, Hajikarimloo B, Javani M, Mohammadzadeh S, Mortezaei A, et al. Artificial intelligence in trigeminal neuralgia: trigeminal nerve segmentation and neurovascular conflict detection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neurosurg Rev. 2026;49(1).
22. Alzoubi I, Bao G, Zheng Y, Wang X, Graeber MB. Artificial intelligence techniques for neuropathological diagnostics and research. Neuropathology. 2023;43(4):277–96.
23. Amurthur A, McCarthy DJ, Schwamm LH, Hillis JM. Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Devices in Neurology: Mapping the Present and Future. Semin Neurol. 2026;46(1):57–66.
24. Andrews M, Di Ieva A. Artificial intelligence for brain neuroanatomical segmentation in magnetic resonance imaging: A literature review. J Clin Neurosci. 2025;134:111073.
25. Aneja S, Chang E, Omuro A. Applications of artificial intelligence in neuro-oncology. Curr Opin

Neurol. 2019;32(6):850–6.
26. Ansari RA, Senapati SG, Ahluwalia V, Panjwani GAR, Kaur A, Yerrapragada G, et al. Artificial Intelligence-Guided Neuromodulation in Heart Failure with Preserved and Reduced Ejection Fraction: Mechanisms, Evidence, and Future Directions. J Cardiovasc Dev Dis. 2025;12(8).
27. Au Yeung J, Wang YY, Kraljevic Z, Teo JTH. Artificial intelligence (AI) for neurologists: do digital neurones dream of electric sheep? Pract Neurol. 2023;23(6):476–88.
28. Auger SD, Jacobs BM, Dobson R, Marshall CR, Noyce AJ. Big data, machine learning and artificial intelligence: a neurologist's guide. Pract Neurol. 2020;21(1):4–11.
29. Awuah WA, Adebusoye FT, Wellington J, David L, Salam A, Weng Yee AL, et al. Recent Outcomes and Challenges of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning in Neurosurgery. World Neurosurg X. 2024;23:100301.
30. Bacon EJ, He D, Achi NAD, Wang L, Li H, Yao-Digba PDZ, et al. Neuroimage analysis using artificial intelligence approaches: a systematic review. Med Biol Eng Comput. 2024;62(9):2599–627.
31. Bakas S, Vollmuth P, Galldiks N, Booth TC, Aerts H, Bi WL, et al. Artificial Intelligence for Response Assessment in Neuro Oncology (AI-RANO), part 2: recommendations for standardisation, validation, and good clinical practice. Lancet Oncol. 2024;25(11):e589–e601.
32. Baker CR, Pease M, Sexton DP, Abumoussa

A, Chambless LB. Artificial intelligence innovations in neurosurgical oncology: a narrative review. J Neurooncol. 2024;169(3):489–96.
33. Balma M, Laudicella R, Gallio E, Gusella S, Lorenzon L, Peano S, et al. Applications of Artificial Intelligence and Radiomics in Molecular Hybrid Imaging and Theragnostics for Neuro-Endocrine Neoplasms (NENs). Life (Basel). 2023;13(8).
34. Bampton TJ, Weber A, Bastiampillai T, Palmer LJ, Clark S. Artificial Intelligence and CT Neuroimaging in Dementia and Psychotic Disorders: A Viewpoint. J Imaging Inform Med. 2026.
35. Barua PD, Vicnesh J, Gururajan R, Oh SL, Palmer E, Azizan MM, et al. Artificial Intelligence Enabled Personalised Assistive Tools to Enhance Education of Children with Neurodevelopmental Disorders-A Review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(3).
36. Basem J, Mani R, Sun S, Gilotra K, Dianati-Maleki N, Dashti R. Clinical applications of artificial intelligence and machine learning in neurocardiology: a comprehensive review. Front Cardiovasc Med. 2025;12:1525966.
37. Basha S, Ks P, Chattopadhyay A, Pai AR, Mahato KK. Artificial intelligence and machine learning in neurodegenerative disease management: A 21st century paradigm. Neurobiol Dis. 2026;220:107307.
38. Battista P, Salvatore C, Berlingeri M, Cerasa A, Castiglioni I. Artificial intelligence and neuropsychological measures: The case of Alzheimer's

disease. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2020;114:211–28.
39. Bearden DJ. Ethical integration of artificial intelligence in pediatric epilepsy neuropsychology: decision authority, communication, and surgical risk modeling. Epilepsy Behav. 2026;185:111295.
40. Bell AJ. Levels and loops: the future of artificial intelligence and neuroscience. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 1999;354(1392):2013–20.
41. Ben-Jaafar A, Sinha A, Nkrumah-Boateng PA, Roy S, Sanker V, Mohamed S, et al. Artificial intelligence-based biomarkers for the diagnosis and treatment of neurological conditions: a narrative review. Mol Brain. 2026;19(1).
42. Bermudez-Contreras E, Clark BJ, Wilber A. The Neuroscience of Spatial Navigation and the Relationship to Artificial Intelligence. Front Comput Neurosci. 2020;14:63.
43. Bhatia A, Khalvati F, Ertl-Wagner BB. Artificial Intelligence in the Future Landscape of Pediatric Neuroradiology: Opportunities and Challenges. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2024;45(5):549–53.
44. Błaszkiewicz J, Madej-Pilarczyk A, Ciara E. Artificial intelligence in neurofibromatosis type I: diagnostic and therapeutic opportunities. J Appl Genet. 2026.
45. Blümcke I, Vorndran J. Neuropathology of focal epilepsy: the promise of artificial intelligence and digital Neuropathology 3.0. Pathology. 2025;57(2):171–7.
46. Bonsanto MM, Tronnier VM. [Artificial intelligence in neurosurgery]. Chirurg. 2020;91(3):229–34.
47. Borchert RJ, Azevedo T, Badhwar A, Bernal J, Betts M, Bruffaerts R, et al. Artificial intelligence for diagnostic and prognostic neuroimaging in dementia: A systematic review. Alzheimers Dement. 2023;19(12):5885–904.
48. Boyle AJ, Gaudet VC, Black SE, Vasdev N, Rosa-Neto P, Zukotynski KA. Artificial intelligence for molecular neuroimaging. Ann Transl Med. 2021;9(9):822.
49. Bravo J, Wali AR, Hirshman BR, Gopesh T, Steinberg JA, Yan B, et al. Robotics and Artificial Intelligence in Endovascular Neurosurgery. Cureus. 2022;14(3):e23662.
50. Broggi G, Mazzucchelli M, Salzano S, Barbagallo GMV, Certo F, Zanelli M, et al. The emerging role of artificial intelligence in neuropathology: Where are we and where do we want to go? Pathol Res Pract. 2024;263:155671.
51. Buchlak QD, Esmaili N, Leveque JC, Bennett C, Farrokhi F, Piccardi M. Machine learning applications to neuroimaging for glioma detection and classification: An artificial intelligence augmented systematic review. J Clin Neurosci. 2021;89:177–98.
52. Buchlak QD, Esmaili N, Leveque JC, Farrokhi F, Bennett C, Piccardi M, et al. Machine learning applications to clinical decision support in neurosurgery: an artificial intelligence augmented systematic review. Neurosurg Rev.

2020;43(5):1235–53.
53. Bush SS. Ethical considerations in the use of artificial intelligence in clinical neuropsychology. Clin Neuropsychol. 2026;40(3):776–96.
54. Calderone A, Latella D, Bonanno M, Quartarone A, Mojdehdehbaher S, Celesti A, et al. Towards Transforming Neurorehabilitation: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Diagnosis and Treatment of Neurological Disorders. Biomedicines. 2024;12(10).
55. Calderone A, Latella D, La Fauci E, Puleo R, Sergi A, De Francesco M, et al. Artificial Intelligence-Driven Neuromodulation in Neurodegenerative Disease: Precision in Chaos, Learning in Loss. Biomedicines. 2025;13(9).
56. Cascianelli S, Scialpi M, Amici S, Forini N, Minestrini M, Fravolini ML, et al. Role of Artificial Intelligence Techniques (Automatic Classifiers) in Molecular Imaging Modalities in Neurodegenerative Diseases. Curr Alzheimer Res. 2017;14(2):198–207.
57. Chadha S, Sritharan DV, Hager T, D'Souza R, Aneja S. Emerging Trends in Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Oncology. Curr Oncol Rep. 2025;27(8):951–62.
58. Chan B, Kim B, Schonfeld E, Nageeb G, Pant A, Sjoholm A, et al. Publicly Available Datasets for Artificial Intelligence in Neurosurgery: A Systematic Review. J Clin Med. 2025;14(16).
59. Chance FS, Aimone JB, Musuvathy SS, Smith MR, Vineyard CM, Wang F. Crossing the

Cleft: Communication Challenges Between Neuroscience and Artificial Intelligence. Front Comput Neurosci. 2020;14:39.
60. Chawla V, Cizmeci MN, Sullivan KM, Gritz EC, V QC, Menkiti O, et al. Emerging modalities for neuroprognostication in neonatal encephalopathy: harnessing the potential of artificial intelligence. Pediatr Res. 2025;98(7):2554–64.
61. Chen C, Du X, Yang J, Zeng Y, Xie H, Wang D, et al. From microfluidics to nanodelivery: artificial intelligence reshapes neuropharmacology research strategies. Front Pharmacol. 2026;17:1796070.
62. Chen N, Wang S, Liu J, Zheng X, Shang H. Artificial intelligence-driven nano-enhanced stem cell therapy for neurodegenerative diseases: from rational design to clinical translation. J Nanobiotechnology. 2026;24(1).
63. Chen Z, Liu X, Yang Q, Wang YJ, Miao K, Gong Z, et al. Evaluation of Risk of Bias in Neuroimaging-Based Artificial Intelligence Models for Psychiatric Diagnosis: A Systematic Review. JAMA Netw Open. 2023;6(3):e231671.
64. Chiorean DM, Mitranovici MI, Mureșan MC, Buicu CF, Moraru R, Moraru L, et al. The Approach of Artificial Intelligence in Neuroendocrine Carcinomas of the Breast: A Next Step towards Precision Pathology?-A Case Report and Review of the Literature. Medicina (Kaunas). 2023;59(4).
65. Christodoulou RC, Papageorgiou PS, Eller D, Vassiliou E, Papageorgiou SG, Solomou EE, et al.

Multimodal artificial intelligence in glioma management: integrating neuroimaging and hematologic biomarkers for precision oncology. Front Oncol. 2026;16:1812518.
66. Christodoulou RC, Papageorgiou PS, Pitsillos R, Woodward A, Papageorgiou SG, Solomou EE, et al. A Narrative Review of Theranostics in Neuro-Oncology: Advancing Brain Tumor Diagnosis and Treatment Through Nuclear Medicine and Artificial Intelligence. Int J Mol Sci. 2025;26(15).
67. Christodoulou RC, Pitsillos R, Petrou V, Sarquis MD, Papageorgiou PS, Solomou EE. Central Nervous System Involvement in Acute Myeloid Leukemia: From Pathophysiology to Neuroradiologic Features and the Emerging Role of Artificial Intelligence. J Clin Med. 2026;15(3).
68. Clark CL, Jerskey BA, Fogler JM. Topical review: Incorporating generative artificial intelligence into neuropsychology training: best practices, pitfalls, and recommendations for effective implementation. J Pediatr Psychol. 2026;51(8):670–6.
69. Conti AA, Conti A, Masoni M, Gensini GF. Clinical pictures of unknown origin in neurology: past, present and future usefulness of artificial intelligence. Ann Ital Med Int. 2005;20(2):113–6.
70. Costello F, Norman GC. Artificial Intelligence and Ocular Imaging in the Evaluation of Neurologic Disorders: The New Era of Neuro-Oculomics? Semin Neurol. 2026;46(1):67–76.
71. Crincoli E, Savastano MC, Savastano A,

Carlà MM, Giannuzzi F, Catania F, et al. Artificial intelligence and neurodegeneration: state of the art and explainability. Int J Retina Vitreous. 2026;12(1).
72. Dagher R, Ozkara BB, Karabacak M, Dagher SA, Rumbaut EI, Luna LP, et al. Artificial intelligence/machine learning for neuroimaging to predict hemorrhagic transformation: Systematic review/meta-analysis. J Neuroimaging. 2024;34(5):505–14.
73. Dalboni da Rocha JL, Lai J, Pandey P, Myat PSM, Loschinskey Z, Bag AK, et al. Artificial Intelligence for Neuroimaging in Pediatric Cancer. Cancers (Basel). 2025;17(4).
74. Damer A, Chaudry E, Eftekhari D, Benseler SM, Safi F, Aviv RI, et al. Neuroimaging Scoring Tools to Differentiate Inflammatory Central Nervous System Small-Vessel Vasculitis: A Need for Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning?-A Scoping Review. Tomography. 2023;9(5):1811–28.
75. Dang J, Lal A, Flurin L, James A, Gajic O, Rabinstein AA. Predictive modeling in neurocritical care using causal artificial intelligence. World J Crit Care Med. 2021;10(4):112–9.
76. Danilov GV, Ishankulov TA, Kotik KV, Shifrin MA, Potapov AA. Artificial intelligence technologies in clinical neurooncology. Zh Vopr Neirokhir Im N N Burdenko. 2022;86(6):127–33.
77. Danilov GV, Shifrin MA, Kotik KV, Ishankulov TA, Orlov YN, Kulikov AS, et al. Artificial Intelligence Technologies in Neurosurgery: a System-

atic Literature Review Using Topic Modeling. Part II: Research Objectives and Perspectives. Sovrem Tekhnologii Med. 2021;12(6):111–8.
78. Danilov GV, Shifrin MA, Kotik KV, Ishankulov TA, Orlov YN, Kulikov AS, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Neurosurgery: a Systematic Review Using Topic Modeling. Part I: Major Research Areas. Sovrem Tekhnologii Med. 2021;12(5):106–12.
79. Daraie AH, Damiani A, Khoshkhou M, Sanchez LA, Smith RJ, Agashe SH, et al. Artificial intelligence for adaptive neuromodulation in drug-resistant epilepsy. Epilepsia. 2026.
80. de Andrade JBC, de Carvalho Leite SN, de Morais A, Carneiro TS, Fernandes PC, Alves DI. Screening and Evaluation of Post-stroke Dysphagia: Insights from Neurology, Artificial Intelligence and Data Science-A Scoping Review. Ann Biomed Eng. 2026.
81. Delgado-López PD, Cárdenas Montes M, Troya García J, Ocaña-Tienda B, Cepeda S, Martínez Martínez R, et al. Artificial intelligence in neuro-oncology: methodological bases, practical applications and ethical and regulatory issues. Clin Transl Oncol. 2025;27(11):4117–30.
82. Dennis AP, Strafella AP. The identification of cognitive impairment in Parkinson's disease using biofluids, neuroimaging, and artificial intelligence. Front Neurosci. 2024;18:1446878.
83. DeRight J, Puente AN. Artificial intelligence in neuropsychological practice-tool selection, privacy, and billing guidance. Clin Neuropsychol. 2026;40(3):797–815.

84. Dhankhar S, Mujwar S, Garg N, Chauhan S, Saini M, Sharma P, et al. Artificial Intelligence in The Management of Neurodegenerative Disorders. CNS Neurol Disord Drug Targets. 2024;23(8):931–40.
85. Dragendorf E, Bültmann E, Wolff D. Quantitative assessment of neurodevelopmental maturation: a comprehensive systematic literature review of artificial intelligence-based brain age prediction in pediatric populations. Front Neuroinform. 2024;18:1496143.
86. Du Y, Niu J, Xing Y, Li B, Calhoun VD. Neuroimage Analysis Methods and Artificial Intelligence Techniques for Reliable Biomarkers and Accurate Diagnosis of Schizophrenia: Achievements Made by Chinese Scholars Around the Past Decade. Schizophr Bull. 2025;51(2):325–42.
87. Duong MT, Rauschecker AM, Mohan S. Diverse Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Neuroradiology. Neuroimaging Clin N Am. 2020;30(4):505–16.
88. Dymm B, Khalid A. Artificial Intelligence in Neurology and Stroke Education: Current Applications and Future Directions. Semin Neurol. 2026;46(1):49–56.
89. Dzialas V, Doering E, Eich H, Strafella AP, Vaillancourt DE, Simonyan K, et al. Houston, We Have AI Problem! Quality Issues with Neuroimaging-Based Artificial Intelligence in Parkinson's Disease: A Systematic Review. Mov Disord.

2024;39(12):2130–43.
90. Ebrahimi H, Hejazian E, Eftekhari Z. Innovative approaches: Utilizing artificial intelligence for early diagnosis of main neurodegenerative diseases. Caspian J Intern Med. 2026;17(3):517–33.
91. Ebrahimian Sadabad F, Honhar P, Houshi S, Nejati SF, Bagherieh S, Brackett A, et al. Detection of parkinson's disease with neuroimaging modalities using machine learning and artificial intelligence: a systematic review. Neurol Sci. 2026;47(1):160.
92. Ekins S, Lane TR. Applications of artificial intelligence in drug discovery for neurological diseases. Neurotherapeutics. 2025;22(4):e00624.
93. El Arab RA, Al Moosa OA, Almagharbeh WT, Abuadas F, Abdalla N, Abdrbo A, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Physical, Occupational and Neuro-Rehabilitation: Clinical Effectiveness, Prognostic Performance, and Pre-Implementation Feasibility - A Systematic Review. J Med Syst. 2026;50(1).
94. El-Banna MM, Rizvi MR, Sami W, Sharma A, Atyeh RR. Digital and Intelligent Rehabilitation Technologies in Stroke and Neurological Disorders: A Systematic Review of Artificial Intelligence, Virtual Reality, Gamification, and Emerging Therapeutic Platforms in Neurorehabilitation. Bioengineering (Basel). 2026;13(2).
95. El-Hajj VG, Gharios M, Edström E, Elmi-Terander A. Artificial Intelligence in Neurosurgery: A Bibliometric Analysis. World Neurosurg.

2023;171:152–8.e4.
96. Ervin B, Arya R. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Neuromodulation for Epilepsy. J Clin Neurophysiol. 2025;42(6):493–504.
97. Etekochay MO, Amaravadhi AR, González GV, Atanasov AG, Matin M, Mofatteh M, et al. Unveiling New Strategies Facilitating the Implementation of Artificial Intelligence in Neuroimaging for the Early Detection of Alzheimer's Disease. J Alzheimers Dis. 2024;99(1):1–20.
98. Farooqui M, Fatima M, Khan S, Singh S, Choudhary F, Farooq T, et al. Serotonin Neurobiology and Artificial Intelligence-Driven Biomarker Detection in Affective Disorders: A Comprehensive Review. ACS Chem Neurosci. 2026;17(20):3388–407.
99. Feng T. Applications of Artificial Intelligence to Diagnosis of Neurodegenerative Diseases. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2023;308:648–55.
100. Fiani B, Pasko KBD, Sarhadi K, Covarrubias C. Current uses, emerging applications, and clinical integration of artificial intelligence in neuroradiology. Rev Neurosci. 2022;33(4):383–95.
101. Filippi CG, Stein JM, Wang Z, Bakas S, Liu Y, Chang PD, et al. Ethical Considerations and Fairness in the Use of Artificial Intelligence for Neuroradiology. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2023;44(11):1242–8.
102. Fontanella F, D'Alessandro T, Nardone E, De Stefano C, Vicidomini C, Roviello GN. Artificial Intelligence for Natural Products Drug Discovery

in Neurodegenerative Therapies: A Review. Biomolecules. 2026;16(1).
103. Forrest DV. Mental, neuropsychic, and brain patterns of defense. Neuropsychic defense continua from psychopathology to the particularly human parallel networks that are problematic for artificial intelligence. J Am Acad Psychoanal. 1991;19(1):99–123.
104. Frassetto FP. The Intersection Between Neuropathology and Artificial Intelligence: A Review. Sage Open Pathol. 2026;19:30502098261472442.
105. Fuentes-Mendoza J, Fernanda-Castillo M, Valdez-Esqueda F, Garza-Boullosa R, Gama-Reyes E, Arreola-Flores M, et al. Determining factors of neuroplasticity in patients with brain tumors: impact of connectome and artificial intelligence. A narrative review. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther. 2026;26(2):179–89.
106. Galldiks N, Angenstein F, Werner JM, Bauer EK, Gutsche R, Fink GR, et al. Use of advanced neuroimaging and artificial intelligence in meningiomas. Brain Pathol. 2022;32(2):e13015.
107. Gallo ML, Moriconi M, Phé V. Current applications and future perspectives of artificial intelligence in functional urology and neurourology: how far can we get? Minerva Urol Nephrol. 2025;77(1):33–42.
108. Ganapathy K, Abdul SS, Nursetyo AA. Artificial intelligence in neurosciences: A clinician's perspective. Neurol India. 2018;66(4):934–9.

109. Ganji Z, Nikparast F, Shoeibi N, Shoeibi A, Zare H, Sharak NA. Retinal imaging and artificial intelligence: A systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic techniques for neurodegenerative diseases. Photodiagnosis Photodyn Ther. 2025;55:104788.
110. García-Reyes RA, Massó Quiñones LN, Ruy H, Castro DC. Neuropsychopharmacology in the era of artificial intelligence and biomolecule prediction software. NPP Digit Psychiatry Neurosci. 2025;3(1):16.
111. Ghosh T. Artificial Intelligence in Neuroradiology: Transforming Diagnosis, Prognostication, and Workflow. Indian J Radiol Imaging. 2026;36(4):544–62.
112. Giansanti D. Bridging Neurobiology and Artificial Intelligence: A Narrative Review of Reviews on Advances in Cochlear and Auditory Neuroprostheses for Hearing Restoration. Biology (Basel). 2025;14(9).
113. Gkintoni E, Antonopoulou H, Sortwell A, Halkiopoulos C. Challenging Cognitive Load Theory: The Role of Educational Neuroscience and Artificial Intelligence in Redefining Learning Efficacy. Brain Sci. 2025;15(2).
114. Gombolay GY, Gopalan N, Bernasconi A, Nabbout R, Megerian JT, Siegel B, et al. Review of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence (ML/AI) for the Pediatric Neurologist. Pediatr Neurol. 2023;141:42–51.
115. Gong B, Khalvati F, Ertl-Wagner BB, Patlas

MN. Artificial intelligence in emergency neuroradiology: Current applications and perspectives. Diagn Interv Imaging. 2025;106(4):135–42.
116. Goudarzi N, Taheri Z, Nezhad Salari AM, Kazemzadeh K, Tafakhori A. Recognition and classification of facial expression using artificial intelligence as a key of early detection in neurological disorders. Rev Neurosci. 2025;36(5):479–95.
117. Green DL, Layton BP, Knapp J, Driggs A, Spinner RJ. Applications of artificial intelligence in peripheral neurosurgery: a systematic review. Neurosurg Rev. 2026;49(1).
118. Gu Z, Ge B, Wang Y, Gong Y, Qi M. Artificial intelligence technologies for enhancing neurofunctionalities: a comprehensive review with applications in Alzheimer's disease research. Front Aging Neurosci. 2025;17:1609063.
119. Guarnera A, Napolitano A, Liporace F, Marconi F, Rossi-Espagnet MC, Gandolfo C, et al. The Expanding Frontier: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Pediatric Neuroradiology. Children (Basel). 2025;12(9).
120. Guerra GA, Grove S, Le J, Hofmann HL, Shah I, Bhagavatula S, et al. Artificial intelligence as a modality to enhance the readability of neurosurgical literature for patients. J Neurosurg. 2025;142(4):1189–95.
121. Gupta S, Arya NK, Reddy V, Sharma RK, Kummari S, Shukla AK, et al. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Diagnostic Radiology: A Paradigm Shift Toward Predictive Neuroimaging

and Early Detection of Brain Disorders. Cureus. 2026;18(4):e107432.
122. Guzik AK, Fraser JF, Southerland AM, Vagal A, Tsai JP, Dumitrascu OM, et al. Creating Virtual Stroke Networks: Current and Future Role of Artificial Intelligence, Mobile Imaging Applications, and Telehealth in Triage and Treatment of Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association: The American Academy of Neurology affirms the value of this statement as an educational tool for neurologists. Stroke. 2026;57(3):e87–e100.
123. Hadar PN, Moura L. Clinical Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Neurology Practice. Continuum (Minneap Minn). 2025;31(2):583–600.
124. Haller S, Van Cauter S, Federau C, Hedderich DM, Edjlali M. The R-AI-DIOLOGY checklist: a practical checklist for evaluation of artificial intelligence tools in clinical neuroradiology. Neuroradiology. 2022;64(5):851–64.
125. Hamzyan Olia JB, Raman A, Hsu CY, Alkhayyat A, Nourazarian A. A comprehensive review of neurotransmitter modulation via artificial intelligence: A new frontier in personalized neurobiochemistry. Comput Biol Med. 2025;189:109984.
126. Harris LT. The Neuroscience of Human and Artificial Intelligence Presence. Annu Rev Psychol. 2024;75:433–66.
127. Hasan MM, Phu J, Sowmya A, Meijering E, Kalloniatis M. Artificial intelligence in the diagno-

sis of glaucoma and neurodegenerative diseases. Clin Exp Optom. 2024;107(2):130–46.
128. Hassabis D, Kumaran D, Summerfield C, Botvinick M. Neuroscience-Inspired Artificial Intelligence. Neuron. 2017;95(2):245–58.
129. Hassan YM, Wanas A, Ali AA, El-Sayed WM. Integrating artificial intelligence with nanodiagnostics for early detection and precision management of neurodegenerative diseases. J Nanobiotechnology. 2025;23(1):668.
130. Hedderich DM, Weisstanner C, Van Cauter S, Federau C, Edjlali M, Radbruch A, et al. Artificial intelligence tools in clinical neuroradiology: essential medico-legal aspects. Neuroradiology. 2023;65(7):1091–9.
131. Hellmann F, Ristow I, Well L, Lohse S, Anokhin M, Kuhlen M, et al. Artificial intelligence-based tools for precision diagnosis and treatment of neurofibromatosis type 1 associated peripheral and central glial tumors. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2025;20(1):551.
132. Hillis JM, Bizzo BC. Use of Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Neurology. Semin Neurol. 2022;42(1):39–47.
133. Ho ML. Artificial intelligence for pediatric neuroimaging. Pediatr Radiol. 2026.
134. Husain AM. Of Pilots and Copilots: The Evolving Role of Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Neurophysiology. Neurodiagn J. 2025;65(1):2–12.
135. Husain AM, Beniczky S, Bensalem-Owen M, Bland J, Brinkman BH, Hanajima R, et al. IFCN

position statement: use of artificial intelligence in clinical neurophysiology. Clin Neurophysiol. 2026;189:2111893.
136. Hussain MA, Grant PE, Ou Y. Inferring neurocognition using artificial intelligence on brain MRIs. Front Neuroimaging. 2024;3:1455436.
137. Ienca M, Ignatiadis K. Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Neuroscience: Methodological and Ethical Challenges. AJOB Neurosci. 2020;11(2):77–87.
138. Ifeoma Anene J, Sharma A, Sharma A, Fatima I, Kancherla N, Ponnada SC, et al. Exploring the Potential of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Augmented Reality (AR) in Neurological Disease Management: A Narrative Review. Cureus. 2025;17(6):e86614.
139. Iorga RE, Donica VC, Danielescu C, Bogdănici CM, Munteanu-Dănulescu RS, Moraru AD. Current Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Ophthalmic Imaging: A Narrative Approach. Med Sci (Basel). 2026;14(4).
140. Iqbal J, Jahangir K, Mashkoor Y, Sultana N, Mehmood D, Ashraf M, et al. The future of artificial intelligence in neurosurgery: A narrative review. Surg Neurol Int. 2022;13:536.
141. Ivanov D, Chezhegov A, Kiselev M, Grunin A, Larionov D. Neuromorphic artificial intelligence systems. Front Neurosci. 2022;16:959626.
142. James S, Bastiampillai T, Palmer LJ, Nair PC. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in neuro-

psychiatric drug discovery: current challenges and future directions. Transl Psychiatry. 2026;16(1).
143. Javed M, Bajwa MH, Bakhshi SK. Artificial intelligence- image learning and its applications in neurooncology: a review. J Pak Med Assoc. 2024;74(4 (Supple-4)):S158–s60.
144. Jeevanandam J, Tsenov G, Danquah MK, Ruiz-Molena D, Boussios S, Ovsepian SV. Smart Nanomedicines for Neurodegenerative Diseases: Empowering New Therapies with Molecular Imaging and Artificial Intelligence. Mol Diagn Ther. 2026;30(1):19–46.
145. Jeong SY, Suh CH, Park HY, Heo H, Shim WH, Kim SJ. [Brain MRI-Based Artificial Intelligence Software in Patients with Neurodegenerative Diseases: Current Status]. Taehan Yongsang Uihakhoe Chi. 2022;83(3):473–85.
146. Jiang LB, Li ZX. [Artificial intelligence in neuro-ophthalmology: prospects, challenges and countermeasures]. Zhonghua Yan Ke Za Zhi. 2026;62(7):481–7.
147. Kaka H, Zhang E, Khan N. Artificial Intelligence and Deep Learning in Neuroradiology: Exploring the New Frontier. Can Assoc Radiol J. 2021;72(1):35–44.
148. Kalani M, Anjankar A. Revolutionizing Neurology: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Advancing Diagnosis and Treatment. Cureus. 2024;16(6):e61706.
149. Kann BH, Vossough A, Brüningk SC, Familiar AM, Aboian M, Linguraru MG, et al. Artificial

Intelligence for Response Assessment in Pediatric Neuro-Oncology (AI-RAPNO), part 1: review of the current state of the art. Lancet Oncol. 2025;26(11):e597–e606.
150. Karamveer, Tiwary BK. Artificial intelligence in multi-omics analysis of neurological diseases. Prog Mol Biol Transl Sci. 2026;222:207–28.
151. Karkhur S, Beri A, Verma V, Gupta S, Singh P. Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Ophthalmology: Opportunities for the Diagnosis of Optic Neuropathies and Visual Pathway Disorders. Cureus. 2025;17(8):e90142.
152. Kaur G, Aggarwal H, Goel N. Artificial intelligence driven neuropsychiatry: a systematic review of electroencephalography-based computational techniques for major depressive disorder prediction. Neuroscience. 2025;581:179–207.
153. Kazemzadeh K, Akhlaghdoust M, Zali A. Advances in artificial intelligence, robotics, augmented and virtual reality in neurosurgery. Front Surg. 2023;10:1241923.
154. Kazerooni AF, Familiar AM, Aboian M, Brüningk SC, Vossough A, Linguraru MG, et al. Artificial Intelligence for Response Assessment in Pediatric Neuro-Oncology (AI-RAPNO), part 2: challenges, opportunities, and recommendations for clinical translation. Lancet Oncol. 2025;26(11):e607–e18.
155. Kedar S, Khazanchi D. Neurology education in the era of artificial intelligence. Curr Opin Neurol. 2023;36(1):51–8.

156. Kelly BS, Clifford SM, Mankad K, Colleran GC. Artificial intelligence in paediatric neuroradiology: current landscape, challenges, and future directions. Pediatr Radiol. 2026;56(9):1882–99.
157. Khalighi S, Reddy K, Midya A, Pandav KB, Madabhushi A, Abedalthagafi M. Artificial intelligence in neuro-oncology: advances and challenges in brain tumor diagnosis, prognosis, and precision treatment. NPJ Precis Oncol. 2024;8(1):80.
158. Kharaji M, Safwat AA, Cheng D, Firoozeh N, Hassan MHD, Zhu C, et al. Artificial intelligence in neuroradiology: a review of Food and Drug Administration-regulated algorithms. Br J Radiol. 2026;99(1185):1721–32.
159. Khawar MM, Abdus Saboor H, Eric R, Arain NR, Bano S, Mohamed Abaker MB, et al. Role of artificial intelligence in predicting neurological outcomes in postcardiac resuscitation. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2024;86(12):7202–11.
160. Khosravi P, Schweitzer M. Artificial intelligence in neuroradiology: a scoping review of some ethical challenges. Front Radiol. 2023;3:1149461.
161. Kim Y, Choe SA, Jeong S, Jie D, Wang X, Lee H, et al. Artificial Intelligence That Changes Clinical Neurology Practice: Translating Algorithms Into Actionable Care. J Clin Neurol. 2026;22(4):392–407.
162. Kitamura FC, Pan I, Ferraciolli SF, Yeom KW, Abdala N. Clinical Artificial Intelligence Applications in Radiology: Neuro. Radiol Clin North Am. 2021;59(6):1003–12.

163. Kono K. Artificial Intelligence in Neuroendovascular Procedures. J Neuroendovasc Ther. 2025;19(1).
164. Kono K. [Real-Time Artificial Intelligence Assistance in Neuroendovascular Surgery]. No Shinkei Geka. 2025;53(2):340–8.
165. Koong K, Preda V, Jian A, Liquet-Weiland B, Di Ieva A. Application of artificial intelligence and radiomics in pituitary neuroendocrine and sellar tumors: a quantitative and qualitative synthesis. Neuroradiology. 2022;64(4):647–68.
166. Kordas B. Multimodal Assessment of Consciousness with Brain-Computer Interfaces and Artificial Intelligence: From Acquired Brain Injury to Neurodegenerative Disease. J Clin Med. 2026;15(14).
167. Kraus JL. From 'molecules of life' to new therapeutic approaches, an evolution marked by the advent of artificial intelligence: the cases of chronic pain and neuropathic disorders. Drug Discov Today. 2021;26(4):1070–5.
168. Kumar R, Nagraik R, Lakhanpal S, Abomughaid MM, Jha NK, Gupta R. Artificial intelligence in gut microbiome research: Toward predictive diagnostics for neurodegenerative disorders. Acta Microbiol Immunol Hung. 2025;72(4):296–312.
169. Kumar R, Waisberg E, Ong J, Paladugu P, Amiri D, Saintyl J, et al. Artificial Intelligence-Based Methodologies for Early Diagnostic Precision and Personalized Therapeutic Strategies in Neuro-Ophthalmic and Neurodegenera-

tive Pathologies. Brain Sci. 2024;14(12).
170. Landau WM. Clinical neuromythology VII. Artificial intelligence: the brain transplant cure for parkinsonism. Neurology. 1990;40(5):733–40.
171. Lapka M, Straňák Z. The Current State of Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Ophthalmology. A Review. Cesk Slov Oftalmol. 2024;80(4):179–86.
172. Leckie J, Wu S, Standell T, Yokota T. Artificial Intelligence-Driven Design of Antisense Oligonucleotides for Precision Medicine in Neuromuscular Disorders. Genes (Basel). 2025;16(12).
173. Lee S, Lee KS. Predictive and Explainable Artificial Intelligence for Neuroimaging Applications. Diagnostics (Basel). 2024;14(21).
174. León-Domínguez U. Towards an artificial intelligence clinical decision-support system based on immersive virtual reality for neurocognitive assessment. Ergonomics. 2026;69(10):1999–2016.
175. Leong YY, Vasseneix C, Finkelstein MT, Milea D, Najjar RP. Artificial Intelligence Meets Neuro-Ophthalmology. Asia Pac J Ophthalmol (Phila). 2022;11(2):111–25.
176. Li L, Zhang Z, Zong L. Artificial intelligence in neurovascular surgery: advancing diagnosis, treatment, and outcomes. Front Surg. 2026;13:1841708.
177. Li W, Gumera A, Surya S, Edwards A, Basiri F, Eves C. The role of artificial intelligence in diagnostic neurosurgery: a systematic review. Neurosurg Rev. 2025;48(1):393.

178. Liao Y, Tan G, Zhang H. Surface Electromyography Combined with Artificial Intelligence in Predicting Neuromuscular Falls in the Elderly: A Narrative Review of Present Applications and Future Perspectives. Healthcare (Basel). 2025;13(10).
179. Liu X, Chen H, Tan G, Zhong L, Jiang H, Smith SM, et al. A comprehensive neuroimaging review of the primary and metastatic brain tumors treated with immunotherapy: current status, and the application of advanced imaging approaches and artificial intelligence. Front Immunol. 2024;15:1496627.
180. Lo Bianco G, Deer TR, Occhigrossi F, Diwan S, Mercieri M, D'Angelo FP, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Neuropathic Pain: From Mechanisms to Neuromodulation and Regenerative Strategies. Curr Pain Headache Rep. 2026;30(1).
181. Ma S, Luo S, Zhong H. Artificial Intelligence in Neuromuscular Diseases: Opportunities for a Data-Scarce Field. Neurol Ther. 2026;15(5):2199–216.
182. Ma X, Wang P, Ma J, Lu Y, Pan S, Hu X. Artificial intelligence for automated detection of interictal epileptiform discharges: methodological progress, clinical evaluation, and neurodevelopmental context. Front Cell Dev Biol. 2026;14:1941616.
183. Magee R, Mupparapu M. Introduction to Methods in Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Neurology. Dent Clin North Am. 2026;70(2):275–85.

184. Maghrabi Y, Jamjoom AB, Algahtani A, Alshareef OH, Jamjoom OM, Alzahrani M. Highly Cited Artificial Intelligence Research Studies Published in Neurosurgical Journals: A Bibliometric Analysis. Cureus. 2025;17(11):e98191.
185. Mahmoudi B. Artificial Intelligence as the Computational Framework for Adaptive Closed-Loop Neuromodulation in Psychiatry. Am J Psychiatry. 2026;183(10):734–42.
186. Mainali R, Deng A, Rayala H, Southerland AM. Potential Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Neurology Education. Semin Neurol. 2026;46(1):e1–e4.
187. Mainali S, Park S. Artificial Intelligence and Big Data Science in Neurocritical Care. Crit Care Clin. 2023;39(1):235–42.
188. Martin D, Tong E, Kelly B, Yeom K, Yedavalli V. Current Perspectives of Artificial Intelligence in Pediatric Neuroradiology: An Overview. Front Radiol. 2021;1:713681.
189. Marzi SJ, Schilder BM, Nott A, Frigerio CS, Willaime-Morawek S, Bucholc M, et al. Artificial intelligence for neurodegenerative experimental models. Alzheimers Dement. 2023;19(12):5970–87.
190. Mathis MW. Artificial intelligence is reshaping neuroscience across scales. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2026;101:103265.
191. Mathis MW. Leveraging insights from neuroscience to build adaptive artificial intelligence. Nat Neurosci. 2026;29(1):13–24.

192. Medenica V, Ivanovic L, Milosevic N. Applicability of artificial intelligence in neuropsychological rehabilitation of patients with brain injury. Appl Neuropsychol Adult. 2024:1–28.
193. Mehari M, Sibih Y, Dada A, Chang SM, Wen PY, Molinaro AM, et al. Enhancing neuro-oncology care through equity-driven applications of artificial intelligence. Neuro Oncol. 2024;26(11):1951–63.
194. Merola E, Fanciulli G, Pes GM, Dore MP. Artificial intelligence in the diagnosis of gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms: Potential benefits and current limitations. J Neuroendocrinol. 2025;37(11):e70087.
195. Merola E, Fanciulli G, Pes GM, Dore MP. Artificial Intelligence for Prognosis of Gastro-Entero-Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Neoplasms. Cancers (Basel). 2025;17(12).
196. Mirkin S, Albensi BC. Should artificial intelligence be used in conjunction with Neuroimaging in the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease? Front Aging Neurosci. 2023;15:1094233.
197. Mofatteh M. Neurosurgery and artificial intelligence. AIMS Neurosci. 2021;8(4):477–95.
198. Mohamed AA, Lucke-Wold B. Text-to-video generative artificial intelligence: sora in neurosurgery. Neurosurg Rev. 2024;47(1):272.
199. Mohamed AA, Rajendran S, Colome D, Sargent EC, Schirmer CM, Vessell M, et al. Neurosurgical journals' policies on artificial intelligence use in manuscript preparation and peer review.

Neurosurg Rev. 2025;48(1):670.
200. Mohamed S, Ben-Jaafar A, Frimpong M, Roy S, Sanker V, Nkrumah-Boateng PA, et al. Applying artificial intelligence in neurodevelopmental disorders management and research. Eur J Med Res. 2026;31(1):185.
201. Monsour R, Dutta M, Mohamed AZ, Borkowski A, Viswanadhan NA. Neuroimaging in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Current Applications. Fed Pract. 2022;39(Suppl 1):S14–s20.
202. Monteith S, Glenn T, Geddes JR, Achtyes ED, Whybrow PC, Bauer M. Challenges and Ethical Considerations to Successfully Implement Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Medicine and Neuroscience: a Narrative Review. Pharmacopsychiatry. 2023;56(6):209–13.
203. Moridian P, Ghassemi N, Jafari M, Salloum-Asfar S, Sadeghi D, Khodatars M, et al. Automatic autism spectrum disorder detection using artificial intelligence methods with MRI neuroimaging: A review. Front Mol Neurosci. 2022;15:999605.
204. Morita S, Asamoto S, Sawada H, Kojima K, Arai T, Momozaki N, et al. The Future of Sustainable Neurosurgery: Is a Moonshot Plan for Artificial Intelligence and Robot-Assisted Surgery Possible in Japan? World Neurosurg. 2024;192:15–20.
205. Mosquera FEC, Guevara-Montoya MC, Serna-Ramirez V, Liscano Y. Neuroinflammation and Schizophrenia: New Therapeutic Strategies through Psychobiotics, Nanotechnology, and Artificial Intelligence (AI). J Pers Med. 2024;14(4).

206. Moura Junior V, Kummer BR, Moura L. Population Health in Neurology and the Transformative Promise of Artificial Intelligence and Large Language Models. Semin Neurol. 2025;45(4):445–56.
207. Mulpuri RP, Konda N, Gadde ST, Amalakanti S, Valiveti SC. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Neuroregeneration: A Systematic Review. Cureus. 2024;16(5):e61400.
208. Nakamura K. Information seeking criteria: artificial intelligence, economics, psychology, and neuroscience. Rev Neurosci. 2022;33(1):31–41.
209. Nakhate V, Gonzalez Castro LN. Artificial intelligence in neuro-oncology. Front Neurosci. 2023;17:1217629.
210. National Academies of Sciences E, Medicine, Health, Medicine D, Board on Health Sciences P, Forum on N, et al. The National Academies Collection: Reports funded by National Institutes of Health. In: Posey Norris SM, Childers E, Ford C, editors. Exploring the Bidirectional Relationship Between Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience: Proceedings of a Workshop. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US)

Copyright 2024 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.; 2024.

211. Nehmeh B, Rebehmed J, Nehmeh R, Taleb R, Akoury E. Unlocking therapeutic frontiers: harnessing artificial intelligence in drug discovery for neurodegenerative diseases. Drug Discov Today.

2024;29(12):104216.
212. Nibila Y, Sivagami M. Artificial intelligence techniques for classification of Alzheimer's disease using neuroimaging data: a review. Front Artif Intell. 2026;9:1748985.
213. Nouroozi F, Kazemi HS, Alinezhad A, Goudarzi N, Khosravi MK, Narimani Z, et al. Artificial Intelligence-based detection of neuropsychiatric lupus: an exploratory meta-analysis of neuroimaging and multimodal biomarker models. Clin Exp Med. 2026;26(1):125.
214. Nozari A, Binda DD, Baker MB. Advancements in Neuroanesthesia Through Artificial Intelligence. Anesthesiol Clin. 2025;43(3):527–47.
215. Nudeshima J. [Ethical Issues in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience]. Brain Nerve. 2019;71(7):715–22.
216. Ocampo-Navia MI, Agudelo-Arrieta M, Marín-Navas F, Taub-Krivoy A, Perez-Mendez W, Arana-Isaac N, et al. Radiomics and artificial intelligence for predicting pituitary neuroendocrine tumor consistency: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neurosurg Rev. 2025;49(1):67.
217. Olthof AW, van Ooijen PMA, Rezazade Mehrizi MH. Promises of artificial intelligence in neuroradiology: a systematic technographic review. Neuroradiology. 2020;62(10):1265–78.
218. Onciul R, Tataru CI, Dumitru AV, Crivoi C, Serban M, Covache-Busuioc RA, et al. Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience: Transformative Synergies in Brain Research and Clinical Applications. J Clin Med. 2025;14(2).
219. Ong J, Waisberg E, Masalkhi M, Kamran SA, Lowry K, Sarker P, et al. Artificial Intelligence Frameworks to Detect and Investigate the Pathophysiology of Spaceflight Associated Neuro-Ocular Syndrome (SANS). Brain Sci. 2023;13(8).
220. Orenuga S, Jordache P, Mirzai D, Monteros T, Gonzalez E, Madkoor A, et al. Traumatic Brain Injury and Artificial Intelligence: Shaping the Future of Neurorehabilitation-A Review. Life (Basel). 2025;15(3).
221. Oullier O, Roser F, Barbaste P, Vasques X. Improving consciousness assessment through neuroadaptive artificial intelligence and quantum-enhanced brain-computer interfaces. Clin Neurol Neurosurg. 2026;266:109396.
222. Palantzas A, Anagnostouli M. The Heart-Brain Axis in the Artificial Intelligence Era: Integrating Old and New Insights Towards New Targeting and Innovative Neuro- and Cardio-Therapeutics. Int J Mol Sci. 2025;26(17).
223. Pan I, Huang RY. Artificial intelligence in neuroimaging of brain tumors: reality or still promise? Curr Opin Neurol. 2023;36(6):549–56.
224. Pandey K, Pandey P, Khanal S, Panday A. Artificial Intelligence Techniques in Cardiac Neuromodulation: Mechanisms, Applications, and Pathways to Clinical Translation. J Arrhythm. 2026;42(4):e70434.
225. Panesar SS, Kliot M, Parrish R, Fernandez-Miranda J, Cagle Y, Britz GW. Promises and Perils of

Artificial Intelligence in Neurosurgery. Neurosurgery. 2020;87(1):33–44.
226. Pantelis AG, Panagopoulou PA, Lapatsanis DP. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in the Diagnosis and Management of Gastroenteropancreatic Neuroendocrine Neoplasms-A Scoping Review. Diagnostics (Basel). 2022;12(4).
227. Park JE. Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Oncologic Imaging: A Brief Review for Clinical Use Cases and Future Perspectives. Brain Tumor Res Treat. 2022;10(2):69–75.
228. Parker TM, Brush B. An Overview of Artificial Intelligence in Neurology. Semin Neurol. 2026;46(1):3–15.
229. Partouche E, Yeh R, Eche T, Rozenblum L, Carrere N, Guimbaud R, et al. Updated Trends in Imaging Practices for Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors (PNETs): A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis to Pave the Way for Standardization in the New Era of Big Data and Artificial Intelligence. Front Oncol. 2021;11:628408.
230. Patel T, Ibrahim HY, Henna F, Nasir F, Hussain A, Naveed R, et al. A narrative review on artificial intelligence in neurosurgery: ethical challenges and implementation considerations. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2025;87(12):8654–63.
231. Patel UK, Anwar A, Saleem S, Malik P, Rasul B, Patel K, et al. Artificial intelligence as an emerging technology in the current care of neurological disorders. J Neurol. 2021;268(5):1623–42.
232. Patil AD, Biousse V, Newman NJ. Artificial intelligence in ophthalmology: an insight into neurodegenerative disease. Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2022;33(5):432–9.
233. Pedersen M, Verspoor K, Jenkinson M, Law M, Abbott DF, Jackson GD. Artificial intelligence for clinical decision support in neurology. Brain Commun. 2020;2(2):fcaa096.
234. Pegorini C, Cattaneo D, Meotti M, Baglio F, Mannini A, Cordani C, et al. Artificial intelligence for gait and balance in neurological disorders: a scoping review of clinical applications and technologies. J Neurol. 2026;273(6).
235. Piñeros-Fernández MC. Artificial Intelligence Applications in the Diagnosis of Neuromuscular Diseases: A Narrative Review. Cureus. 2023;15(11):e48458.
236. Pinnelli SP, T SB, Ca J, Pinnelli VB, Harikrishna GV, Mudamanchu VK, et al. Artificial Intelligence for the Diagnosis and Management of Neurodegenerative Diseases: A Comprehensive Review With an Emphasis on Parkinson's and Alzheimer's Diseases. Cureus. 2026;18(7):e112325.
237. Pokhriyal SC, Shukla A, Gupta U, Al-Ghuraibawi MMH, Yadav R, Panigrahi K. Application of Artificial Intelligence in Neuroendocrine Lung Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment: A Systematic Review. Cureus. 2024;16(5):e61012.
238. Pringle C, Kilday JP, Kamaly-Asl I, Stivaros SM. The role of artificial intelligence in paediatric neuroradiology. Pediatr Radiol. 2022;52(11):2159–72.

239. Pyo SG. RRAM-Based Neuromorphic Devices for Artificial-Intelligence Hardware: Device Physics, Materials, Processing, and Packaging. Micromachines (Basel). 2026;17(9).
240. Qansuwa EM, Atalah HN, Salama MM. Rehabilitation, neuroplasticity, and machine learning: Approaching artificial intelligence for equitable health systems. Neuroscience. 2025;587:38–46.
241. Qasem MH, Sariera TMA, Alhumaid K, Alshraah SM, Mufleh ASS, Chihaoui N. A Comprehensive Review of Artificial Intelligence for Brain Tumor Analysis: Taxonomy, Robustness, and Open Challenges in Neuro-Oncology. J Imaging. 2026;12(6).
242. Qiu S, Malhotra AK, Quon JL. Comprehensive Overview of Computational Modeling and Artificial Intelligence in Pediatric Neurosurgery. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2024;1462:487–98.
243. Raghavendra U, Acharya UR, Adeli H. Artificial Intelligence Techniques for Automated Diagnosis of Neurological Disorders. Eur Neurol. 2019;82(1-3):41–64.
244. Rahimi M, Rahimi P. A Short Review on the Impact of Artificial Intelligence in Diagnosis Diseases: Role of Radiomics In Neuro-Oncology. Galen Med J. 2023;12:e3158.
245. Rahmani AH, Sarwar T. Artificial Intelligence and Digital Biomarkers for Early Detection and Monitoring of Neurological Disorders: A Narrative Review. Diagnostics (Basel). 2026;16(17).

246. Ramírez MAN, Rodríguez MM, Salas MJC, Rincón EHH. Artificial intelligence in diagnosis of pediatric neurodevelopmental disorders: a scoping review. World J Pediatr. 2026;22(3):315–29.
247. Rapoport N, Pavelchek C, Michelson AP, Shew MA. Artificial Intelligence in Otology and Neurotology. Otolaryngol Clin North Am. 2024;57(5):791–802.
248. Rathee P, Lohan S, Khatkar S, Malik N, Küpeli Akkol E, Sehrawat R, et al. Artificial intelligence-assisted neuropharmacology: reshaping drug discovery and translational strategies for neurological diseases. Turk J Med Sci. 2026;56(2):405–25.
249. Reyes JS, Lohia VN, Almeida T, Niranjan A, Lunsford LD, Hadjipanayis CG. Artificial intelligence in neurosurgery: a systematic review of applications, model comparisons, and ethical implications. Neurosurg Rev. 2025;48(1):455.
250. Rosen JM. How Artificial Intelligence, Virtual Reality, and Other Digital Technologies Are Changing the Field of Pediatric Neurogastroenterology. Gastroenterol Clin North Am. 2025;54(3):667–79.
251. Rudie JD, Rauschecker AM, Bryan RN, Davatzikos C, Mohan S. Emerging Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Neuro-Oncology. Radiology. 2019;290(3):607–18.
252. Saberi K, Abbood RS, Al-Taie SF, Smerat A, Mukhamedovich AM, Khamdamjonovna MM, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Veterinary Neurology:

Comparative Insights From Human Medicine and Cross-Species Technology Transfer. Vet Med Sci. 2026;12(5):e71152.
253. Saigal K, Patel AB, Lucke-Wold B. Artificial Intelligence and Neurosurgery: Tracking Antiplatelet Response Patterns for Endovascular Intervention. Medicina (Kaunas). 2023;59(10).
254. Salman A, Elewa A, Safina A, Marwan A. Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Endoscopic Ultrasound-Guided Ablation of Pancreatic Neuroendocrine Tumors: Toward Precision Diagnosis, Risk Stratification, and Personalized Therapy. Cureus. 2026;18(5):e109721.
255. Santana GO, Couto RM, Loureiro RM, Furriel B, de Paula LGN, Rother ET, et al. Economic Evaluations and Equity in the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Imaging Examinations for Medical Diagnosis in People With Dermatological, Neurological, and Pulmonary Diseases: Systematic Review. Interact J Med Res. 2025;14:e56240.
256. Scandola M, Esposito M, Guidotti R, Romano D. How artificial intelligence is shaping neuropsychology: A focus on cognitive assessment of neurodegenerative disorders. J Neuropsychol. 2026;20(1):256–75.
257. Schweingruber N, Gerloff C. [Artificial intelligence in neurocritical care]. Nervenarzt. 2021;92(2):115–26.
258. Schweizer-Schubert S, von Waldeyer-Hartz G, Schütze SE, Mahringer D, Ruhl AS, Graf M, et al. Transforming the interrelated nature of human

psychoneuroendocrine health and endocrine disrupting compounds in our planet's water: from Wilhelm Waldeyer's neuron theory to an artificial intelligence extension of the human body? Front Med (Lausanne). 2025;12:1583203.
259. Senders JT, Arnaout O, Karhade AV, Dasenbrock HH, Gormley WB, Broekman ML, et al. Natural and Artificial Intelligence in Neurosurgery: A Systematic Review. Neurosurgery. 2018;83(2):181–92.
260. Șerban M, Toader C, Covache-Busuioc RA. CRISPR and Artificial Intelligence in Neuroregeneration: Closed-Loop Strategies for Precision Medicine, Spinal Cord Repair, and Adaptive Neuro-Oncology. Int J Mol Sci. 2025;26(19).
261. Serbena DR, Cieslack ILF, Ratis RC, Chaves DVP, de Oliveira Filho SS, Neves H, et al. Artificial Intelligence for Diagnosis, Risk Stratification, and Prognosis of Neuroblastoma - A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Curr Oncol Rep. 2026;28(1).
262. Seriramulu VP, Suppiah S, Lee HH, Jang JH, Omar NF, Mohan SN, et al. Review of MR spectroscopy analysis and artificial intelligence applications for the detection of cerebral inflammation and neurotoxicity in Alzheimer's disease. Med J Malaysia. 2024;79(1):102–10.
263. Shemesh A, Leisman G, Grobman YJ. Bridging Space Perception, Emotions, and Artificial Intelligence in Neuroarchitecture. Brain Sci. 2026;16(2).
264. Shiino A. [Artificial Intelligence for Diag-

nostic Support of Neuroimage]. Brain Nerve. 2019;71(7):733–48.
265. Shrivastava M, Ye L. Neuroimaging and artificial intelligence for assessment of chronic painful temporomandibular disorders-a comprehensive review. Int J Oral Sci. 2023;15(1):58.
266. Siddiqi R, Cheema A, Marikh M, Alsaidi A, Pruinelli L, Javed S, et al. Leveraging artificial intelligence to optimize neuromodulation in the treatment of patients with chronic pain. Front Pain Res (Lausanne). 2026;7:1827351.
267. Singh S, Gambill JL, Attalla M, Fatima R, Gill AR, Siddiqui HF. Evaluating the Clinical Validity and Reliability of Artificial Intelligence-Enabled Diagnostic Tools in Neuropsychiatric Disorders. Cureus. 2024;16(10):e71651.
268. Singh S, Sharma Y, Bhardwaj P, Kothari D, Chhikara A, Gupta V, et al. Next generation preventive neurology: how artificial intelligence and machine learning are reshaping Alzheimer's disease research. Behav Brain Funct. 2026;22(1).
269. Sirilertmekasakul C, Rattanawong W, Gongvatana A, Srikiatkhachorn A. The current state of artificial intelligence-augmented digitized neurocognitive screening test. Front Hum Neurosci. 2023;17:1133632.
270. Siviero I, Vale N, Menegaz G, Ramos-Murguialday A, Francesca Storti S. Artificial Intelligence and Wearable Technologies for Upper Limb Neurorehabilitation. IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng. 2026;34:732–49.

271. Soltanieh S, Khalvati F, Yeh EA. Federated Learning in Neurology: Bridging Data Privacy and Artificial Intelligence for Brain Health. Semin Neurol. 2026;46(1):38–48.
272. Sonobe S, Niizuma K, Endo H. Artificial Intelligence in Neuroendovascular Therapy: Current Applications and Future Directions. J Neuroendovasc Ther. 2025;19(1).
273. Sooranahalli Nabh Y, Rayapati AD, Hamid A. Artificial Intelligence in Acute Neuroimaging Pathways: Diagnostic Accuracy, Workflow Performance, and Clinical Outcomes Across CT and MRI in Stroke and Trauma. Cureus. 2025;17(12):e98312.
274. Soulier T, Burgos N, Hassanaly R, Pitombeira M, Solal M, Roy H, et al. Artificial intelligence in presymptomatic neurological diseases: Bridging normal variation and prodromal signatures. Rev Neurol (Paris). 2025;181(9):944–50.
275. Soun J, Masudathaya LAY, Biswas A, Chow DS. The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Neurooncology Imaging. In: Colliot O, editor. Machine Learning for Brain Disorders. New York, NY: Humana

Copyright 2023, The Author(s). 2023. p. 963–76.

276. Sargazi M, Abdollahpour S, Marbini SA, Gorjizadeh N, Zare ZY, Ahmadzadeh O, et al. Role of Artificial Intelligence in Rare Disease Diagnosis and Orphan Drug Discovery. Kindle. 2026;6(1):1–233.

277. Kakeroudi SH, Daliri M, Abedi S, Fard SS, Seyedi SAR, Razavi DS, et al. AI-Enabled Health Ecosystems in Smart Societies. Kindle. 2026;6(1):1–318.
278. Gorjizadeh N, Tavousi N, Talebi S, Moallem M, Gheibi M, Bagherzadeh S, et al. Mechanistic AI in Medicine: Discovery of Mechanisms and Origins of Diseases: PreferPub; 2026.
279. Farrokhi M, Daliri M, Valiandoost R, Darbani R, Nasiri SM, Gheshlaghi P, et al. Role of AI in Health Economics: Reducing Costs in Global Health Through Innovations. Kindle. 2026;6(1):1–214.
280. Farrokhi M, Abdollahpour S, Marbini SA, Taheri N, Sahebi S, Asadi F, et al. AI for Holistic Medicine: Understanding Multi-Organ Interactions in Cancers. PreferPub. 2026;6(1):1–186.
281. Farrokhi M, Abdollahpour S, Hekmatnia Y, Rashidinejad B, Hoorshad B, Jabbari N, et al. AI-Driven Precision Care for Chronic Diseases. Kindle. 2026;6(1):1–279.
282. Farrokhi M, Abbasmofrad H, Karami M, Hezarani HB, Alemohammad SS, Atighi J, et al. AI for Self-Diagnosis, Self-Monitoring, and Personalized Medicine. Kindle. 2026;6(1):1–226.
283. Babamiri B, Taghipour N, Hashemi N, Sargazi M, Nematollahi R, Arani RM, et al. Next-Generation Cancer Treatment Using Digital Twins. Kindle. 2026;6(1):1–322.
284. Tahavvori A, Chelan RJ, Aminoleslami S, Moghadam OF, Haghighi L, Abdian Y, et al. Large

Language Models and ChatGPT in Medical Sciences: Foundations, Capabilities, and Challenges. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–222.
285. Ramezanian M, Benis DS, Nikakhtar R, Gorjizadeh N, Asadi F, Bagherianlemraski M, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Genomic Medicine: Improving Diagnostic Accuracy and Treatment Outcomes. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–215.
286. Rahmani E, Farrokhi M, Aghajan A, Gholampour G, Ghoodjani E, Shemshadigolafzani R, et al. AI-Driven Strategies for Improving Patient Quality of Life. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–214.
287. Rahaeimehr R, Babakhani Z, Moghadam OF, Nasir SM, Safaei P, Abdollahi MAA, et al. Application of AI in Research and Data Science. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–362.
288. Niakosari V, Mosaddeghi-Heris R, Hezarani HB, Farrokhi M, Safaei P, Nikseresht H, et al. AI in Medical Imaging and Early Disease Detection. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–203.
289. Louia S, Mosaddeghi-Heris R, Kamvar R, Zahmatkesh N, Damiri M, Esfahani MA, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Cancer Genomics: Transforming Diagnosis, Treatment, and Precision Medicine. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–234.
290. Louia S, Moghadam OF, Chelan RJ, Taheri N, Amini F, Ahmadi S, et al. Role of Immunogenetics in the Etiology, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Diseases. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–222.
291. Javadzadeh A, Shafiei D, Amlash RS, Mehrvar R, Sepehrian S, Shafiee A, et al. The Brain-

Body Connection: Neuroscience's Role Across Medical Sciences Disciplines. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–210.
292. Hedayati F, Chelan RJ, Alijaniha M, Koma KK, Irajian P, Rajabi N, et al. Explainable Artificial Intelligence for Reducing the Global Cancer Burden. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–195.
293. Harati K, Tahernejad M, Saddam SMS, Farshi M, Saeedfar M, Gheibi M, et al. The Future of Prosthetics and Organ Transplantation: A Therapeutic Approach Across Various Medical Disciplines. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–193.
294. Harati K, Mosaddeghi-Heris R, Kiani K, Saligheh Rad M, Morovatshoar R, Kamali M, et al. The AI Revolution: Predicting and Managing the Next Global Health Challenges and Emerging Disease Outbreaks. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–326.
295. Harati K, Abbasmofrad H, Ebrahimi M, Hashemlu L, Chelan RJ, Hashemzadeh A, et al. Intelligent Patient Engagement: Education and Follow-Up through AI and Telemedicine. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–185.
296. Gheibi M, Rajabloo Y, Alipour-Khabir Y, Azami P, Louia S, Bojnordi TE, et al. Artificial Intelligence in Biomarker Discovery: Applications Across Medical Specialties. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–209.
297. Farrokhi M, Taheri N, Moghadam OF, Armoon M, Samimi S, Torkashvand N, et al. Artificial Intelligence for Hard-to-Treat and Unknown-Origin Cancers. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–296.
298. Farrokhi M, Mehrtabar S, Harati K, Pourlak

T, Ghadirzadeh E, Abbasmofrad H, et al. Clinical Decision-Making Using Artificial Intelligence. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–236.
299. Farrokhi M, Ghalamkarpour N, Nouri S, Babaei M, Rajabloo Y, Sattari M, et al. Innovative Vaccination: A New Era in Cancer Prevention. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–194.
300. Babaheidarian P, Soltanattar A, Sajadi SK, Rostamian L, Foroutani L, Soleymanpourshamsi T, et al. Robotics in Healthcare. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–178.
301. Niakosari V, Mosaddeghi-Heris R, Hezarani HB, Farrokhi M, Safaei P, Nikseresht H, et al. Academic Textbook: AI in Medical Imaging and Early Disease Detection. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–203.
302. Farrokhi M, Ghalamkarpour N, Nouri S, Babaei M, Rajabloo Y, Sattari M, et al. Academic Textbook: Innovative Vaccination: A New Era in Cancer Prevention. Kindle. 2025;5(1):1–194.
303. Farrokhi M, Fallahian AH, Rahmani E, Aghajan A, Alipour M, Khouzani PJ, et al. Current applications, challenges, and future directions of artificial intelligence in emergency medicine: a narrative review. Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine. 2025;13(1):e45.
304. Moteshakereh SM, Zarei H, Nosratpour M, Moshfegh MZ, Shirvani P, Mirahmadi A, et al. Evaluating the diagnostic performance of MRI for identification of meniscal ramp lesions in ACL-deficient knees: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JBJS. 2024;106(12):1117–27.

305. Karimian S, Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Farrokhi M, Bayat Z, Zadeh SAM, et al. Academic Textbook: Digital Health and Wearable Technologies. Kindle. 2024;4(1):1–240.
306. Goodarzy B, Rahmani E, Farrokhi M, Tavakoli R, Fard AM, Ghaleh MR, et al. Diagnostic value of chest computed tomography scan for identification of foreign body aspiration in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine. 2024;13(1):e3.
307. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Moeini A, Farrokhi M, Ghadirzadeh E, Khouzani PJ, et al. Academic Textbook: Artificial Intelligence for Drug Development, Personalized Prescriptions, and Adverse Event Prediction. Kindle. 2024;4(1):1–180.
308. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Tosi YEK, Ghadirzadeh E, Bagheri M, et al. Academic Textbook: Nanomedicine: Technologies and Applications. Kindle. 2024;4(1):1–196.
309. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Moeini A, Tooyserkani SH, Shahali A, et al. Academic Textbook: Anti-Aging Strategies to Prevent Diseases: Promoting Longevity and Optimal Health. Kindle. 2024;4(1):1–194.
310. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Heydari Z, Darbani R, Salbi M, et al. Academic Textbook: Advancements and Innovations in Cancer Management: A Comprehensive Perspective. Kindle. 2024;4(1):1–161.
311. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Emtiazi N, Talebi M, Akbari A, et al. Academic Textbook:

Human and AI: Collaborative Medicine in the Age of Technology. Kindle. 2024;4(1):1–160.
312. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Bayat Z, Damiri M, Farrokhi M, Ghadirzadeh E, et al. Role of lifestyle medicine in the prevention and treatment of diseases. 2024.
313. Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Fard AM, Rahmani E, Soltani R, Shamsedanesh S, et al. Academic Textbook: Role of Micronutrients and Nutrition in Prevention and Treatment of Cancers. Kindle. 2023;3(1):1–102.
314. Rahmani E, Fayyazishishavan E, Afzalian A, Varshochi S, Amani-Beni R, Ahadiat S-A, et al. Point-of-care ultrasonography for identification of skin and soft tissue abscess in adult and pediatric patients; a systematic review and meta-analysis. Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine. 2023;11(1):e49.
315. Mirahmadi A, Hosseini-Monfared P, Amiri S, Taheri F, Farokhi M, Minaei Noshahr R, et al. Cross-cultural adaptation and validation of the Persian version of the new Knee Society Knee Scoring System (KSS). Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research. 2023;18(1):858.
316. Kazemi S-M, Khorram R, Fayyazishishavan E, Amani-Beni R, Haririan Y, Khameneh SMH, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of Ottawa Knee Rule for diagnosis of fracture in patients with knee trauma; a systematic review and meta-analysis. Archives of Academic Emergency Medicine. 2023;11(1):e30.
317. Farrokhi M, Taheri F, Moeini A, Farrokhi M,

Rabiei S, Farahmandsadr M. Sex and gender differences in the pathogenesis and treatment of diseases. Kindle. 2023;3(1):1–168.
318. Farrokhi M, Moeini A, Taheri F, Mostafavi M, Farrokhi M, Ardakan AK, et al. Academic Textbook: Artificial Intelligence in Cancer Care: From Diagnosis to Prevention and Beyond. Kindle. 2023;3(1):1–149.
319. Farrokhi M, Moeini A, Taheri F, Farrokhi M, Khodashenas M, Babaei M, et al. Academic Textbook: AI-assisted Screening and Prevention Programs for Diseases. Kindle. 2023;3(1):1–209.
320. Amini N, Taheri F, Khanian ZS, Yousofi H, Ghasemi Y, Farrokh F, et al. Academic Textbook: Role of Microbiome, Infection, and Inflammation in Autoimmune Diseases. Kindle. 2023;3(1):1–102.
321. Farrokhi M, Khurshid M, Mohammadi S, Yarmohammadi B, Bahramvand Y, Nasrollahi E, et al. Comparison of ultrasound-accelerated versus conventional catheter-directed thrombolysis for deep vein thrombosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Vascular. 2022;30(2):365–74.
322. Farrokhi M, Peykanpour F. Vascular endothelial growth factor–loaded bioresorbable delivery system for pulp regeneration. Journal of Endodontics. 2017;43(9):1414.
323. Farrokhi M, Arjaki D. Statistical comments on “Cytokine and chemokine profiles in patients with neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorder”. Neuroimmunomodulation. 2017;24(2):120–.

324. Farrokhi M, Dabirzadeh M, Dastravan N, Etemadifar M, Ghadimi K, Saadatpour Z, et al. Mannose-binding lectin mediated complement pathway in autoimmune neurological disorders. Iranian Journal of Allergy, Asthma and Immunology. 2016:251–6.
325. Farrokhi M, Beni AA, Etemadifar M, Rezaei A, Rivard L, Zadeh AR, et al. Effect of fingolimod on platelet count among multiple sclerosis patients. International Journal of Preventive Medicine. 2015;6:125.

Proof