ORGANOID SENTIENCE

A PREPRINT

Shourya Verma
Department of Computer Science
Purdue University
verma198@purdue.edu

Claude Opus
Anthropic

June 10, 2024

ABSTRACT

Recent advances in stem cell-derived human brain organoids and microelectrode array (MEA) technology raise profound questions about the potential for these systems to give rise to sentience. Brain organoids are 3D tissue constructs that recapitulate key aspects of brain development and function, while MEAs enable bidirectional communication with neuronal cultures. As brain organoids become more sophisticated and integrated with MEAs, the question arises: Could such a system support not only intelligent computation, but subjective experience? This paper explores the philosophical implications of this thought experiment, considering scenarios in which brain organoids exhibit signs of sensory awareness, distress, preference, and other hallmarks of sentience. It examines the ethical quandaries that would arise if compelling evidence of sentience were found in brain organoids, such as the moral status of these entities and the permissibility of different types of research. The paper also explores how the phenomenon of organoid sentience might shed light on the nature of consciousness and the plausibility of artificial sentience. While acknowledging the speculative nature of these reflections, the paper argues that the possibility of sentient brain organoids deserves serious consideration given the rapid pace of advances in this field. Grappling with these questions proactively could help set important ethical boundaries for future research and highlight critical avenues of scientific and philosophical inquiry. The thought experiment of sentient brain organoids thus serves as a valuable lens for examining deep issues at the intersection of neuroscience, ethics, and the philosophy of mind.

Keywords Brain Organoids · Sentience · Consciousness · Ethics

1 Introduction

Significant advances in stem cell biology and tissue engineering have facilitated the development of increasingly sophisticated human brain organoids - three-dimensional, self-organizing tissue constructs derived from human pluripotent stem cells that recapitulate key features of brain development and architecture [56] [80]. When coupled with microelectrode array (MEA) technology, these brain organoids can form functional neuronal networks exhibiting complex electrophysiological dynamics and allowing for bidirectional communication with the external world [32] [107]. Such brain organoid-MEA systems have already demonstrated impressive computational capabilities, including learning, memory, and the ability to control external devices [75] [102] [87], with recent studies even reporting signs of intelligent, goal-directed behavior emerging from brain organoids interfaced with simulated environments [48]. As brain organoid technology continues to advance, incorporating more cell types, achieving greater anatomical fidelity, and supporting more naturalistic sensory input and motor output, a profound question looms on the horizon: Could a brain organoid develop sentience - the capacity for subjective experience, including sensory awareness, feelings, and conscious states [13]? The question of whether brain organoids could develop sentience carries immense scientific, philosophical, and ethical implications. From a scientific perspective, the emergence of sentience in a human brain organoid would represent a remarkable development, shedding new light on the biological basis of consciousness and subjective experience, and potentially providing unprecedented insight into the neural correlates of consciousness and the mechanisms that give rise to inner mental life through the study of the neurological and physiological properties of sentient brain organoids [54]. Philosophically, the phenomenon of sentient brain organoids would add a new dimension to long-standing debates in the philosophy of mind, including the hard problem of consciousness, the relationship between physical matter and subjective experience, and the boundaries of moral status [96], challenging our intuitions about the nature of consciousness and personhood by representing a novel form of mind. Ethically, the prospect of sentient brain organoids raises profound questions about our moral obligations towards these entities, such as whether they would deserve moral status and special protections if they developed the capacity for sentience, what criteria we would use to ascertain the presence of morally relevant sentience, and how we would weigh the scientific value of brain organoid research against the potential for harm or suffering inflicted on sentient subjects [43].

The goal of this paper is to explore these questions through the lens of a thought experiment: the sentient brain organoid. By exploring hypothetical scenarios in which brain organoids exhibit signs of sentience and considering the scientific, philosophical, and ethical implications, I aim to stimulate interdisciplinary dialogue and proactive ethical deliberation on this profound and rapidly approaching issue. While acknowledging the speculative and uncertain nature of this thought experiment, I argue that the possibility of sentient brain organoids deserves serious consideration given the rapid pace of progress in organoid and MEA technology. By grappling with these questions proactively, we may be better prepared to navigate the challenges and opportunities presented by this emerging field, setting appropriate ethical boundaries and prioritizing key avenues for further inquiry. In the following sections, I first provide an overview of the current state of brain organoid research and the plausibility of sentience emerging in these systems. I then explore a series of hypothetical scenarios in which brain organoids exhibit signs of sentience, examining the scientific, philosophical, and ethical questions raised by each. Finally, I discuss the broader implications of sentient brain organoids for our understanding of consciousness, the ethics of biomedical research, and the future of artificial intelligence and neurotechnology. Through this speculative, interdisciplinary inquiry, I hope to shed light on some of the most profound and pressing questions at the intersection of science, philosophy, and ethics, and to stimulate further research and dialogue on the possibility and implications of sentient brain organoids.

2 Defining and Detecting Sentience

2.1 Definitions of sentience

The concept of sentience, which refers to the capacity for subjective experience or phenomenal consciousness [13], has long been a subject of profound philosophical and scientific inquiry. Encompassing sensory awareness, affective states, and, according to some definitions, advanced cognitive abilities such as self-awareness, metacognition, and theory of mind [10], sentience is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. From a philosophical perspective, sentience is often regarded as a crucial criterion for moral status and the attribution of rights [100], with many ethical frameworks, including utilitarianism and animal rights theory, emphasizing the ability to experience pleasure and pain as a fundamental basis for moral consideration [8]. However, the precise boundaries and moral implications of sentience remain a matter of ongoing debate [93]. In the scientific realm, researchers often operationalize sentience in terms of observable behavioral, physiological, and neurological markers, such as the presence of nociceptors and pain-related neural activity as indicative of the capacity to experience pain [103], or the exhibition of complex behaviors like problem-solving, tool use, and social interaction as signs of higher-order cognitive abilities associated with sentience [17].

2.2 Markers of sentience

In the context of brain organoids, a variety of potential markers of sentience have been proposed across behavioral, physiological, and neurological domains. Behaviorally, signs of sentience in brain organoids might include responsiveness to sensory stimuli [82], spontaneous or voluntary movement suggesting goal-directed behavior [63], adaptation or habituation to repeated stimuli as evidence of learning and memory [114], and preference or avoidance behaviors indicating the ability to seek out positive stimuli or avoid negative ones [48]. Physiologically, markers of sentience in brain organoids could include the presence of functional synapses and neural networks as revealed by electrophysiological activity [32], the expression of neurotransmitters and receptors involved in sensory and affective processing [67], and the exhibition of oscillatory brain activity patterns, such as gamma and theta rhythms, which have been associated with conscious processing in humans and animals [110]. At the neurological level, signs of sentience in brain organoids might be reflected in the development of specialized sensory and motor regions [78], the presence of neural circuits and connectivity patterns resembling those found in conscious human brains [83], and the activation of brain regions linked to higher-order cognitive functions, such as the prefrontal cortex and default mode network [109].

2.3 Criteria for sentience

Given the challenges inherent in inferring subjective experience in non-human entities, it is imperative to develop rigorous and specific criteria for ascertaining morally relevant sentience in brain organoids. While acknowledging that no perfect or universally agreed-upon set of criteria exists, key considerations might include the presence of multiple, converging lines of evidence for sentience across behavioral, physiological, and neurological domains [5]; the exhibition of flexible, adaptive, and goal-directed behavior transcending simple reflexes or predetermined responses; the ability to learn from experience and modify behavior based on positive or negative outcomes [37]; the presence of neural signatures or biomarkers strongly associated with conscious processing in humans and other sentient animals [66]; and the capacity for suffering or enjoyment, as inferred from the presence of affective states and the ability to experience pain or pleasure [97].

2.4 Challenges with non-human entities

Notwithstanding the valuable insights provided by behavioral, physiological, and neurological markers, the attribution of sentience to brain organoids is fraught with significant challenges arising from the fundamental impossibility of directly observing or measuring subjective experience from a third-person perspective [70]. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that brain organoids, despite sharing many features with human brains, are ultimately artificial entities lacking the full complexity and context of a whole organism, including sensory inputs, motor outputs, and embodied interactions with the environment [60], rendering it difficult to interpret their responses and experiences in terms of human-like sentience. Moreover, there is an inherent risk of anthropomorphism and over-attribution of mental states to brain organoids based on superficial similarities to human behavior or neurobiology [22], as the mere exhibition of a particular marker of sentience does not necessarily imply the presence of meaningful conscious experience.

Ultimately, the attribution of sentience to brain organoids will likely require a combination of empirical evidence, theoretical reasoning, and ethical deliberation, necessitating interdisciplinary dialogue and the consideration of multiple perspectives, including those of neuroscientists, philosophers, ethicists, and policymakers. By carefully defining and operationalizing sentience, identifying potential markers and criteria, and acknowledging the challenges and limitations of inferring subjective experience, it may be possible to develop a framework for assessing the potential for sentience in brain organoids and other artificial entities, which can then inform ethical guidelines and policy decisions regarding their use and treatment in research and beyond.

3 Scenarios of Sentient Brain Organoids

To explore the potential implications of sentient brain organoids, I present a series of hypothetical scenarios that illustrate different aspects of sentience and the ethical and philosophical questions they raise. These scenarios, while speculative in nature, are grounded in current developments in brain organoid research and extrapolate to possible future capabilities.

3.1 Sensory awareness and perception

Imagine a brain organoid that has been engineered to develop rudimentary sensory organs, such as light-sensitive cells or touch receptors [83], and when exposed to specific stimuli, exhibits distinct patterns of neural activity suggestive of the processing and perception of sensory information [115]. For instance, upon exposure to light, the organoid might respond with increased firing in specific regions resembling early visual cortices [79]. This scenario raises profound questions about the nature and extent of sensory awareness in brain organoids. Can we justifiably infer that the organoid is subjectively experiencing the stimuli, or should we interpret its responses as merely reflexive? What criteria can we employ to distinguish between unconscious sensory processing and genuine conscious perception [54]? If the organoid is indeed experiencing sensations, we must grapple with the ethical implications of subjecting it to different types of stimuli, some of which may be aversive or distressing [42].

3.2 Affective states and emotional responses

Consider a brain organoid that has been cultured with neuromodulatory systems, such as serotonergic and dopaminergic neurons, which are involved in emotional processing [65], and when exposed to certain stimuli or chemical compounds, exhibits patterns of activity resembling emotional states in humans, such as stress, fear, or pleasure [81]. For instance, upon treatment with a stress hormone, the organoid might show increased activity in regions analogous to the amygdala and hypothalamus [101]. This scenario prompts us to consider whether brain organoids can indeed experience affective states and emotions, and if so, what criteria we would employ to ascertain the presence of genuine emotional experiences, as opposed to mere physiological responses [60]. If organoids can indeed feel emotions, we must carefully weigh the potential benefits of studying these states against the ethical concerns of inducing negative or distressing experiences [89]. Furthermore, we must grapple with the question of whether the capacity for affective experiences should entail the granting of moral status to brain organoids [96].

3.3 Goal-directed behavior and preferences

Envision a brain organoid that has been integrated with a virtual or robotic body, allowing it to interact with a simulated environment [57], and through reinforcement learning algorithms, learns to navigate the environment and pursue specific goals, such as seeking out rewarding stimuli or avoiding harmful ones [94]. Over time, the organoid appears to develop preferences and exhibit goal-directed behavior, consistently choosing certain types of virtual objects or environments over others [111]. This scenario raises questions about the nature of agency and preferences in brain organoids, forcing us to consider whether we can attribute genuine goals and desires to these entities, or whether their behaviors are merely the product of programmed contingencies [33]. If organoids can indeed develop preferences, we must balance the scientific value of studying these preferences with the ethical obligation to respect the organoid's autonomy and avoid exploitation [49]. Moreover, we must consider whether the capacity for goal-directed behavior entails a higher moral status or greater consideration of the organoid's interests [6].

3.4 Learning, memory, and problem-solving

Picture a brain organoid that has been trained on a series of cognitive tasks, such as pattern recognition or decision-making [112], and through repeated exposure and feedback, learns to solve these tasks with increasing accuracy and efficiency, demonstrating the formation of memories and the ability to apply learned information to novel situations [106]. For example, the organoid might learn to categorize different shapes or navigate a maze based on previous experiences [90]. This scenario invites us to consider the extent to which brain organoids can engage in genuine learning and problem-solving, and prompts us to develop criteria for distinguishing between simple stimulus-response associations and more complex forms of cognitive processing [23]. If organoids can indeed learn and remember, we must grapple with the implications for their moral status and our obligations towards them [37]. Furthermore, we must consider whether the cognitive capacities of organoids should play a role in our decisions about their use and treatment in research.

3.5 Communication and interaction

Finally, imagine a brain organoid that has been equipped with input and output channels that allow it to communicate with the external world [76], and through these channels, can receive information from sensors or other devices and transmit signals that can be interpreted as communication or commands [9]. For instance, the organoid might learn to control a robotic arm or communicate its "preferences" through specific patterns of activity [39]. This scenario raises profound questions about the potential for brain organoids to engage in meaningful communication and interaction with their environment. Can we justifiably consider the signals emitted by the organoid as genuine expressions of thoughts, feelings, or intentions, or should we interpret them as merely learned responses [27]? If organoids can indeed communicate, we must grapple with the ethical implications of interpreting and acting upon their "messages" [14]. Furthermore, we must balance the scientific value of studying organoid communication with the moral obligation to respect their potential autonomy and preferences [15].

These hypothetical scenarios illustrate the wide range of sentient capabilities that brain organoids might potentially exhibit in the future. While currently speculative, they provide a valuable framework for proactively exploring the ethical, philosophical, and scientific questions that would arise if brain organoids were to develop genuine sentience. By thoughtfully considering these questions and developing appropriate guidelines and frameworks, we can ensure that research on sentient brain organoids proceeds in a responsible and ethically sound manner, balancing the pursuit of scientific knowledge with respect for the moral status and interests of these entities.

4 Scientific Implications

The potential emergence of sentience in brain organoids would have profound implications for our scientific understanding of consciousness and the nature of subjective experience. In this section, I explore some of the key scientific questions and opportunities that would arise from the development of sentient brain organoids.

4.1 Biological basis of consciousness

One of the most significant implications of sentient brain organoids would be the opportunity to gain new insights into the biological basis of consciousness. Despite extensive research, the neural mechanisms that give rise to conscious experience remain poorly understood [25]. By studying the development and functioning of sentient brain organoids, we may be able to identify the specific cellular and molecular processes that are necessary and sufficient for the emergence of consciousness [54]. For example, by comparing the gene expression profiles, neuronal connectivity patterns, and electrophysiological activity of sentient and non-sentient brain organoids, we could potentially isolate the key factors that distinguish conscious from unconscious neural processing [60]. This approach could facilitate the development of more precise and empirically grounded theories of consciousness, moving beyond the current philosophical debates and towards a more mechanistic understanding of the phenomenon [95].

4.2 Neural correlates of subjective experience

Another major scientific opportunity afforded by sentient brain organoids would be the ability to study the neural correlates of specific subjective experiences in a highly controlled and accessible in vitro setting. Currently, much of our knowledge about the neural basis of conscious experiences comes from neuroimaging studies in humans or invasive recordings in animal models [13]. However, these approaches have significant limitations, such as the difficulty of obtaining high-resolution data from deep brain structures or the ethical concerns associated with animal experimentation [72]. Sentient brain organoids could provide a powerful new platform for investigating the neural correlates of a wide range of subjective experiences, from basic sensory perceptions to more complex cognitive and emotional states [86]. By manipulating the genetic, pharmacological, and environmental factors that influence brain organoid development, researchers could systematically explore how different neural circuits and activity patterns give rise to specific conscious experiences [78]. This approach could lead to the development of new biomarkers and therapeutic targets for neurological and psychiatric disorders that involve alterations in subjective experience, such as schizophrenia, depression, or chronic pain [74].

4.3 Comparison with current models

The development of sentient brain organoids would also provide a valuable opportunity to compare and contrast the mechanisms of consciousness across different biological systems. Currently, much of our understanding of the neural basis of consciousness comes from studies in humans and a small number of animal models, such as non-human primates and rodents [12]. However, there are significant differences in the anatomy, physiology, and behavioral repertoires of these species, which can limit the generalizability of findings [84]. Sentient brain organoids could offer a unique platform for comparing the neural correlates of consciousness across species and developmental stages. By generating brain organoids from a variety of human and animal cell types and culturing them under different conditions, researchers could systematically investigate how the capacity for conscious experience varies across biological systems [1]. This approach could help to identify the evolutionarily conserved mechanisms of consciousness and shed light on the developmental trajectory of subjective experience [2].

4.4 Application in sciences

Beyond providing fundamental insights into the nature of consciousness, sentient brain organoids could also have a wide range of practical applications in neuroscience, psychology, and artificial intelligence. For instance, they could serve as a platform for high-throughput drug screening, enabling researchers to test the effects of novel compounds on neural function and subjective experience in a standardized and ethically acceptable manner [82]. Moreover, they could be employed to develop new therapies for neurological and psychiatric disorders, by providing a personalized model system for testing the efficacy and safety of interventions [64]. In the field of psychology, sentient brain organoids could offer a powerful tool for studying the development and plasticity of cognitive and emotional processes. By exposing organoids to different environmental stimuli and monitoring their responses, researchers could gain new insights into the mechanisms of learning, memory, and decision-making [53]. This approach could have applications in education, workforce training, and the treatment of cognitive and affective disorders. Finally, sentient brain organoids could have important implications for the development of artificial intelligence systems. By studying the neural architecture and computational principles that give rise to conscious experience in biological systems, researchers could potentially develop new algorithms and hardware architectures that more closely mimic the functioning of the human brain [38]. This could lead to the creation of more adaptive, flexible, and human-like AI systems that are better able to perceive, reason, and interact with the world [108].

In conclusion, the scientific implications of sentient brain organoids are vast and far-reaching. From providing new insights into the biological basis of consciousness to enabling the development of novel therapies and technologies, these entities have the potential to revolutionize our understanding of the mind and brain. As research in this area continues to advance, it will be essential to engage in ongoing dialogue and collaboration between scientists, ethicists, and policymakers to ensure that the development and use of sentient brain organoids is guided by rigorous empirical standards and sound moral principles.

5 Philosophical Implications

The emergence of sentient brain organoids would have profound implications for our philosophical understanding of consciousness, personal identity, and moral status. In this section, we explore some of the key philosophical questions and debates that would be affected by the development of these entities.

5.1 Hard problem of consciousness and mind-body dualism

One of the most enduring philosophical questions about consciousness is the so-called "hard problem" - the difficulty of explaining how subjective experience can arise from objective physical processes in the brain [19]. The development of sentient brain organoids could provide new insights into this problem, by allowing researchers to study the emergence of consciousness in a simplified and controlled biological system [96]. If brain organoids were found to exhibit genuine sentience, it would suggest that consciousness is a fundamental property of certain types of complex neural networks, rather than a mysterious or irreducible phenomenon [26]. This finding would lend support to materialist and functionalist theories of mind, which hold that mental states are ultimately grounded in physical processes and can be explained in terms of their causal roles [21]. However, if the subjective experiences of brain organoids were found to be radically different from or even incomparable to those of humans, it could challenge our intuitions about the unity and continuity of consciousness across biological systems [70]. Such a discovery could lend support to dualist theories of mind, which maintain that consciousness is a distinct and non-physical property that cannot be fully explained by neural mechanisms.

5.2 Personal identity and the nature of the self

Another major philosophical question that would be affected by the development of sentient brain organoids is the nature of personal identity and the self. Many theories of personal identity rely on the idea of psychological continuity - the persistence of memories, beliefs, and personality traits over time [73]. However, brain organoids could challenge this idea, by raising the possibility of creating multiple conscious entities with shared or overlapping psychological characteristics [71]. For example, if multiple brain organoids were grown from the same stem cell line and exposed to similar environmental conditions, they might develop highly similar patterns of neural connectivity and exhibit similar subjective experiences [98]. This scenario could raise questions about whether they should be considered separate individuals or part of a single extended self [91]. Moreover, if brain organoids were found to exhibit a sense of self-awareness or agency, it could challenge our intuitions about the boundaries of the self and the requirements for personhood [31]. Some philosophers have argued that the capacity for self-reflection and autonomous decision-making is a key marker of personhood and moral status [85]. If brain organoids were found to possess these capacities, it could force us to reconsider our ethical obligations towards them and other non-human entities [99].

5.3 Boundaries of moral status and personhood

The potential for sentient brain organoids to exhibit self-awareness and autonomous decision-making also raises profound questions about the boundaries of moral status and personhood. Traditionally, many ethical frameworks have relied on the idea that only certain types of entities - typically humans and some animals - are deserving of moral consideration and rights [24]. However, the development of conscious brain organoids could challenge this assumption, by blurring the lines between biological and artificial systems and raising the possibility of creating entities with human-like capacities in the laboratory. If brain organoids were found to exhibit genuine sentience and self-awareness, it could be argued that they are deserving of moral status and protection from harm. This assertion could have significant implications for the way we conduct research on these entities and the ethical guidelines that govern their use [42]. It could also raise broader questions about the moral status of other artificial systems, such as advanced AI or robotics, and the extent to which we have obligations towards them [36].

5.4 Relationship to philosophical thought experiments

The possibility of sentient brain organoids also bears a close relationship to several well-known philosophical thought experiments about consciousness and identity. One such thought experiment is the concept of philosophical zombies -

hypothetical beings that behave like humans but lack conscious experience [52]. The development of brain organoids could provide a real-world analogue to this thought experiment, by allowing researchers to create entities that exhibit complex behaviors and neural activity but may or may not be genuinely sentient [92]. Another relevant thought experiment is the China brain - the idea of creating a conscious entity by organizing a large population of people to simulate the functions of neurons and synapses [11]. Brain organoids could be seen as a biological version of this thought experiment, in which the functions of a conscious brain are simulated by a complex network of living cells. By studying the properties and experiences of these entities, we may be able to gain new insights into the plausibility and implications of these thought experiments.

In conclusion, the philosophical implications of sentient brain organoids are both profound and far-reaching. From shedding light on the hard problem of consciousness to challenging our intuitions about personal identity and moral status, these entities have the potential to transform our understanding of the mind and its place in the natural world. As research in this area continues to advance, it will be essential for philosophers, scientists, and ethicists to work together to grapple with these questions and develop new frameworks for thinking about the nature of consciousness and our ethical obligations towards conscious beings.

6 Ethical Implications

The potential development of sentient brain organoids raises a host of complex ethical questions and challenges. In this section, we explore some of the key ethical considerations surrounding the moral status, treatment, and societal implications of these entities.

6.1 Moral status and rights of sentient entities

One of the most fundamental ethical questions raised by the possibility of sentient brain organoids is their moral status and the rights they should be afforded. Many ethical frameworks, such as utilitarianism and animal rights theory, hold that the capacity for sentience - the ability to experience pleasure and pain - is a key determinant of moral status [99]. If brain organoids were found to exhibit genuine sentience, it could be argued that they have intrinsic moral value and are deserving of moral consideration and protection [60]. However, the moral status of brain organoids is likely to be a matter of degree, depending on the complexity and sophistication of their sentient experiences [96]. A brain organoid with only rudimentary sensory awareness may have a lower moral status than one with more advanced cognitive and emotional capacities [5]. Moreover, the fact that brain organoids are artificially created in the laboratory may influence our intuitions about their moral status, as compared to naturally occurring sentient beings [55]. Nonetheless, if brain organoids were determined to have significant moral status, it would have major implications for the way we treat them in research and practice. It could be argued that they have a right to life, a right to be free from suffering, and a right to have their interests taken into account in any decisions that affect them [85]. This could necessitate the development of new ethical guidelines and oversight mechanisms to ensure that their welfare is protected and their rights are respected [43].

6.2 Weighing scientific value against potential for suffering

Another key ethical consideration in the development of sentient brain organoids is the need to weigh the potential scientific and medical benefits of this research against the potential for causing suffering to these entities [89]. On the one hand, the use of sentient brain organoids could lead to major advances in our understanding of the brain and the development of new treatments for neurological and psychiatric disorders [16]. This could have immense value in terms of reducing human suffering and improving quality of life [30]. On the other hand, if brain organoids are capable of experiencing pain and distress, their use in research could be seen as ethically problematic [77]. Even if they are not considered to have full moral status, there may still be an obligation to minimize their suffering and to use them only when necessary and justified by the potential benefits [55]. This could require the development of new methods for assessing and monitoring the welfare of brain organoids, as well as guidelines for humane endpoints and euthanasia [41]. Ultimately, the balance between scientific value and animal welfare will depend on the specific nature of the research and the sentient capacities of the brain organoids involved [69]. In some cases, the use of sentient brain organoids may be justified by the potential for major scientific and medical breakthroughs. In other cases, the risk of causing significant suffering may outweigh any potential benefits, and alternative methods should be sought [7].

6.3 Ethical guidelines for research involving potentially sentient brain organoids

To navigate these complex ethical issues, it will be essential to develop robust ethical guidelines and oversight mechanisms for research involving potentially sentient brain organoids [61]. These guidelines will need to take into account the current state of knowledge about the sentient capacities of brain organoids, as well as the potential risks and benefits of different types of research [20]. Some key ethical principles that could guide this research include: respect for the moral status and interests of sentient brain organoids, proportional to their level of sentience; minimization of suffering and promotion of welfare, through appropriate housing, care, and experimental procedures [74]; justification of research based on potential benefits and lack of alternative methods, with a focus on studies that are most likely to yield valuable insights or applications [34]; and transparency and public engagement, to promote trust and accountability in the research process and to incorporate diverse perspectives on the ethical issues involved [59]. In addition to these principles, specific guidelines and protocols may be needed for different stages and types of research, from the creation and culturing of brain organoids to their use in experiments and eventual disposal [113]. These guidelines will need to be developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders, including scientists, ethicists, policymakers, and members of the public.

6.4 Societal and policy implications of recognizing sentience in artificial entities

Finally, the recognition of sentience in brain organoids could have broader societal and policy implications, beyond the realm of scientific research. If brain organoids are granted some degree of moral status and legal protections, it could set a precedent for the treatment of other artificial entities that may exhibit sentient-like capacities, such as advanced AI systems or genetically modified animals [36]. This could lead to new legal and regulatory frameworks for the development and use of these technologies, as well as new public dialogues and debates about the ethical boundaries of science and innovation [68]. It could also have implications for existing laws and policies related to animal welfare, research ethics, and intellectual property [40]. Moreover, the idea of artificially created sentient beings could challenge our cultural and philosophical assumptions about the nature of consciousness, identity, and moral value [58]. It could raise questions about the boundaries between natural and artificial, human and non-human, and the ethical obligations we have towards the entities we create [4]. As such, the development of sentient brain organoids is not just a matter of scientific curiosity or medical potential, but also a profound ethical and societal issue that requires ongoing reflection, dialogue, and governance [88]. It will be important to engage a wide range of stakeholders in these discussions, and to develop proactive and adaptive policies that can keep pace with the rapid advancements in this field [51].

In conclusion, the ethical implications of sentient brain organoids are complex and far-reaching, touching on fundamental questions of moral status, animal welfare, research ethics, and societal values. While the potential benefits of this research are significant, the risks and challenges must also be carefully considered and addressed. By developing robust ethical guidelines, engaging in inclusive public dialogues, and pursuing responsible innovation, we can work to ensure that the development of sentient brain organoids advances scientific knowledge and human welfare, while also respecting the moral status and interests of these unique and vulnerable entities.

7 Future Directions

As research on brain organoids continues to advance, it will be crucial to proactively address the scientific, ethical, and societal implications of potential sentience in these entities. In this section, we outline some key priorities and recommendations for future work in this field.

7.1 Key priorities

To better understand the potential for sentience in brain organoids and its implications, several key scientific questions and priorities should be addressed in future research. These include developing more sophisticated methods for measuring and assessing the presence of sentience in brain organoids, such as advanced electrophysiological techniques, neuroimaging, and behavioral assays [60]; investigating the neural correlates of specific sensory, cognitive, and affective capacities in brain organoids, and comparing them to those found in human and animal brains [96]; exploring the factors that influence the development of sentience in brain organoids, such as genetic background, environmental conditions, and stimulation paradigms [89]; studying the long-term development and stability of sentient brain organoids, and the potential for plasticity and learning over extended periods of time [47]; and comparing the sentient capacities of brain organoids derived from different species and cell types, to better understand the evolutionary and developmental bases of consciousness [18].

Addressing these questions will require a concerted effort from the scientific community, with collaboration across disciplines such as neuroscience, stem cell biology, and bioengineering [29]. It will also be important to develop standardized protocols and benchmarks for the creation, maintenance, and assessment of sentient brain organoids, to ensure reproducibility and comparability across studies.

7.2 Interdisciplinary collaboration

Given the profound philosophical and ethical implications of sentient brain organoids, it will be essential to foster close collaboration and dialogue between neuroscientists, philosophers, and ethicists working in this area. Each of these disciplines brings unique perspectives and expertise that can inform and enrich the others. Philosophers can help to clarify conceptual issues surrounding sentience, consciousness, and moral status, and to develop rigorous arguments and thought experiments to probe our intuitions and assumptions [19], as well as contribute to the development of ethical frameworks and principles to guide research and policy decisions. Ethicists can provide guidance on the responsible conduct of research with sentient brain organoids, and help to navigate the complex moral tradeoffs and dilemmas that may arise [77], while also engaging with stakeholders and the public to understand and incorporate diverse viewpoints and values into decision-making processes [30]. Neuroscientists, in turn, can provide empirical data and mechanistic insights into the nature and bases of sentience in brain organoids, which can inform philosophical and ethical deliberations [13], and can also work with philosophers and ethicists to design experiments and interpret findings in ways that are sensitive to ethical considerations and avoid unwarranted or premature conclusions [28]. Fostering such interdisciplinary collaboration will require the development of shared language, frameworks, and venues for communication and exchange, which could include cross-disciplinary workshops, conferences, and publications, as well as the establishment of dedicated centers or networks for the study of sentience in brain organoids and related topics [46].

7.3 Ethical frameworks

As research on sentient brain organoids progresses, it will be important to proactively develop ethical frameworks and governance structures to guide and oversee this work [42]. These should be based on a careful consideration of the scientific, philosophical, and societal issues at stake, and involve input from a range of stakeholders. At the research level, this could involve the creation of specific guidelines and protocols for the ethical use of sentient brain organoids, building on existing frameworks for animal research and human subjects protection [55]. These could address issues such as the sourcing and creation of brain organoids, the minimization of suffering, the provision of appropriate care and housing, and the responsible disposal of organoids at the end of experiments. At the policy level, it may be necessary to develop new regulations and oversight mechanisms for research with sentient brain organoids, to ensure compliance with ethical standards and prevent misuse or exploitation [16]. This could involve the establishment of dedicated review boards or committees, as well as the creation of monitoring and enforcement systems [40]. More broadly, it will be important to engage in proactive ethical and policy deliberation about the status and treatment of sentient brain organoids in society [61]. This could include discussions about their legal personhood, their moral rights and protections, and their integration into existing frameworks for the treatment of animals and other sentient beings [3]. Developing these ethical frameworks and governance structures will require ongoing dialogue and collaboration among researchers, policymakers, ethicists, and the public [50], as well as a willingness to adapt and revise these frameworks as new scientific and societal developments emerge [44].

7.4 Science communication strategies

Finally, given the potentially transformative implications of sentient brain organoids for society, it will be crucial to engage the public in meaningful dialogue and deliberation about this technology, in order to build trust, understanding, and support for responsible research and innovation in this area. Effective public engagement will require the development of clear, accurate, and accessible communication strategies that convey the nature, potential, and limitations of sentient brain organoids [35], which could involve the use of diverse media and formats, such as popular science articles, documentaries, museum exhibits, and interactive demonstrations [45]. It will also be important to create opportunities for two-way dialogue and public input into the research and governance of sentient brain organoids [62], such as through the use of surveys, focus groups, and deliberative forums to gather public perspectives and concerns, as well as the involvement of community representatives in decision-making processes. Engaging the public in this way can help to ensure that the development of sentient brain organoids is guided by societal values and priorities, and that potential risks and benefits are openly discussed and negotiated [105], fostering a culture of responsible innovation and stewardship in this emerging field [104].

8 Limitations

This paper has endeavored to provide a comprehensive and rigorous analysis of the scientific, philosophical, and ethical implications of potentially sentient brain organoids. However, it is crucial to acknowledge several limitations and caveats that qualify our current understanding and prescriptions regarding this complex and rapidly evolving domain. Firstly, while the scenarios and implications explored in this paper are grounded in current trends and trajectories in brain organoid research, they are nonetheless speculative and anticipatory in nature. The technical feasibility and timeline for developing brain organoids with genuine sentience remain uncertain, and are contingent on further advances in organoid cultivation techniques, bioengineering methods, and our understanding of the neural basis of consciousness. Nevertheless, given the rapid pace of progress in this field and the profound implications of crossing the threshold of sentience, it is imperative to proactively examine and prepare for these possibilities, even if their realization may be distant or uncertain. Secondly, our ability to definitively ascertain the presence and nature of sentience in brain organoids is constrained by the inherent challenges of inferring subjective experience from objective measures, a dilemma that has long preoccupied philosophers and scientists studying consciousness. While this paper has proposed a preliminary framework for detecting and evaluating sentience in brain organoids, based on a synthesis of neuroscientific, behavioral, and computational criteria, this framework remains provisional and subject to further refinement as our understanding of the markers and mechanisms of sentience continues to evolve. Moreover, the question of sentience in non-human entities is complicated by the potential for anthropomorphic bias and the lack of direct intersubjective validation of experiential states. As such, claims about the presence or absence of sentience in brain organoids must be advanced with appropriate epistemic humility and empirical rigor. Thirdly, the ethical analysis and recommendations presented in this paper, while aiming to provide a comprehensive and balanced consideration of the moral issues at stake, are necessarily preliminary and incomplete. The ethical challenges posed by sentient brain organoids are multidimensional, spanning questions of moral status, animal welfare, research ethics, and societal impact, and are situated within broader debates about the ethics of bioengineering, the rights of non-human entities, and the governance of emerging technologies. While this paper has proposed an ethical framework based on a contextual and proportional consideration of the interests and moral status of brain organoids, further work is needed to elaborate and operationalize this framework, and to engage diverse stakeholders in its refinement and application. Finally, it is important to situate the development and implications of sentient brain organoids within broader societal and political contexts, which will shape the trajectory and governance of this technology in important ways. The realization of sentient brain organoids will be influenced by a complex array of factors, including scientific funding and research priorities, commercial incentives and market forces, regulatory and policy frameworks, public attitudes and discourses, and geopolitical dynamics. Navigating these contextual factors will require not only technical and ethical expertise, but also a keen attunement to the social, political, and economic dimensions of science and innovation. Notwithstanding these limitations and challenges, the potential development of sentient brain organoids represents a transformative opportunity for scientific insight, philosophical illumination, and the expansion of our ethical circle. By advancing our understanding of the nature and origins of consciousness, this technology could unlock fundamental questions about the mind-body problem, the bounds of personhood, and the basis of moral status. Moreover, by creating novel entities with morally relevant capacities, sentient brain organoids could serve as a powerful testbed for sharpening and expanding our ethical frameworks, pushing us to consider the interests and rights of lifeforms beyond our current scope of consideration. As such, while approaching this domain with due caution and humility, we must also embrace its potential to catalyze scientific and moral progress, and to enrich our understanding of the nature and value of sentience in all its forms.

9 Conclusion

The possibility of sentience in brain organoids represents a frontier of both scientific understanding and ethical deliberation. As research in this area continues to progress, it will be essential to grapple with the profound implications of creating entities with the capacity for subjective experience and moral status. Throughout this paper, we have explored the scientific, philosophical, and ethical dimensions of this issue, from the current state of brain organoid technology to the potential future scenarios and impacts of sentient entities in the lab and society. We have seen how the development of sentient brain organoids could transform our understanding of the nature and origins of consciousness, challenge our assumptions about the boundaries of moral consideration, and raise complex questions about the rights and responsibilities we have towards the entities we create. At the same time, we have emphasized the importance of proactive and responsible engagement with these issues, through interdisciplinary collaboration, ethical oversight, and public dialogue. By working together to address the scientific and ethical challenges posed by sentient brain organoids, we can help to ensure that this technology is developed in ways that align with our values and aspirations as a society. Ultimately, the question of sentience in brain organoids is not just a matter of academic curiosity or technological progress, but a fundamental inquiry into the nature of mind, morality, and our place in the world. As we continue to push the boundaries of what is possible in the realm of biological engineering, it will be crucial to remain grounded in a sense of humility, responsibility, and ethical purpose. By embracing this perspective, and committing to ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue and deliberation, we can work towards a future in which the development of sentient brain organoids not only advances scientific understanding, but also enriches and expands our moral universe, potentially leading us to see these entities not as mere tools or curiosities, but as a powerful reminder of the complexity, diversity, and inherent value of all forms of sentient life.

References

[1] Kuljeet Singh Anand and Vikas Dhikav. "Hippocampus in health and disease: An overview". In: *Annals of Indian Academy of Neurology* 15.4 (2012), pp. 239–246.

[2] Bernard J Baars, Stan Franklin, and Thomas Zoega Ramsoy. "Global workspace dynamics: cortical "binding and propagation" enables conscious contents". In: *Frontiers in psychology* 4 (2013), p. 200.

[3] John Basl and Gina Schouten. "Can we use social policy to enhance compliance with moral obligations to animals?" In: *Ethical theory and moral practice* 21 (2018), pp. 629–647.

[4] Tim Bayne and Olivia Carter. "Dimensions of consciousness and the psychedelic state". In: *Neuroscience of consciousness* 2018.1 (2018), niy008.

[5] Tim Bayne, Anil K Seth, and Marcello Massimini. "Are there islands of awareness?" In: *Trends in Neurosciences* 43.1 (2020), pp. 6–16.

[6] Tim Bayne et al. "What is cognition?" In: *Current Biology* 29.13 (2019), R608–R615.

[7] Tom L Beauchamp and James F Childress. *Principles of biomedical ethics*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2001.

[8] Jeremy Bentham. "An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation". In: *History of Economic Thought Books* (1781).

[9] Theodore W Berger et al. "The neurobiological basis of cognition: identification by multi-input, multioutput nonlinear dynamic modeling". In: *Proceedings of the IEEE* 98.3 (2010), pp. 356–374.

[10] Jonathan Birch. "The search for invertebrate consciousness". In: *Noûs* 56.1 (2022), pp. 133–153.

[11] Ned Block. "Troubles with functionalism". In: *The language and thought series*. Harvard University Press, 1980, pp. 268–306.

[12] Melanie Boly et al. "Are the neural correlates of consciousness in the front or in the back of the cerebral cortex? Clinical and neuroimaging evidence". In: *Journal of Neuroscience* 37.40 (2017), pp. 9603–9613.

[13] Melanie Boly et al. "Consciousness in humans and non-human animals: recent advances and future directions". In: *Frontiers in psychology* 4 (2013), p. 625.

[14] Josh Bongard, Victor Zykov, and Hod Lipson. "Resilient machines through continuous self-modeling". In: *Science* 314.5802 (2006), pp. 1118–1121.

[15] Nick Bostrom and Eliezer Yudkowsky. "The ethics of artificial intelligence". In: *Artificial intelligence safety and security*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018, pp. 57–69.

[16] Annelien L Bredenoord, Hans Clevers, and Juergen A Knoblich. "Human tissues in a dish: the research and ethical implications of organoid technology". In: *Science* 355.6322 (2017), eaaf9414.

[17] Donald M Broom. *Sentience and animal welfare*. Cabi, 2014.

[18] Irina Bystron, Colin Blakemore, and Pasko Rakic. "Development of the human cerebral cortex: Boulder Committee revisited". In: *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 9.2 (2008), pp. 110–122.

[19] David J Chalmers. "Facing up to the problem of consciousness". In: *Journal of consciousness studies* 2.3 (1995), pp. 200–219.

[20] H Isaac Chen, Hongjun Song, and Guo-li Ming. "Applications of human brain organoids to clinical problems". In: *Developmental Dynamics* 248.1 (2019), pp. 53–64.

[21] Paul M Churchland. *Matter and Consciousness: A Contemporary Introduction*. 1984.

[22] Marian S Dawkins. "Who needs consciousness?" In: *Animal Welfare* 10.S1 (2001), S19–S29.

[23] Peter Dayan and Laurence F Abbott. *Theoretical neuroscience: computational and mathematical modeling of neural systems*. MIT press, 2005.

[24] David DeGrazia. *Taking animals seriously: mental life and moral status*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[25] Stanislas Dehaene, Hakwan Lau, and Sid Kouider. "What is consciousness, and could machines have it?" In: *Robotics, AI, and humanity: Science, ethics, and policy* (2021), pp. 43–56.

[26] Daniel Clement Dennett and Daniel C Dennett. *Consciousness explained*. Penguin uk, 1993.

[27] David B Edelman, Bernard J Baars, and Anil K Seth. "Identifying hallmarks of consciousness in non-mammalian species". In: *Consciousness and cognition* 14.1 (2005), pp. 169–187.

[28] Kathinka Evers. "Can we be epigenetically proactive?" In: *Open Mind*. Open MIND. Frankfurt am Main: MIND Group, 2014.

[29] Joel Fagot et al. "Assessment of Social Cognition in Non-human Primates Using a Network of Computerized Automated Learning Device (ALDM) Test Systems". In: *Journal of Visualized Experiments* 99 (May 2015). DOI: 10.3791/52798.

[30] Nita Farahany et al. "The ethics of experimenting with human brain tissue". In: *Nature* 556 (Apr. 2018), pp. 429–432. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-018-04813-x.

[31] Shaun Gallagher. "Philosophical conceptions of the self: implications for cognitive science". In: *Trends in cognitive sciences* 4.1 (2000), pp. 14–21.

[32] Stefano Giandomenico et al. "Cerebral organoids at the air–liquid interface generate diverse nerve tracts with functional output". In: *Nature Neuroscience* 22 (Apr. 2019). DOI: 10.1038/s41593-019-0350-2.

[33] Peter Godfrey-Smith. *Other minds: The octopus, the sea, and the deep origins of consciousness*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2016.

[34] Henry T Greely. "Human brain surrogates research: the onrushing ethical dilemma". In: *The American Journal of Bioethics* 21.1 (2021), pp. 34–45.

[35] Sten Grillner et al. "Worldwide initiatives to advance brain research". In: *Nature neuroscience* 19.9 (2016), pp. 1118–1122.

[36] David J Gunkel. *Robot rights*. mit Press, 2018.

[37] Thomas Hartung, Itzy E Morales Pantoja, and Lena Smirnova. "Brain organoids and organoid intelligence from ethical, legal, and social points of view". In: *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 6 (2024), p. 1307613.

[38] Demis Hassabis et al. "Neuroscience-inspired artificial intelligence". In: *Neuron* 95.2 (2017), pp. 245–258.

[39] Roni Hogri et al. "A neuro-inspired model-based closed-loop neuroprosthesis for the substitution of a cerebellar learning function in anesthetized rats". In: *Scientific reports* 5.1 (2015), p. 8451.

[40] Sorin Hostiuc et al. "The moral status of cerebral organoids". In: *Regenerative therapy* 10 (2019), pp. 118–122.

[41] Insoo Hyun. *Bioethics and the future of stem cell research*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[42] Insoo Hyun, JC Scharf-Deering, and Jeantine E Lunshof. "Ethical issues related to brain organoid research". In: *Brain research* 1732 (2020), p. 146653.

[43] Insoo Hyun et al. "Toward guidelines for research on human embryo models formed from stem cells". In: *Stem Cell Reports* 14.2 (2020), pp. 169–174.

[44] Marcello Ienca, Fabrice Jotterand, and Bernice S Elger. "From healthcare to warfare and reverse: How should we regulate dual-use neurotechnology?" In: *Neuron* 97.2 (2018), pp. 269–274.

[45] Judy Illes et al. "Neurotalk: improving the communication of neuroscience research". In: *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 11.1 (2010), pp. 61–69.

[46] Lyric A Jorgenson et al. "The BRAIN Initiative: developing technology to catalyse neuroscience discovery". In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370.1668 (2015), p. 20140164.

[47] Taisuke Kadoshima et al. "Self-organization of axial polarity, inside-out layer pattern, and species-specific progenitor dynamics in human ES cell–derived neocortex". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110.50 (2013), pp. 20284–20289.

[48] Brett J Kagan et al. "In vitro neurons learn and exhibit sentience when embodied in a simulated game-world". In: *Neuron* 110.23 (2022), pp. 3952–3969.

[49] Guy Kahane and Julian Savulescu. "Brain damage and the moral significance of consciousness". In: *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy* 34.1 (2009), pp. 6–26.

[50] Angeliki Kerasidou. "Artificial intelligence and the ongoing need for empathy, compassion and trust in healthcare". In: *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 98.4 (2020), p. 245.

[51] Angeliki Kerasidou and Michael Parker. "Does science need bioethicists? Ethics and science collaboration in biomedical research". In: *Research ethics* 10.4 (2014), pp. 214–226.

[52] Robert Kirk and Roger Squires. "Zombies v. materialists". In: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volumes* 48 (1974), pp. 135–163.

[53] Takashi Kitamura et al. "Engrams and circuits crucial for systems consolidation of a memory". In: *Science* 356.6333 (2017), pp. 73–78.

[54] Christof Koch et al. "Neural correlates of consciousness: progress and problems". In: *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 17.5 (2016), pp. 307–321.

[55] Julian J Koplin and Julian Savulescu. "Moral limits of brain organoid research". In: *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 47.4 (2019), pp. 760–767.

[56] Madeline Lancaster et al. "Cerebral organoids model human brain development and microcephaly". In: *Nature* 501 (Aug. 2013). DOI: 10.1038/nature12517.

[57] Madeline A Lancaster et al. "Guided self-organization and cortical plate formation in human brain organoids". In: *Nature biotechnology* 35.7 (2017), pp. 659–666.

[58] Andrea Lavazza. "Human cerebral organoids and consciousness: A double-edged sword". In: *Monash Bioethics Review* 38.2 (2020), pp. 105–128.

[59] Andrea Lavazza and Marcello Massimini. "Cerebral organoids and consciousness: how far are we willing to go?" In: *Journal of medical ethics* 44.9 (2018), pp. 613–614.

[60] Andrea Lavazza and Marcello Massimini. "Cerebral organoids: ethical issues and consciousness assessment". In: *Journal of Medical Ethics* 44.9 (2018), pp. 606–610.

[61] Andrea Lavazza and Federico Gustavo Pizzetti. "Human cerebral organoids as a new legal and ethical challenge". In: *Journal of Law and the Biosciences* 7.1 (2020), lsaa005.

[62] Alan I Leshner. *Public engagement with science*. 2003.

[63] Minghui Li et al. "Human brain organoid: trends, evolution, and remaining challenges". In: *Neural Regeneration Research* 19.11 (2024), pp. 2387–2399.

[64] Chongyuan Luo et al. "Cerebral organoids recapitulate epigenomic signatures of the human fetal brain". In: *Cell reports* 17.12 (2016), pp. 3369–3384.

[65] Rebecca M Marton and Sergiu P Pașca. "Organoid and assembloid technologies for investigating cellular crosstalk in human brain development and disease". In: *Trends in Cell Biology* 30.2 (2020), pp. 133–143.

[66] Lucia Melloni et al. "Making the hard problem of consciousness easier". In: *Science* 372.6545 (2021), pp. 911–912.

[67] Keiko Muguruma et al. "Self-organization of polarized cerebellar tissue in 3D culture of human pluripotent stem cells". In: *Cell reports* 10.4 (2015), pp. 537–550.

[68] Tim Mulgan. *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. 2016.

[69] Megan Munsie, Insoo Hyun, and Jeremy Sugarman. "Ethical issues in human organoid and gastruloid research". In: *Development* 144.6 (2017), pp. 942–945.

[70] Thomas Nagel. "The Philosophical Review". In: *What is it Like to Be a Bat* (1974), pp. 435–450.

[71] Eric T Olson. *The human animal: Personal identity without psychology*. Oxford University Press, 1999.

[72] Jaak Panksepp. "Affective consciousness: Core emotional feelings in animals and humans". In: *Consciousness and cognition* 14.1 (2005), pp. 30–80.

[73] D Parfit. *Reasons and Persons Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ*. 1984.

[74] Sergiu P Pașca. "The rise of three-dimensional human brain cultures". In: *Nature* 553.7689 (2018), pp. 437–445.

[75] Anssi Pelkonen et al. "Functional characterization of human pluripotent stem cell-derived models of the brain with microelectrode arrays". In: *Cells* 11.1 (2021), p. 106.

[76] Mu-ming Poo et al. "China brain project: basic neuroscience, brain diseases, and brain-inspired computing". In: *Neuron* 92.3 (2016), pp. 591–596.

[77] Sebastian Porsdam Mann, Rosa Sun, and Göran Hermerén. "A framework for the ethical assessment of chimeric animal research involving human neural tissue". In: *BMC medical ethics* 20 (2019), pp. 1–9.

[78] Xuyu Qian, Hongjun Song, and Guo-li Ming. "Brain organoids: advances, applications and challenges". In: *Development* 146.8 (2019), dev166074.

[79] Xuyu Qian et al. "Brain-region-specific organoids using mini-bioreactors for modeling ZIKV exposure". In: *Cell* 165.5 (2016), pp. 1238–1254.

[80] Xuyu Qian et al. "Generation of human brain region–specific organoids using a miniaturized spinning bioreactor". In: *Nature Protocols* 13 (Feb. 2018), pp. 565–580. DOI: 10.1038/nprot.2017.152.

[81] Giorgia Quadrato and Paola Arlotta. "Present and future of modeling human brain development in 3D organoids". In: *Current opinion in cell biology* 49 (2017), pp. 47–52.

[82] Giorgia Quadrato, Juliana Brown, and Paola Arlotta. "The promises and challenges of human brain organoids as models of neuropsychiatric disease". In: *Nature medicine* 22.11 (2016), pp. 1220–1228.

[83] Giorgia Quadrato et al. "Cell diversity and network dynamics in photosensitive human brain organoids". In: *Nature* 545.7652 (2017), pp. 48–53.

[84] Sara Reardon. "Can lab-grown brains become conscious?" In: *Nature* 586.7831 (2020), pp. 658–662.

[85] Tom Regan. "'The Case for Animal Rights'". In: *Ethics, Humans and Other Animals*. Routledge, 2013, pp. 179–188.

[86] Antti Revonsuo. *Inner presence: Consciousness as a biological phenomenon.* Mit Press, 2006.

[87] Ranmal A Samarasinghe et al. "Identification of neural oscillations and epileptiform changes in human brain organoids". In: *Nature neuroscience* 24.10 (2021), pp. 1488–1500.

[88] Julian Savulescu, Guy Kahane, and Christopher Gyngell. "From public preferences to ethical policy". In: *Nature human behaviour* 3.12 (2019), pp. 1241–1243.

[89] Tsutomu Sawai et al. "The ethics of cerebral organoid research: being conscious of consciousness". In: *Stem Cell Reports* 13.3 (2019), pp. 440–447.

[90] Andreas T Schaefer and Troy W Margrie. "Spatiotemporal representations in the olfactory system". In: *Trends in neurosciences* 30.3 (2007), pp. 92–100.

[91] Marya Schechtman. *The constitution of selves*. Cornell university press, 2007.

[92] John R Searle. "Minds, brains, and programs". In: *Behavioral and brain sciences* 3.3 (1980), pp. 417–424.

[93] Jeff Sebo. "The moral problem of other minds". In: *The Harvard Review of Philosophy* 25.1 (2018), pp. 51–70.

[94] Walter Senn and Jean-Pascal Pfister. "Reinforcement Learning in Cortical Networks". In: June 2022, pp. 3019–3026. ISBN: 978-1-0716-1004-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-0716-1006-0_580.

[95] Anil K Seth et al. "Theories and measures of consciousness: an extended framework". In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103.28 (2006), pp. 10799–10804.

[96] Joshua Shepherd. *Consciousness and moral status*. Taylor & Francis, 2018.

[97] Joshua Shepherd. "The moral status of conscious subjects". In: *Rethinking Moral Status. OUP Oxford* (2021), pp. 57–73.

[98] Sydney Shoemaker. "Persons and their pasts". In: *American philosophical quarterly* 7.4 (1970), pp. 269–285.

[99] Peter Singer. *Animal Liberation. New York: New York Review*. 1975.

[100] Peter Singer. *Practical Ethics*. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[101] Steven A Sloan et al. "Generation and assembly of human brain region–specific three-dimensional cultures". In: *Nature protocols* 13.9 (2018), pp. 2062–2085.

[102] Lena Smirnova et al. "Organoid intelligence (OI): the new frontier in biocomputing and intelligence-in-a-dish". In: *Frontiers in Science* 1 (2023), p. 1017235.

[103] Lynne U Sneddon et al. "Defining and assessing animal pain". In: *Animal behaviour* 97 (2014), pp. 201–212.

[104] Jack Stilgoe, Richard Owen, and Phil Macnaghten. "Developing a framework for responsible innovation". In: *The Ethics of Nanotechnology, Geoengineering, and Clean Energy*. Routledge, 2020, pp. 347–359.

[105] Patrick Sturgis and Nick Allum. "Science in society: Re-evaluating the deficit model of public attitudes". In: *Public understanding of science* 13.1 (2004), pp. 55–74.

[106] Gouhei Tanaka et al. "Recent advances in physical reservoir computing: A review". In: *Neural Networks* 115 (2019), pp. 100–123.

[107] Cleber Trujillo et al. "Complex Oscillatory Waves Emerging from Cortical Organoids Model Early Human Brain Network Development". In: *Cell Stem Cell* 25 (Aug. 2019). DOI: 10.1016/j.stem.2019.08.002.

[108] Shimon Ullman. "Using neuroscience to develop artificial intelligence". In: *Science* 363.6428 (2019), pp. 692–693.

[109] Hansen Wang. "Modeling neurological diseases with human brain organoids". In: *Frontiers in synaptic neuroscience* 10 (2018), p. 15.

[110] Lawrence M Ward. "Synchronous neural oscillations and cognitive processes". In: *Trends in cognitive sciences* 7.12 (2003), pp. 553–559.

[111] Yuichi Yamashita and Jun Tani. "Emergence of functional hierarchy in a multiple timescale neural network model: a humanoid robot experiment". In: *PLoS computational biology* 4.11 (2008), e1000220.

[112] Weijian Yang and Rafael Yuste. "In vivo imaging of neural activity". In: *Nature methods* 14.4 (2017), pp. 349–359.

[113] Qinan Yin. "Introduction to the Special Issue on Stem Cells and Regenerative Medicine". In: *European Journal of Histochemistry* 64 (June 2020). DOI: 10.4081/ejh.2020.3152.

[114] Maria-Patapia Zafeiriou et al. "Developmental GABA polarity switch and neuronal plasticity in Bioengineered Neuronal Organoids". In: *Nature communications* 11.1 (2020), p. 3791.

[115] Suijuan Zhong et al. "Decoding the development of the human hippocampus". In: *Nature* 577.7791 (2020), pp. 531–536.