Ethical and Safety Considerations in the Miniaturization of Medical Implants: A Comprehensive Review

Rohan Raj Butani[1], Theodore Ioan Oltean[2], and Reece Zhen-Tao Sun[3]

[1]Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, United States

[2]Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, United States

[2]UCLA, Los Angeles, United States

Abstract

This paper reviews the emerging trend of miniaturization in medical implants, with special attention given to the associated ethical and safety considerations. An extensive literature review was undertaken to examine current technological advancements, the historical precedent of implant design, and the bioethical principles that inform clinical practice. Special focus is placed on informed consent procedures, data privacy and security, equitable access to emerging technologies, and the regulatory frameworks guiding implant implementation. In addition, the paper reviews the challenges of ensuring biocompatibility, managing infection risk, and maintaining device durability in miniaturized implants without stifling innovation. In discussing these topics, the paper aims to outline the benefits and the potential pitfalls of miniaturization while also identifying areas in which further research is needed. The review does not seek to advocate for a particular policy but rather to provide an objective analysis that may guide future ethical deliberations and technological innovations within the field of medical implant design.

Introduction

The rapid evolution of medical technology has led to a significant increase in the miniaturization of implantable devices (Harmon et al., 2015). Microengineering and material science advancements have enabled the development of smaller, less invasive, and potentially more versatile implants than their traditional counterparts (Rav Acha et al., 2020). In bioethics, these developments prompt a reexamination of already established ethical principles such as patient autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice (Chao et al., 2010). An objective analysis of these issues is warranted, given the potential implications for patient care, clinical practice, and regulatory oversight

This paper examines the ethical and safety dimensions inherent in the miniaturization of medical implants. In doing so, the paper goes over several key areas of inquiry: (1) the historical context and technological advancements that have made miniaturization feasible, (2) the ethical concerns related to informed consent, data privacy, and equitable access, (3) safety issues such as biocompatibility, infection risk, and mechanical reliability, and (4) emerging trends and future directions for research and regulation.

This review systematically examines existing literature, including peer‑reviewed articles, regulatory guidelines, and recent technological evaluations. Although the development of miniaturized devices offers considerable promise in patient outcomes and resource efficiency, it also introduces challenges that may complicate the clinical decision-making process and raise questions about the balance between technological innovation and ethical responsibility. The present analysis is structured to provide a comprehensive account of the underlying technologies,

followed by a discussion of the moral frameworks relevant to implantable devices. Ultimately, the review offers an integrative perspective supporting continued dialogue among practitioners, policymakers, and researchers.

Background and Definitions

Key Terms and Concepts

Several key definitions are offered to contextualize the discussion. Miniaturization refers to the process by which devices are reduced in size while maintaining or improving upon their functional capabilities (Dinis et al., 2017). In the context of medical implants, this often involves the integration of micro-scale components, advanced materials, and energy-efficient designs. The term medical implant denotes any device that is surgically placed into the human body to replace, support, or enhance biological functions. These implants may be used for various applications, ranging from sensory data collection to life-sustaining functions.

The field of bioethics provides a framework within which the ethical implications of these technological advancements may be assessed. In particular, core principles such as patient autonomy (with informed consent being a critical component), beneficence (maximizing benefit while minimizing harm), non-maleficence (avoiding harm), and justice (ensuring fair distribution of healthcare resources) are invoked in evaluating both traditional and miniaturized implants. The informed consent process, for example, requires that patients be provided with

comprehensive information about the nature, risks, and benefits of an implantable device to make decisions in line with their values and individual health needs.

Historical Development and Trends

Progressive improvements in design and function have marked the evolution of medical implants (Mohamed et al., 2021). Relatively large sizes and limited functionality defined earlier generations of implants. Over time, advances in materials science, engineering, and surgical techniques have allowed the development of smaller, more reliable devices (Rav Acha et al., 2020). Trends in miniaturization are not only indicative of broader technological progress but also of a growing focus on reducing invasiveness and improving patient outcomes. The differentiation between more traditional implants and their miniaturized counterparts is apparent in their physical profiles and the technological solutions employed to overcome inherent challenges such as power supply, data transmission, and compatibility with biological tissues.

Parallel developments in robotics, nanotechnology, and wireless communication have supported the technological impetus behind miniaturization. These advances have spurred a shift towards minimally invasive procedures that may help reduce recovery times and improve patients' overall quality of life. Nonetheless, the rapid pace of innovation has also necessitated a closer examination of these devices' ethical and safety implications and the regulatory frameworks that govern their use.

Technological Components and Developments

Advances in Implant Design and Functionality

Recent innovations have enabled the design of smaller implants yet capable of performing complex functions. These developments include biocompatible materials such as titanium, medical-grade stainless steel, and advanced biopolymers engineered to reduce the risk of immune rejection and infection (Harmon et al., 2020). Techniques such as surface modification, including hydrophilic coatings and engineered surface smoothness, are increasingly employed to improve tissue integration and minimize bacterial adhesion (Bourges et al., 2006). As a result, a growing body of literature examines the relationship between material properties and clinical outcomes in implant surgery.

In addition to material considerations, miniaturized implants often incorporate sensors and data transmission modules that allow for real-time monitoring of physiological parameters. Integrating microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) and wireless communication technology has led to implants capable of therapeutic and diagnostic functions (Drummond & Coulet, 2022). However, this technological complexity introduces new challenges concerning data security and device reliability.

Power Sources and Energy Harvesting

Many implants have historically been powered by lithium-based batteries, which balance energy density and longevity (Kuiken, 2010). Nonetheless, concerns regarding sustainability and the

environmental impact of battery disposal have prompted investigations into alternative energy sources. Biofuel cells, for instance, can generate power by harvesting energy from the patient's physiological processes (e.g., body heat, oxygen, and glucose levels) (Fuerch et al., 2019). Combining traditional battery technology with bioenergy harvesting methods is currently under exploration, to achieve greater device longevity and minimize environmental impact.

Implications for Clinical Practice

Translating these technological innovations into clinical practice requires a careful balancing act. On one hand, miniaturization promises reduced surgical invasiveness, improved patient comfort, and enhanced monitoring capabilities. (Rav Acha et al., 2020). On the other hand, the complexity of these devices necessitates rigorous testing, robust regulatory oversight, and clear protocols for maintenance and eventual removal or upgrading of the implant. In this context, clinical practitioners are increasingly required to navigate the interface between advanced technology and established medical ethics.

Ethical Considerations

Informed Consent

In implantable devices, obtaining informed consent assumes a critical role. The ethical principle of respect for patient autonomy accentuates the need to provide comprehensive information about the device's functionality, risks, and long-term implications. Informed consent in this

context involves detailed discussions regarding the technical aspects of the implant, including its miniaturized nature and the differences between traditional and newer devices. A tailored approach is often necessary given the complex information associated with such implants. For example, in the case of miniaturized cochlear implants, the consent process may need to be adjusted to accommodate the specific needs of individuals with hearing impairment (Chao et al., 2010).

Informed consent must be viewed as an ongoing process rather than a single event. This includes providing information regarding the implantation procedure and the potential for device removal or technological upgrades. The literature suggests that the option to withdraw consent remains a fundamental right of patients, provided that such withdrawal does not compromise their overall well-being. In pediatric cases where legal ambiguities may arise regarding the capacity for consent, additional safeguards are typically employed to ensure that the patient and their guardians are adequately informed (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2022).

Data Privacy and Security

Sensor technology in miniaturized implants has significantly increased the potential for collecting and transmitting patient data. In this regard, ethical considerations extend to data privacy and security issues. The potential for data breaches, whether through cyberattacks or human error, necessitates the implementation of robust security protocols. Healthcare providers must adhere to regulations such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

(HIPAA) to ensure patient data are processed and stored securely (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2024).

Recent studies have explored the ethical dimensions of biometric data collection, noting that the sensitivity of health-related information demands rigorous safeguards (Blakely et al., 2022). Monitoring device usage and data access logs is increasingly common in clinical settings, and some institutions have adopted multi-factor authentication measures to prevent unauthorized access. Although the literature does not universally prescribe a single best practice for data security, the consensus suggests that ongoing monitoring and adaptive security measures are essential to protecting patient privacy.

Equitable Access and Socioeconomic Considerations

While technologically promising, miniaturized medical implants pose important questions regarding equitable access. The distribution of these advanced technologies may be influenced by insurance coverage, socioeconomic status, and regional disparities present in healthcare infrastructure (Dinallo, 2021). The ethical principle of justice calls for a careful examination of whether access to these devices is being determined by need or by the patient's ability to pay.

Insurance providers may exhibit a degree of hesitancy in covering the costs associated with newer miniaturized devices, which may exacerbate existing disparities in access. Comparisons have been drawn with other areas of medical technology, such as organ transplantation, where allocation protocols are designed to be as impartial as possible. In the case of miniaturized

implants, revisions to insurance coding and reimbursement models may be necessary to facilitate more equitable access across different socioeconomic groups.

Regulatory Frameworks

The regulatory landscape for medical devices, including miniaturized implants, remains nuanced and ever-evolving. Governing bodies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) are tasked with ensuring that new devices meet stringent standards for safety and efficacy (Tarver, 2024). Within this regulatory context, ethical considerations arise in determining the extent to which oversight should be applied. While strict regulation may protect patients from potential harm, overly burdensome requirements could stifle innovation.

Current literature may reflect an ongoing debate about the optimal balance between regulatory oversight and technological progress. Some studies have recommended that traditional implant classification systems be reevaluated in light of the distinct characteristics of miniaturized devices (Hansson, 2020). This recalibration is seen as a means of ensuring that ethical and safety standards are maintained without unnecessarily impeding the advancement of promising technologies.

End-of-Life Considerations and Comfort Care

An additional ethical dimension arises when considering the role of implants in end-of-life care. In scenarios where medical implants are used to prolong life, questions emerge regarding the

alignment of such interventions with the principles of comfort care. Comfort care, or palliative care, emphasizes alleviating suffering and maintaining quality of life rather than the indefinite extension of life. Some bioethical analyses have noted that the use of life-sustaining implants may inadvertently extend patient suffering if not carefully managed.

Akdeniz et al. (2021) suggest that provisions should be made for the controlled disablement of devices in circumstances where continued intervention may no longer serve the patient's best interests. However, such measures raise further ethical questions regarding patient autonomy and the moral responsibilities of healthcare providers and device manufacturers. Although consensus on the best approach has not been reached, these concerns underline the need for transparent policies that address the potential conflict of interest between life-prolonging technology and the goals of palliative care.

Safety Considerations

Biocompatibility and Material Selection

Safety considerations in miniaturized implants are multifaceted, with device biocompatibility a central concern. The compatibility of implant materials with human tissue is critical in preventing adverse immune responses and ensuring the long-term functionality of the device (Mohamed et al., 2021). Recent advancements have focused on using titanium, medical-grade stainless steel, and specialized biopolymers (Daniel et al, 2010). Research has demonstrated that surface engineering techniques, including applying hydrophilic coatings and optimizing surface

smoothness, may mitigate the risk of bacterial colonization and reduce inflammatory responses (Kligman et al., 2021).

While the current literature highlights the potential benefits of these material innovations, it also highlights that challenges remain in ensuring consistent biocompatibility. In vitro and in vivo studies are frequently cited to support the argument that material selection must be context-specific and that ongoing research is required to identify the optimal combinations of materials and surface treatments. Integrating these findings into clinical practice is a necessary step toward minimizing the risk of immune rejection and other complications.

Electromagnetic Interference

Miniaturized medical implants are particularly susceptible to electromagnetic interference (EMI), a phenomenon where external electromagnetic (EM) waves harmfully interfere with electronic devices. The effects of EMI on implants vary considerably based on frequency and should be analyzed accordingly (Driessen et al., 2019).

Low‑frequency EMI lies between 30 Hz and 100 kHz and can be emitted by many electronic components, including household appliances, power lines, electric motors, and large electrical machinery. Frequencies below 100 kHz are particularly problematic due to their ability to penetrate biological tissues and the implant (Tiikkaja et al., 2013). These EM waves have long wavelengths and are primarily impervious to reflective surfaces designed to shield circuits from interference (Tiikkaja et al., 2013).

Granted, low-frequency EMI is strong enough to induce unwanted currents within an implant, potentially disrupting its proper function or leading to complete device failure (Driessen et al., 2019). The vast majority of research discussing EMI's effects on implants focuses on cardiac implantable electronic devices (CIEDs). Implanted CIEDs are especially vulnerable to unwanted EM fields, as induced currents from EMI can be misinterpreted as legitimate electrical activity from the heart (Irnich et al., 1996; Hayes et al., 1997). The leads connecting to the heart often function as antennae, picking up additional currents from the EMI (Hayes et al., 1997). In such cases, improper pacing or unintended defibrillation can occur, leading to intense discomfort or even life-threatening cardiac events (Irnich et al., 1996). In vitro studies have strongly linked the malfunction of implantable cardioverter defibrillators to EMI, and magnetic fields with flux densities as low as 100 μT have been shown to cause some CIEDs to register dangerous heart rhythms falsely. With the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) setting exposure limits of 200 μT for the general public and 1000 μT for workers, EMI remains a prevalent threat (Tiikkaja et al., 2013).

However, in vivo studies suggest that clinically relevant occurrences of EMI-induced malfunction are less frequent than expected. In the case of cellphones, which emit higher frequencies, even worst-case levels of EMI fail to disrupt CIEDs in most instances (Irnich et al., 1996; Hayes et al., 1997). Irregularities are observed only when a cell phone is placed directly over the implant, whereas placement near the ear or around the waist generally does not affect normal implant function (Hayes et al., 1997). More comprehensive studies that observed CIED function over extended periods have reported annual incidence rates of harmful EMI at under 1% (Driessen et al., 2019). Although the everyday risk of EMI appears relatively low, patients are

advised to exercise extreme caution in environments with high EMI levels, such as hospitals or power stations (Driessen et al., 2019).

Large amounts of EMI can also cause localized heating, damaging the surrounding human tissue. Small eddy currents are generated when an EM wave interacts with a conductive surface, such as the metal components of an implant (Driessen et al., 2019). These currents cause Joule heating as the resistance in the metal dissipates the energy as heat. Higher frequencies of EMI tend to produce more substantial eddy currents and exhibit a pronounced skin effect, both increasing the risk of harmful heating (Driessen et al., 2019). The most frequent case of resistance heating of medical implants occurs during magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), which uses frequencies between 1 MHz and 300 MHz (Driessen et al., 2019). Because the magnitude of heating varies significantly with an implant's materials and design parameters, industry safety standards should mandate individual testing using appropriate methodologies (Driessen et al., 2019).

The trend toward greater miniaturization further compounds the potency of EMI (Driessen et al., 2019). Smaller devices typically contain less physical shielding to protect the implant’s circuitry from external fields. Such shielding works by using conductive materials that absorb incoming EM waves and generate opposing electric currents, producing EM waves that counteract the interference (Driessen et al., 2019). A thinner shielding layer, however, has a diminished capacity to generate these opposing currents, reducing its effectiveness at attenuating EM waves. Furthermore, miniaturization may inherently lead to lower operating voltages and currents, as devices with limited power supplies and higher circuit resistances become more susceptible to interference, as even small amounts of EMI can create unwanted currents that compromise the signal (Driessen et al., 2019).

Infection Control and Risk of Microbial Contamination

Introducing any foreign body into the human organism presents an inherent risk of infection. Despite their reduced size, Miniaturized implants are not exempt from this risk. Implant-associated infections (IAIs) have been the subject of intensive study, and the literature suggests that the risk of infection is influenced by factors including the nature of the implant's surface, the duration of implantation, and the patient's immunological status (Mohamed et al., 2022).

Current strategies to minimize infection risk in dental implants include the design of implants with smoother surfaces that are less conducive to microbial adhesion and using antimicrobial coatings (Zhai et al., 2023). In addition, intensive surgical protocols and post-operative monitoring are recommended to detect and manage infections early. Although the body of evidence supports these approaches, it is acknowledged that infection control remains a critical area in which further research and improved clinical practices are needed.

Mechanical Reliability and Device Durability

The safety of miniaturized implants is also contingent upon their mechanical reliability. Mechanical failure, which may result from material fatigue, manufacturing defects, or improper surgical implantation, can significantly affect patient safety (Valentino & Pavlica, 2016). Several studies have underscored the importance of adhering to quality management system regulations (QMSR) during device development's design and production phases (Valentino & Pavlica, 2016).

Current literature may indicate that a systematic approach to evaluating mechanical performance, encompassing laboratory-based stress testing and real-world clinical trials, is essential to establish robust safety profiles (Valentino & Pavlica, 2016). In cases where device malfunction occurs, determining whether the failure is attributable to the implant or the implantation procedure is necessary to guide future design and clinical protocol improvements. Although no system is entirely without risk, ongoing refinements in manufacturing techniques and post-market surveillance are key to minimizing mechanical failure.

Power Sources, Energy Harvesting, and Long-Term Sustainability

The selection of power sources for miniaturized implants is closely linked to both safety and sustainability. Historically, lithium batteries have been the standard, offering a predictable life span and reliable energy output (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2024). However, the environmental implications of battery disposal and the finite operational life of such power sources have prompted investigations into alternative energy harvesting methods. Biofuel cells, which convert biochemical energy from the patient's body into electrical energy, have emerged as a promising solution (Bock et al., 2012).

While biofuel cells may extend the operational lifespan of implants and reduce environmental impact, a hybrid approach that combines traditional battery technology with bioenergy harvesting may prove most effective (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2024). Evaluations

of these energy solutions reflect the need for ongoing research into their long-term safety, reliability, and compatibility with miniaturized implant systems.

Discussion and Future Directions

Emerging Technologies and Innovations

Emerging technologies in miniaturized implants continue to expand the scope of possible applications. Developments in nanotechnology, wireless data transmission, and robotic-assisted surgical techniques are among the innovations that are anticipated to influence future device design (de Jongh & Massey, 2022). The literature reviewed suggests that these advances may further reduce implant size while enhancing functionality and patient monitoring capabilities.

Researchers have also noted that the evolution of implantable sensors, which allow for continuous biometric monitoring, may lead to devices that can anticipate and respond to physiological changes in real-time (Fan & Li, 2015). Although promising, these novel technological advancements raise new questions regarding data management, device interoperability, and the ethical implications of continuous patient monitoring (Fan & Li, 2015). Therefore, future research should focus on integrating these technologies into existing clinical frameworks while ensuring that ethical and safety standards are upheld.

Recommendations for Practice and Policy

Based on the current literature, several recommendations emerge for clinical practice and policy formulation. First, the informed consent process should be continually updated to reflect the evolving nature of implant technology. Healthcare providers may also benefit from standardized protocols that provide detailed information about device functionality, risks, and possible future removal or upgrades.

Second, regulatory agencies might consider revising existing guidelines to accommodate the distinct characteristics of miniaturized implants (Acha et al., 2020). Such revisions could include developing new classification systems that differentiate between traditional and miniaturized devices, thereby ensuring that oversight is appropriate and proportional to the risk involved.

Third, securing patient data must remain a priority as implants become increasingly connected. Adopting advanced cybersecurity measures, including encryption protocols and multi-factor authentication, should be considered essential components of any clinical implementation strategy.

Fourth, addressing equitable access issues requires policy adjustments and increased funding for research into cost-effective manufacturing methods. As the literature indicates, the high costs associated with new technologies may exacerbate socioeconomic disparities. Policy measures that facilitate broader insurance coverage and subsidized access to state-of-the-art implants may contribute to a more just allocation of medical resources.

Future Research Priorities

Reviewing existing studies reveals several key areas for further research. Comparative studies evaluating the long-term outcomes of miniaturized versus traditional implants could provide valuable insights into each approach's relative risks and benefits. In addition, interdisciplinary research that combines expertise in bioengineering, clinical medicine, and ethics will likely yield innovative solutions to the challenges identified in this review.

Specifically, future research may focus on:

1. *Enhanced Biocompatibility:* Investigating novel materials and surface engineering techniques to improve implant integration with biological tissues.
2. *Data Security:* Developing adaptive cybersecurity frameworks that can evolve alongside emerging implant technologies.
3. *Economic Analyses:* Conducting cost-benefit analyses considering the financial costs and the environmental and social implications of manufacturing miniaturized devices.
4. *Patient-Centered Outcomes:* Undertaking longitudinal studies to assess the impact of miniaturized implants on quality of life, patient satisfaction, and long-term clinical outcomes.
5. *Regulatory Innovations:* Evaluating the effectiveness of revised regulatory models in fostering innovation while ensuring patient safety and ethical integrity.

Conclusion

This review has sought to provide an integrative analysis of the ethical and safety considerations associated with the miniaturization of medical implants. An in-depth examination of the historical development of implant technology reveals that advances in material science, sensor integration, and power management have driven a shift toward smaller, less invasive devices (Acha et al., 2020). Concurrently, ethical concerns have emerged regarding informed consent, data privacy, equitable access, and the responsibilities of regulatory bodies in ensuring that innovation does not interfere with patient welfare.

Safety issues remain at the forefront of the discussion, with biocompatibility, infection control, mechanical reliability, and sustainable power sources identified as key areas of concern. Although technological advancements hold significant promise for improving clinical outcomes, the complexity of these devices necessitates rigorous testing, ongoing research, and the establishment of robust ethical and regulatory frameworks.

The review suggests that future research and policy development should focus on refining informed consent protocols, enhancing cybersecurity measures, and addressing disparities in access to cutting-edge technologies. Such efforts are essential in ensuring that the benefits of miniaturization in medical implants are realized without compromising ethical principles or patient safety.

In conclusion, the balance between technological innovation and ethical responsibility remains vital in medical implants. As research and development progress, a multidisciplinary approach that integrates clinical practice, bioethical analysis, and technological innovation will be crucial

in guiding future advancements and ensuring they are implemented to uphold the highest patient care and social justice standards.

References

[1] Akdeniz, M., Yardımcı, B., & Kavukcu, E. (2021). Ethical considerations at the end-of-life care. *SAGE Open Medicine, 9*, 20503121211000918. https://doi.org/10.1177/20503121211000918

[2] Blakely, B., Rogers, W., Johnson, J., et al. (2022). Ethical and regulatory implications of the COVID-19 pandemic for the medical devices industry and its representatives. *BMC Medical Ethics, 23*, 31. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-022-00771-2

[3] Bock, D. C., Marschilok, A. C., Takeuchi, K. J., & Takeuchi, E. S. (2012). Batteries used to Power Implantable Biomedical Devices. *Electrochimica Acta, 84*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2012.03.057

[4] Chao, K. Z., Riskin, D. J., & Krummel, T. M. (2010). A patient-centered, ethical approach to medical device innovation. *AMA Journal of Ethics, 12*(2), 91–95. https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/patient-centered-ethical-approach-medical-device-innovation/2010-02

[5] Daniel, A. S., Anand, S. P., Naveen, J., Khan, T., & Khahro, S. H. (2024). Advancement in biomedical implant materials—a mini review. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, 12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2024.1400918

[6] de Jongh, D., Massey, E. K., VANGUARD consortium, & Bunnik, E. M. (2022). Organoids: a systematic review of ethical issues. *Stem Cell Research & Therapy, 13*(1), 337. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-022-02950-9

[7] Dinallo, R. (2021). AMA Code of Medical Ethics' opinions related to implantable devices. *AMA Journal of Ethics, 23*(9), E702–E704. https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2021.702

[8] Dinis, H., Colmiais, I., & Mendes, P. M. (2017). Extending the Limits of Wireless Power Transfer to Miniaturized Implantable Electronic Devices. *Micromachines, 8*(12), 359. https://doi.org/10.3390/mi8120359

[9] Drummond, D., & Coulet, A. (2022). Technical, Ethical, Legal, and Societal Challenges With Digital Twin Systems for the Management of Chronic Diseases in Children and Young People. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 24*(10), e39698. https://doi.org/10.2196/39698

[10] Driessen, S., Napp, A., Schmiedchen, K., Kraus, T., & Stunder, D. (2019). Electromagnetic interference in cardiac electronic implants caused by novel electrical appliances emitting electromagnetic fields in the intermediate frequency range: A systematic review. *Europace, 21*(2), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1093/europace/euy155

[11] Fan, B., & Li, W. (2015). Miniaturized optogenetic neural implants: a review. *Lab on a Chip, 15*(19), 3838–3855. https://doi.org/10.1039/c5lc00588d

[12] Fuerch, J. H., Sanderson, P., Barshi, I., & Liley, H. (2019, December). Developing safe devices for neonatal care. In *Seminars in Perinatology* (Vol. 43, No. 8, p. 151176). WB Saunders.

[13] Hansson, S. O. (2020). The Ethics of Cranial Nerve Implants. *Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America, 53*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otc.2019.09.001

[14] Harmon, S. H., Haddow, G., & Gilman, L. (2015). New risks inadequately managed: the case of smart implants and medical device regulation. *Law, Innovation and Technology, 7*(2), 231–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/17579961.2015.1106107

[15] Hayes, D. L., Wang, P. J., Reynolds, D. W., Estes, M. 3rd, Griffith, J. L., Steffens, R. A., Carlo, G. L., Findlay, G. K., & Johnson, C. M. (1997). Interference with cardiac pacemakers by cellular telephones. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 336*(21), 1473–1479. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199705223362101

[16] Irnich, W., Batz, L., Müller, R., & Tobisch, R. (1996). Electromagnetic interference of pacemakers by mobile phones. *Pacing and Clinical Electrophysiology: PACE, 19*(10), 1431–1446. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-8159.1996.tb03155.x

[17] Kligman, S., Ren, Z., Chung, C. H., Perillo, M. A., Chang, Y. C., Koo, H., Zheng, Z., & Li, C. (2021). The Impact of Dental Implant Surface Modifications on Osseointegration and Biofilm Formation. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 10*(8), 1641. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm10081641

[18] Mohamed, J., Reetz, D., van de Meent, H., Schreuder, H., Frölke, J. P., & Leijendekkers, R. (2022). What Are the Risk Factors for Mechanical Failure and Loosening of a Transfemoral Osseointegrated Implant System in Patients with a Lower-limb Amputation? *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 480*(4), 722–731. https://doi.org/10.1097/CORR.0000000000002074

[19] Polla, D. L., Erdman, A. G., Robbins, W. P., Markus, D. T., Diaz-Diaz, J., Rizq, R., Nam, Y., Brickner, H. T., Wang, A., & Krulevitch, P. (2000). Microdevices in medicine. *Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering, 2*, 551–576. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.bioeng.2.1.551

[20] Rav Acha, M., Soifer, E., & Hasin, T. (2020). Cardiac Implantable Electronic Miniaturized and Micro Devices. *Micromachines, 11*(10), 902. https://doi.org/10.3390/mi11100902

[21] Tiikkaja, M., Alanko, T., Lindholm, H., Hietanen, M., Toivonen, L., & Hartikainen, J. (2012). Interference of low frequency magnetic fields with implantable cardioverter-defibrillators. *Scandinavian Cardiovascular Journal: SCJ, 46*(5), 308–314. https://doi.org/10.3109/14017431.2012.716525

[22] Tiikkaja, M., Aro, A. L., Alanko, T., Lindholm, H., Sistonen, H., Hartikainen, J. E., Toivonen, L., Juutilainen, J., & Hietanen, M. (2013). Electromagnetic interference with cardiac pacemakers and implantable cardioverter-defibrillators from low-frequency electromagnetic fields in vivo. *Europace, 15*(3), 388–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/europace/eus345

[23] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2024). The HIPAA Privacy Rule. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

[24] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Lithium-ion battery recycling: Frequently asked questions. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. https://www.epa.gov/hw/lithium-ion-battery-recycling-frequently-asked-questions

[25] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). Ethical considerations for clinical investigations of medical products involving children: Guidance for industry, sponsors, and IRBs (Draft guidance). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

[26] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024, November 21). CDRH announces communications pilot to enhance medical device recall program. https://www.fda.gov

[27] Valentino, M., & Pavlica, P. (2016). Medical ethics. *Journal of Ultrasound, 19*(1), 73–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40477-015-0189-7

[28] Zhai, S., Tian, Y., Shi, X., Liu, Y., You, J., Yang, Z., Wu, Y., & Chu, S. (2023). Overview of strategies to improve the antibacterial property of dental implants. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, 11*, 1267128. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1267128