

Title: Open Letter on Intervention Regimes and Adverse Events in Focused Ultrasound for Neuromodulation

Dear Editor,

Focused ultrasound is a promising technology for neuromodulation with significant potential to advance our understanding and treatment of the human brain. It spans a wide spectrum of intervention regimes from low to high intensities. Ensuring participant and patient safety is a central part of developing this field responsibly across the intensity spectrum.

Recently, a case report described a serious adverse event during a clinical trial applying intermediate- to high-intensity, low-frequency focused ultrasound for the treatment of substance use disorder (Rezai et al., 2025). We commend the authors for sharing their observations with the broader community - open reporting of adverse events is crucial for protecting participants and for maintaining public trust in this emerging technology.

This report has prompted important discussion in the field, including the commentaries authored by Profs Kim Butts Pauly and Elsa Fouragnan (Fouragnan, 2025; Pauly, 2025). With this writing, we, the undersigned, and the ITRUSST safety group express our full support for their statements. The context and recommendations they provide reflect the shared position of a broad community of experts in focused ultrasound and neuromodulation.

Focused ultrasound can be applied from low-, to intermediate-, to high-intensities. Each regime has distinct utilities and safety profiles.

- At the high-intensity end, the goal is to induce irreversible structural change, as in transcranial thermoablation.
- In the intermediate range, which is less clearly defined, effects may exceed the normal physiological range of healthy brain function but remain reversible. An example in the domain of focused ultrasound is microbubble-mediated blood-brain barrier opening under stable cavitation.
- At the low-intensity end, effects remain within the normal physiological range, as when using transcranial ultrasound stimulation to modulate spiking probability via mechanosensitive ion channels.

A recent consensus statement proposed low-intensity exposure levels below which transcranial ultrasound stimulation is not associated with significant risk (Aubry et al., 2025).

The reported study used acoustic feedback to monitor cavitation activity and to adjust or halt the transmission of power. Direct feedback control, both thermal and acoustic, has proven robust and reliable in high-intensity focused ultrasound thermoablation and microbubble-mediated blood-brain barrier opening (McMahon et al., 2019; Meng et al., 2021; Quadri et al., 2018). However, in the absence of injected microbubbles, the suitability of using cavitation detection to titrate energy or prevent injury in low-frequency ultrasound treatment has yet to be established (Martínez-Fernández et al., 2025; Pauly, 2025).

The methodology described in the current case report seems to have inadvertently invited cavitation, a biophysical effect beyond the normal physiological range. Cavitation is a stochastic process whose likelihood increases with higher pressures and lower ultrasound frequencies. At 220-230 kHz, upper-bound thresholds for thermally significant cavitation have been estimated at approximately 1.8 to 2.1 MPa (mechanical index, $MI = 3.8$ to 4.4 ; (Hynynen, 1991; McDannold et al., 2016), although isolated cavitation events likely begin at lower pressures. The team that published the case report has previously reported reaching pressures of approximately 1.6 MPa and 1.9 MPa in their trials, corresponding to transcranial MI values at 220 kHz of 3.4 and 4.0 (Mahoney III et al., 2025; Mahoney et al., 2023). There are significant uncertainties associated with these pressure and MI estimates, particularly given potential skull reflections. Taken together, considering both exposure and effect, the intervention generally operated in an intermediate regime, near the transition to high-intensity. For the affected patient, where cavitation led to irreversible tissue changes, the intervention was unequivocally within the high-intensity regime.

In consultation with the community, the manufacturer kindly shared key technical information on the device settings used in this trial. For brevity, we include below the elements most relevant to estimating in-situ pressure; their full contribution is provided in the Supplementary Information.

“Estimated Pressure Levels in Clinical Setting - The typical parameters are 220KHz, an emitted power of 80W-100W with a pulse pattern of 100 ms and 27% duty cycle spread between 8 sub-targets (3.3% for each specific spot). The estimated pressure at the target is influenced by multiple variables such as the acoustic properties of the skull’s layered bone structure (skull density ratio), skull and scalp inhomogeneity, tissue properties, electronic beam steering, etc. This theoretically leads to an estimated [in situ] root-mean-square (RMS) pressure of 1.5 - 2.5 MPa. The manufacturer’s experience with over 30,000 procedures, suggests that true pressure levels are 60-70% of this theoretical value - leading to an estimated RMS pressure of 0.9 - 1.7 MPa.”

These RMS pressure estimates correspond to peak negative pressures of approximately 2.1–3.5 MPa for the theoretical range and 1.3-2.4 MPa for the true in-situ pressure range.

The findings of the case report help advance our understanding of cavitation risk and safety of transcranial ultrasound in general. However, importantly, since the reported intervention did not operate in the low-intensity regime, either in effect or exposure, it does not change the safety assessment of transcranial studies conducted with low intensity exposures ($MI_{tc} < 1.9$). For such studies, analytical and numerical approaches can be used to ensure sufficiently low exposure levels (Aubry et al., 2025), taking into account uncertainties in derived estimates. When pressure and frequency are chosen such that $MI_{tc} < 1.9$ (Aubry et al., 2025), there is no significant risk of cavitation. Additional direct feedback can also be leveraged when signals remain within the physiological range, for example using acoustic radiation force displacement imaging (McDannold and Maier, 2008; Mohammadjavadi et al., 2025; Sigona and Caskey, 2024). Demonstrating operation within this regime benefits from reporting key acoustic parameters as outlined in recent recommendations (Martin et al., 2024). These data were not originally made available in the case report (Rezai et al., 2025). Providing such information, along with patient-specific data including treatment imaging and acoustic feedback signals - as reported in other clinical studies using the same device (McDannold et al., 2024) - would greatly assist the community in interpreting these findings and guiding future studies. We look forward to

forthcoming analyses or simulations by those involved in the case report, as well as to prospective investigations that may further clarify the boundaries between low-, intermediate-, and high-intensity regimes.

Focused ultrasound neuromodulation holds great promise for advancing brain research and clinical care. We are at a pivotal moment - one that offers the opportunity to make a lasting difference for human health and well-being. We highlight the importance of continued collaboration and detailed reporting to ensure that this technology continues to develop safely, for the benefit of patients and the public.

Supplementary Information

Contribution from Insightec (Haifa, Israel) – italic text reflects quote from manufacturer

The manufacturer shared key technical elements of the device used in this study; however it should be noted that the manufacturer is not endorsing this entire letter. As the only manufacturer that has gained a multitude of regulatory approvals worldwide, the manufacturer emphasizes that it is the combination of all parameters together that should be considered in addressing the safety of this approach. Considering each parameter separately may not provide the required safety profile.

- *Transducer Shape - The hemispherical shaped array provides very tight focusing with a typical spot size of 3.5 x 3.5 x 7 mm (full width at half maximum (-6 dB)).*
- *Estimated Pressure Levels in Clinical Setting - The typical parameters are 220 kHz, an emitted power of 80-100 W with a pulse pattern of 100 ms and 27% duty cycle spread between 8 sub-targets (3.3% for each specific spot). The estimated pressure at the target is influenced by multiple variables such as the acoustic properties of the skull's layered bone structure (skull density ratio), skull and scalp inhomogeneity, tissue properties, electronic beam steering, etc. This theoretically leads to an estimated root-mean-square (RMS) pressure of 1.5 - 2.5 MPa [corresponding to a peak negative pressure of approximately 2.1 - 3.5 MPa]. The manufacturer's experience with over 30,000 procedures, suggests that true pressure levels are 60-70% of this theoretical value - leading to an estimated RMS pressure of 0.9 - 1.7 MPa [corresponding to a peak negative pressure of approximately 1.3 - 2.4 MPa].*
- *Acoustic feedback is monitored in real time and adapts to tissue inhomogeneity by modulating the power to each focal spot independently and by stopping or modulating the power based on the acoustic feedback. These mechanisms allow the application of such power levels and high pressures while avoiding tissue damage.*
- *MRI Imaging - The unique setting of the Exablate in the MRI adds two important attributes. In the planning phase, one can observe the target tissue (i.e., gray/white matter) or identify vascular abnormalities. During treatment, intraprocedural MRI can be used to confirm no immediate undesired effects before continuing with the treatment.*

The manufacturer also shared with us that these considerations have been thoroughly investigated by the FDA as part of this reported case. As a result, modifications have been made to the safety halt mechanism, and the power is now automatically modulated in response to acoustic feedback signals. With these measures in place, the FDA cleared the study to continue.

Author list

Miriam Klein-Flügge, Raag Airan*, David Attali, Jean-Francois Aubry, Ellen Bubrick, Charles Caskey, Robin Cleveland, Elsa Fouragnan, Ryan Jones, Tatiana Khokhlova, Jan Kubanek, Harriet Lea-Banks, Wynn Legon, Nathan McDannold, Keith Murphy, Takahiro Osada, Kim Butts Pauly, Samuel Pichardo, Jérôme Sallet, Lei Sun, Brad Treeby, Hairong Zheng, Eleanor Martin[†], Lennart Verhagen[†], and the ITRUSST safety group

* Co-authors are listed alphabetically

[†] These authors contributed equally

Author affiliations

Author name	Author affiliation
Miriam C Klein-Flügge	1 Oxford Centre for Integrative Neuroimaging, Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3EL, United Kingdom; 2 Department of Psychiatry, Warneford Hospital, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7JX, United Kingdom
Raag D. Airan	3 Stanford University
David Attali	4 Unité de Neuropsychiatrie Interventionnelle, Hôpital Sainte-Anne, GHU Paris Psychiatrie & Neurosciences, Université Paris Cité, 75014 Paris, France 5 Institute Physics for Medicine Paris, Inserm U1273, ESPCI Paris, PSL University, CNRS UMR 8063, 75015 Paris, France
Jean-Francois Aubry	6 Institute Physics for Medicine Paris – INSERM, CNRS, ESPCI Paris-PSL, Paris, France
Ellen J Bubrick	7 Brigham and Women's Hospital, Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School
Charles F. Caskey	8 Vanderbilt University Medical Center
Robin O. Cleveland	9 Institute of Biomedical Engineering, University of Oxford
Elsa F. Fouragnan	10 School of Psychology, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth, UK; Brain Research Imaging Center, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth, UK
Ryan M. Jones	11 Physical Sciences Platform, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, ON, Canada
Tatiana D. Khokhlova	12 Division of Gastroenterology, University of Washington School of Medicine 13 Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington
Jan Kubanek	14 Psychiatry, Radiology, Neurology, and Biomedical Engineering; Washington University
Harriet Lea-Banks	15 Department of Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering, University College London, London, UK 16 UCL Centre for Advanced Biomedical Imaging, Division of Medicine, University College London, London, UK
Wynn Legon	17 Fralin Biomedical Research Institute at Virginia Tech Carilion
Nathan McDannold	7 Brigham and Women's Hospital, Department of Neurology, Harvard Medical School
Keith R. Murphy	18 Attune Neurosciences, San Francisco, CA, U.S.A.

Takahiro Osada	19 Department of Neurophysiology, Juntendo University School of Medicine
Kim Butts Pauly	3 Stanford University
Samuel Pichardo	20 Radiology and Clinical Neurosciences, Hotchkiss Brain Institute, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary
Jérôme Sallet JS	21 INSERM Lyon France, 1 University of Oxford
Lei SUN	22 The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
Bradley E. Treeby	23 NeuroHarmonics LTD, 71-75 Shelton Street, Covent Garden, London, UK
Hairong Zheng	24 Shenzhen Institutes of Advanced Technology
Eleanor Martin	15 Department of Medical Physics and Biomedical Engineering, University College London, London
Lennart Verhagen	25 Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Radboud University, 6525 GD, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Acknowledgements

The authors thank all signatories and the community for their participation in this response. A live list of signatories, which remains open for additional signatures will be available at: <https://itrusst.com/blog/open-letter>. This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of generative AI use

Generative AI was not used in the preparation of this letter.

Table 1 - Signatories:

Surname	Forename	Affiliation
Aflalo	Tyson	Forest Neurotech
Ash	Ryan T. MD, PhD	Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of California San Francisco
Atkinson-Clement	Cyril	Brain Research and Imaging Centre, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth, Plymouth PL6 8BU, United Kingdom.
Bader	Kenneth	University of Chicago
Barenholtz	Jeremy	Nudge
Bault	Nadège	University of Plymouth, UK
Bawiec	Christopher R.	Prophetic
Bergmann	Til Ole	Neuroimaging Center (NIC), Johannes Gutenberg University Medical Center Mainz, Langenbeckstr. 1, 55131 Mainz, Germany

Boon	Paul, MD, PhD, FEAN	Ghent University, Belgium and Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
Bouakaz	Ayache	Inserm iBrain
Butler	Chris	Department of Brain Sciences, Imperial College London
Caulfield	Kevin A.	Department of Psychiatry, Medical University of South Carolina
Chen	Li Min, MD, PhD	Department of Radiology and Radiological Sciences, Institute of Imaging Science, Vanderbilt University Medical Center
Chen	Robert	Krembil Research Institute and University of Toronto
Choi	James	Imperial College London
Coxon	James	Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
Crone	Julia Sophia	University of Vienna; Paris Lodron University of Salzburg
Crum	Lawrence A.	University of Washington
Darmani	Ghazaleh	Krembil Research Institute, University of Toronto
Di Ianni	Tommaso, PhD	University of California San Francisco
Dumont	Erik	CEO, Image Guided Therapy, France
Emilie	Franceschini	Aix-Marseille University, CNRS, LMA, Marseille
Escoffre	Jean-Michel	iBrain, U1253, Inserm, Université de Tours, France
Fan	Joline	University of California San Francisco
Ferrera	Vincent P.	Zuckerman Institute for Mind Brain and Behavior, Columbia University
Fisher	Robert S., MD, PhD	Department of Neurology and Neurological Science, Stanford University School of Medicine
Fowlkes	J. Brian, PhD	Department of Radiology and Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Michigan
Girgis	Fady	University of Calgary
He	Bin	Department of Biomedical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University
Kaiser	Marcus	Centre for Neurotechnology, Neuromodulation, and Neurotherapeutics, University of Nottingham and DeepBrain, United Kingdom
Khalighinejad	Nima	University of Oxford
Khokhlova	Vera A.	University of Washington, USA and Moscow State University, Russia, D.Sc
Konishi	Seiki	Department of Neurophysiology, Juntendo University School of Medicine
Konofagou	Elisa	Columbia University
Kop	Benjamin	Stanford University

Kreider	Wayne	University of Washington, USA
LAFON	Cyril	INSERM LabTAU
Lafond	Maxime	Laboratory of Therapeutic Applications of Ultrasound, LabTAU, Inserm U1032, Lyon, France
Lee	Mary R., MD	Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Washington DC
Liu	Yunzhe	Beijing Normal University
Liu	Hao-Li	Department of Electrical Engineering, National Taiwan University
Lozano	Andres	Division of Neurosurgery, University Health Network and University of Toronto
Maduke	Merritt	Stanford University School of Medicine
Martino	Davide	Department of Clinical Neuroscience & Hotchkiss Brain Institute, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB Canada
Meng	Ying	University of Toronto
Morse	Dr Sophie	Imperial College London
N'Djin	W. Apoutou	Laboratory of Therapeutic Applications of Ultrasound (LabTAU), INSERM, University Claude Bernard of Lyon, France
Nandi	Tulika	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Nord	Camilla	University of Cambridge, MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit
Norman	Sumner	Forest Neurotech
Norris	David	Radboud University, Donders Institute for Brain Cognition and Behaviour
Palmeri	Mark, M.D., Ph.D.	Duke University, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Parker	Dennis L.	Department of Radiology and Imaging Science, University of Utahs
Petkov	Christopher	University of Iowa
Philip	Noah, MD	Center for Neurorestoration & Neurotechnology, VA Providence & Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence RI USA
Pike	G. Bruce	University of Calgary
Pineda-Pardo	José A.	HM CINAC MADRID (Centro Integral de Neurociencias Abarca Campal). Hospital Universitario HM Puerta del Sur, HM Hospitales. Madrid, Spain
Pinton	Gianmarco	Joint Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill & North, Carolina State University
Pouget	Pierre	ICM Paris Brain Institute, CNRS
Pouliopoulos	Antonios	King's College London

Prada	Francesco	Istituto Neurologico C. Besta, Milano
Roelofs	Karin	Donders Institute, Centre for Cognitive Neuroimaging, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands
Rushworth	Matthew	University of Oxford
Saffari	Nader	University College London (UCL)
Sapozhnikov	Oleg A	University of Washington, USA and Moscow State University, Russia
Schafer	Mark	Rockefeller Neuroscience Institute, West Virginia University
Segar	David J.	Nudge
Shapiro	Mikhail G	Max Delbrück Professor of Chemical & Medical Engineering at Caltech and Investigator at HHM
Shoham	Shy	Tech4Health Institute and Departments of Neuroscience and of Ophthalmology, NYU Grossman School of Medicine
Siebner	Hartwig Roman	Danish Research Centre for Magnetic Resonance, Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, Copenhagen University Hospital - Amager and Hvidovre
Stride	Eleanor	University of Oxford
Suarez-Castellano	Ivan, PhD	Laboratory of Therapeutic Applications of Ultrasound (LabTAU), INSERM U1032, Lyon, France.
Sugrue	Leo P, MD PhD	University of California, San Francisco
Terao	Yasuo	Department of Medical Physiology, Kyorin University
Thielscher	Axel	Technical University of Denmark & Danish Research Centre for MR
Toni	Ivan	Donders Institute, Radboud University
Tyler	William J.	UAB Center for Neuroengineering and Brain Computer Interfaces
Ugawa	Yoshikazu	Fukushima Medical University
Villringer	Arno	Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences
Waspe	Adam C.	Hospital for Sick Children and University of Toronto
Webb	Taylor	Department of Radiology and Imaging Sciences, University of Utah
Weber	Lilian Aline	Center for Cognitive Science, Osnabrueck University, Osnabrueck, Germany
Whitcomb	Daniel	University of Bristol
Wittmann	Marco K	University College London
Yang	Yaoheng	University of Southern California
Yoo	Seung-Schik	Associate Professor, Department of Radiology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School

Yu	Kai	Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Connecticut
----	-----	---

References

- Aubry, J.-F., Attali, D., Schafer, M.E., Fouragnan, E., Caskey, C.F., Chen, R., Darmani, G., Bubrick, E.J., Sallet, J., Butler, C.R., Stagg, C.J., Klein-Flügge, M.C., Yoo, S.-S., Holland, C., Treeby, B., Martin, E., Verhagen, L., Butts Pauly, K., 2025. ITRUSST consensus on biophysical safety for transcranial ultrasonic stimulation. *Brain Stimulat.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2025.10.007>
- Fouragnan, E., 2025. Preprint [WWW Document]. elsaforagnan. URL <https://www.elsa-fouragnan.com/blog> (accessed 11.7.25).
- Hynynen, K., 1991. The threshold for thermally significant cavitation in dog's thigh muscle *in vivo*. *Ultrasound Med. Biol.* 17, 157–169. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-5629\(91\)90123-E](https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-5629(91)90123-E)
- Mahoney III, J.J., Thompson-Lake, D.G.Y., Ranjan, M., Marton, J.L., Carpenter, J.S., D'Haese, P.-F., Arsiwala, T., Suffridge, J., Farmer, D.L., Finomore, V.S., Tirumalai, P., Hodder, S.L., Rezai, A.R., 2025. A case report of focused ultrasound neuromodulation of the bilateral nucleus accumbens for methamphetamine use disorder. *Exp. Clin. Psychopharmacol.* <https://doi.org/10.1037/pha0000793>
- Mahoney, J.J., Haut, M.W., Carpenter, J., Ranjan, M., Thompson-Lake, D.G.Y., Marton, J.L., Zheng, W., Berry, J.H., Tirumalai, P., Mears, A., D'Haese, P., Finomore, V.S., Hodder, S.L., Rezai, A.R., 2023. Low-intensity focused ultrasound targeting the nucleus accumbens as a potential treatment for substance use disorder: safety and feasibility clinical trial. *Front. Psychiatry* 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1211566>
- Martin, E., Aubry, J.-F., Schafer, M., Verhagen, L., Treeby, B., Pauly, K.B., 2024. ITRUSST consensus on standardised reporting for transcranial ultrasound stimulation. *Brain Stimulat.* 17, 607–615. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2024.04.013>
- Martínez-Fernández, R., Pineda-Pardo, J.A., Natera-Villalba, E., Rodríguez-Rojas, R., Del Álamo, M., Jiménez, T., Gasca-Salas, C., Matarazzo, M., Obeso, J.A., 2025. Brain Bleeding Associated With Cavitation During Focused Ultrasound Ablation. *Neurosurgery* 97, 1215–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1227/neu.0000000000003663>
- McDannold, N., Livingstone, M., Top, C.B., Sutton, J., Todd, N., Vykhodtseva, N., 2016. Preclinical evaluation of a low-frequency transcranial MRI-guided focused ultrasound system in a primate model. *Phys. Med. Biol.* 61, 7664. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/61/21/7664>
- McDannold, N., Maier, S.E., 2008. Magnetic resonance acoustic radiation force imaging. *Med. Phys.* 35, 3748–3758. <https://doi.org/10.1118/1.2956712>
- McDannold, N., Wen, P.Y., Reardon, D.A., Fletcher, S.-M., Golby, A.J., 2024. Cavitation monitoring, treatment strategy, and acoustic simulations of focused ultrasound blood-brain barrier disruption in patients with glioblastoma. *J. Controlled Release* 372, 194–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2024.06.036>
- McMahon, D., Poon, C., Hynynen, K., 2019. Evaluating the safety profile of focused ultrasound and microbubble-mediated treatments to increase blood-brain barrier permeability. *Expert Opin. Drug Deliv.* 16, 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17425247.2019.1567490>
- Meng, Y., Hynynen, K., Lipsman, N., 2021. Applications of focused ultrasound in the brain: from thermoablation to drug delivery. *Nat. Rev. Neurol.* 17, 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41582-020-00418-z>

- Mohammadjavadi, M., Ash, R.T., Glover, G.H., Pauly, K.B., 2025. Optimization of MR acoustic radiation force imaging (MR-ARFI) for human transcranial focused ultrasound. *Magn. Reson. Med.* 94, 1060–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.30539>
- Pauly, K.B., 2025. Letter to the Editor in Response to "Brain Injury During Focused Ultrasound Neuromodulation for Substance Use Disorder". *Brain Stimulat.* S1935861X25003754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2025.11.004>
- Quadri, S.A., Waqas, M., Khan, I., Khan, M.A., Suriya, S.S., Farooqui, M., Fiani, B., 2018. High-intensity focused ultrasound: past, present, and future in neurosurgery. *Neurosurg. Focus* 44, E16. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2017.11.FOCUS17610>
- Rezai, A., Ranjan, M., Bhagwat, A., Arsiwala, T., Carpenter, J., Schafer, M., Adams, G., Marton, J., Tirumalai, P., Farmer, D., Mahoney, J., Finomore, V., 2025. Brain injury during focused ultrasound neuromodulation for substance use disorder. *Brain Stimulat.* 18, 2050–2053. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2025.10.012>
- Sigona, M.K., Caskey, C.F., 2024. Ultrasound neuromodulation: planning and validating treatments. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* 59, 101430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2024.101430>

Declaration of interest statement

Raag D Airan is on the advisory boards of Cordance Medical and Lumos Labs and has received grant funding from AbbVie. David Attali has been invited to scientific meetings, served as a speaker, and received compensation from Janssen. David Attali has been invited to scientific meetings by Neuraxpharm. Jean-Francois Aubry reports a relationship with InSightec that includes: funding grants. Jean-Francois Aubry reports a relationship with Sonomind that includes: equity or stocks and consulting or advisory. Elsa Fourgagnan: Advisor for Attune Neuroscience. Tatiana Khokhlova: Scientific advisor for Petal Surgical, Inc and Associate Editor for Ultrasonics. Jan Kubanek: Co-founder of SPIRE Therapeutics Inc. K.R.M. holds equity and is a salaried employee of Attune Neurosciences, Inc. Kim Butts Pauly reports a relationship with Attune Neurosciences that includes: consulting or advisory and equity or stocks. Kim Butts Pauly reports a relationship with Surf Therapeutics that includes: consulting or advisory. Kim Butts Pauly reports a relationship with MR Instruments that includes: non-financial support. Bradley E. Treeby reports a relationship with NeuroHarmonics LTD that includes: board membership, employment, and equity or stocks. EM has acted as a consultant for BrainBox Ltd. Lennart Verhagen reports a relationship with Brainbox that includes: non-financial support. Lennart Verhagen reports a relationship with Sonic Concepts that includes: non-financial support. Lennart Verhagen reports a relationship with Image Guided Therapy that includes: non-financial support. Lennart Verhagen reports a relationship with Nudge that includes: consulting or advisory.