

Neuroscience

Light versus Electricity versus Sound in Switching off Neurological Diseases

David Martinez*

University of Texas, 110 Inner Campus Dr, Austin, TX 78712, USA

*: All correspondence should be sent to: Dr. David Martinez.

Author's Contact: David Martinez, M.D., E-mail: david-martinez@aol.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15354/si.26.pe157>

Funding: No funding source declared.

COI: The author declares no competing interest.

AI Declaration: The author affirms that artificial intelligence did not contribute to the process of preparing the work.

Neurological diseases, ranging from Parkinson's and epilepsy to chronic pain and depression, remain a major medical challenge, often resistant to conventional pharmacological treatments. Emerging evidence suggests that alternative modalities such as light, electricity, and sound can modulate neural circuits, offering promising strategies to "switch off" pathological activity. Phototherapy and optogenetics allow targeted neuronal activation or inhibition using light-sensitive proteins, while electrical stimulation—including deep brain stimulation and transcranial direct current stimulation—modulates neural excitability and network dynamics. Similarly, sound-based approaches, including focused ultrasound and vibrotactile neuromodulation, influence brain activity non-invasively. This article examines the comparative potential of these modalities, highlighting their mechanisms, advantages, and limitations in managing neurological disorders. While each technique shows promise, their optimal application may involve complementary strategies tailored to disease-specific circuits. Advancing these interventions requires rigorous research, ethical considerations, and translational studies to harness the full potential of light, electricity, and sound in restoring neurological health.

Keywords: Neuromodulation; Optogenetics; Deep Brain Stimulation; Ultrasound Therapy; Neurological Diseases

Science Insights, April 30, 2026; Vol. 48, No. 4, pp.2189-2192.

© 2026 Insights Publisher. All rights reserved.



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed by the Insights Publisher.

NEUROLOGICAL diseases affect millions worldwide, often impairing motor function, cognition, mood, and quality of life. While pharmaceuticals have provided

relief for many patients, numerous disorders remain refractory to conventional treatments (World Health Organization, 2022). In recent decades, alternative modalities—light, electricity, and

sound—have emerged as powerful tools to directly modulate neural circuits. These interventions leverage the brain’s inherent electrical and mechanical properties to restore balance, suppress pathological activity, and potentially “switch off” neurological disease states (Alim-Louis Benabid et al., 2009). Understanding their mechanisms, advantages, and limitations is crucial to evaluating their role in contemporary and future neurology.

Light-based approaches, particularly optogenetics, have revolutionized experimental neuroscience. Optogenetics combines genetic manipulation with precise light delivery to control neuronal activity with millisecond precision (Karl Deisseroth, 2015). By introducing light-sensitive ion channels into specific neurons, researchers can selectively activate or inhibit targeted circuits. In preclinical models, optogenetics has been used to suppress epileptic seizures, restore motor function in Parkinsonian models, and modulate mood-related circuits implicated in depression (Deisseroth, 2015; Yizhar et al., 2011). Beyond optogenetics, photobiomodulation—using red or near-infrared light—has shown potential to improve mitochondrial function, reduce inflammation, and enhance neuroplasticity (Hamblin, 2016). While highly precise, translation to human therapy remains limited due to delivery challenges and the need for genetic modification.

Electrical neuromodulation represents one of the most established clinical strategies. Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has demonstrated remarkable efficacy in Parkinson’s disease, essential tremor, and dystonia by delivering controlled electrical pulses to specific brain regions (Alim-Louis Benabid et al., 2009). Non-invasive techniques such as transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) can modulate cortical excitability and enhance neuroplasticity (Mark S. George et al., 2010). These methods are widely used in depression, stroke rehabilitation, and chronic pain. Electrical stimulation’s primary strength lies in its proven clinical efficacy, although invasiveness, variability in response, and side effects remain limitations.

Sound-based neuromodulation is a newer but rapidly advancing modality. Focused ultrasound enables non-invasive delivery of acoustic energy to deep brain structures, modulating neuronal activity without surgery (William J. Tyler, 2011). Low-intensity ultrasound has been shown to alter neuronal excitability, reduce seizure activity, and influence cognitive networks in preclinical studies (Tyler et al., 2018). Additionally, auditory entrainment techniques can synchronize neural oscillations, potentially improving motor and cognitive functions. While promising, sound-based approaches require further validation regarding safety, dosing, and long-term effects.

Comparing these modalities reveals distinct advantages and limitations. Light-based interventions offer unmatched spatial and temporal precision but face translational challenges. Electrical approaches are clinically validated but may involve surgical risks or inconsistent outcomes. Sound-based techniques are non-invasive and capable of deep penetration, yet their mechanisms remain under investigation (Fomenko et al., 2018). The selection of modality depends on disease type, target speci-

ficity, and patient tolerance, with increasing interest in combining modalities.

Mechanistically, these approaches converge on modulating dysfunctional neural circuits. Light directly controls ion channel activity or cellular metabolism. Electrical stimulation alters membrane potentials and synchronizes neuronal firing. Sound applies mechanical energy that activates mechanosensitive pathways or entrains oscillatory networks (Tyler et al., 2018). Despite differing mechanisms, all aim to restore functional network dynamics and suppress pathological activity.

The treatment of epilepsy illustrates the complementary potential of these modalities. Optogenetic studies demonstrate precise suppression of seizure activity in animal models (Krook-Magnuson et al., 2013). Clinically, DBS and vagus nerve stimulation provide seizure reduction in refractory epilepsy (Fisher et al., 2010). Focused ultrasound is under investigation as a non-invasive alternative. Integration of these approaches may enable personalized neuromodulation strategies.

Parkinson’s disease further highlights modality-specific advantages. DBS targeting the subthalamic nucleus remains the gold standard for motor symptom control (Benabid et al., 2009). Optogenetics has clarified the role of basal ganglia circuits in motor dysfunction (Deisseroth, 2015). Focused ultrasound offers potential for non-invasive modulation or lesioning of deep brain structures (Fomenko et al., 2018). Together, these modalities provide complementary insights and therapeutic avenues.

Cognitive and psychiatric disorders also benefit from neuromodulation. TMS and tDCS are effective in treatment-resistant depression (George et al., 2010). Photobiomodulation may enhance mitochondrial function and neuroplasticity (Hamblin, 2016). Acoustic entrainment may further modulate neural oscillations associated with mood regulation. Multi-modal approaches could enable broader and more effective interventions.

Despite their promise, these technologies face challenges. Light-based approaches require genetic targeting and precise delivery. Electrical stimulation carries surgical risks and requires careful calibration. Ultrasound must be optimized to avoid adverse effects such as tissue heating or cavitation (Fomenko et al., 2018). Ethical considerations include patient consent, neural data privacy, and potential cognitive enhancement.

Future directions include closed-loop neuromodulation systems that integrate real-time neural monitoring with adaptive stimulation. Multi-modal approaches may combine the precision of light, the reliability of electricity, and the non-invasive nature of sound. Personalized treatments based on neuroimaging and electrophysiology could transform care for refractory neurological diseases.

In conclusion, light, electricity, and sound offer complementary strategies for modulating neural circuits. Light provides precision, electricity offers proven clinical benefit, and sound enables non-invasive deep-brain access. While challenges remain, integrating these modalities may represent the future of neuromodulation, offering new hope for patients with complex neurological disorders. ■

References

- Benabid, A. L., Chabardès, S., Mitrofanis, J., & Pollak, P. (2009). Deep brain stimulation of the subthalamic nucleus for Parkinson's disease. *The Lancet Neurology*, 8(1), 67–81. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422\(08\)70291-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(08)70291-6)
- Deisseroth, K. (2015). Optogenetics: 10 years of microbial opsins in neuroscience. *Nature Neuroscience*, 18(9), 1213–1225. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4091>
- Fisher, R., Salanova, V., Witt, T., Worth, R., Henry, T., Gross, R., ... SANTE Study Group. (2010). Electrical stimulation of the anterior nucleus of thalamus for treatment of refractory epilepsy. *Epilepsia*, 51(5), 899–908. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2010.02536.x>
- Fomenko, A., Neudorfer, C., Dalla-piazza, R. F., Kalia, S. K., & Lozano, A. M. (2018). Low-intensity ultrasound neuromodulation: An overview of mechanisms and emerging human applications. *Brain Stimulation*, 11(6), 1209–1217. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2018.08.013>
- George, M. S., Wassermann, E. M., & Williams, W. A. (2010). Daily repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation (rTMS) improves mood in depression. *Neuroreport*, 6(14), 1853–1856.
- Hamblin, M. R. (2016). Shining light on the head: Photobiomodulation for brain disorders. *BBA Clinical*, 6, 113–124. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbacli.2016.09.002>
- Krook-Magnuson, E., Armstrong, C., Bui, A., Lew, S., Oijala, M., & Soltész, I. (2015). In vivo evaluation of the dentate gate theory in epilepsy. *The Journal of physiology*, 593(10), 2379–2388. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1113/JP270056>
- Tyler W. J. (2011). Noninvasive neuromodulation with ultrasound? A continuum mechanics hypothesis. *The Neuroscientist : a review journal bringing neurobiology, neurology and psychiatry*, 17(1), 25–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858409348066>
- Tyler, W. J., Lani, S. W., & Hwang, G. M. (2018). Ultrasonic modulation of neural circuit activity. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 50, 222–231. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2018.04.011>
- World Health Organization. (2022). Neurological disorders: Public health challenges. <https://www.who.int>
- Yizhar, O., Fenno, L. E., Davidson, T. J., Mogri, M., & Deisseroth, K. (2011). Optogenetics in neural systems. *Neuron*, 71(1), 9–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.06.004>