The Neurofeedback Dilemma: A Critical Review of the Science, Commerce, and Controversy of Brain Training

Introduction: The Promise and Peril of Self-Directed Brain Change

Neurofeedback presents a compelling and modern solution to the timeless challenge of mental wellness. It is marketed as a "significant advancement in mental health care," a revolutionary technique that taps into the brain's innate capacity for change—its neuroplasticity—to empower individuals to regulate their own brain activity.[1] This premise, which leverages the principles of learning theory to offer a non-invasive, drug-free alternative to conventional treatments, holds an almost irresistible appeal for a public increasingly seeking personalized and holistic paths to well-being.[3] By providing real-time feedback on brainwave patterns, the therapy promises to teach the brain to function in a healthier, more balanced manner, offering hope for conditions ranging from ADHD and anxiety to PTSD and chronic pain.[1]

Yet, beneath this veneer of cutting-edge science and self-empowerment lies a deep and persistent fault line of controversy. Despite having been in existence for over half a century, neurofeedback remains a "lightning-rod issue," mired in questions about its fundamental efficacy and scientific validity.[5] A significant body of scientific literature suggests that the benefits reported by clients may be attributable not to the specific mechanism of brain training, but to powerful placebo effects, amplified by the high-tech allure of the procedure itself.[8] This has created a stark divergence between the claims made in the scientific literature and the promises made in the commercial marketplace, raising serious ethical and legal concerns about misrepresentation and misleading advertising.[5]

This report provides a critical and exhaustive review of the neurofeedback landscape, moving beyond a simple assessment of whether the technology "works" to investigate the more pressing question of whether the industry, as it currently operates, has largely devolved into a high-cost, low-evidence enterprise that meets the functional

definition of a scam. To this end, the analysis will deconstruct the scientific evidence for and against its efficacy, scrutinize the business practices and marketing tactics of its providers, examine the fragmented and often inadequate regulatory environment in which it operates, and place it in direct comparison with established, evidence-based medical treatments. By synthesizing these disparate domains—from neuroscience and clinical psychology to regulatory law and commercial ethics—this report aims to deliver a nuanced, data-driven verdict on the state of neurofeedback and provide a clear framework for navigating its promises and its perils.

Section 1: The Scientific Foundation: A House Divided

The entire edifice of neurofeedback rests on a scientific foundation that is, upon closer inspection, deeply fractured. The theoretical principles are elegant and intuitive, drawing from well-established concepts in psychology and neuroscience. However, the translation of this theory into effective clinical practice is the subject of a contentious and seemingly intractable debate. This debate is characterized by conflicting evidence, methodological disputes, and a continuous evolution of the proposed mechanisms of action, creating a state of scientific gridlock that has significant implications for both practitioners and consumers.

1.1 The Theory: Operant Conditioning for the Brain

At its core, neurofeedback is a specialized form of biofeedback that applies the principles of instrumental or operant conditioning directly to the brain's electrical activity.[9] The concept, which dates back to the 1960s, is straightforward: behavior that is rewarded is more likely to reoccur.[9] In a typical neurofeedback session, sensors are placed on the scalp to measure brainwaves via electroencephalography (EEG).[2] This brain activity is processed in real-time and "fed back" to the individual through visual or auditory cues, such as a video game that progresses or a sound that plays only when the brain produces a desired pattern of activity.[2] By rewarding these desired brain states and discouraging undesired ones, the therapy aims to teach the brain to produce the target patterns more frequently and consistently.[11]

The ultimate goal of this process is to enhance the brain's capacity for self-regulation.[1] Proponents posit that by leveraging neuroplasticity—the brain's fundamental ability to reorganize its structure, connections, and function in response to experience—neurofeedback can induce lasting changes.[2] This learned self-regulation is claimed to translate into tangible clinical benefits, such as improved emotional control, enhanced cognitive function, greater mental resilience, and the alleviation of symptoms associated with various psychological conditions.[1]

The practice is not monolithic; different neurofeedback protocols are designed to target specific brainwave frequencies, which are oscillating electrical voltages in the brain associated with different mental states.[2] For example, alpha waves (8-12 Hz) are linked to states of relaxation and calm, while beta waves (12-30 Hz) are associated with active focus and concentration.[2] A protocol for treating anxiety might therefore aim to train an individual to increase their alpha wave activity while simultaneously reducing excessive beta wave activity, thereby promoting a state of relaxed alertness.[3] Similarly, protocols for depression may target asymmetries in alpha activity between the brain's hemispheres, while protocols for ADHD often focus on increasing the ratio of beta-to-theta waves to improve focus.[3] This theoretical framework, which connects observable brain activity to targeted psychological outcomes via a clear learning mechanism, provides neurofeedback with a compelling and scientifically plausible narrative.

1.2 The Case for Efficacy: A Body of Promising, if Contested, Evidence

Based on this theoretical foundation, proponents of neurofeedback have applied the technique to a vast array of clinical and non-clinical applications, generating a body of research that suggests potential efficacy. This evidence, while often contested, forms the basis for the industry's claims and its appeal to consumers seeking alternatives to conventional medicine.

For Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), neurofeedback is frequently presented as one of its most successful applications. Proponents describe it as a "promising therapeutic approach" capable of normalizing brainwave patterns to improve sustained attention, reduce impulsivity and hyperactivity, and enhance executive functions like planning and working memory.[12] Some research reviews and provider websites claim that neurofeedback can be as effective as stimulant medications, the standard pharmacological treatment for ADHD.[15] One of the most

powerful endorsements cited by practitioners is a rating from the American Academy of Pediatrics, which has allegedly designated neurofeedback as a "Level 1 Best Support" treatment for the condition, placing it on par with medication.[4]

The application of neurofeedback extends to mood and anxiety disorders as well. A 2023 meta-analysis of studies on depression concluded that both neurofeedback and heart rate variability (HRV) biofeedback are associated with a significant reduction in self-reported depressive symptoms, with a particularly strong effect size seen in randomized controlled trials (RCTs).[16] The theoretical rationale for this is based on consistent EEG findings that show individuals with depression often exhibit an asymmetry in frontal alpha wave activity; neurofeedback protocols aim to correct this imbalance, which is hypothesized to improve mood regulation.[16] Similarly, some studies suggest that neurofeedback can relieve symptoms of anxiety by training the brain to reduce patterns associated with hyperarousal and stress.[15]

The treatment of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) has also become a key area of focus, with some of the most robust-sounding claims. A 2023 systematic review and meta-analysis reported that EEG neurofeedback significantly reduces PTSD symptoms, finding a remarkable 79.3% remission rate in treatment groups compared to just 24.4% in control groups.[17] This has been bolstered by regulatory recognition; the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has granted clearance to at least one neurofeedback device, "Prism," specifically for the treatment of PTSD, lending it a significant measure of legitimacy.[17] Beyond clinical disorders, neurofeedback is also promoted for performance enhancement in healthy populations, with applications in sports to improve motor skills and in military contexts to enhance cognitive functions like attention, decision-making, and emotional regulation under stress.[17] This broad portfolio of promising findings, spanning from clinical remediation to peak performance, constitutes the primary evidence base cited by the neurofeedback community.

1.3 The "Neuroplacebo" Rebuttal: The Problem of the Sham Control

Despite the proponents' claims, a formidable and scientifically rigorous body of research presents a starkly different picture, suggesting that the purported benefits of neurofeedback may have little to do with the specific training of brainwaves. The central pillar of this critique is the evidence from well-designed, placebo-controlled studies, which consistently find that neurofeedback is often no more effective than a

sham procedure.[5]

A landmark study that crystallizes this argument was published by Schabus and colleagues in the journal *Brain* in 2017.[9] This double-blind, placebo-controlled trial investigated the use of neurofeedback for primary insomnia. The researchers compared the effects of genuine neurofeedback with a sham condition, where participants received feedback from irrelevant brainwave frequencies. The results were striking: both the real and the sham neurofeedback groups reported

equal improvements in their subjective experience of sleep.[9] This finding alone suggests that the active ingredient was not the neurofeedback itself, but rather non-specific factors like patient expectation, motivation, and the therapeutic context. The study went further, however. It found that while participants in the genuine neurofeedback group did, in fact, learn to successfully modulate the targeted brain signals, this learned ability had

no correlation with their reported behavioral improvements.[10] Perhaps most damningly, neither the real nor the sham group showed any change in objective, physiological measures of sleep quality as recorded by a polysomnogram.[10] The study also indicated that the ability to self-regulate brain activity seemed to plateau after only a few sessions, calling into question the rationale for the standard 20- to 40-session protocols common in clinical practice.[10]

This and similar findings have given rise to the "neuroplacebo" hypothesis, championed by critics such as meta-researcher Robert Thibault.[10] The argument is that neurofeedback may function as an unusually potent form of placebo. The entire therapeutic environment—which involves high patient engagement, the use of impressive-looking, cutting-edge technology, and a narrative of "retraining your brain" over many sessions—creates a powerful sense of "neuroenchantment".[10] This context can "hold special sway over critical reasoning" and amplify the non-specific effects of treatment, leading to strong subjective improvements even in the absence of a specific therapeutic mechanism.[10] This effect may be so powerful that neurofeedback could be considered a "superplacebo," where the placebo response is even stronger than that observed in other clinical domains like psychopharmacology.[10]

Further evidence questioning a direct causal link comes from a 2024 study on pain perception. Researchers found that while healthy participants could successfully learn to use neurofeedback to regulate their somatosensory alpha oscillations—a brainwave pattern correlated with pain processing—this learned regulation did *not* actually modulate their pain ratings or the brain's response to painful stimuli.[23] In essence,

participants learned the brain-training task, but it had no effect on the intended outcome. This body of critical research suggests that the benefits of neurofeedback may be an illusion, driven by powerful psychosocial factors rather than the specific, mechanistic brain training that providers claim to be selling.

1.4 The Methodological Stalemate: Are the Critics' Studies Themselves Flawed?

The scientific debate does not end with the placebo critique. Proponents of neurofeedback have developed a sophisticated counter-argument that challenges the very validity of the sham-controlled trials used to discredit the therapy.[24] This defense creates a methodological stalemate, where each side can plausibly claim that the other's evidence is fundamentally flawed, leaving the question of efficacy in a state of perpetual uncertainty.

The core of this counter-argument, articulated in papers such as "The Fallacy of Sham-Controlled Neurofeedback Trials," is that the "gold standard" studies cited by critics fail to implement neurofeedback correctly.[25] These trials often use training methodologies that are "antithetical to the established science of operant conditioning".[24] A common example is the use of an automatically adjusting reward threshold, where the difficulty of the task is constantly changed to ensure the participant receives a reward approximately 80% of the time.[24] From an operant conditioning perspective, this is a fatal flaw. True learning requires a clear and consistent relationship between a specific behavior (producing the target brainwave) and a reward. If the reward is given for variable and inconsistent performance, the brain cannot learn the association.

Based on a deconstruction of six such sham-controlled trials for ADHD, these proponents found that in every single study, there was no evidence that the subjects in the "real" neurofeedback group actually learned to self-modulate their targeted EEG activity.[25] Therefore, they argue, these trials were not comparing genuine, effective neurofeedback against a placebo. Instead, they were comparing "two forms of false-feedback".[25] The "real" group received non-contingent feedback due to a flawed protocol, and the "sham" group received non-contingent feedback by design.

The conclusion drawn from this analysis is that the premise that neurofeedback's benefits are merely a placebo effect is "unproven".[25] The intervention, as it should be properly practiced according to the principles of operant conditioning, has never

been adequately tested in these highly cited, rigorous trials. This argument effectively neutralizes the strongest evidence from the critics, creating a scientific impasse. The critics point to high-quality sham-controlled trials showing no effect, while the proponents retort that those trials failed to test the real intervention. This leaves the field in a state of gridlock, where the evidence base is simultaneously claimed to be definitive by both sides of the debate. This dynamic of shifting explanations and methodological disputes in the face of critical evidence is a significant point of concern. It demonstrates a pattern where the field's foundational claims are a moving target, making it exceptionally difficult for standard scientific validation methods to arrive at a conclusive verdict.

1.5 The Infra-Low Frequency (ILF) Frontier: Evolution or Evasion?

The scientific argument has become even more complex with the rise of a new and influential approach to neurofeedback that abandons the classical model altogether. Pioneered by physicist Siegfried Othmer and his wife, the late Sue Othmer, this method focuses on Infra-Low Frequency (ILF) training, which targets brainwave activity below 0.1 Hz.[26] Crucially, the Othmer method and its associated ILF protocols discard the discrete, threshold-based rewards that are the cornerstone of the operant conditioning model. Instead, it utilizes a continuous feedback signal that reflects the brain's waveform, a process the Othmers term "endogenous neuromodulation".[26]

According to this revised theory, the brain responds to the full dynamics of the feedback signal, not just to binary rewards and punishments. Othmer argues that the rapid, single-session state shifts and symptom relief often observed in their clinical practice cannot be explained by the slow, gradual learning curve of traditional operant conditioning.[28] The ILF model posits that the brain is engaging with its own activity in a more holistic way, using the feedback to guide its intrinsic self-regulatory mechanisms toward a state of equilibrium.[31] This approach emphasizes a high degree of individualization, with clinicians searching for a client's specific "optimal response frequency" (ORF) where the training is most effective.[27]

While this evolution of the technique could be seen as a legitimate advancement, it is also highly controversial and raises serious scientific and ethical questions. A primary issue is the lack of rigorous evidence. Systematic reviews of ILF neurofeedback have noted that the high degree of protocol individualization "poses a challenge for researchers in terms of producing controlled and comparable findings".[29] The

evidence base for the Othmer method consists largely of case studies, proof-of-concept reports, and multi-center trials that lack adequate control groups, rather than the large-scale, randomized controlled trials required to establish efficacy.[32]

Furthermore, there are troubling anecdotal reports of adverse effects. Online forums contain accounts from individuals who have undergone the Othmer ILF method and claim to have experienced a significant *worsening* of their symptoms, including increased anxiety, brain fog, and other issues, with some reporting being "badly damaged" for years after the treatment.[36] These reports, while not systematic data, raise safety concerns about a powerful but poorly understood intervention.

Most critically, this pivot away from a testable mechanism like operant conditioning represents a form of strategic evasion of scientific scrutiny. It effectively renders the entire debate about the validity of sham-controlled, operant conditioning-based trials moot for this new modality. By proposing a new, less-defined mechanism of "endogenous neuromodulation" whose success is judged primarily by subjective client response and clinician intuition, the ILF method becomes difficult to distinguish from the "neuroenchantment" and powerful placebo effects described by critics. The scientific goalposts have been moved once again, making the therapy even harder to validate or falsify through conventional scientific methods. This pattern of shifting explanations is a recurring theme in the neurofeedback field and a significant red flag when assessing its overall scientific credibility.

The "scientific debate" itself is not a symmetrical one between two equally disinterested academic camps. A significant portion of the research supporting neurofeedback's efficacy is conducted by individuals with direct financial and ideological stakes in its commercialization.[37] Siegfried Othmer, for instance, is not only a key theoretical proponent but also the Chief Scientist at the EEG Institute, a for-profit entity that develops, sells, and provides training for neurofeedback systems based on his methods.[26] This creates a clear conflict of interest that, while not invalidating the research outright, introduces a high risk of bias. In contrast, many of the most prominent critics, such as Robert Thibault, are meta-researchers whose work focuses on improving scientific rigor and reproducibility across all fields, and who do not have a commercial stake in neurofeedback's success or failure.[40] This fundamental asymmetry in incentives is crucial context for understanding why positive, less rigorous studies tend to proliferate and be promoted within the practitioner community, while critical, well-controlled studies are often dismissed or ignored.

Table 1: The Scientific Evidence Matrix: Claims vs. Counter-Claims

Condition	Proponent Claims & Supporting Evidence	Criticisms & Counter-Evidence (Sham/Placebo Findings)	Methodological Rebuttals (Critiques of Sham Studies)
ADHD	Claimed to be a "promising" and "efficacious and specific" treatment, improving attention, impulsivity, and executive function.[12] Some proponents cite an American Academy of Pediatrics "Level 1" rating.[4]	A triple-blind study found neurofeedback was not superior to sham neurofeedback or group CBT for adult ADHD.[20] A pilot study found stimulants were effective while neurofeedback was not.[21] Many critics attribute benefits to placebo.[21]	Proponents argue that sham-controlled ADHD trials used flawed methodologies that were "antithetical to the established science of operant conditioning," preventing subjects from learning. Thus, they compared "two forms of false-feedback".[24]
Depression	A meta-analysis found a significant reduction in self-reported depression, with a large effect size in RCTs.[16] The mechanism is claimed to be the correction of frontal alpha asymmetry.[16]	The evidence base is limited, with most studies being small.[15] The broader critique of placebo effects and "neuroenchantment" applies, questioning if subjective improvements are due to the specific intervention.[10]	The same methodological critiques of sham trials apply here, questioning whether the "real" neurofeedback condition in studies was ever properly implemented to allow for true learning.[25]
Anxiety	Claimed to relieve anxiety symptoms like thought problems and somatic complaints by training the brain to reduce patterns of hyperarousal.[3]	The evidence base is considered to be in need of more research.[15] The general placebo argument is a primary criticism, suggesting that the high-tech, high-engagement nature of the therapy drives subjective	As with other conditions, proponents can argue that negative findings are the result of poorly designed studies that do not adhere to the principles of operant conditioning, making their conclusions

		feelings of improvement.[10]	about efficacy invalid.[25]
Insomnia	Early studies suggested beneficial effects on sleep.[9] Protocols often target sensorimotor rhythm (SMR) to enhance sleep quality.[9]	The landmark Schabus et al. (2017) double-blind, sham-controlled study found neurofeedback was no better than placebo for subjective sleep complaints and had *no effect* on objective sleep measures (polysomnogram).[9]	While the Schabus study is a powerful critique, a dedicated neurofeedback proponent could apply the same methodological argument: that the study's protocol may not have represented a valid application of operant conditioning, thus failing to test the intervention properly.[25]
PTSD	A meta-analysis reported a high remission rate (79.3%).[17] The FDA has cleared at least one device ("Prism") for PTSD treatment, lending significant credibility.[17]	The evidence for the FDA-cleared device was from an open-label trial, not a sham-controlled one, and the data had not yet been published at the time of the report.[18] The broader concerns about placebo effects remain highly relevant.[10]	The critique of sham-controlled trials remains a viable defense for proponents. They can argue that the absence of strong, positive sham-controlled data is a reflection of flawed research designs, not a flawed therapy.[25]

Section 2: The Neurofeedback Marketplace: Commerce Outpacing Consensus

While scientists and researchers debate the efficacy and mechanisms of neurofeedback in academic journals, a burgeoning and lucrative commercial industry has emerged, operating on a far more definitive set of assumptions. This marketplace is characterized by high costs, aggressive marketing that often outstrips the scientific

evidence, and a business model that appears to be predicated on the very ambiguity and controversy that plagues the research field. An examination of this commercial landscape reveals a significant chasm between the product being sold to the public and the product being validated by rigorous science.

2.1 The Economics of Neuro-Hope: A High-Cost Proposition

For the consumer, neurofeedback is a significant financial undertaking, often paid for entirely out-of-pocket. The cost structure of the industry reflects a high-end, specialized service, positioning it as a premium therapeutic option. In-clinic sessions typically range from $50 to as high as $300 per session, with an average cost frequently cited between $120 and $200.[43] This per-session fee is often preceded by a mandatory initial assessment, which can include a quantitative EEG (qEEG) or "brain map." This initial evaluation can add another $100 to $600 to the total cost, with some practitioners charging up to $1,000 for the baseline analysis.[44]

Given that a standard course of treatment typically involves a recommendation of 20 to 40 sessions—and sometimes as many as 60 for more complex cases—the total investment for a single individual can easily range from $3,000 to $8,000, and potentially much higher.[21] Many clinics offer package deals to make these costs seem more manageable, such as a 10-session package for $1,800-$2,000, but the overall financial commitment remains substantial.[45]

The market has also expanded beyond the clinic to include a variety of hardware options for both home and professional use. On the lower end, direct-to-consumer wearable devices like the MUSE headband, FocusCalm, and Narbis smart glasses are available for between $250 and $700.[44] While more affordable upfront, these devices often come with the added cost of monthly or yearly subscriptions for full access to their associated apps and training programs.[44] At the higher end, professional-grade systems, such as those using the NeurOptimal® software, are marketed for home rental or outright purchase. Renting such a system can cost between $650 and $950 per month, while purchasing a system for home or professional use can range from $8,000 to $11,000.[46]

Despite these high costs and the contested scientific evidence, the global neurofeedback market is projected to see significant growth. This expansion is driven largely by the increasing prevalence of neurological and mental health disorders

worldwide and a growing consumer demand for non-invasive, non-pharmacological therapies.[47] The financial model of the industry appears robust, capitalizing on a clear and growing market need. This business model, which relies on selling long and expensive treatment courses, is predicated on the narrative that "retraining the brain" is a necessarily slow, cumulative, and high-tech process. This justification, however, stands in direct conflict with the "neuroplacebo" evidence, which suggests that any benefits are likely front-loaded due to expectation and novelty, and that neural regulation may plateau after just a few sessions.[10] If the primary therapeutic driver is a placebo effect, a 40-session course at a cost of thousands of dollars is not clinically justifiable. This reveals a fundamental tension: the industry has a powerful financial incentive to reject the placebo hypothesis and promote the "slow training" narrative, regardless of the evidence. The high cost and long duration are not merely features of the treatment; they are essential components of a business model that capitalizes on consumer hope and the perceived sophistication of the technology, creating a commercial feedback loop where the financial needs of the industry may dictate the scientific narrative presented to the public.

2.2 Marketing vs. Reality: A Chasm of Credibility

The chasm between the scientific consensus and the commercial reality of neurofeedback is most evident in the industry's marketing practices. A systematic analysis of the websites of 371 neurofeedback providers in the United States found a pervasive pattern of broad, unsubstantiated claims delivered using language designed to sound scientific while appealing to a wellness-oriented consumer base.[5]

The study revealed that an overwhelming 97% of provider websites made claims about treating at least one clinical indication, with anxiety, ADHD/ADD, and depression being the most common targets.[6] A majority also advertised neurofeedback for non-clinical purposes, such as cognitive enhancement (90% of sites) and peak performance (67.9% of sites).[5] These claims are presented with a confidence that is not reflected in the cautious and contested academic literature.

The language used to promote these services is particularly revealing. Providers frequently employ simple, powerful analogies that are easy to grasp but scientifically imprecise. The most common of these is the "brain gym" metaphor, with websites featuring slogans like, "Think of it as exercise for your brain!" or "When was your last BrainPhysical?".[5] This framing makes the abstract process of brainwave training feel

familiar and proactive.

Furthermore, approximately three-quarters of the analyzed websites used language associated with complementary and alternative medicine (CAM).[5] Neurofeedback is often positioned as a "fun, pain-free, natural alternative to medications" that involves a "holistic emphasis on body, mind and spirit".[5] This strategy simultaneously invokes the authority of neuroscience and the perceived safety and purity of natural wellness, a combination that is highly appealing to consumers who may be wary of pharmaceuticals but are impressed by technology.[50] This is not merely poor marketing; it is a sophisticated communication strategy that exploits cognitive biases. It frames the treatment in a way that is difficult to critique with simple facts, creating a self-contained belief system for its customers.

This "neuro-mystique" is further amplified by powerful, emotionally charged testimonials. Websites feature quotes from clients claiming that neurofeedback is the "most amazing therapy I have ever had the privilege to witness" or that it is "giving me my life back".[5] While compelling, these anecdotes are not a substitute for scientific evidence. The marketing strategy is the commercial application of the "neuroenchantment" effect described by critics—it uses the allure of brain science to bypass critical reasoning.[10]

This gap between marketing and reality is underscored by a critical finding regarding practitioner qualifications. The same study that analyzed marketing claims found that only 36% of the providers had either a medical degree (MD) or a doctoral-level degree in psychology.[6] This reveals a significant disconnect: the industry is making wide-ranging claims about treating complex medical and psychological disorders, yet a majority of its practitioners lack the advanced, licensed credentials typically required to diagnose and treat such conditions. This suggests that the pervasive marketing language may be more of a sales script than a reflection of deep scientific or clinical expertise.

2.3 Case Study in Controversy: The Scrutiny of Neurocore

The case of Neurocore, a prominent neurofeedback franchise, serves as a powerful real-world example of the industry's controversial practices and the resulting clash with regulatory bodies. The company garnered significant national media attention in 2017, not only for its aggressive expansion but also due to a multi-million-dollar

investment from then-U.S. Education Secretary Betsy DeVos.[5]

Neurocore's marketing was a textbook example of the kind of unsubstantiated claims that concern critics. The company advertised remarkable success rates, including a 90% improvement rate for conditions such as depression, anxiety, and ADHD.[5] It also made specific, quantifiable claims about its effectiveness for autism, citing a study that reported a 26% decrease in symptoms on an evaluation checklist.[50] These powerful claims were central to its business model, attracting clients seeking definitive solutions for difficult conditions.

However, these claims quickly drew the scrutiny of advertising watchdogs. The National Advertising Division (NAD), an investigative arm of the Better Business Bureau, launched an inquiry into Neurocore's advertising practices.[5] The NAD concluded that the company did not possess sufficient evidence to substantiate its dramatic claims and recommended that it cease making them.[5] Although Neurocore initially promised to rein in its advertising, the controversy did not end there. In November 2019, the non-profit organization Truth in Advertising filed a formal complaint with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), alleging that Neurocore had continued to make unsubstantiated claims despite the NAD's findings.[5]

The Neurocore case is emblematic of the wider issues plaguing the neurofeedback industry. It demonstrates how a company can build a high-profile brand and attract significant investment based on marketing claims that far exceed the available scientific evidence. It also highlights the reactive and often slow-moving nature of regulatory oversight, which struggles to keep pace with the commercial marketplace. For every high-profile case like Neurocore that attracts national attention, there are hundreds, if not thousands, of smaller, independent providers making similar, unvetted claims to the public.[5] This case study provides a stark illustration of the profound and concerning divergence between the commercial promotion of neurofeedback and the standards of scientific and ethical advertising.

Section 3: The Regulatory Void: A System of Gaps and Gray Areas

The neurofeedback industry operates within a complex and fragmented regulatory landscape characterized by significant gaps, gray areas, and a general lack of direct, enforceable oversight. This environment has allowed the commercial marketplace to flourish with minimal accountability, leaving consumers vulnerable to unsubstantiated

claims and high costs. The regulatory failure is not the result of a single loophole, but rather a "perfect storm" created by the interplay of three distinct areas of weakness: device approval, medical billing, and practitioner credentialing. This combination of an unregulated supply of tools, an unregulated workforce, and a high-reward financial structure has created an ecosystem where the incentives to make broad claims and charge high prices far outweigh the regulatory or professional risks.

3.1 The FDA's Ambiguous Role: The 510(k) Exemption Loophole

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) plays a central, yet often misunderstood, role in the regulation of neurofeedback. The FDA's authority extends to medical devices, not the practice of medicine itself.[52] According to FDA guidelines, if a neurofeedback technology is marketed with the explicit intention to diagnose or treat a specific disease or psychiatric condition, it is considered a medical device and requires FDA clearance or approval before it can be sold for that purpose.[52] An example of this is the "Prism" device by GrayMatters Health, which received FDA 510(k) clearance as a prescription-based intervention for PTSD.[18]

However, the vast majority of neurofeedback devices on the market bypass this level of scrutiny by exploiting a significant regulatory loophole related to the 510(k) premarket notification process. Neurofeedback devices are generally classified as a subset of biofeedback devices, which fall under Class II medical devices.[53] Crucially, the FDA has exempted many Class II biofeedback devices from the 510(k) process, provided they are intended for general wellness purposes, such as "relaxation training" and "stress management".[53]

This exemption creates a clear pathway for manufacturers to bring devices to market with minimal regulatory burden. A company can develop a neurofeedback system, market it with vague wellness claims like "stress reduction," and thereby sell it without ever having to submit evidence of its safety or effectiveness to the FDA.[53] A practitioner can then legally purchase this unvetted device and use it "off-label" to treat specific clinical conditions like ADHD, depression, or anxiety.[52] While this off-label use is a standard part of medical practice, in the context of neurofeedback it means that consumers are being treated for serious conditions using devices that have never been evaluated by the FDA for those specific applications. This has led some device manufacturers to openly dismiss FDA clearance as little more than a "marketing technique" rather than a necessary requirement for clinical use.[53] This gap

in device oversight provides the unregulated supply of tools that fuels the industry.

3.2 The Billing Quagmire and Fraud: A Lack of Specificity

The second major regulatory gap lies in the realm of medical billing and insurance reimbursement. There is no specific Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) code designated for neurofeedback therapy.[57] CPT codes are the universal language used by healthcare providers to bill insurers for services rendered. This lack of a dedicated code creates a state of confusion and ambiguity that is ripe for both accidental errors and intentional fraud.

In the absence of a specific code, many neurofeedback providers have resorted to using CPT code 90901, which is designated for "biofeedback training by any modality".[57] However, this practice is highly problematic. According to government analyses and insurer policies, code 90901 is generally interpreted as being for biofeedback that treats physiological conditions, such as hypertension or urinary incontinence.[57] When providers use this code to bill for neurofeedback aimed at treating psychological symptoms, insurers frequently deny the claims, viewing it as an inappropriate use of the code.[57] This leaves many patients to pay for the expensive therapy out-of-pocket.

This ambiguity does more than just create financial burdens for patients; it creates a fertile ground for large-scale fraud. The federal indictment of the founders of Golden Victory Medical LLC provides a stark case study.[57] In March 2025, prosecutors unsealed charges alleging a $15 million scheme to defraud Medicare, Medicaid, and private insurers. A central component of the alleged fraud was the systematic and intentional misuse of billing codes for neurofeedback services. The indictment claims the company used inapplicable CPT codes to boost reimbursements, billed for combinations of codes that were by definition impossible to perform together, and billed for longer sessions than were actually provided.[57] According to the government, this behavior persisted even after the company received repeated warnings from insurers, a CMS payment suspension, and an adverse audit.[57] This case powerfully illustrates how the lack of a clear, specific billing code for neurofeedback creates a high-reward, low-risk environment that can be exploited for massive financial gain, ultimately at the expense of taxpayers and public health programs.

3.3 Professional Standards: A Patchwork of Voluntary Oversight

The final piece of the regulatory puzzle is the lack of mandatory, enforceable standards for the practitioners themselves. While professional organizations such as the International Society for Neurofeedback and Research (ISNR) and the Biofeedback Certification International Alliance (BCIA) exist, their role is largely voluntary.[61] These bodies provide ethical guidelines, promote continuing education, and offer certification programs to demonstrate a practitioner's competence.[61] However, holding a certification from BCIA or being a member of ISNR is not a legal prerequisite to practice neurofeedback in most jurisdictions.

This creates an extremely low barrier to entry into the field. An individual can purchase a neurofeedback device (which, as noted, may not have been vetted by the FDA), take a short certification course (one provider offers a "Basic Certification" for $660), and open a clinic to treat clients for complex psychological conditions.[46] This reality helps to explain the finding that a majority of neurofeedback providers do not hold a doctoral-level degree in psychology or a medical degree.[6]

The standards set by these voluntary bodies stand in stark contrast to the requirements established by more rigorous institutions. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), for example, has established stringent minimum proficiencies for any neurofeedback provider treating veterans through its community care network.[62] These providers must hold a current state license for their clinical field (e.g., psychology, medicine) and must be able to demonstrate extensive, specific training in neurofeedback, such as completing 36 didactic hours and 25 supervised contact hours, or being certified by an accrediting body.[62]

The lack of universal standards has also led many major insurance providers to view the practice with skepticism. Policies from insurers like Blue Cross and Health Net explicitly state that they consider neurofeedback to be "investigational and/or unproven" and therefore "NOT MEDICALLY NECESSARY" for most conditions.[63] This widespread lack of insurance coverage pushes neurofeedback further into a cash-based, direct-to-consumer market that operates largely outside the checks and balances of the mainstream healthcare system. The absence of mandatory professional oversight completes the "perfect storm" of regulatory failure, creating an unregulated workforce to match the unregulated supply of tools and the ambiguous

financial incentives.

Table 2: Regulatory and Professional Oversight Landscape

Regulatory Body/Area	Governing Body/Standard	Requirement/Standard	Enforceability	Key Gap/Loophole
FDA Device Approval	U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)	Premarket Notification (510(k)) or Premarket Approval (PMA) is required for devices marketed to treat a specific disease.[52]	Legally mandatory for marketing a device for a specific medical indication.	**The "Wellness" Exemption:** Biofeedback devices marketed for general "relaxation" or "stress management" are exempt from 510(k) review. This allows unvetted devices to enter the market and be used "off-label" for clinical conditions.[53]
Medical Billing	American Medical Association (CPT Codes); Insurers (Medicare, Medicaid, Private)	Providers must use appropriate Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes to bill for services.	Claims using inappropriate codes can be denied and may constitute fraud if done intentionally.[57]	**Lack of a Specific Code:** There is no CPT code specifically for neurofeedback. Providers often use the general biofeedback code (90901), which insurers may deem inappropriate for psychological services, leading to denials and creating an environment

				ripe for fraudulent billing practices.[57]
Practitioner Credentialing	State Licensing Boards; Professional Organizations (e.g., BCIA, ISNR)	State licensure is required for independent clinical practice (e.g., psychology, medicine). BCIA/ISNR offer voluntary certification in neurofeedback.[6] [1]	State licensure is legally enforceable. BCIA/ISNR certification is **voluntary** and not legally required to practice neurofeedback.	**No Universal Standard:** There is no legally mandated license or universal standard of training required specifically to practice neurofeedback. This allows individuals with minimal qualifications to offer services to the public, creating a significant consumer protection gap.[6]

Section 4: A Comparative Framework: Neurofeedback vs. The Gold Standards

To fully evaluate the value proposition of neurofeedback and address the question of whether it constitutes a "scam," it is essential to place it in context. A therapy does not exist in a vacuum; its worth must be judged relative to the other options available to a patient. This section provides a critical comparative analysis, contrasting neurofeedback's evidence base, cost, and regulatory status directly against the established, "gold standard" treatments for the same conditions it purports to treat, namely Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) and FDA-approved pharmacotherapy. This comparison reveals that the "alternative" label often applied to neurofeedback

serves not only as a marketing tool but also as a shield to deflect direct, evidence-based scrutiny against superior therapeutic options.

4.1 The Established Benchmarks: Evidence-Based Care

The modern healthcare landscape relies on a foundation of evidence-based practice, where treatments are recommended based on a large body of high-quality scientific research demonstrating their safety and effectiveness. For the most common conditions targeted by neurofeedback providers—such as anxiety, depression, and ADHD—there are well-established, first-line treatments that serve as the benchmarks against which any new therapy must be measured.

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) is a highly structured, goal-oriented form of psychotherapy, or "talk therapy".[65] Its core principle is that psychological problems are based, in part, on unhelpful patterns of thinking and learned patterns of unhelpful behavior.[66] During CBT, a therapist helps a patient identify these patterns and learn new coping skills to respond to challenges in a healthier way.[65] CBT is supported by a massive evidence base from decades of research. It is strongly recommended as a first-line treatment for a wide range of conditions—including depression, numerous anxiety disorders (GAD, social anxiety, phobias, OCD), and PTSD—by major health organizations like the American Psychological Association (APA) and the UK's National Health Service (NHS).[65] Numerous large-scale studies have demonstrated that CBT is as effective as, or in some cases more effective than, psychiatric medications, and its benefits have been shown to be long-lasting, as it equips patients with skills for life.[66]

FDA-Approved Pharmacotherapy represents the other pillar of standard-of-care treatment. For a condition like ADHD, the FDA has approved a variety of both stimulant (methylphenidate- and amphetamine-based) and non-stimulant (e.g., atomoxetine, viloxazine) medications.[73] These drugs have undergone a rigorous, multi-phase approval process involving extensive clinical trials to prove their safety and efficacy in treating ADHD symptoms in both children and adults. Similarly, for depression and anxiety disorders, a range of antidepressant medications, such as Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs) and Serotonin-Norepinephrine Reuptake Inhibitors (SNRIs), are approved by the FDA and recommended in clinical practice guidelines as effective first-line treatments.[68] These medications are prescribed and managed by licensed medical professionals and are a cornerstone of

modern psychiatric care.

4.2 Head-to-Head: A Cost-Benefit Analysis for the Consumer

When neurofeedback is placed in a direct, head-to-head comparison with these gold-standard treatments, its value proposition for the consumer diminishes dramatically across every key metric: efficacy, cost, and regulatory oversight.

In terms of **efficacy**, the contrast is stark. As detailed in Section 1, the evidence for neurofeedback is highly contested, with the most rigorous, sham-controlled trials suggesting its effects do not exceed those of a placebo.[9] A triple-blind study that directly compared neurofeedback to CBT for adults with ADHD found no statistical superiority for neurofeedback.[20] In contrast, CBT and FDA-approved medications are supported by a vast and robust evidence base, built over decades of research, which demonstrates specific, significant therapeutic effects that are demonstrably superior to placebo.[66] The "alternative" framing of neurofeedback often serves to obscure this critical difference in evidentiary quality. It allows the industry to exist in a separate, less rigorous evidence ecosystem. For a consumer, however, the choice is not between two different-but-equal philosophies of healing; it is between treatments with a high, established burden of proof (CBT, medication) and one with a low, contested, and scientifically uncertain burden of proof (neurofeedback).

Regarding **cost and time**, neurofeedback represents a significantly higher barrier to access for most people. A full course of treatment requires a major investment of both time (20-40+ sessions) and money (often $3,000-$8,000 or more), and it is frequently not covered by insurance, making it an out-of-pocket expense.[44] While CBT also requires a time commitment, a typical course is shorter (usually 5-20 sessions) and is widely covered by most insurance plans.[65] FDA-approved medications are also almost universally covered by insurance, making them a financially accessible option.

Finally, concerning **regulation and safety**, neurofeedback operates in a precarious gray area. As established in Section 3, the devices are often unvetted by the FDA for their clinical use, and the practitioners are not subject to any mandatory, universal licensing or training standards.[53] While generally considered non-invasive, adverse effects including fatigue, headaches, and a worsening of the very symptoms being treated have been reported.[7] In sharp contrast, CBT is delivered by licensed mental health professionals (such as psychologists, clinical social workers, and licensed

professional counselors) who are legally and ethically accountable to state licensing boards. Pharmacotherapy is even more tightly regulated; medications must pass the FDA's stringent approval process to establish their safety and efficacy, and they can only be prescribed and managed by licensed medical professionals.

This comparative analysis makes it clear that for the vast majority of consumers, neurofeedback does not represent a rational first choice for treatment. It is a high-cost, high-time-commitment, and poorly regulated intervention with a deeply contested evidence base. When compared to the effective, accessible, and well-regulated standard-of-care treatments available, its value proposition is exceedingly weak.

Table 3: Comparative Efficacy: Neurofeedback vs. Standard-of-Care Treatments

Metric	Neurofeedback	Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)	FDA-Approved Medication
Evidence Base	Highly contested; numerous high-quality, sham-controlled trials show no effect beyond placebo.[9] Proponents critique these trials as methodologically flawed.[25]	Massive evidence base; considered a "gold standard" treatment. Numerous studies show it is as effective or more effective than medication, with long-lasting benefits.[66]	Extensive evidence base; each medication must pass rigorous, multi-phase clinical trials to demonstrate safety and efficacy superior to placebo before receiving FDA approval.[75]
Regulatory Status	Operates in a regulatory void. Devices often enter the market under a "wellness" exemption, bypassing FDA review for clinical use.[53] No specific billing code exists.[57]	Highly regulated. Practiced by licensed mental health professionals who are legally and ethically governed by state boards.[65]	Highly regulated. Prescribed and managed by licensed medical professionals. Manufacturing and marketing are strictly overseen by the FDA.[73]
Typical Cost	Very high. $3,000 - $8,000+ for a full course.[44] Often not covered by insurance	Moderate. Typically covered by insurance, with patient responsibility limited to co-pays or	Moderate. Typically covered by insurance, with patient responsibility limited to co-pays or

	and paid for out-of-pocket.[49]	deductibles.	deductibles.
Typical Duration	Long. 20-40+ sessions are standard.[2]	Shorter-term. Typically 5-20 sessions, though duration can vary.[65]	Ongoing, depending on the condition. Requires regular check-ins with a prescriber.
Practitioner Oversight	Minimal and voluntary. Certification is not legally required. Many practitioners lack advanced medical or psychological degrees.[6]	Strict. Practitioners must meet extensive educational and supervised training requirements to obtain and maintain a state license to practice.	Strict. Prescribers must be licensed medical professionals (e.g., MD, DO, NP, PA) with specific training in pharmacology and medicine.

Conclusion and Recommendations: Navigating the Neuro-Marketplace

After a comprehensive and critical review of the scientific literature, commercial practices, and regulatory landscape, a clear and troubling picture of the neurofeedback industry emerges. While the underlying technology may hold potential as a research tool for probing the intricacies of brain function, its translation into the mainstream consumer marketplace has been fraught with controversy, unsubstantiated claims, and systemic failures of oversight. The central question of this report is whether neurofeedback, in its current commercial form, has mostly turned into a scam. The evidence strongly suggests that while the intent of every individual practitioner may not be malicious—many may be sincere believers in the therapy [37]—the industry as a whole exhibits the primary characteristics of a systemic deception perpetrated on a vulnerable public.

A scam, in its functional sense, involves deception for financial gain. The neurofeedback industry meets this definition through a confluence of factors. First, there is a profound and undeniable disconnect between the definitive, often miraculous claims made in marketing materials and the deeply contested, ambiguous,

and often negative findings in the rigorous scientific literature.[5] Providers promise to "retrain the brain" to treat a host of serious medical conditions, yet the best available evidence suggests these benefits are often indistinguishable from a placebo effect.[9] Second, the industry engages in a form of financial exploitation by charging consumers thousands of dollars for long, drawn-out treatment courses that are not supported by high-quality evidence.[10] The business model is predicated on a "slow training" narrative that is directly contradicted by studies suggesting that any placebo-driven benefits are front-loaded and that neural learning plateaus quickly. Third, the entire enterprise is built upon a foundation of systemic regulatory evasion. The industry capitalizes on a perfect storm of loopholes—in FDA device approval, medical billing codes, and professional accountability—that allows these practices to flourish with minimal risk of legal or professional consequence.[53]

In synthesis, neurofeedback is not a monolithic entity. In the controlled environment of a research laboratory, it is a fascinating technology. However, when packaged and sold on the open market, it has largely morphed into a high-cost, low-evidence product. The combination of unproven efficacy for its marketed purposes, "neuro-mystique" marketing that preys on hope and scientific illiteracy, exorbitant costs that are rarely covered by insurance, and a near-total lack of meaningful oversight pushes the practice, in its widespread commercial form, firmly into the territory of a systemic scam.

Based on this analysis, the following recommendations are provided for key stakeholders:

For Consumers:

- **Prioritize Evidence-Based Treatments:** For any diagnosed mental health condition, consumers should pursue established, standard-of-care treatments like Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) and/or FDA-approved medications as the first line of defense. These therapies have a proven track record of efficacy, are regulated, and are typically covered by insurance.
- **Approach Neurofeedback with Extreme Skepticism:** View neurofeedback as a highly experimental and unproven intervention. Be wary of any provider who guarantees results, dismisses the role of the placebo effect, or presents the therapy as a cure-all.
- **Demand Credentials and Rationale:** If considering neurofeedback, consumers should verify that the practitioner holds a current state license to practice psychotherapy or medicine (e.g., licensed psychologist, psychiatrist, LCSW, LPC). A weekend "neurofeedback certification" is not a substitute for a clinical license.

Demand a clear, evidence-based rationale for the specific protocol being recommended for your specific condition.

For Clinicians:

- **Adhere to Ethical Principles of Informed Consent:** Licensed clinicians have an ethical duty to provide clients with a complete and accurate picture of the treatment they are offering. This must include a transparent discussion about the contested nature of the evidence for neurofeedback, the significant possibility that its effects are placebo-driven, and its status relative to established, evidence-based treatments.
- **Avoid Unsubstantiated Claims:** Clinicians must not make marketing or clinical claims that extend beyond the robust scientific literature. Promoting neurofeedback as a proven treatment for conditions where its efficacy is questionable constitutes a serious ethical breach.

For Policymakers and Regulators:

- **Close the Regulatory Void:** The current patchwork of voluntary standards and loopholes is insufficient to protect the public. Legislative and regulatory action is required on three fronts:
  1. **FDA Oversight:** The 510(k) exemption for biofeedback devices should be re-evaluated and potentially closed for any device being used in a clinical setting to treat a diagnosed disorder, regardless of its marketing claims.
  2. **Billing Transparency:** A specific CPT code for neurofeedback should be established. This would force the industry into a transparent billing structure, reduce the potential for fraud, and allow insurers to make clear, evidence-based coverage decisions.
  3. **Practitioner Standards:** State licensing boards should consider establishing clear and enforceable standards for the practice of neurofeedback, defining it within the scope of practice of licensed professionals and setting minimum training and supervision requirements, similar to those implemented by the VA.

Until such systemic reforms are enacted, neurofeedback will likely remain a "Wild West" of mental health care—a marketplace where hope is sold at a premium, and the consumer is left to bear all the risk.

Works cited

1. How Neurofeedback Therapy Enhances Self-Regulation - MyBrainDR, accessed June 23, 2025,

https://mybraindr.com/2024/03/05/how-neurofeedback-therapy-enhances-self-regulation/
2. The Science of Self-Regulation: Neurofeedback Explained - Ageless Regenerative Medical, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.agelessregenerativemedical.com/blog/the-science-of-self-regulation-neurofeedback-explained
3. Emotional Regulation & Neurofeedback Training | NHA Health - NeuroHealth Associates, accessed June 23, 2025, https://nhahealth.com/emotional-regulation-neurofeedback-training/
4. Is Neurofeedback Legitimate? What Clients in Cypress, Texas Should Know About Brain-Based Healing - Serenity Wellness and Counseling Center, accessed June 23, 2025, https://serenitywellnessandcounseling.com/is-neurofeedback-legit-cypress/
5. Neuroenhancement for sale: assessing the website claims of neurofeedback providers in the United States - PMC, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8218893/
6. Neuroenhancement for sale: assessing the website claims of neurofeedback providers in the United States - PubMed, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34164596/
7. Neurofeedback: myth or promise? - BrainWise Media, accessed June 23, 2025, https://brainwisemedia.com/neurofeedback-myth-or-promise/
8. Neurofeedback - Psychology Today, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/therapy-types/neurofeedback
9. Better than sham? A double-blind placebo-controlled neurofeedback study in primary insomnia | Brain | Oxford Academic, accessed June 23, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/140/4/1041/3039235
10. Neurofeedback or neuroplacebo? | Brain | Oxford Academic, accessed June 23, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/brain/article/140/4/862/3090927
11. Neurofeedback for Emotional Regulation - Number Analytics, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/neurofeedback-emotional-regulation
12. Neurofeedback: Applications and Efficacy in ADHD Treatment - Open Access Journals, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.openaccessjournals.com/articles/neurofeedback-applications-and-efficacy-in-adhd-treatment-17950.html
13. Neurofeedback: A Comprehensive Review on System Design, Methodology and Clinical Applications - PubMed Central, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4892319/
14. Neuroplasticity and Neurofeedback: How Do They Relate?, accessed June 23, 2025, https://neurofeedbackservicesny.com/neuroplasticity-and-neurofeedback/
15. Neurofeedback: Legitimate? How Does It Work? | SimplePractice, accessed June 23, 2025, https://s27630.pcdn.co/blog/neurofeedback/
16. Efficacy of bio- and neurofeedback for depression: a meta-analysis - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8842225/

17. Neurofeedback - Wikipedia, accessed June 23, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neurofeedback
18. FDA Clears Neurofeedback Intervention for PTSD | Psychiatric News, accessed June 23, 2025, https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/10.1176/appi.pn.2023.08.8.60
19. Interest of neurofeedback training for cognitive performance and risk of brain disorders in the military context - Frontiers, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1412289/full
20. No Evidence to Support Neurofeedback Over CBT for ADHD - Medscape, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/885241
21. Neurofeedback for ADHD: Does it work? What to expect, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/315261
22. Neurofeedback or neuroplacebo? - Oxford Academic, accessed June 23, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/brain/article-pdf/140/4/862/18245053/awx033.pdf
23. Neurofeedback and attention modulate somatosensory alpha oscillations but not pain perception | PLOS Biology, accessed June 23, 2025, https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3002972
24. Sham-Controlled Neurofeedback Trials in ADHD are Appropriately Using Operant Conditioning - ResearchGate, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376832432_Sham-Controlled_Neurofeedback_Trials_in_ADHD_are_Appropriately_Using_Operant_Conditioning
25. The Fallacy of Sham-Controlled Neurofeedback Trials: A Reply to ..., accessed June 23, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30078340/
26. Siegfried Othmer, PhD, BCIAC - Neurotherapy Conference, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.neurotherapyconference.com/speakers/siegfried-othmer
27. Development History of the Othmer Method: - EEG Info, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.eeginfo.com/research/researchpapers/Research-w-Othmer-Method-2017.pdf
28. (PDF) Infra-Low-Frequency Neurofeedback for Optimum Performance - ResearchGate, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304573503_Infra-Low-Frequency_Neurofeedback_for_Optimum_Performance
29. Infra-Low Frequency Neurofeedback: A Systematic Mixed Studies Review - Frontiers, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.920659/full
30. Infra-Low Frequency Neurofeedback: A Systematic Mixed Studies Review - PubMed Central, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9314572/
31. A Revisionist View of Neurofeedback - EEG INFO, accessed June 23, 2025, https://news.eeginfo.com/a-revisionist-view-of-neurofeedback/
32. Effect of Neurofeedback on Variables of Attention in a Large Multi-Center Trial, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233060756_Effect_of_Neurofeedback_on_Variables_of_Attention_in_a_Large_Multi-Center_Trial

33. Improvements in IQ Score and Maintenance of Gains Following EEG Biofeedback with Mildly Developmentally Delayed Twins - Journal of Neurotherapy, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.isnr-jnt.org/article/view/16745/10710
34. Infra-Low Frequency Neurofeedback rapidly ameliorates schizophrenia symptoms: A case report of the first session - PubMed Central, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9532604/
35. Infra Low Frequency Neurofeedback Training for Trauma Recovery: A Case Report, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.905823/full
36. Infra Low Frequency Neurofeedback has left me with worse symptoms - Othmer method, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/Neurofeedback/comments/11y06vu/infra_low_frequency_neurofeedback_has_left_me/
37. Neurofeedback as placebo: a case of unintentional deception? - PMC, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9205641/
38. Siegfried and Susan Othmer, Neurofeedback Pioneers - EEG Info, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.eeginfo.com/doctorothmer/
39. Othmer Method – Neurovitalia | Mentes que sonríen, accessed June 23, 2025, https://neurovitalia.es/en/neurovitalia-professionals/othmer-method/
40. Robert Thibault - GP2 - Global Parkinson's Genetics Program, accessed June 23, 2025, https://gp2.org/individuals/robert-thibault/
41. Robert Thibault, PhD - Coalition for Aligning Science, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.aligningscience.com/team/robert-thibault/
42. Robert THIBAULT | Research profile - ResearchGate, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Robert-Thibault
43. benavieri.com, accessed June 23, 2025, https://benavieri.com/neurofeeback-cost/#:~:text=Neurofeedback%20Pricing%3A%20What%20to%20Expect&text=On%20average%2C%20neurofeedback%20therapy%20sessions,recommended%20for%20your%20specific%20needs.
44. Neurofeedback Therapy Cost: What You Need to Know - Mendi.io, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.mendi.io/blogs/brain-health/neurofeedback-therapy-cost-what-you-need-to-know
45. What is the Cost of Neurofeedback Therapy? A Comprehensive Guide to Neurotherapy Pricing - Benavieri Counseling, accessed June 23, 2025, https://benavieri.com/neurofeeback-cost/
46. Neurofeedback Cost & Best Training Options, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.neurofeedbacktraining.com/programs-with-cost
47. Neurofeedback Market to Surpass US$ 2,056.9 Million by - GlobeNewswire, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2023/4/13/2646204/0/en/Neurofeedback-Market-to-Surpass-US-2-056-9-Million-by-2030-Says-Coherent-Market-Insights-CMI.html
48. Fees | Neurofeedback & Counseling Center of PA, accessed June 23, 2025,

https://www.neuroandcounselingcenter.com/fees
49. Neurofeedback Market See Incredible Growth 2023-2030 | Mitsar Co. Ltd, Emotiv, Brainworks, Narbis, InteraXon Inc., accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.einpresswire.com/article/668135123/neurofeedback-market-see-incredible-growth-2023-2030-mitsar-co-ltd-emotiv-brainworks-narbis-interaxon-inc
50. DeVos-Backed Neurofeedback Company Has Escaped Government Scrutiny, accessed June 23, 2025, https://slate.com/technology/2017/10/devos-backed-company-has-escaped-government-scrutiny.html
51. 6 Reasons You Haven't Heard of Neurofeedback - Michigan Brain Health, accessed June 23, 2025, https://michiganbrainhealth.com/6-reasons-you-havent-heard-of-neurofeedback/
52. Workshop: Neurofeedback Intervention Development: Opportunities ..., accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.nimh.nih.gov/news/media/2024/workshop-neurofeedback-intervention-development-opportunities-and-challenges
53. FDA Requirements for Equipment - brain-trainer.com, accessed June 23, 2025, https://brain-trainer.com/answer/fda-requirements-for-equipment/
54. Medical Device Exemptions 510(k) and GMP Requirements - accessdata.fda.gov, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfpcd/315.cfm?GMPPart=882
55. Class I and Class II Device Exemptions - FDA, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/classify-your-medical-device/class-i-and-class-ii-device-exemptions
56. Procedures for Class II Device Exemptions from Premarket ... - FDA, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/procedures-class-ii-device-exemptions-premarket-notification-guidance-industry-and-cdrh-staff
57. Neurofeedback in the Crosshairs: Analyzing the $15 Million Fraud Allegations Against Golden Victory Medical - The Suarez Law Firm, P.A., accessed June 23, 2025, https://suarezlawfirm.com/news-and-blog/neurofeedback-in-the-crosshairs-analyzing-the-15-million-fraud-allegations-against-golden-victory-medical/
58. DOJ Targets Neurofeedback Billing in $15 Million Behavioral Health Fraud Case, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.thefcainsider.com/2025/04/doj-targets-neurofeedback-billing-in-15-million-behavioral-health-fraud-case/
59. Minnesota Couple Indicted In $15 Million Medical Billing Fraud Scheme, accessed June 23, 2025, https://oig.hhs.gov/fraud/enforcement/minnesota-couple-indicted-in-15-million-medical-billing-fraud-scheme/

60. Minnesota Couple Indicted in $15 Million Medical Billing Fraud Scheme, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.justice.gov/usao-mn/pr/minnesota-couple-indicted-15-million-medical-billing-fraud-scheme-0
61. Guidelines for Practice | Neurofeedback Training and Research - ISNR, accessed June 23, 2025, https://isnr.org/guidelines-for-practice
62. Guidance on Standards for Community Care Network Providers of Biofeedback/Neurofeedback - Whole Health, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.va.gov/wholehealth/professional-resources/Guidance_CCN_Biofeedback_Neurofeedback.asp
63. Neurofeedback, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.southcarolinablues.com/web/public/brands/medicalpolicy/external-policies/neurofeedback/
64. Clinical Policy: Neurofeedback for Behavioral Health Disorders, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.healthnet.com/static/general/unprotected/pdfs/national/policies/Neurofeedback.pdf
65. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT): What It Is & Techniques - Cleveland Clinic, accessed June 23, 2025, https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/treatments/21208-cognitive-behavioral-therapy-cbt
66. What is Cognitive Behavioral Therapy? - American Psychological Association, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.apa.org/ptsd-guideline/patients-and-families/cognitive-behavioral
67. Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) - NHS, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.nhs.uk/mental-health/talking-therapies-medicine-treatments/talking-therapies-and-counselling/cognitive-behavioural-therapy-cbt/
68. Depression Treatments for Adults, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.apa.org/depression-guideline/adults
69. Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Generalised Anxiety Disorder (GAD) and Panic Disorder (PD) - PMC, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5310105/
70. APA clinical practice guideline development - American Psychological Association, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.apa.org/about/offices/directorates/guidelines/clinical-practice
71. Clinical Practice Guideline for the Assessment and Treatment of Children and Adolescents With Anxiety Disorders - PubMed, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32439401/
72. Study finds CBT offers long-term benefits for people with depression, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.psych.ox.ac.uk/news/study-finds-cbt-offers-long-term-benefits-for-people-with-depression
73. Treating and Dealing with ADHD | FDA, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.fda.gov/consumers/consumer-updates/treating-and-dealing-adhd
74. ADHD Medications Approved by the US FDA (infographic) - CHADD, accessed

June 23, 2025, https://chadd.org/about-adhd/adhd-medications-approved-by-the-us-fda/
75. FDA approves multiple generics of ADHD and BED treatment, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.fda.gov/drugs/news-events-human-drugs/fda-approves-multiple-generics-adhd-and-bed-treatment
76. FDA Updates Viloxazine Label for ADHD - Pharmacy Times, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.pharmacytimes.com/view/fda-updates-viloxazine-label-for-adhd
77. FDA Approves First Nonstimulant Medication for ADHD Treatment | Psychiatric News, accessed June 23, 2025, https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/full/10.1176/pn.37.24.0021b
78. Major Depressive Disorder Treatment Guidelines in America and ..., accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.psychiatrist.com/jcp/major-depressive-disorder-treatment-guidelines-america/
79. Major depressive disorder: Validated treatments and future challenges - PMC, accessed June 23, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8610877/
80. Neurofeedback Market Challenges and Opportunities - Coherent Market Insights, accessed June 23, 2025, https://www.coherentmarketinsights.com/market-insight/neurofeedback-systems-market-5506/market-challenges-and-opportunities