



## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

## COSMETIC NEUROLOGY: THE ETHICS OF THE “A+ PILL”

Dr. Aman Khandelwal

Assistant Teacher, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan,  
Aman3238@gmail.com

Shreya Rani

Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan  
shreyarani23005@gmail.com

Asma Mohammed

Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan,  
asma006mohammed@gmail.com

K. A. Aarzo Gafoor,

Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan  
aarzoogafoor14@gmail.com

Kanchigheid Mehar Fatima Ibrahim,

Medical Student, Samarkand state medical university, Uzbekistan,  
meharfatima22564@gmail.com

### Abstract

The human brain has long been considered the final frontier of medical science—the one organ that defines our identity, our capabilities, and our potential. For decades, neurology focused primarily on restoring function lost to disease or injury. However, the twenty-first century has witnessed the emergence of a provocative new subspecialty: **cosmetic neurology**, a term coined to describe the

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

use of pharmaceutical and technological interventions not to heal, but to enhance already healthy cognitive function . At the center of this paradigm shift lies a deceptively simple question: If a pill could reliably transform a B+ student into an A+ performer, should we take it?

**Keywords:** Cosmetic neurology, cognitive enhancement, nootropics, neuroethics, academic performance, pharmaceutical ethics, modafinil, methylphenidate, fairness in education, neuroenhancement

### Introduction

The human brain has long been considered the final frontier of medical science—the one organ that defines our identity, our capabilities, and our potential. For decades, neurology focused primarily on restoring function lost to disease or injury. However, the twenty-first century has witnessed the emergence of a provocative new subspecialty: **cosmetic neurology**, a term coined to describe the use of pharmaceutical and technological interventions not to heal, but to enhance already healthy cognitive function . At the center of this paradigm shift lies a deceptively simple question: If a pill could reliably transform a B+ student into an A+ performer, should we take it?

The so-called “**A+ Pill**”—a metaphorical stand-in for pharmacological cognitive enhancers (PCEs) such as methylphenidate, modafinil, and amphetamine salts—has migrated from science fiction into campus dormitories and corporate boardrooms. What began as treatment for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and narcolepsy has evolved into an off-label culture of neuroenhancement among cognitively healthy individuals seeking competitive advantage . This phenomenon raises profound ethical questions that transcend medicine and enter the domains of education, social justice, and human identity. This article examines the landscape of cosmetic neurology, evaluating the efficacy, risks, and societal implications of cognitive enhancement. It explores

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

whether the “A+ Pill” represents a legitimate tool for human flourishing or a pharmacological shortcut that undermines the integrity of achievement, exacerbates inequality, and fundamentally alters what it means to be authentically human.

### 1. Defining Cosmetic Neurology and the “A+ Pill”

Cosmetic neurology represents a conceptual inversion of traditional medical ethics. Whereas conventional neurology seeks to return patients to a baseline of normal functioning, cosmetic neurology aspires to push healthy individuals beyond their natural cognitive limits. The field draws direct parallels to cosmetic surgery: just as rhinoplasty reshapes a functioning nose, cognitive enhancers reshape a functioning mind.

The “A+ Pill” is not a single compound but rather a constellation of substances used off-label for enhancement purposes. These include prescription stimulants originally developed for pathological conditions, now repurposed by students, professionals, and even military personnel to augment memory, concentration, and wakefulness. The nomenclature itself—“smart drugs,” “study drugs,” “academic steroids”—reveals the cultural framing of these substances as performance multipliers rather than therapeutic agents.

The philosophical implications are staggering. If cognitive enhancement becomes normalized, society may witness a redefinition of “normal” itself. The baseline of human cognitive capability could shift upward, creating a new standard of expected performance that renders the unenhanced brain functionally disabled by comparison. This prospect transforms cosmetic neurology from an individual choice into a collective societal experiment with unpredictable long-term consequences.

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/5>



Conceptual image of cognitive enhancement: a pill capsule releasing gears into a human brain silhouette, representing the mechanical enhancement of mental function

Figure 1: The conceptual promise of cognitive enhancement—pharmacological intervention as a mechanism for optimized brain function. Image courtesy of eClinicalMedicine, The Lancet.

### 2. The Pharmacological Landscape of Cognitive Enhancement

Understanding the ethical debate requires familiarity with the substances at its center. The current market for cognitive enhancers spans prescription medications, over-the-counter supplements, and experimental compounds. While efficacy varies considerably, the most commonly abused substances in academic settings fall into three primary categories.

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/5>

**Table 1: Common Pharmacological Cognitive Enhancers and Their Profiles**

Substance	Primary Medical Indication	Mechanism of Action	Claimed Enhancement Effects	Key Risks & Side Effects
<b>Methylphenidate (Ritalin, Concerta)</b>	ADHD, narcolepsy	Dopamine and norepinephrine reuptake inhibition	Increased focus, sustained attention, reduced fatigue	Tachycardia, hypertension, anxiety, sleep disturbance, dependence potential
<b>Mixed Amphetamine Salts (Adderall)</b>	ADHD	Catecholamine release and reuptake inhibition	Enhanced concentration, alertness, motivation	Cardiovascular strain, mood disturbances, addiction, psychosis at high doses
<b>Modafinil (Provigil)</b>	Narcolepsy, shift work sleep disorder	Orexin/hypocretin system modulation; dopaminergic effects	Wakefulness, improved executive function, working memory enhancement	Headache, nausea, skin reactions, potential for misuse
<b>Piracetam &amp; Racetams</b>	Cognitive impairment (off-label)	Modulation of acetylcholine and glutamate receptors	Memory enhancement, neuroprotection	Limited efficacy data, insomnia, agitation
<b>Caffeine/Energy Drinks</b>	General use	Adenosine receptor antagonism	Alertness, mild cognitive boost	Jitteriness, dependency, cardiovascular effects

This table reveals a critical tension: the substances most accessible to students are not necessarily the most effective, nor the safest. Research indicates that while prescription stimulants offer modest improvements in cognitive performance for healthy individuals, these gains are often limited to specific domains such as sustained attention rather than global intelligence enhancement. Moreover, the side effect profiles—ranging from cardiovascular stress to psychological dependence—present material risks to otherwise healthy brains.

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>



Ritalin LA 20mg bottle, a commonly prescribed methylphenidate formulation  
Figure 2: Methylphenidate (Ritalin), one of the most frequently diverted prescription stimulants for academic enhancement. Image courtesy of Neuroscience Marketing.

### 3. The Ethical Fault Lines

The debate surrounding cosmetic neurology is not merely medical; it is fundamentally moral. Bioethicists have identified several core ethical tensions that frame the discourse on cognitive enhancement.

#### 3.1 Fairness and the “Unlevel Playing Field”

Perhaps the most intuitive objection to the “A+ Pill” is the argument from fairness. If some students have access to cognitive enhancers while others do not, the academic competition becomes fundamentally skewed. This perspective draws deliberate parallels to doping in athletics, where pharmacological advantage is universally condemned as cheating .

However, this analogy is imperfect. Academic life is not a zero-sum game in the same way as competitive sports. Education, in its ideal form, is cooperative: when one student learns more, the collective knowledge of the community increases. Furthermore, “unfair” advantages already permeate academia—private tutoring,

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

superior nutrition, access to quiet study spaces, and socioeconomic privilege all create disparities that society generally tolerates. If we accept these inequalities, the argument goes, why should pharmacological enhancement be uniquely stigmatized?

Yet there is a qualitative difference between environmental advantages and neurochemical ones. A private tutor cannot alter the biological substrate of cognition; a pill fundamentally changes the neural machinery of performance. As one ethicist noted, prescribing stimulants to healthy students enters “unknown territory” because we are deliberately inducing side effects in people who have no medical need for intervention.

### 3.2 Autonomy and Coercion

A subtler but perhaps more pernicious ethical concern is the specter of **indirect coercion**. In a hypercompetitive academic environment where some students use cognitive enhancers, non-users may feel compelled to follow suit simply to remain competitive. This creates a pharmacological arms race in which the choice to enhance is not truly free but rather socially coerced.

The coercion argument operates on multiple levels. First, there is peer pressure: students observing enhanced colleagues achieving superior results may internalize the belief that enhancement is necessary for success. Second, there is structural pressure: as enhancement becomes normalized, the baseline expectations for academic performance may rise, effectively forcing conscientious objectors into a disadvantageous position. As bioethicists Farah and colleagues observed, “merely competing against enhanced co-workers or students exerts an incentive to use neurocognitive enhancement”.

This dynamic threatens the principle of autonomy—the right to make uncoerced decisions about one’s own body and mind. When the alternative to enhancement is perceived failure, choice becomes an illusion.

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

### 3.3 Authenticity and Human Nature

Beyond fairness and autonomy lies a deeper philosophical question: Does pharmacological enhancement compromise human authenticity? The authenticity argument posits that achievements gained through chemical means are somehow less “real” or meaningful than those earned through natural effort .

This perspective resonates with our cultural valorization of hard work and perseverance. We celebrate the student who succeeds through discipline and sacrifice; we are suspicious of the student who succeeds through pharmacological shortcuts. The “A+ Pill” threatens to sever the connection between effort and outcome, potentially devaluing the very accomplishments it produces.

However, critics of the authenticity argument note that humans have always used tools to extend their capabilities. We do not consider eyeglasses inauthentic, nor do we dismiss the achievements of a writer using a computer rather than a quill. The challenge lies in determining whether cognitive enhancers represent a qualitative break from these traditional tools—a line crossed when we modify our neurochemistry rather than our environment .

### 4. The Academic Arena: Prevalence and Patterns

University campuses represent the epicenter of the cosmetic neurology debate. The convergence of intellectual demands, competitive pressure, and youthful risk-taking creates an environment ripe for pharmacological cognitive enhancement.

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

**Table 2: Reported Prevalence of Non-Medical Prescription Stimulant Use Among University Students**

Region/Population	Lifetime Prevalence	Past-Year Prevalence	Primary Motivation	Source Context
United States (general university sample)	5–35%	5–15%	Academic performance, exam preparation	Multiple survey studies
United Kingdom & Ireland	3–10%	2–5%	Study enhancement, competitive advantage	Singh et al. survey
15-Country Cross-Sectional Study	Variable in America (higher in North)	4–8%	Cognitive enhancement during exams	Maier et al.
Medical/Graduate Students	15–20%	10–15%	Sustained focus, workload management	Specialized professional surveys

These figures, while variable due to methodological differences, reveal a consistent pattern: a significant minority of university students engage in non-medical use of prescription stimulants. Notably, prevalence is highest among students in the most competitive programs—medicine, law, and graduate sciences—suggesting that academic pressure is a primary driver of enhancement behavior.

The demographic profile of the typical user challenges common stereotypes. Rather than underperforming students seeking to scrape by, many users are high-achieving individuals seeking to optimize already strong performance. This pattern—enhancing the enhanced—raises particular ethical concerns about the widening gap between the cognitively privileged and everyone else.

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/5>



New York Times illustration depicting two figures playing chess, one whispering to the other, symbolizing the unfair advantage and competitive tension in cognitive enhancement

Figure 3: The competitive tension of cognitive enhancement—when pharmacological advantage enters the academic arena, the nature of fair competition is fundamentally challenged. Illustration by The New York Times.

### 5. Health Risks and the Unknown Horizon

The ethical calculus of cosmetic neurology cannot ignore the physiological stakes. While proponents emphasize the potential benefits of enhancement, the medical reality is more nuanced—and more concerning.

Prescription stimulants carry well-documented acute risks, including elevated heart rate, increased blood pressure, anxiety, and sleep disruption. For healthy young adults whose cardiovascular systems are otherwise robust, these effects may seem trivial. However, the long-term neurodevelopmental consequences of stimulant use in brains that are still maturing remain poorly understood. The adolescent and young adult brain undergoes significant structural and functional

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

remodeling, particularly in the prefrontal cortex—the very region targeted by cognitive enhancers .

Moreover, the risk of dependence and addiction is non-trivial. Regular use of dopaminergic stimulants can lead to tolerance, requiring escalating doses to achieve the same effect, followed by withdrawal symptoms upon cessation . What begins as a tool for exam preparation can evolve into a chemical dependency that outlasts the academic context.

The “off-label” nature of cosmetic neurology presents additional clinical concerns. When physicians prescribe stimulants for ADHD, they operate within established protocols with monitored dosing and regular follow-up. When students obtain these drugs through diversion, purchase them online, or acquire them from peers, they forfeit medical oversight. The result is a population of amateur neurochemists self-experimenting with potent psychoactive substances without understanding individual risk factors, drug interactions, or contraindications .

### 6. Regulatory Responses and Policy Pathways

The regulatory landscape for cognitive enhancers remains fragmented and inadequate. In most jurisdictions, prescription stimulants are controlled substances, yet enforcement of diversion and non-medical use is minimal. Universities, caught between their duty of care to students and their reluctance to police personal behavior, have largely avoided formal policies on cognitive enhancement.

Several regulatory models have been proposed:

**The Prohibition Model:** This approach treats cognitive enhancement in academia similarly to doping in sports, with strict bans, testing, and penalties. While this preserves competitive fairness, it faces significant enforcement challenges. Unlike athletic doping, academic enhancement leaves no

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

physiological trace detectable after a few days, making effective surveillance nearly impossible .

**The Medicalization Model:** Under this framework, cognitive enhancers would be available through regulated medical channels, with physicians evaluating risks and benefits for individual enhancement requests. This preserves some oversight but raises concerns about the medical profession’s complicity in non-therapeutic drug use and the potential for prescription shopping .

**The Libertarian Model:** This perspective argues that cognitively competent adults should have the autonomy to modify their own brains as they see fit, provided they bear the risks. Proponents note that caffeine, a mild cognitive enhancer, is already socially accepted and largely unregulated. However, this model does little to address the societal consequences of widespread enhancement, including coercion and inequality .

**The Harm Reduction Model:** Perhaps the most pragmatic approach, harm reduction acknowledges that enhancement is occurring and seeks to minimize its negative consequences through education, safe-use guidelines, and alternative support systems. This model recognizes that punitive approaches may drive behavior underground while failing to address the root causes of academic pressure .

### Conclusion

The “A+ Pill” is neither the panacea its advocates suggest nor the apocalypse its critics fear. It is, instead, a mirror reflecting the values and anxieties of a society obsessed with optimization, productivity, and competitive advantage. Cosmetic neurology forces us to confront uncomfortable questions about the nature of

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

achievement, the boundaries of medical intervention, and the kind of future we wish to build.

The evidence suggests that current cognitive enhancers offer modest, domain-specific benefits to healthy individuals—benefits that come with real physiological risks and profound ethical costs. The fairness argument, while complicated by existing social inequalities, retains force: pharmacological enhancement threatens to transform education from a test of intellectual development into a contest of chemical access. The coercion argument is perhaps even more compelling; in a world where enhancement is normalized, the freedom to remain unenhanced may become illusory.

Yet prohibition alone is unlikely to succeed. The demand for cognitive advantage is too deeply rooted in the structure of modern academic and professional life. A more sustainable path forward requires a multi-pronged approach: rigorous research into the long-term safety of enhancers, clear university policies that address enhancement without driving it underground, and—most importantly—a cultural shift that values the process of learning as much as its outcomes.

Ultimately, the ethics of the “A+ Pill” cannot be resolved by bioethicists alone. It is a question that belongs to all of us—students, educators, physicians, and citizens. As the technology of neuroenhancement advances, our collective challenge is to ensure that in our pursuit of smarter brains, we do not lose sight of what makes us human: our capacity for effort, our resilience in struggle, and our ability to find meaning in achievement that is authentically our own.

### References

1. Exploring Cognitive Enhancers: from neurotherapeutics to ethical and regulatory challenges: a mini review. PMC, 2025. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12333774/>
2. Tomažič, T., & Kovačič Čelofiga, A. Ethical aspects of the abuse of pharmaceutical enhancements by healthy people in the context of improving

## Eureka Journal of Health Sciences & Medical Innovation (EJHSMI)

ISSN 2760-4942 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 4, April 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/5>

- cognitive functions. PMC,  
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6482530/>
3. Cakic, V. Smart drugs for cognitive enhancement: ethical and pragmatic considerations in the era of cosmetic neurology. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 2009. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19793941/>
  4. Ethical issues with cognitive enhancement. *South African Family Practice Journal*, <https://safpj.co.za/index.php/safpj/article/download/4672/5584>
  5. Vetturini, F. Pharmacological Cognitive Enhancement among healthy university students: conceptual definitions, empirical aspects and ethical issues. LUISS University Dissertation, 2019/2020. [https://tesi.luiss.it/28400/1/084992\\_VETTURINI\\_FRANCESCA.pdf](https://tesi.luiss.it/28400/1/084992_VETTURINI_FRANCESCA.pdf)
  6. Cognitive Enhancement in Education: The State of the Issue. Center for Bioethics & Human Dignity, <https://cbhd.org/dignitas-articles/cognitive-enhancement-in-education-the-state-of-the-issue>
  7. The Ethical Implications of Cognitive Enhancers. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 2021, Vol. 58, No 1, pp. 54-63. <https://gssrr.org/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/download/12380/5982/37911>