Ecology & Evolution | Mar 19, 2026 | 8 min read | By Bryan White

The First Neurobots: Integrating Nervous Systems into Biohybrid Machines

Biology * AI

Synthetic Morphology and the Lineage of Living Machines

While traditional robotics relies on inorganic metals, silicon, and polymers that lack self-repair or metabolic autonomy, the synthesis of developmental biology, computer science, and bioengineering has established the field of synthetic morphology: utilizing living cells to build programmable biological machines. This paradigm produced the first "xenobots" in 2020 -- millimeter-sized multicellular constructs derived from the embryonic cells of the African clawed frog, Xenopus laevis.[1] First-generation xenobots used evolutionary algorithms on the Deep Green supercomputer to design top-down configurations of passive epidermal cells and contractile cardiac muscle cells.[2][7][8] Second-generation "standard biobots" (Xenobots 2.0) and human tracheal "Anthrobots" shifted to bottom-up self-assembly, repurpose-differentiating surface cilia as microscopic oars for rapid aqueous locomotion and self-healing without muscular tissue.[6][7][10]

Despite their autonomy, early biobots lacked a centralized information-processing architecture, restricting their movements to uncoordinated surface ciliary beating.[4] In the spring of 2026, a landmark study in Advanced Science reported the creation of the first "neurobots" -- self-organizing cellular robots equipped with functional, internally integrated nervous systems.[4][9] By implanting neural precursor cells into host biobots during a precise morphogenesis window, researchers demonstrated that dense neural networks can spontaneously wire themselves inside a synthetic embodiment.[4][9] This report analyzes the embryological construction, anatomical innervation, electrophysiological dynamics, and phylostratigraphic transcriptomics of neurobots within synthetic biology and evolutionary developmental biology.

Embryonic Sourcing and the Morphogenetic Construction Paradigm

Constructing a neurobot requires exploiting a transient 30-minute morphogenetic window during embryogenesis.[9] Researchers excise the animal cap -- undifferentiated ectodermal tissue -- from a Nieuwkoop and Faber stage 9 Xenopus laevis embryo.[9] Upon excision, the flat epithelial sheet curls inward into an open cup before sealing into a sphere.[9] While normal animal cap cells default to epidermal fate, mechanically dissociating donor animal caps (from ~50 embryos) into single cells and maintaining separation for 3 hours deprives them of intercellular signaling, inducing cellular differentiation into a default neural fate.[9]

These neural-destined cells are reaggregated into dense precursor clusters and implanted into the open cavity of the curling host cap before it heals shut.[4][9] To isolate neural effects from mechanical tissue addition, researchers constructed "sham neurobots" by reaggregating dissociated donor cells within 30 minutes -- preserving their non-neural ectodermal fate prior to implantation.[9]

Anatomical Integration and Macroscopic Morphological Shifts

By day three post-surgery, neurobots develop surface multiciliated cells and initiate autonomous swimming.[9] Confocal microscopy and immunostaining against acetylated alpha-tubulin confirmed that implanted precursors differentiate into mature neurons with defined somata, long axonal projections, and branched dendritic arbors.[5][9] Robust expression of synapsin-1 and MAP2 (Microtubule-Associated Protein 2) verified active synapse formation.[9] Crucially, axons project outward through the host interior to establish peripheral innervation with four surface cell types: (1) Multiciliated Cells (MCCs) driving propulsion, (2) mucus-secreting goblet cells, (3) ionocytes regulating epithelial electrochemical gradients, and (4) Small Secretory Cells (SSCs) modulating ciliary beating.[4]

Active neural branching also reshapes macroscopic body morphology. While standard biobots and sham neurobots remain highly spherical (high Roundness Index), true neurobots grow significantly larger in area (Kruskal-Wallis test, $p = 0.0007$) and assume an elongated, asymmetrical geometry (lower Roundness Index, $p = 0.047$) by day six, demonstrating bidirectional morphogenetic cross-talk between the developing neural network and its host body.[9]

| Morphological Metric | | Standard Biobots | | Sham Neurobots (Control) | | True Neurobots (Neural Implant) | | Statistical Significance |

| Cellular Composition | | Ectodermal cells | | Ectodermal + Non-neural implant | | Ectodermal + Neural precursor cells | | N/A |

| Internal Neural Projections | | Absent | | Absent | | Dense axonal and dendritic networks | | N/A |

| Peripheral Innervation | | None | | None | | Extensive (MCCs, Goblet, Ionocytes, SSCs) | | N/A |

| Roundness Index (Shape) | | High (Highly spherical) | | High (Highly spherical) | | Low (Significantly elongated) | | Kruskal-Wallis test, $p = 0.047$ [9] |

| Overall Construct Size | | Baseline Area | | Baseline Area | | Significantly larger area | | Kruskal-Wallis test, $p = 0.0007$ [9] |

Electrophysiological Validation and Pharmacological Probing

Automated kinematic tracking revealed that neurobots exhibit significantly higher minimum movement speeds -- spending far less time idle -- and execute complex, repeating behavioral motifs compared to the simple circular loops of standard biobots.[4][9] To confirm electrical action potentials, researchers expressed the genetically encoded calcium indicator GCaMP6s in donor neural cells.[9] Live fluorescence imaging at 5 frames per second over 10-minute intervals demonstrated synchronized bursts of intracellular calcium signaling across distant regions of the internal neural circuit.[5][9]

Definitive proof of neural motor governance came from pharmacological probing with pentylenetetrazole (PTZ), a central nervous system stimulant that antagonizes inhibitory GABA-A receptors.[9][11] In non-neuronal biobots, PTZ exhibited baseline epithelial toxicity, significantly depressing ciliary beating and slowing

motility.[4] In neurobots, however, blocking GABA-A inhibitory brakes disinhibited the internal neural network, generating overriding axonal motor commands to surface MCCs that produced hypermotility and heightened movement complexity.[4]

| Organism Type | | Baseline Motility | | Internal Nervous System | | Expected PTZ Effect (Direct Cellular Toxicity) | | Actual PTZ Movement Response | | Conclusion |

| Standard Biobot | | Continuous, simple | | Absent | | Decreased ciliary beating | | Significantly decreased motility | | Drug exhibits baseline epithelial toxicity. |

| Neurobot | | Continuous, complex | | Present (GABA-A active) | | Decreased ciliary beating | | Heterogeneous; Increased complexity & hypermotility | | Disinhibited neural network overrides peripheral cell toxicity. |

Transcriptomic Variability and Phylostratigraphic Reversion

Comparative transcriptomics via high-throughput RNA sequencing revealed that liberating cells from standard embryonic morphogen gradients triggers intense "exploratory adaptation" across the cellular collective.[4][12] When researchers quantified inter-individual gene expression variance across sample pools using the Coefficient of Variation (CV -- defined as the standard deviation of gene counts divided by the mean expression count across pools), synthetic constructs exhibited substantially higher transcriptomic variability than age-matched wild-type frog embryos across 96.06% of all expressed genes.[9][12] Across 100 expression-percentile bins, permutation tests confirmed that the synthetic construct distribution (mean CVX = 2.6115) vastly exceeded the tightly regulated natural embryo distribution (mean CVE = 1.2537), with neural precursor integration in neurobots amplifying this transcriptional space exploration even further beyond the baseline biobot.[9][12]

Alongside expected upregulations in axon guidance and synaptic assembly pathways, RNA sequencing uncovered a remarkable emergent phenomenon: despite being millimeter-wide spheres of skin and neural tissue completely devoid of eyes, retinas, or lenses, neurobots spontaneously upregulated large genetic cascades governing the Xenopus visual system, photoreceptor differentiation, and optical phototransduction signaling.[4] This indicates that the self-organizing neural network molecularly anticipates environmental perception and prepares the biochemical machinery for visually guided phototaxis even in the absence of optical organs.[4]

Furthermore, applying phylostratigraphy -- a computational bioinformatics method that assigns each gene in the genome to its ancestral evolutionary stratum across the phylogenetic tree of life -- revealed a profound transcriptomic shift toward deep evolutionary antiquity.[9] Approximately 54% of all significantly upregulated genes in neurobots belonged to the two oldest cellular strata (shared with unicellular life and bacteria), with 941 ancient genes upregulated versus only 279 downregulated.[9] Differentially expressed transcripts were heavily enriched in Metazoan (multicellularity), Eumetazoan (primitive epithelia and diffuse nerve nets), and Bilaterian (early centralized neural cords) strata, while modern Xenopus laevis-specific developmental pathways were actively suppressed.[9][12]

| Evolutionary Stratum | | Evolutionary Milestone | | Neurobot Gene Expression Trend

(vs. Biobot) | | Percentage of Total Upregulated Genes |

| All Living Organisms | | Basal cellular mechanics | | Highly Upregulated | | ~54% (Combined with next oldest strata) |

| Metazoa | | First multicellularity | | Significantly Enriched | | 941 ancient genes upregulated vs. 279 downregulated [9] |

| Eumetazoa | | First true tissues/nerve nets | | Significantly Enriched | | Enriched ancestral nerve-net pathways [12] |

| Bilateria | | First centralized nervous cords | | Significantly Enriched | | Enriched ancestral neural-cord pathways [12] |

| Xenopus laevis | | Modern, species-specific | | Downregulated / Suppressed | | N/A |

Implications for Evolution and Regenerative Medicine

The spontaneous assembly of a functional, electrically active, and behavior-modulating nervous system inside an engineered body plan demonstrates that complex biological teleonomy is not restricted to phenotypes sculpted by eons of gradual natural selection.[4][13] Faced with an unprecedented morphological configuration that has never existed in Earth's evolutionary history, wild-type amphibian cells abandon species-specific tadpole developmental subroutines and query deeply conserved Eumetazoan and Bilaterian genetic toolkits to coordinate diffuse nerve nets with ciliated epithelia in real time.[12]

Beyond challenging evolutionary dogma, neurobots provide a highly tractable, deeply observable sandbox for stem cell biology and regenerative medicine.[5] Decoding the bioelectric and transcriptomic rules that enable implanted neural precursors to navigate dense host tissue and innervate peripheral targets offers a direct blueprint for programming human stem cells to bridge severed spinal cords or repair ischemic brain injuries.[4][5] Ultimately, biodegradable neurobots -- potentially sustained beyond their 10-day maternal yolk window to express functional photosensitivity -- establish a foundation for autonomous living micro-machines capable of targeted drug delivery and arterial lipid plaque clearance without inorganic toxicity.[3][4]

Updates... (Nov 22, 2026): Corrected Ref [6] (University of Vermont, Mar 31, 2021) from a misdated 2026 label to its true 2021 Xenobots 2.0 publication date and realigned 2026 neurobot immunostaining, GCaMP6s, and PTZ citations to Fotowat et al. (2026) Ref [9] and Tufts Now (Mar 16, 2026) Ref [5]; earlier (Nov 15, 2026) added the Advanced Science DOI.

Works Cited

* [1] Building Xenobots from Frog Cells | The Scientist (2024), https://www.the-scientist.com/a-leap-towards-building-synthetic-organisms-71715

* [2] Cells Form Into 'Xenobots' on Their Own - Quanta Magazine (2021), https://www.quantamagazine.org/cells-form-into-xenobots-on-their-own-20210331/

* [3] Living robots built using frog cells - ScienceDaily (2020), https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2020/01/200113175653.htm

* [4] Advancing Autonomous, Self-Organizing Biological Robots Equipped with Nervous Systems - Bioengineer.org (Mar 16, 2026), https://bioengineer.org/advancing-autonomous-self-organizing-biological-robots-equipped-with-nervous-systems/

* [5] Scientists Create Novel Organism with Primitive Nervous System - Tufts Now (Mar 16, 2026), https://now.tufts.edu/2026/03/16/scientists-create-novel-organism-primitive-nervous-system

* [6] Scientists Create the Next Generation of Living Robots - University of Vermont (Mar 31, 2021), https://www.uvm.edu/uvmnews/news/scientists-create-next-generation-living-robots

* [7] Kriegman, S., Blackiston, D., Levin, M., & Bongard, J. (2020). A scalable pipeline for designing reconfigurable organisms. PNAS, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910837117

* [8] Scientists Create the Next Generation of Living Robots & Xenobots 2.0 - Wyss Institute (2021), https://wyss.harvard.edu/news/team-builds-first-living-robots-that-can-reproduce/

* [9] Fotowat, H., O'Neill, K., Pio-Lopez, L., Sperry, M. M., Erickson, P. D., Lin, Z., & Levin, M. (2026). Engineered Living Systems With Self-Organizing Neural Networks: From Anatomy to Behavior and Gene Expression. Advanced Science, https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202508967

* [10] Gumuskaya, G., Srivastava, P., Cooper, B. G., Lesser, H., Semegran, B., Garnier, S., & Levin, M. (2023). Motile Living Biobots Self-Construct from Adult Human Somatic Progenitor Seed Cells. Advanced Science, https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202303575

* [11] Toward autonomous self-organizing biological robots with a nervous system - Wyss Institute (2026), https://wyss.harvard.edu/news/toward-autonomous-self-organizing-biological-robots-with-a-nervous-system/

* [12] Pai, V. P., Pio-Lopez, L., Sperry, M. M., Erickson, P., & Levin, M. (2025). Basal Xenobot transcriptomics reveals changes and novel control modality in cells freed from organismal influence. Communications Biology, https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-025-08086-9

* [13] Clawson, W. P., & Levin, M. (2022). Endless forms most beautiful 2.0: teleonomy and the bioengineering of chimaeric and synthetic organisms. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/blac073