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The articles in this special issue of Court Review provide the reader with a broad introduction to the emerging field of Law and Neuroscience. Many of these articles are specifically adapted and updated from previous publications for Court Review readers; others were written specifically for this issue.

The special issue begins with an overview article by professors Owen Jones, Joshua Buckholtz, Jeffrey Schall, and René Marois—whose collective expertise spans law, biology, psychology, and neuroscience—surveying the ways in which brain science has been, and continues to be, integrated into law. The next article, by law professor David Faigman, places attention on one of the most difficult challenges inherent in neurolaw: what can the legal system reasonably infer about individuals before the court from group-based neuroscience data?

The next article, by lawyer and psychiatrist Susan Rushing, explores questions of admissibility in the illustrative context of Positron Emission Tomography (PET), which courts have encountered for some years. The issue then shifts to consider two special topics where neuroscience research may have great import for law: adolescent brain development and pain. Psychologist Laurence Steinberg, a leading authority on adolescent development, discusses how the science should (and should not) be applied. Law professor Amanda Pustilnik then explores both the promise and limitations of using pain neuroimaging research to resolve legal disputes.

Law professor and psychologist Stephen Morse looks to the future of neurolaw in the next article, cautioning against over-enthusiasm but pointing out areas where neuroscience contributions may be most salient.

The issue concludes with law professor Francis Shen’s essay summarizing a compendium of resources, for background information or for more extensive consultation, related to neuroscience in the courtroom.

The preparation of this special issue was aided, in part, by support from the MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Law and Neuroscience (www.lawneuro.org).—Francis X. Shen and Owen D. Jones