

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE

Medical Concept Papers

57 investigations across cerebrovascular science, neuropsychiatry, bile physiology, metabolic medicine, infection, vaccine evidence, and medical AI

VOLUME TWO · COMPLETE NEW-IDEAS COLLECTION · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Open access for reading. These essays are conceptual research perspectives, not new clinical trial reports, systematic reviews, or peer-reviewed journal articles. Reader discretion and appropriate medical care remain essential.

Contents

00 • Foundational systems-medicine thesis

01. The Disease Is the Final Event: Compensation, Clearance and the Threshold of Clinical Failure

01 • Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport

02. The Stroke Begins Outside the Brain
03. When Cholesterol Cannot Leave the Body: The Sitosterolemia Experiment
04. The Bile-Platelet Connection
05. The FXR-Ceramide-Atherosclerosis Axis
06. Can Bile Acids Protect the Ischemic Brain?
07. Why Stroke Cannot Be Treated as One Disease
08. When the Visible Thrombus Does Not Explain the Stroke
09. The Artery of Percheron: The Stroke Easily Missed
10. Convulsions After Weakness: Stroke, Seizure or Both?

02 • Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance

11. When Lipid Transport Failure Looks Like Madness
12. The Biological Differential Diagnosis of Psychosis
13. The Blood-Brain Barrier Is a Lipid Transport System
14. The Forgotten Clearance Systems of Alzheimer's Disease
15. Could Bile-Acid Profiles Identify Psychiatric Subtypes?
16. When Parkinson's Disease Is Not Parkinson's Disease
17. Ketones, Mitochondria and the Psychiatric Brain
18. The Postpartum Metabolic Vulnerability Hypothesis
19. Oxalates and Acute Neuropsychiatric Deterioration: A Multi-Hit Hypothesis

03 • Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology

20. The Silent Biliary Dysfunction Hypothesis
21. The Hormones That Govern Bile
22. Cholesterol Disposal as an Essential Metabolic Function
23. The Gut-Liver-Brain Feedback Loop
24. The Detoxification Paradox of Dietary Fiber
25. Medication-Induced Biliary Dysfunction
26. Life Without a Gallbladder

04 • Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk

27. Retinal Vein Occlusion as a Window into Systemic Vascular Disease
28. The Patient with Normal Triglycerides but Elevated ApoB
29. When HbA1c and Fasting Glucose Disagree
30. Endocrine Influences on Microvascular Function
31. Nitric Oxide Is Not a Substitute for Stroke Prevention

05 • Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery

32. When Fat Mobilization Exceeds Elimination
33. The Biology of the Weight-Loss Plateau
34. Fasting and the Brain: What Actually Changes?
35. Electrolyte Physiology During Prolonged Dietary Restriction

- 36. Why Refed Foods Can Produce Unexpected Reactions
- 37. Does a Metabolic Reset Persist After Refeeding?
- 38. The Difference Between Losing Weight and Restoring Health

06 • Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease

- 39. When Infection Masquerades as Autoimmunity
- 40. Parasites, Seizures and Focal Brain Disease
- 41. When a Negative Stool Test Is Not the End of the Investigation
- 42. The Hidden Danger of Strongyloides During Immunosuppression
- 43. Chagas Disease and the Cardioembolic Stroke Pathway
- 44. Parasites, Mast Cells and Eosinophilic Inflammation

07 • Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism

- 45. Does the Childhood Vaccination Schedule Have Adequate Combination-Level Safety Evidence?
- 46. Can Rare Vaccine Adverse Effects Remain Undetected?
- 47. The Problem of Healthy-Vaccinee Bias
- 48. The Susceptible Host Hypothesis in Vaccine Adverse Reactions
- 49. Vaccination, Autoimmunity and Causal Attribution
- 50. Comparing Vaccine Risks with Infection Risks

08 • Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI

- 51. The Body as a Longitudinal Diagnostic Record
- 52. Can AI Recognize Disease Before the Patient Recognizes Illness?
- 53. Visible Signs of Systemic Illness
- 54. Movement as a Neurological Biomarker
- 55. Can Wearables Detect Physiological Deterioration Before Symptoms?
- 56. The Problem of False Positives in AI Health Screening
- 57. The Predictive Terrain Blood Panel

The Disease Is the Final Event: Compensation, Clearance and the Threshold of Clinical Failure

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 00 · Foundational systems-medicine thesis · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Modern clinical practice must name diseases accurately, yet a diagnosis often captures the endpoint of a lengthy biological sequence rather than the first cause. This paper proposes an organizing model for chronic illness built on initiating perturbations, adaptive compensation, altered transport or clearance, accumulated vulnerability, threshold crossing and clinically recognizable disease. It argues that an effective causal explanation should account for why symptoms appear when they do, why people with similar exposures develop different outcomes, and when a protective adaptation becomes maladaptive. The model does not claim a universal hidden toxin, a universal bile blockage or a single cause underlying every diagnosis.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

A cardiovascular event provides one illustration. Years of apoB-particle retention, vascular inflammation and hypertension may proceed without an overt infarct until plaque thrombosis, embolism or another acute trigger occludes sufficient flow. A neuropsychiatric presentation offers another: a rare sterol transport disorder can silently accumulate neurological injury before mood or behavioral symptoms become prominent. The earliest biologically relevant event differs, yet the causal architecture is similar: compensated systems may continue functioning while reserve declines. Defining a disease solely by its last visible manifestation can obscure preventable antecedents, although acute treatment of the final event remains essential.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The model distinguishes six classes of phenomena. An initiating exposure or defect might be an infection, variant transporter, metabolic burden or external injury. Compensatory response might include endocrine feedback, increased transport capacity, collateral circulation or immune remodeling. A bottleneck arises when flow, substrate delivery, repair or waste clearance cannot match demand. Reserve determines how much perturbation a person tolerates before symptoms appear. A trigger—such as an arrhythmia, infection or drug exposure—may precipitate threshold crossing. Finally, a downstream phenotype becomes measurable as infarction, organ failure, severe psychiatric disturbance or clinical deterioration. The terms are not a universal biological law; they are a disciplined checklist intended to prevent incomplete causal stories.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The language of compensation is useful only if it remains mechanistic. The body compensates for a narrowing vessel through altered pressure and collateral circulation; it compensates for reduced circulating fuel through changes in substrate mobilization and hepatic metabolism; it can alter inflammatory and endocrine feedback in response to chronic stressors. These adaptations are not necessarily benevolent, and some become damaging when sustained. Likewise, the term “clearance” encompasses very different routes: renal filtration, biliary secretion, hepatic metabolism, cellular proteolysis and lymphatic or perivascular exchange. A systems model loses its value if all are called detoxification without naming the substance and pathway. Different diseases will require different components of the framework rather than every component at once.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The main challenge is that the framework could become unfalsifiable if every observation is retroactively labeled “terrain.” To avoid that failure, an explanation must specify measurable intermediates, temporal order, relevant compartments and plausible alternatives. A cholesterol-handling hypothesis should predict atherosclerotic rather than every stroke subtype. A bile-brain hypothesis should not infer brain injury from stool color. A nutrient-processing argument must distinguish adequate serum supply from cellular uptake and clinical effect. It must also be possible to say that a simple conventional explanation is sufficient; complexity is not intrinsically superior to parsimony.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The most important criterion is whether the systems map improves a decision. Can it identify a neglected but measurable upstream variable, clarify which diagnostic test is appropriate, explain why an intervention worked in one patient but not another, or prevent a dangerous delay in acute treatment? If not, the map remains philosophy rather than clinical science. Its purpose is to sharpen ordinary causal reasoning, not to replace it with the vocabulary of an unfalsifiable master theory.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The clinical consequence is a two-level approach to medicine. At the point of danger, stabilize and treat the identifiable syndrome using evidence-based emergency care. Outside the acute window, investigate upstream risks that are demonstrable and modifiable, prioritizing interventions with patient-important outcome evidence. This permits imaginative research into overlooked interactions without mistaking speculation for treatment. A good systems explanation is not the one that absorbs every fact into its own vocabulary; it is the one that makes sharper predictions, changes decisions for the better, and remains willing to fail when reality disagrees.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Sitosterolemia: a review and update of pathophysiology, clinical spectrum, diagnosis, and management](#)
2. [Cerebrotendinous Xanthomatosis: Molecular Pathogenesis, Clinical Spectrum, Diagnosis, and Disease-Modifying Treatments](#)

3. Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19

4. Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss

5. Impact of Retinal Vein Occlusion on Stroke Incidence: A Meta-Analysis

Source lineage: Overarching synthesis of Terrain Medicine Handbook and 2026 stroke, metabolism and psychiatric investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Stroke Begins Outside the Brain

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

An ischemic stroke is a neurological emergency, yet the vessel occlusion may be the end of a process that began years earlier in the intestine, liver, heart, vascular wall or coagulation system. This paper presents a multi-compartment model of stroke causation. It distinguishes lipid retention and plaque development from the immediate thrombotic or embolic event, and asks when impaired sterol handling may contribute to the former without directly accounting for the latter.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The phrase “fat cannot be processed” is too vague for causal medicine. Dietary triglycerides normally enter circulation through chylomicrons, while intestinal NPC1L1 and ABCG5/ABCG8 transporters govern sterol uptake and exclusion. The liver redistributes cholesterol in lipoproteins and removes sterol through biliary secretion and bile-acid conversion. Each step has different pathological consequences. Atherogenic apoB-containing particles infiltrate susceptible arterial walls; retained lipoproteins may provoke inflammatory responses and plaque formation. None of this implies that undigested fat collects directly within a brain artery.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A useful model includes five paths: intestinal sterol entry; hepatic lipoprotein production and clearance; endothelial retention of apoB particles; plaque destabilization and platelet-rich thrombosis; and cardioembolism or small-vessel injury arising through separate mechanisms. Rare ABCG5/8 disorders establish that abnormal absorption and biliary excretion can be clinically consequential, but most ischemic strokes are not caused by sitosterolemia. The model therefore treats abnormal clearance as one potential contributor to atherosclerotic stroke, not a unifying explanation for intracranial embolism, dissection or atrial fibrillation.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A sophisticated vascular account must distinguish the source of plaque from the source of the clot. The atheroma develops in a particular arterial environment under sustained exposure to retained lipoproteins, local injury and immune-cell recruitment. A plaque may remain clinically silent until rupture or erosion produces thrombosis, or it may cause critical narrowing without an acute rupture. By contrast, an embolus produced in a fibrillating atrium can occlude a cerebral vessel without needing substantial atherosclerotic plaque in that artery. Bile-acid handling is potentially relevant upstream of lipoprotein biology; it does not by itself explain cardiac rhythm, coagulation or the anatomy of embolization. This nested-cause framework protects both conventional knowledge and original inquiry.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

It would be disproved as a general thesis by stroke subgroups in which plaque biology is irrelevant. Lacunar infarction related to arteriolosclerosis, atrial-fibrillation-associated embolism, and arterial dissection have different proximate mechanisms. Even in atherosclerotic disease, serum cholesterol concentration, apoB burden, hypertension, diabetes, smoking and inherited factors may better explain risk than a presumed bile-flow defect. The distinction between circulating lipoprotein particles and fat malabsorption is indispensable.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

What would distinguish the hypotheses? Evidence for ABCG5/ABCG8 dysfunction or major sterol abnormalities would support a sterol-handling component in an unusual case. Evidence for a left atrial appendage thrombus, atrial fibrillation or a spontaneous cervical artery dissection would favor alternative proximate causes. A convincing explanatory model must identify the stage at which each factor acts, not simply claim that the last event was “downstream.”

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The practical research question is not “does bile blockage cause stroke?” but “which measurable transport phenotype predicts which stroke mechanism after standard risk factors are considered?” Useful measures include apoB, lipoprotein phenotype, relevant genetic findings, hepatic disease when clinically indicated, carotid and intracranial imaging, cardiac rhythm evaluation and stroke-territory concordance. No dietary cleanse should be substituted for acute stroke reperfusion assessment or proven secondary prevention.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Sitosterolemia: a review and update of pathophysiology, clinical spectrum, diagnosis, and management](#)
2. [Sitosterolemia: Twenty Years of Discovery of ABCG5 ABCG8](#)
3. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)

Source lineage: Prior stroke-pathogenesis investigation; Terrain Medicine Handbook

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When Cholesterol Cannot Leave the Body: The Sitosterolemia Experiment

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Sitosterolemia offers a rare but informative demonstration that handling of absorbed sterols—not merely the amount consumed—can alter cardiovascular biology. The disorder results from deficient ABCG5/ABCG8 transport and permits unusual accumulation of plant sterols in plasma and tissues. Its interpretation must remain precise: severe disease may involve very high LDL cholesterol, and the specific causal contribution of phytosterols to atherosclerosis is still debated.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

In ordinary physiology ABCG5 and ABCG8 form a transporter complex in enterocytes and hepatocytes. At the intestinal surface it sends absorbed sterols back into the lumen; in the liver it favors sterol export into bile. Biallelic pathogenic variants impair this dual exclusion mechanism. Patients may present with xanthomas, hemolytic anemia, abnormal platelets, hypercholesterolemia, or premature vascular disease. Standard lipid screening may not measure plant sterols directly, making a misleadingly familiar lipid phenotype possible.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The case illustrates why an exposure cannot be interpreted apart from the receiving organism. Foods containing phytosterols may have cholesterol-lowering effects in typical physiology, yet individuals with sitosterolemia can accumulate abnormal concentrations. This is not evidence that ordinary plant foods poison healthy people; it is evidence that transport genotype changes the biological meaning of exposure. It also creates a model for examining whether milder, heterozygous variants modify sterol metabolism or cardiovascular susceptibility.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The interpretive paradox is that a nutrient-related substance can be benign or useful at ordinary exposure yet pathologic when a transporter fails. Genetics serves as an unusually strong perturbation of a metabolic system; nonetheless, the resulting clinical syndrome combines multiple abnormalities. Depending on genotype and age, severe LDL elevation may dominate some vascular presentations, while increased circulating phytosterols and hematological findings reveal the underlying disease. Treatment experience with reduced sterol absorption helps establish the pathway's clinical importance, although intervention effects do not completely partition the relative causal role of each accumulated molecule. This is why rare diseases are explanatory experiments but not instant proofs of population-wide dietary harm.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Some authors argue that elevated LDL itself is the dominant driver of arterial disease in sitosterolemia, rather than the deposited phytosterols. That criticism limits any dramatic thesis that “plant sterols cause plaque.” The condition's phenotypic heterogeneity and rarity also prevent simple extrapolation to common obesity, stroke or dementia. Clinical reasoning should differentiate severe biallelic disease from broader population variation in cholesterol absorption.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A discriminating observation would compare age, measured plant sterols, LDL particle burden and clinical vascular disease within adequately characterized patients, not merely compare people who do and do not eat vegetables. Studies of heterozygous carriers also need to identify whether any apparent cardiovascular association survives adjustment for conventional lipid risk. The answer might be that sterol exclusion is essential while ordinary dietary phytosterols remain safe for most hosts.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

For the institute, sitosterolemia belongs in an educational paper about causal inference through exceptional diseases. The question is how uncommon transport failures reveal physiologic dependencies that population averages obscure. Clinical recognition requires targeted evaluation and specialist treatment, not blanket avoidance of vegetables or indiscriminate bile stimulation. It is a strong model case precisely because its limits are visible.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Sitosterolemia: a review and update of pathophysiology, clinical spectrum, diagnosis, and management](#)
2. [Sitosterolemia: Twenty Years of Discovery of ABCG5 ABCG8](#)

Source lineage: Stroke and vegetable-chemistry research

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Bile-Platelet Connection

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Bile acids are not confined to digestion. They signal through nuclear and cell-surface receptors and influence inflammatory and vascular biology. This paper examines a narrow frontier possibility: altered bile-acid composition may change the cellular environment in which platelet activation, endothelial dysfunction and thrombosis occur. It does not claim that a sluggish gallbladder directly produces clots or that a bile-acid supplement prevents stroke.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The platelet question requires distinguishing direct interaction with platelets from indirect changes in hepatic lipid output, intestinal endocrine signaling, vascular inflammation and gut microbial metabolites. FXR and GPBAR1/TGR5 are established bile-acid-responsive systems, but receptor expression and functional responses vary by tissue and experimental conditions. Plasma bile-acid composition also changes with meals, disease, medications, microbiota and circadian timing. A single total bile-acid value would poorly characterize this complexity.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Our mechanistic framework places bile-acid species and concentrations upstream of vascular signaling, then asks whether they modify platelet reactivity or endothelial activation independently of hypertension, apoB burden and conventional thrombotic risk. It predicts that receptor-specific effects may be bidirectional: a hydrophobic bile acid at high concentrations can behave quite differently from a physiologic or therapeutically used hydrophilic species. The biological distinction between cholestatic disease and healthy enterohepatic cycling must remain central.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The chemical specificity of bile acids should guide the whole argument. Different conjugation states change solubility and receptor affinity; microbes generate secondary species whose signaling may differ from primary bile acids. Platelets circulate in a dynamic fluid exposed to shear forces, coagulation factors and endothelial signals, so an effect seen in isolated platelets need not survive in whole blood. Conversely, a hepatic change in lipid distribution may alter vascular risk without a direct platelet receptor effect. Separating direct and indirect action avoids a mistaken inference that every altered platelet result can be traced back to bile secretion.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The hypothesis is vulnerable to several major alternatives. Platelet activation is chiefly regulated by collagen, thrombin, ADP, thromboxane and shear-dependent pathways; atrial fibrillation and mechanical vascular injury may cause thrombosis without a bile-specific intermediate. Observed bile-acid differences after stroke may result from acute illness, altered feeding and medication rather than precede the event. Mechanistic experiments would need prospective temporality and clinically relevant concentrations.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The most informative evidence would compare defined bile-acid species at physiologic concentrations with platelet aggregation and vascular biomarkers, while controlling for statins, antiplatelet therapy, renal function, diabetes and inflammatory disease. If only supraphysiologic concentrations generate the effect, or if the association disappears after liver disease is considered, the proposed clinical interpretation would weaken substantially. The boundary between receptor possibility and proven stroke prevention remains large.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

An appropriate conceptual endpoint is a map of unanswered vascular-receptor questions, not a recommendation for empiric “bile thinning.” Stroke prevention depends on matching treatment to mechanism, and anticoagulants, antiplatelets, lipid lowering and reperfusion have distinct indications. Bile-acid signaling deserves investigation because it intersects with multiple relevant systems—not because it has displaced those established pathways.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [FXR signaling in the enterohepatic system](#)

Source lineage: Stroke investigation and bile-acid signaling discussion

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The FXR-Ceramide-Atherosclerosis Axis

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Atherogenesis is often discussed in terms of cholesterol alone. Yet hepatointestinal bile-acid receptors regulate lipid synthesis, glucose homeostasis and inflammatory signaling. This paper proposes a conditional model in which FXR-dependent changes in circulating metabolites, including ceramide species, could modify vascular risk. The focus is on causal architecture rather than any claim that a single receptor determines stroke risk.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Bile acids activate intestinal FXR, induce FGF19 signaling and suppress hepatic bile-acid synthesis through feedback to CYP7A1. Intestinal and hepatic FXR signaling are not identical, and manipulations can alter microbial ecology and systemic lipid metabolism. Ceramides form part of membrane biology and signaling pathways implicated in metabolic dysfunction. Connecting these domains requires specifying the compartment: ileal FXR activation, portal endocrine signals, hepatic lipid synthesis and aortic plaque biology cannot be merged into one undefined “bile pathway.”

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The proposed causal chain has multiple forks. Bile-acid composition may alter intestinal FXR activity; FXR may change endocrine feedback and lipid metabolism; selected ceramide pools may correlate with atherogenic particle biology or inflammatory injury. It is equally plausible that insulin resistance or liver disease drives both bile-acid and ceramide changes without one mediating the other. This paper therefore emphasizes measurable mediators, experimental receptor specificity and the difference between association and mediation.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The network is highly compartmentalized. Intestinal FXR regulates endocrine signals reaching the liver; hepatic FXR alters transporter and synthetic gene expression; circulating ceramide species reflect multiple tissue contributions. Even a well-controlled animal experiment may manipulate several pathways simultaneously by changing the bile-acid pool itself. To establish mediation rather than co-movement, the causal chain must survive selective blockade or rescue of the proposed intermediate. Human plasma lipidomics can identify associations but does not reveal the source tissue or determine whether a particular species is harmful, protective or merely a marker of metabolic distress.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Receptor agonists can have mixed therapeutic and adverse effects depending on disease context. Animal knockout or pharmacologic studies are not direct proof of cerebrovascular prevention in humans, and measured plasma ceramides cannot automatically establish a causal driver. Intrahepatic cholestasis and metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease also change receptor signaling in ways that resist simple “more is better” conclusions.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The decisive observations would include receptor-specific perturbations, longitudinal measurements of individual ceramide species, and cardiovascular outcomes matched to the experimental model. If changing FXR signaling alters ceramides but not plaque biology, the proposed mediator may be incidental. If effects disappear when LDL burden is held constant, a simpler atherogenic pathway may be sufficient. The aim is to specify precisely what FXR adds to existing causal knowledge.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The intellectually useful claim is that cholesterol transport, endocrine bile feedback and membrane lipid signaling may interact in atherogenesis. The clinical application remains investigative; lipid lowering and established cardiovascular risk modification should not be displaced. Future mechanistic synthesis should ask which receptor–ceramide associations survive adjustment for apoB, hepatic disease, diabetes and medication exposure.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [FXR signaling in the enterohepatic system](#)
2. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)

Source lineage: Stroke, biliary physiology and cardiometabolic research

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Can Bile Acids Protect the Ischemic Brain?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Some bile-acid species and derivatives are being studied for cellular stress responses, mitochondrial function and inflammation in neural injury. This paper examines the provocative possibility that the same enterohepatic molecules involved in digestion and metabolic signaling might alter neuronal resilience after ischemia. It separates effects on cell survival after stroke from prevention of a clot that produces stroke.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

An ischemic event deprives tissue of oxygen and glucose, initiating energy failure, glutamate-mediated excitotoxicity, calcium imbalance, oxidative stress and inflammation. Restoration of perfusion is time-critical, but reperfusion itself can create additional stress. A compound that affects apoptotic signaling or cellular membranes in an experimental preparation might improve measured injury without having any effect on arterial blockage, platelet activation or long-term disability. That separation is foundational to interpretation.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A realistic neuroprotection model must name the species, formulation, dose, timing, access across the blood-brain barrier and stroke model. “Bile acids are protective” cannot be generalized across hydrophobic and hydrophilic species. Their membrane interactions, receptor affinities and potential toxicity differ greatly. The plausibility of targeting inflammation does not resolve whether a compound reaches ischemic human tissue at safe concentrations or improves functional recovery beyond contemporary care.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The distinction between rescuing stressed tissue and preventing vascular injury has therapeutic significance. Neurons in the ischemic core may be irreversibly damaged, while the penumbra is potentially salvageable if reperfusion occurs in time. Experimental neuroprotective molecules could act on mitochondrial membranes, programmed-cell-death pathways or neuroinflammation, but activity in a cell line does not prove access to the penumbra. Blood-brain barrier disruption after stroke may change access over time, yet this same process can worsen edema and introduce confounding. The time window, route of administration and location of action are not secondary details; they define whether the mechanism could possibly matter.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Many compounds reduce infarct size in rodent studies but do not become effective clinical stroke therapies. Animal lesion size is not interchangeable with independent living, cognitive outcomes or survival. Moreover, the bile-acid profile measured after stroke can reflect fasting, hepatic stress, antibiotics or critical illness. Such associations might be consequences, not antecedents or protective factors.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A rigorous paper would rank evidence from molecular models, animals with functional testing, observational human biomarker studies and clinical trials. The hypothesis would be substantially weakened if a compound only works before an experimentally induced stroke or at concentrations incompatible with safe human exposure. A valid human claim requires improvement in disability or survival beyond standard treatment, not merely a smaller lesion in an animal experiment.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper's contribution is a two-axis classification: vascular-event causation versus neural-injury modulation. It encourages precise questions while making clear that these ideas do not justify delaying emergency imaging, thrombolysis assessment or thrombectomy where indicated. The field should judge neuroprotective strategies by human functional outcomes, not by compelling molecular narratives alone.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [Mfsd2a is critical for the formation and function of the blood-brain barrier](#)

Source lineage: Prior investigation of bile acids and brain-cell protection

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Why Stroke Cannot Be Treated as One Disease

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

“Stroke” describes a clinical syndrome, not a single etiology. Ischemic arterial occlusion, intracranial hemorrhage, cerebral venous thrombosis and stroke mimics require different reasoning and sometimes mutually incompatible treatments. This paper argues that any root-cause theory of stroke must be partitioned by mechanism before it can be evaluated.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

For ischemic disease the relevant etiologies include large-artery atherosclerosis, cardioembolism, small-vessel occlusion, arterial dissection, prothrombotic disorders and other determined or undetermined causes. Even within one broad category, a proximal embolus and local in-situ thrombosis imply different preventive strategies. The central distinction is between predisposition, vessel event and brain response: hypertension can increase small-vessel risk; atrial fibrillation can generate emboli; infarct size and collateral flow shape outcome.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A terrain-based explanation can contribute if it identifies a measurable upstream exposure that maps onto a recognized phenotype. For example, cholesterol-handling abnormalities are more directly relevant to atherosclerotic mechanisms than to traumatic dissection. An infection-associated cardiomyopathy may lead to cardioembolism, whereas a retinal vascular event may signal systemic risk without revealing the precise causal pathway. Mechanism-specific thinking prevents one attractive explanation from becoming universal.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Classification is not just taxonomy; it predicts different interventions. Large-artery disease may motivate evaluation of local stenosis and plaque, atrial fibrillation may require anticoagulation, and hemorrhagic stroke makes some antithrombotic interventions immediately hazardous. Small-vessel pathology is strongly shaped by longstanding vascular risk, while dissection involves a lesion in the arterial wall. There are also mixed-mechanism patients: an older person can have carotid plaque and intermittent atrial fibrillation together. The clinician must determine which abnormality explains the current event and whether both require prevention. An inclusive systems theory should make this differentiation easier, not erase it.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Stroke-like deficits can result from seizures, hypoglycemia, migraine and functional neurological symptoms. Conversely, a normal initial CT may fail to visualize an early ischemic infarct; the scan's clinical role includes excluding hemorrhage and assessing reperfusion candidacy. A convincing alternate diagnosis must explain localization and time course, not simply coexist with a negative early scan.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A good stress test for any proposed unified mechanism is whether it explains a cerebral venous thrombosis, deep small-vessel lacune and embolic cortical infarct equally well. If the explanation changes definitions to encompass all three, it has probably ceased to discriminate. The value of a model depends on excluding some alternatives in addition to explaining those it favors.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

Every future ABSURD stroke paper should state the lesion's vascular territory, likely occlusion mechanism, the relevant evidence and the uncertainty. The most humane consequence of better theoretical classification is faster recognition of situations where immediate stroke evaluation remains necessary. Exploratory explanations and emergency treatment must never compete for time.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Navigating the clinical landscape of artery of Percheron infarction: A systematic review](#)
2. [Sitosterolemia: a review and update of pathophysiology, clinical spectrum, diagnosis, and management](#)

Source lineage: Acute stroke differential and vascular investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When the Visible Thrombus Does Not Explain the Stroke

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Imaging can uncover more than one vascular abnormality. The presence of a thrombus, plaque or stenosis does not prove that it caused a particular infarct. This paper proposes an anatomical-concordance method for interpreting complicated vascular studies, especially when an obvious neck-vessel lesion and a brain infarct occupy different circulation territories.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Arterial supply is a constrained network. The internal carotid artery generally supplies anterior circulation territories, whereas the vertebral and basilar system supports much of the posterior circulation. Variations such as a fetal-origin posterior cerebral artery complicate simplistic rules, but they do not erase the need to trace a plausible embolic route. A left common carotid lesion and bilateral paramedian thalamic infarcts, for example, should prompt investigation of posterior circulation mechanisms rather than an automatic causal label.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The interpretive sequence begins with lesion location and MRI diffusion pattern, then CTA or MRA vessel findings, vascular variants and cardiac sources. Artery of Percheron anatomy, when relevant, may explain bilateral paramedian thalamic injury despite the absence of a large visible occlusion. A separate carotid thrombus can remain clinically important even if it does not explain the observed infarcts. Two problems may coexist without one being the cause of the other.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Vascular territory reasoning has an especially important limitation: unusual arterial variants can permit routes that standard diagrams overlook. Thus a mismatch is a reason to revisit imaging, not an automatic proof of incidental disease. The artery of Percheron and fetal-origin posterior cerebral arteries provide contrasting examples of variant anatomy: one changes perforator supply, while the other can alter whether a posterior cerebral territory receives blood predominantly from the internal carotid. Accurate interpretation requires knowing which variant is actually present, not speculating that one might exist simply to rescue a preferred causal story.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Temporal and anatomical correlation are necessary but not always sufficient. A vascular abnormality seen after the event might represent an embolic source, incidental disease or a consequence of altered flow; detailed neuroradiology and stroke-neurology assessment are crucial. Overcalling causality can lead to wrong secondary prevention, while dismissing an incidental but dangerous thrombus can also be harmful.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The strongest discriminating workup asks whether the infarct configuration, vessel imaging and cardiac findings fit one route. If the pattern remains posterior-circulation specific with no supporting carotid-to-posterior pathway, a common carotid thrombus does not become the proven culprit merely because it looks alarming. It may still be an independent serious problem requiring management. Separating causal attribution from clinical importance is the paper's central discipline.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The practical lesson is to write two sentences: what the imaging definitely shows, and which mechanism most plausibly explains the affected tissue. If those statements do not align, the case remains mechanistically unresolved. That is not diagnostic failure; it is diagnostic discipline. The paper is an educational framework and does not interpret any identifiable patient's records.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Artery of Percheron Infarction: Imaging Patterns and Clinical Spectrum](#)
2. [Navigating the clinical landscape of artery of Percheron infarction: A systematic review](#)

Source lineage: Stroke case analysis including discordant carotid and thalamic imaging

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Artery of Percheron: The Stroke Easily Missed

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Bilateral paramedian thalamic infarction can follow occlusion of a single variant perforating artery arising from the posterior cerebral circulation: the artery of Percheron. Because the presentation can include altered alertness, memory disturbance, eye-movement abnormalities and sometimes unusual behavior, the syndrome can initially be mistaken for a diffuse toxic, psychiatric or epileptic process.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The thalamus participates in ascending arousal networks, memory circuitry and sensorimotor integration. Symmetric injury can therefore produce a perplexing syndrome without a dramatic unilateral cortical deficit. Standard noncontrast CT may be unrevealing early. MRI diffusion-weighted imaging is often more informative, although interpretation requires attention to timing and artifacts. Conventional large-vessel angiography frequently cannot directly show a tiny perforating artery.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

This case illustrates why symptom-based reassurance can be hazardous. A patient with unexplained somnolence, confusion, vertical gaze palsy or fluctuating consciousness after an abrupt event warrants serious consideration of posterior circulation ischemia, among other emergencies. The occlusion may already have occurred even if no large visible thrombus appears on CTA. Diagnostic reasoning should combine time course, examination and lesion-specific imaging.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The published imaging series describes several patterns of bilateral paramedian thalamic infarction with and without rostral midbrain involvement. These variants explain why the bedside phenotype is not uniform: some patients present chiefly with impaired alertness, others with ocular motor findings or memory disturbance. Diagnostic delay can be aggravated when a patient is considered intoxicated, postictal or psychiatrically disturbed before posterior circulation ischemia is considered. The disease is rare, however, and broad emergency differential diagnosis still includes metabolic and venous causes. The best lesson is pattern recognition combined with disciplined exclusion, not fixation on a dramatic uncommon diagnosis.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Bilateral thalamic lesions also have alternatives: deep cerebral venous thrombosis, metabolic injury, Wernicke encephalopathy, infection and inflammatory disease. An imaging pattern must therefore be interpreted, not merely recognized. Calling every bilateral thalamic abnormality “Percheron” would repeat the same one-diagnosis error the paper seeks to correct.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A useful educational case exercise would present the initial symptoms, early CT, diffusion MRI and vascular anatomy in stages, asking what information changed the probability of an artery of Percheron infarct. The answer depends on imaging and anatomy rather than on a claim that bilateral confusion is pathognomonic. Recognition matters because time-sensitive stroke systems should be engaged while the diagnosis is clarified.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The institute's clinical argument is modest but consequential: uncommon vascular anatomy deserves a place in emergency differential diagnosis because delay can cost treatment opportunity. This educational discussion supports specialist evaluation and acute stroke systems; it does not recommend a home treatment or symptom-based substitute for imaging.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Artery of Percheron Infarction: Imaging Patterns and Clinical Spectrum](#)
2. [Navigating the clinical landscape of artery of Percheron infarction: A systematic review](#)

Source lineage: Bilateral thalamic stroke investigation

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Convulsions After Weakness: Stroke, Seizure or Both?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 01 · Cerebrovascular systems and sterol transport · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A sudden neurological deficit followed by abnormal movements creates a diagnostic trap: observers may reclassify the entire episode as a seizure and abandon the stroke differential. This paper argues that the order of events matters and that seizure and ischemia can coexist. The clinically meaningful question is which mechanism best explains the initial focal weakness, the movements, post-event state and vascular findings.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Seizures can cause transient postictal weakness—Todd paresis—and stroke can provoke early symptomatic seizures through cortical irritation or tissue injury. These explanations are not interchangeable. Weakness beginning before movements, sharply lateralized deficits, vascular-risk context and persistent neurological signs demand targeted attention. The presence or absence of dramatic generalized tonic-clonic activity does not settle whether an episode was epileptic; focal motor and nonconvulsive seizures can present less stereotypically.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Evaluation may involve repeated focal examinations, bedside glucose, electrolyte and infection assessment, appropriately selected CT/CTA/MRI, and EEG when clinically indicated. A normal early noncontrast CT excludes some emergencies but does not reliably rule out evolving ischemia. The distinction between clinical suspicion and test confirmation should be explicit; no anecdotal description of hands or head moving proves a specific localization.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Temporal sequence deserves its own clinical history. Was the weakness first noticed while the person was fully alert? Did movements begin in the same limb or on the opposite side? Was there impaired awareness, a prolonged postictal period, recurrent stereotyped episodes or persistent aphasia afterward? Each element alters the plausibility of an initial focal seizure versus ischemia with a subsequent seizure. Even witnesses may disagree about timing, and remote descriptions of “flipping” or shaking can capture tremor, myoclonus, focal seizure or non-epileptic movement without sufficient specificity. Mechanism should be inferred only after localization and objective findings are considered.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Competing possibilities include migraine aura, toxic-metabolic disturbance, functional neurological episodes and movement disorders. Conversely, a clear epileptiform EEG does not necessarily establish that the preceding weakness was postictal; a precipitating infarct remains possible. Both false reassurance and indiscriminate stroke labeling create avoidable risks.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

An alternative diagnosis becomes persuasive when it accounts for the earliest observed deficit, duration, recurrence pattern and objective testing better than stroke does. Clinical urgency does not require premature diagnostic certainty. The purpose of an emergency differential is to preserve the chance to treat dangerous possibilities while evidence accumulates, not to make a definitive declaration from incomplete witness language.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

For frontline medical systems, the priority is preserving emergency evaluation while refining the differential. The paper emphasizes temporal sequencing, neurological localization and safety rather than attempting to diagnose from a remote narrative. Stroke treatments, antiseizure treatments and antithrombotic decisions depend on a confirmed clinical context and cannot be chosen from this conceptual framework alone.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Navigating the clinical landscape of artery of Percheron infarction: A systematic review

Source lineage: Urgent differential discussion of weakness followed by convulsive movements

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When Lipid Transport Failure Looks Like Madness

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Psychosis, depression and personality change can sometimes arise within inherited disorders of cholesterol trafficking or bile-acid synthesis. Cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis and Niemann-Pick type C are compelling clinical examples, because psychiatric manifestations may precede definitive neurological recognition. Their importance is not that common psychosis is secretly a lipid-storage disorder, but that biochemical disease can produce experiences that superficially resemble primary psychiatric illness.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

In cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis, CYP27A1 deficiency impairs normal bile-acid synthesis and promotes accumulation of cholestanol. Neurological signs may emerge after years of childhood diarrhea, cataracts or tendon xanthomas. In Niemann-Pick type C, NPC1/NPC2 abnormalities impair intracellular lipid movement, with progressive visceral and neurological consequences. Reported adult presentations include hallucinations, mood disturbance, executive dysfunction and treatment-resistant psychiatric symptoms. These are mechanistic categories—not generic synonyms for “toxins in the brain.”

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The shared insight is that brain function depends on lipid trafficking, not merely dietary fat supply. Membrane composition, intracellular sterol distribution, myelin integrity and neural signaling can be perturbed without a simple serum cholesterol signature. The two diseases are biologically distinct, and their pathology cannot be collapsed into one “bile blockade.” Nevertheless, they demonstrate a clinical bridge between metabolic medicine and psychiatry that merits broader awareness.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis is particularly instructive because the defective enzyme participates in bile-acid synthesis, yet the nervous-system consequences reflect much more than intestinal fat malabsorption. Abnormal cholestanol metabolism and tissue accumulation occur over years, while cataracts and tendon findings may have preceded the psychiatric diagnosis. Niemann-Pick type C instead involves intracellular transport in lysosomal compartments. Calling both conditions “cholesterol problems” is accurate only at a broad descriptive level. Their contrasting biochemistry actually strengthens the central point: several different failures in lipid handling can converge on neurobehavioral manifestations through different pathways.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Base rates matter. These disorders are rare; the probability that a typical depression or psychosis presentation represents them is low without clues such as gaze palsy, cerebellar signs, progressive cognition changes, cataracts or hepatosplenomegaly. Retrospective case series also overrepresent complex and severe phenotypes. Finding psychiatric features in a metabolic disorder does not establish metabolic causation for most psychiatric disease.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A powerful counterexample would be ordinary psychosis with normal neurological function, no suggestive systemic history and no progressive cognitive signs. Its existence would not refute the rare-disease examples; it would limit their generality. Conversely, a patient with psychosis, gaze palsy and declining coordination would warrant a more targeted differential. A high-quality paper keeps these probabilities and presentations separate.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The conceptual recommendation is a red-flag rather than universal screening approach. A progressive, atypical or syndromically complex psychiatric presentation should invite neurological and metabolic differential diagnosis when objective clues exist. This protects against both the under-recognition of treatable disease and unnecessary testing driven by an unqualified theory of “blocked fats.”

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Cerebrotendinous Xanthomatosis: Molecular Pathogenesis, Clinical Spectrum, Diagnosis, and Disease-Modifying Treatments
2. Psychiatric burden in a cohort of adults with Niemann Pick type C disease
3. Niemann-Pick type C disease: neuropsychiatric presentation, diagnosis and treatment

Source lineage: Bile-fat-hormone and psychiatric illness investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Biological Differential Diagnosis of Psychosis

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Psychosis describes disturbances in perception, belief or thought; it does not by itself establish etiology. This paper proposes an etiologically layered differential that includes primary psychiatric disorders alongside endocrine crises, delirium, autoimmune encephalitis, medication effects, intoxication, neurologic disease and rare inborn metabolic defects. The point is clinical precision, not dismissal of the reality or severity of psychiatric illness.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The first distinction is between acute delirium with fluctuating attention and a primarily psychiatric psychosis with relatively preserved awareness. Fever, seizures, autonomic instability, new focal signs and rapid cognitive decline create a different workup from slowly progressive isolated symptoms. Thyroid disease, severe glycemic disturbances, electrolyte disorders, vitamin deficiencies and medication effects may contribute in selected patients. Autoimmune encephalitis is especially important when psychiatric change clusters with seizures, dyskinesias or abnormal consciousness.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A terrain perspective can be operational if it asks about exposures, time course, neurologic examination and objective organ dysfunction rather than attributing the experience to an undefined “toxic burden.” A structured approach maps syndrome, onset, medication chronology, accompanying neurological features, laboratory abnormalities and imaging/EEG relevance. Each proposed explanation should account for the observed pattern more successfully than alternatives.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The critical distinction is between a thorough initial medical assessment and indiscriminate “root cause” testing. For an acutely altered person, orientation, attention, vital signs, substance exposure, medication chronology and neurological findings may be more urgent than an elaborate micronutrient panel. Autoimmune encephalitis enters the differential when the syndrome includes characteristic temporal progression and neurological phenomena, but isolated anxiety or depressive symptoms do not justify labeling a patient with encephalitis. Rare metabolic disorders become more plausible when symptoms cluster with systemic findings. This is a probabilistic process, not a hunt for one universal overlooked toxin.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Overtesting every patient can create false-positive findings, delay appropriate psychiatric treatment and increase cost. The reverse error is premature closure after assigning a psychiatric label. Neither all psychoses nor all psychiatric medications are manifestations of hidden metabolic failure; evidence supports multiple causal pathways and meaningful benefit from established psychiatric treatments.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The model would improve clinical practice if it increased recognition of treatable organic conditions without postponing appropriate psychiatric care. Its failure modes are equally important: overtesting, incidental abnormalities, false diagnoses and delay of treatment for mania, psychosis or suicidal risk. The integrity of the framework is measured by what it helps rule out as well as what it helps discover.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The question for publication is how to preserve urgent psychiatric care while recognizing biologically specific exceptions. Clinicians require red-flag algorithms and referral thresholds, not a new universal diagnostic panel. When self-harm, dangerous behavior, catatonia or impaired self-care occurs, emergency assessment takes precedence over speculative root-cause exploration.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism
2. Recommendations for detection and diagnosis of Niemann-Pick disease type C

Source lineage: Covenant Psychiatry; Depression research; complex psychiatric differential

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Blood-Brain Barrier Is a Lipid Transport System

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

The blood-brain barrier is often described only as a wall excluding harmful material. Yet its endothelial cells also actively supply essential molecules. Research identifying MFSD2A as a carrier for lysophosphatidylcholine-bound docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) shows that brain lipid access is highly selective. This paper develops the idea of selective nutritional transport as a missing dimension of simplistic claims about “feeding the brain.”

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The 2014 MFSD2A work showed reduced brain DHA and neurological abnormalities in deficient mice, while related research established the protein's role in limiting endothelial transcytosis and sustaining barrier integrity. The distinction between free DHA and lysophosphatidylcholine-bound DHA is important: chemical form can determine entry even where the nutrient itself is abundant in blood. Other BBB transporters, pericytes and astrocytes participate in neural homeostasis; MFSD2A is not the whole barrier.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A dietary intervention may change circulating lipid pools without proportionately changing cerebral delivery. This provides a counterexample to the assumption that simply increasing intake guarantees adequate neuronal lipid availability. Potential bottlenecks include intestinal absorption, hepatic packaging, blood carrier form, endothelial transport and downstream cellular utilization. The model becomes meaningful only when compartment-specific evidence, not generic serum lipid concentrations, is available.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The MFSD2A findings provide an unusually elegant example of biological specificity. Dietary DHA, DHA incorporated into circulating phospholipids and DHA transported across endothelial cells do not represent equivalent pools. The form attached to lysophosphatidylcholine matters for the transporter. More generally, the blood-brain barrier includes selective carriers for glucose, amino acids and other molecules; restriction and supply occur together. A clinical nutrition model must therefore keep ingestion, intestinal absorption, plasma delivery and brain uptake conceptually distinct. This is a richer argument than asserting simply that the brain “needs fat.”

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

These discoveries do not prove that common dementia, depression or ADHD stems from occult MFSD2A insufficiency. Animal knockout phenotypes can involve severe developmental defects and cannot be treated as dietary response trials. Moreover, the brain is capable of substantial local lipid synthesis and homeostatic adaptation, and essential fatty-acid deficits are not equivalent to global “fat deficiency.”

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The strongest limiting question is whether variation in a transporter under ordinary human conditions is large enough to cause common clinical syndromes. Rare severe gene defects can reveal necessity without showing that marginal dietary adjustments produce benefit. A future application would require clinically validated tests of transport-related brain lipid deficiency rather than serum markers alone. Without such data, speculation should not become supplementation advice.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The contribution of this paper is a new educational question: which nutrients reach their target organ in a biologically available form, and how do transport gates shape deficiency? It is relevant to nutrition, neurodevelopment, drug design and BBB disease research, but carries no implication that a particular fat-rich diet restores barrier function.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Mfsd2a is a transporter for the essential omega-3 fatty acid docosahexaenoic acid](#)
2. [Mfsd2a is critical for the formation and function of the blood-brain barrier](#)

Source lineage: Terrain Medicine Handbook; lipid-processing and neural health discussion

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Forgotten Clearance Systems of Alzheimer's Disease

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Neurodegeneration is often discussed through proteins that accumulate in brain tissue. This paper asks how protein and lipid clearance systems, vascular health, sleep and cerebral fluid transport might interact to shape Alzheimer disease risk and progression. The thesis is systemic but not monocausal: impaired clearance may be one part of a process that also includes tau pathology, amyloid biology, inflammation and vascular injury.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Potentially relevant pathways include microglial clearance of debris, endothelial transport across the blood-brain barrier, perivascular exchange and sleep-associated glymphatic dynamics. Cerebral lipid metabolism is inseparable from astrocytes, apolipoprotein E and membrane homeostasis. Cerebral small-vessel disease can compromise perfusion and barrier regulation while independently worsening cognitive outcomes. Such overlapping pathways make an exclusively “one toxic protein” narrative insufficient as an explanatory framework, although the accumulation of amyloid and tau remains biologically important.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The research model separates impaired production/degradation balance from defective efflux, vascular injury and neuronal susceptibility. It suggests that two patients with similar cognitive symptoms may arrive there through different combinations of protein burden, vascular lesions and systemic disease. It also predicts that clearing a measured biomarker does not automatically guarantee restoration of lost neural circuits, particularly in advanced disease.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Clearance is not a single pipe that can be opened. Proteins may be degraded intracellularly, removed by microglial activity, exchanged through perivascular routes or transported across endothelium; lipid handling has overlapping but different pathways. Meanwhile neuronal death changes the clinical significance of removing a deposit. An intervention that modestly reduces a biomarker might be biologically active yet fail to restore cognition when synaptic networks have already been lost. This creates a general research tension between preventing pathogenic accumulation, clearing accumulated material and repairing downstream injury. Each question needs a different endpoint and time horizon.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The glymphatic hypothesis is biologically interesting but measurement and causal interpretation in living humans remain contested. Associations between sleep disturbance and dementia do not establish that manipulating sleep alone reverses established disease. Nor can liver or gallbladder “detoxification” be presumed to remove brain amyloid; anatomical barriers and molecular clearance systems differ.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

One discriminating test is whether biomarkers of clearance predict progression after vascular lesions, baseline cognitive reserve, sleep pathology and known genetic risk are considered. Associations with poor sleep or altered CSF dynamics may still represent consequences of neurodegeneration. A convincing causal model must distinguish these temporal directions and avoid claiming clinical restoration from surrogate improvement alone.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

A sophisticated systems paper should place disease-specific biomarkers, vascular imaging, sleep physiology and clinical function on separate explanatory axes. Readers should be encouraged to distinguish plausible mechanisms from outcomes shown in trials. This approach broadens scientific inquiry without claiming an unvalidated cure for neurodegeneration.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Mfsd2a is critical for the formation and function of the blood-brain barrier
2. Mfsd2a is a transporter for the essential omega-3 fatty acid docosahexaenoic acid

Source lineage: Terrain Medicine Handbook; neurodegeneration and body-clearance investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Could Bile-Acid Profiles Identify Psychiatric Subtypes?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Bile-acid signatures differ across liver disease, medication use, microbiome composition and metabolic states. Experimental evidence links bile-acid receptors to neural and inflammatory signaling, creating a plausible question: might carefully measured bile-acid profiles help identify biologically distinct subgroups among patients carrying the same psychiatric diagnosis? A biomarker that distinguishes subgroups is not necessarily a biomarker that causes their symptoms.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The enterohepatic pool contains primary and secondary bile acids with different conjugation states and receptor affinities. FXR/FGF19 feedback, microbial deconjugation, intestinal transit, gallbladder dynamics and renal function can all influence circulating levels. Psychiatric symptoms are also shaped by sleep, medication, endocrine abnormalities and physical illness. A valid model therefore requires sampling time, fasting state and confounder documentation before any association can be interpreted.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Rather than seeking a universal “depression bile level,” the proposal is phenotype-specific: some patients might have coexisting cholestatic symptoms, inflammatory disorders, altered bowel transit or metabolic disease. Multivariate bile-acid measurement could be compared with controls and adjacent diagnoses, ideally including repeated within-person samples. A meaningful biomarker would need reproducibility and incremental predictive value beyond simple liver tests and clinical history.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The word “subtype” should imply more than statistically distinct clusters. A useful subtype predicts a clinically relevant outcome, treatment response or disease trajectory with acceptable reproducibility. Samples must be collected under comparable dietary and circadian conditions because bile acids change markedly after meals and vary with bowel transit. Medications used in psychiatry can affect weight, glucose metabolism and gastrointestinal function, all of which may shift bile-acid profiles. Any case-control difference must survive these confounders before being interpreted as neurobiological evidence.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Reverse causation is a powerful alternative: reduced food intake, medication exposure and physical inactivity associated with psychiatric symptoms may change bile-acid profiles. Numerous small biomarker studies are vulnerable to multiple testing and selective reporting. Even a reliable classifier could be biologically incidental, and prescribing bile-acid drugs for depression is not supported by the framework.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A biomarker discovery analysis should include independent replication, correction for multiple testing and clinically meaningful incremental prediction. It should also determine whether a simpler measurement—hepatic enzyme pattern, metabolic syndrome or medication exposure—explains the signature. If a sophisticated bile-acid panel adds no value beyond these factors, the proposed psychiatric subtype would not justify clinical use.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper should invite better characterization rather than biomarker commercialization. The highest-value claim is that mechanistically informed metabolic subtyping is worth evaluating alongside established psychiatric assessment. It is neither proof of a bile-generated psychiatric illness nor evidence that bile “cleansing” treats psychosis.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism](#)

Source lineage: Covenant Psychiatry; Bile-acid affective symptoms paper

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When Parkinson's Disease Is Not Parkinson's Disease

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Parkinsonism is a pattern of motor findings, not a single diagnosis. Bradykinesia, rigidity, tremor, postural change and gait disturbance can arise through idiopathic Parkinson disease, atypical neurodegeneration, medication exposure, structural disease and some metabolic conditions. This paper asks how a carefully reconstructed symptom history prevents premature diagnostic closure.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The tempo and sequence of signs carry information. Rest tremor with asymmetric bradykinesia may suggest one path; gait freezing or autonomic dysfunction early in disease may suggest another. Drug-induced parkinsonism, essential tremor, dystonic tremor, functional movement disorders, vascular parkinsonism and cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis have different clinical implications. A diagnosis should account for examination findings, course, medication history and response without treating any single feature as dispositive.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Long-term levodopa response can support a diagnosis but is not a complete substitute for neurological examination and periodic reassessment. Absence of the expected progressive course raises legitimate questions, although progression varies and effective treatment can mask some changes. Video can reveal movement patterns but may not document rigidity or formally establish bradykinesia. Liver and bile dysfunction should not be inferred merely from tremor.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

One misleading reassurance is that a patient who has remained relatively stable for many years cannot have Parkinson disease. Disease course varies, and substantial symptomatic benefit from treatment can obscure progression. The converse mistake is to regard every tremor that improves after a dopaminergic agent as conclusive proof of idiopathic Parkinson disease. Tremor can also vary with stress, stimulants, sleep loss and task demands. The differential depends on the full motor examination and its evolution, not a single therapeutic episode.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A tempting alternative is that every unusually stable patient must have been misdiagnosed. That inference ignores phenotypic variability, treatment effects and observational error. Rare metabolic diagnoses require compatible accompanying signs and targeted tests. Replacing conventional neurology with a metabolic narrative would repeat the same premature closure being criticized.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A clinically useful paper would compare hypotheses against a structured chronology: earliest symptom, asymmetry, slowness, rigidity, gaze or gait findings, cognition, autonomic problems, medication exposures and prior specialist documentation. A new diagnosis should follow evidence, not novelty. Rare lipid disorders belong in this conversation only when there are accompanying clues such as juvenile cataracts, tendon xanthomas or systemic abnormalities.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The right editorial message is diagnostic humility with action: seek a movement-disorder specialist when the history is atypical, clarify the original diagnostic evidence, and examine tremor phenomenology, gait and medication effects systematically. A revised diagnosis, when justified, can change management; when not justified, it can still improve confidence in care.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Cerebrotendinous Xanthomatosis: Molecular Pathogenesis, Clinical Spectrum, Diagnosis, and Disease-Modifying Treatments](#)
2. [Recommendations for detection and diagnosis of Niemann-Pick disease type C](#)

Source lineage: Earlier extended Parkinson diagnosis discussion

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Ketones, Mitochondria and the Psychiatric Brain

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Ketone bodies become more available during carbohydrate restriction and fasting and can serve as substrates for cerebral energy metabolism. This paper asks when altered fuel availability might influence psychiatric outcomes, without assuming that ketosis is a universal neurological reset. The distinction between biochemical plausibility and patient-centered effectiveness is particularly important in a field already vulnerable to dramatic anecdotal claims.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Beta-hydroxybutyrate and acetoacetate are generated by hepatic metabolism and can enter the brain through monocarboxylate transporters. Their use varies with age, metabolic state and adaptation. In specific neurological disorders, ketogenic treatment has established indications—for example, certain drug-resistant epilepsies—but its psychiatric applications remain under investigation. Possible mechanisms span energy availability, excitability, inflammation and neurotransmitter balance rather than one simple “dopamine restoration” pathway.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A narrower thesis might concern patients with clear metabolic dysfunction or treatment-associated weight and glucose abnormalities. Other scenarios may involve changes in sleep or reduced ultra-processed food intake rather than a ketone-specific action. Any interpretation must distinguish starvation, nutritional ketosis, diabetic ketoacidosis and dietary patterns rich in saturated fat. They are not interchangeable metabolic states.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The energy-source hypothesis is attractive because brain cells are metabolically demanding. But the route from fuel availability to mood is indirect: metabolic substrate, neuronal excitability, neurotransmission, sleep and social experience all interact. Diet changes usually bundle several interventions—less refined carbohydrate, fewer processed foods, altered caloric intake and a new daily routine. Without separating these factors, improvement cannot be attributed specifically to beta-hydroxybutyrate. Moreover, the body produces ketones during states that can range from controlled nutritional therapy to dangerous metabolic derangement, so the mere presence of ketones conveys little about safety.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The opposing case is strong: improvements during fasting can arise from placebo effects, reduced caloric intake, altered routine and simultaneous medication changes. Severe restriction can also destabilize psychiatric illness, particularly in eating disorders, bipolar-spectrum illness or medically vulnerable people. Rapid, unsupervised fasting is not a substitute for psychiatric evaluation and treatment.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A convincing outcome would distinguish short-term subjective change from sustained psychiatric function and relapse risk. Competing explanations such as improved sleep, weight loss or medication adjustment need direct consideration. A worsening episode during food restriction would also count as evidence rather than an inconvenient exception. This approach permits a meaningful exploration of metabolism without converting ketosis into a universal psychiatric prescription.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The useful paper is a mechanistic map defining when fuel substitution is credible, what observations would distinguish ketone effects from diet effects and which harms require vigilance. It can be intellectually ambitious without promising psychiatric cure through deprivation.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)
2. [Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism](#)

Source lineage: Resurrection Biology; Absurd Fast; depression and ketogenic metabolism

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Postpartum Metabolic Vulnerability Hypothesis

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Pregnancy and birth involve abrupt endocrine transitions, sleep disruption, inflammatory changes and altered caregiving demands. In a small subset of new parents, severe mood or psychotic syndromes develop during this period. This paper frames postpartum neuropsychiatric illness as a multi-hit vulnerability problem, while avoiding retrospective causal claims about individual tragedies or any assumption that nutritional changes alone explain psychiatric crisis.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Biological candidates include estrogen and progesterone withdrawal, thyroid dysfunction, circadian disruption, immune signaling and genetic susceptibility. Sleep loss can be both a precipitant and an early symptom of postpartum mania or psychosis, making timing crucial. Medication initiation, discontinuation and interactions may complicate presentations. Nutritional insufficiency can worsen overall reserve, but a general allegation of “toxins from spinach” is not a clinically established explanation for postpartum psychosis.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The model proposes distinct layers: predisposition before delivery, triggering physiologic shifts, behavioral warning signs, and environmental capacity for rapid recognition and protection. Prior bipolar or postpartum psychosis history materially changes risk, so a one-size-fits-all prevention narrative is inadequate. The inquiry should also protect against a moral interpretation that blames the individual for the disease.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The most difficult causal problem is separating triggers from early manifestations. Insomnia immediately before a postpartum psychiatric episode might reflect externally imposed infant care, an emerging manic process or both. Similarly, a medication change may have been prescribed because symptoms were already beginning. Reconstructing the timeline matters more than attaching a retrospective label to whichever factor appears dramatic. Pregnancy also substantially changes thyroid physiology, iron requirements and sleep architecture, but these are not interchangeable explanations for psychosis. Differential diagnosis must remain sensitive to rapid deterioration and physical red flags.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Confounding is severe in retrospective accounts. A food eaten during the postpartum period, a drug prescribed or a period of insomnia can be temporally correlated with deterioration without causing it. Severe episodes require urgent evaluation; studies of unusual biochemical explanations cannot displace psychiatric assessment, infant safety planning and evidence-based treatment.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

No lawful causal conclusion about a particular family tragedy follows from the existence of a plausible biological pathway. A well-written population-level hypothesis does not establish who acted, why they acted or whether a single exposure caused the episode. This boundary is both scientifically and ethically essential. The appropriate public-health emphasis is prompt recognition, care access and protection during severe episodes.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

As a concept paper, this is best framed around early recognition and causal humility. The value lies in appreciating interacting biological vulnerabilities while retaining clear emergency thresholds. Any individual criminal or legal case would require separate evidence and should not be repurposed as proof of a medical mechanism.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Sleep and Postpartum Psychosis: A Narrative Review of the Existing Literature](#)
2. [Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism](#)

Source lineage: Postpartum psychiatric deterioration case investigation; Covenant Psychiatry

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Oxalates and Acute Neuropsychiatric Deterioration: A Multi-Hit Hypothesis

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Oxalate can be medically consequential in specific metabolic and renal contexts, but claims that ordinary vegetable servings trigger psychiatric collapse are not established. This paper explores a carefully bounded hypothesis: in a vulnerable host with severe oxalate burden, kidney dysfunction, electrolyte abnormalities or systemic illness, neurological deterioration might reflect downstream physiologic injury rather than a direct food-to-psychosis effect.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Oxalate-related pathology is clearest in calcium oxalate kidney stones, primary hyperoxalurias, enteric hyperoxaluria and certain toxic exposures. Disturbed calcium balance, renal injury and metabolic derangement can alter neurological function in severe disease. Yet oxalate intake, urinary oxalate, tissue deposition and CNS effects occupy different causal steps. The existence of crystalline renal injury does not prove a neurotoxic effect from a normal serving of spinach.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The proposed multi-hit chain would require unusually high exposure or altered absorption, a host incapable of normal excretion, measurable systemic disturbance and a temporally consistent neuropsychiatric syndrome. Alternative explanations—sleep deprivation, intoxication, medications, endocrine crises, infection and primary psychiatric illness—would need to be examined first. Nonspecific fatigue after food does not validate the chain.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

An oxalate-mediated neurological hypothesis must traverse several biological barriers. The molecule must be present in a relevant absorbed dose; the host must fail to excrete it or experience some specific systemic disturbance; that disturbance must be sufficient to affect neural function; and the clinical timeline must fit. Ordinary dietary exposure usually stops well short of this chain. The severe renal consequences documented in hyperoxaluria should be taken seriously without invoking them to explain everyday irritability, emotional lability or psychiatric symptoms. Distinguishing ingestion from systemic exposure is therefore the center of the argument.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A useful falsifier is the absence of hyperoxaluria, renal compromise or relevant biochemical abnormalities in suspected cases. Even if such findings coexist, psychiatric symptoms may have another cause. Controlled food re-challenge is not ethically appropriate when an individual is suspected of serious renal or psychiatric risk. The argument should never become an invitation to provoke reactions.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Even in a hypothetical vulnerable patient, clinicians should look for recognized pathology such as acute kidney injury, hypocalcemia or severe metabolic abnormalities before treating oxalates as causal. In the absence of those intermediates, common causes of psychiatric deterioration remain stronger. The hypothesis is worth describing only if these potential disconfirming observations are made explicit.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper illustrates how frontier theories can be written responsibly: specify every required intermediate step, acknowledge the weak human evidence for direct psychiatric effects, and distinguish kidney disease from neuropsychiatric illness. Its educational value may be greater in showing what a valid causal explanation would require than in defending the hypothesis itself.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)
2. [Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism](#)

Source lineage: Investigation into spinach, oxalates and psychiatric deterioration

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Silent Biliary Dysfunction Hypothesis

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A patient may report food-related discomfort, altered bowel habits or intolerance to fatty meals without an obvious gallstone or duct obstruction. Could selected functional disturbances of biliary physiology contribute to these complaints before structural imaging becomes abnormal? This paper defines a narrower, testable concept of biliary dysfunction and rejects the idea that an invisible blockage should be presumed whenever symptoms remain unexplained.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Biliary physiology spans hepatocyte bile-acid synthesis, conjugation, canalicular secretion, duct transit, gallbladder storage and contraction, pancreatic coordination, intestinal micelle formation and ileal reuptake. A defect at one step can cause a different syndrome from failure at another. Cholestasis is not synonymous with gallbladder dyskinesia; bile-acid diarrhea is not the same as insufficient luminal bile acids; functional abdominal pain may occur without impaired bile delivery. Nonspecific pale or variable stools cannot reliably quantify enterohepatic function.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The construct becomes useful if phenotypes are defined: clinically significant cholestasis with biochemical markers; documented gallbladder emptying abnormalities in an appropriate setting; bile-acid malabsorption; pancreatic insufficiency; or established intestinal fat malabsorption. The analysis should use symptom chronology, medication history and targeted testing rather than the unvalidated term “stagnant bile” as a diagnosis. Functional disturbances may be real, but proving them requires more than the absence of structural findings.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The phrase “silent dysfunction” is most useful if it describes a patient group with a reproducible physiologic abnormality, not a residual category for symptoms medicine has not yet explained. A person with postprandial abdominal pain and objectively impaired gallbladder emptying is not in the same group as a patient with normal imaging, normal blood tests and diffuse fatigue. Likewise, bile-acid diarrhea entails excess bile acids reaching the colon rather than necessarily deficient bile in the small intestine. Conflating these states would produce mutually contradictory treatment assumptions. Precision begins by describing the symptom, organ, proposed mechanism and evidence that the mechanism is present.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Fatty-meal discomfort also occurs with reflux, dyspepsia, peptic disease, functional gastrointestinal disorders and food intolerance. Gallbladder imaging is imperfect, but negative imaging does not establish a hidden sludge process. HIDA scan ejection fractions have interpretive limits and should not become a universal screen. Supplement responses are vulnerable to placebo effects and regression to the mean.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The decisive question is whether functional measurements explain outcomes after standard gastrointestinal diagnoses and medication effects are considered. If the proposed biomarkers do not distinguish symptomatic from asymptomatic people, “silent biliary dysfunction” has not yet gained clinical meaning. A successful concept must yield a defined phenotype and useful discriminating information, not merely an evocative name.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The proposed clinical outcome is a better diagnostic taxonomy, not universal prescription of bitters, bile salts or “liver flushes.” Cholestatic jaundice, severe right-upper-quadrant pain, fever or dark urine with pale stools require conventional medical assessment. A carefully defined functional phenotype could invite future physiologic study without replacing established gastroenterology.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)

Source lineage: Terrain Medicine Handbook; Bile and hormonal investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Hormones That Govern Bile

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Bile physiology and endocrine physiology influence each other, but claims that impaired bile directly causes generalized hormone deficiency go beyond current evidence. This paper maps known feedback between bile-acid synthesis, estrogen-related cholestasis, progesterone effects on motility, thyroid status and metabolic signaling. The aim is to identify precise directions of causality rather than invoke a single unexplained liver-hormone blockage.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Bile acids are synthesized from cholesterol; steroid hormones also derive from cholesterol, but they do not require dietary animal fat to arrive as a special intact substrate. The liver regulates steroid metabolism and excretion, while estrogen-related states can alter hepatobiliary transport and gallstone risk. Thyroid function affects lipid metabolism and gastrointestinal physiology. FXR/FGF19 feedback coordinates bile-acid synthesis, while intestinal bile acids help absorb fat-soluble nutrients. These pathways intersect but operate through distinct enzymes and control loops.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The strongest hypothesis concerns people with measurable hepatobiliary dysfunction in whom endocrine signs coexist. Associations could reflect altered clearance of hormone metabolites, intestinal nutrient absorption, hepatic inflammation, or third factors such as obesity. Correct analysis requires distinguishing plasma hormone concentration, receptor activity, hormone production and metabolic elimination. A low measured hormone is not evidence of failure to digest dietary fat.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The liver and endocrine glands share cholesterol-related chemistry but use it differently. Cholesterol is the precursor of steroid hormones through enzymatic pathways that operate in endocrine tissues, while bile-acid synthesis converts cholesterol into amphipathic compounds used for fat handling and signaling. Both processes are regulated, and the liver can clear hormones through conjugation and excretion. Thus a patient may have sufficient endogenous cholesterol for hormone synthesis despite consuming no cholesterol, or may have significant dyslipidemia while producing normal sex steroids. This distinction defeats simplistic analogies equating low dietary animal fat with hormone starvation.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The idea that vegan diets inherently prevent steroid hormone synthesis is inaccurate: humans can synthesize cholesterol and steroid hormones without consuming cholesterol. A vegan diet can still create nutrient-deficiency risks if poorly planned, while animal-fat excess can raise cardiovascular risk in some dietary contexts. Seed oils do not become an undifferentiated toxic class merely because they contain polyunsaturated fats; oxidation, food processing, energy balance and fatty-acid substitution matter.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A clinically useful analysis should specify whether the hypothesized abnormality concerns hormone production, receptor signaling, tissue conversion, transport or elimination. Measurements that cannot distinguish these possibilities should not be presented as definitive. Pregnancy-associated cholestatic syndromes and thyroid-related changes in lipid metabolism offer concrete starting points, but cannot establish a universal nutrition–psychosis causal chain.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper should make the hormone–bile axis comprehensible through diagrams of directionality and compartments. It can legitimately argue against dismissing liver and intestinal disease in endocrine assessment, without claiming that supplementation with saturated fats treats psychiatric illness or corrects all hormone disorders.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)

Source lineage: Bile–fat–hormone investigation; Absurd Diet

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Cholesterol Disposal as an Essential Metabolic Function

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Cholesterol is indispensable for cell membranes, myelin and steroid synthesis, yet excessive atherogenic lipoprotein exposure contributes to cardiovascular disease. This paper explores cholesterol clearance as an active physiologic process rather than a passive consequence of eating less fat. Its conceptual contribution is to connect synthesis, transport, recycling and excretion without romanticizing cholesterol as uniformly beneficial or uniformly harmful.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Human cells synthesize cholesterol through regulated pathways; lipoproteins carry it through plasma; hepatic uptake and biliary excretion help regulate whole-body balance. Conversion to bile acids is a major route of cholesterol disposal, while unmodified cholesterol also enters bile and intestinal contents. Transport proteins including ABCG5/8 and LDL receptors influence different steps. A failure of plasma LDL clearance has different consequences from failure to absorb fat, and a normal blood cholesterol test does not describe every tissue compartment.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The framework separates three questions often confused in popular medicine: Is cholesterol supply adequate for tissue synthesis? Are circulating apoB particles elevated enough to create vascular risk? Does a particular inherited or acquired condition impair handling of sterols or bile acids? The answers can differ in the same person. Sitosterolemia and cerebrotendinous xanthomatosis illustrate uncommon failures at different points in the network.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Cholesterol balance exists at both cellular and whole-body levels. Cells regulate endogenous synthesis, uptake, storage and efflux, while the liver integrates lipoprotein metabolism with bile-acid production and biliary sterol secretion. It is possible for a person to have adequate intracellular cholesterol for essential functions and still carry an excessive number of atherogenic apoB particles. This apparent paradox disappears once function and location are separated. The cholesterol inside a neural membrane is not the same causal quantity as the cholesterol circulating inside an LDL particle that may be retained in an arterial wall.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The suggestion that high LDL is simply a marker of failed bile elimination would ignore substantial causal and therapeutic evidence concerning apoB-containing particles. Likewise, lowering serum cholesterol does not necessarily diagnose or repair a specific hepatic clearance defect. Mechanistic diagrams should not turn complex metabolic control into a single “outflow obstruction” narrative.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Natural experiments strengthen the framework precisely because they show different outcomes from different pathway defects. ABCG5/8 abnormalities highlight intestinal and biliary sterol movement; CYP27A1 deficiency changes bile-acid synthesis and cholestanol metabolism. A grand theory that cannot distinguish these conditions has sacrificed explanatory precision for breadth. Their differences should become a central part of the paper.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

A strong public-facing conclusion is that effective medicine must consider both biological necessity and context-dependent harm. Cholesterol is neither poison nor unconditional medicine. Understanding it requires tracking where it is made, carried, used and removed—and respecting the clinical consequences of persistently elevated atherogenic particle burden.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Sitosterolemia: Twenty Years of Discovery of ABCG5 ABCG8](#)
2. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)
3. [Sitosterolemia: a review and update of pathophysiology, clinical spectrum, diagnosis, and management](#)

Source lineage: Stroke and cholesterol-clearance investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Gut-Liver-Brain Feedback Loop

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

The intestine, liver and nervous system exchange signals through nutrients, bile acids, inflammatory mediators, microbial products and neural pathways. This paper proposes a feedback model in which changes in one compartment modify the others, while resisting the temptation to reduce all mental illness to gut dysfunction. It treats the gut-liver-brain axis as a network of bidirectional influences rather than a single hidden toxin pipeline.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Hepatic bile acids reach the intestine, facilitate lipid absorption, activate FXR and GPBAR1 pathways, and are modified by gut organisms before reuptake. Their altered pool can affect gut ecology, transit and hepatic signaling. Meanwhile stress and sleep can modify eating patterns, gastrointestinal activity and immune function. The vagus nerve and systemic inflammatory mediators create additional communication channels, but the blood-brain barrier constrains which substances enter cerebral tissue.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

One useful distinction is between direct receptor-mediated effects and indirect consequences of chronic illness. Depression in a patient with active cholestatic disease might arise from pruritus, poor sleep, systemic inflammation, medication effects or shared metabolic pathology. Finding altered microbial bile acids would not prove they generated the psychiatric symptoms. The conceptual model therefore specifies several plausible routes and their competing explanations.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Feedback implies that the direction of influence can change over time. Stress-related autonomic changes may alter intestinal motility and appetite, which can influence microbial substrate exposure and bile-acid composition; hepatic illness may also affect sleep, cognition and systemic inflammation. In one patient the gut may contribute to symptoms; in another psychiatric illness may initiate the dietary and gastrointestinal changes. The same observed association therefore admits opposing causal explanations. A convincing model must specify which step is upstream, which is downstream and what observation would distinguish the directions.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Microbiome studies are sensitive to diet, medication, geography, sequencing approach and multiple comparison problems. Rodent behavioral changes after altered bile-acid exposure cannot be generalized to schizophrenia or autism in humans. Broad claims that “healing the gut heals the brain” outpace intervention evidence and may distract from acute neurological or psychiatric care.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Clinical relevance is a separate hurdle. Even if a metabolite changes receptor activity in isolated cells, it must reach a relevant human tissue at a plausible concentration and alter a meaningful outcome. A microbiome profile that predicts stool characteristics is not automatically a treatment target for psychosis. This paper can be powerful by refusing that shortcut while preserving the real complexity of the network.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper's distinctive contribution is a mechanistic causal map accompanied by guardrails: avoid conflating receptor biology, symptomatic gastrointestinal disease and proven psychiatric treatment. Readers gain a better set of questions: Which direction does the evidence run, which compartment is measured, and what clinical outcome is actually improved?

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [FXR signaling in the enterohepatic system](#)
3. [Mfsd2a is a transporter for the essential omega-3 fatty acid docosahexaenoic acid](#)

Source lineage: Covenant Psychiatry; Terrain Handbook; bile gut brain investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Detoxification Paradox of Dietary Fiber

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Fiber can alter intestinal transit, stool composition, microbial fermentation and, in some contexts, bile-acid binding. Yet both “fiber is essential for everyone” and “fiber traps toxins and makes everyone ill” are excessive generalizations. This paper examines whether the effects of a particular fiber depend on intestinal physiology, chemical properties, host disease and dose, with special attention to bile-acid recirculation.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Soluble viscous fibers can bind or interfere with reabsorption of certain bile constituents, while insoluble fibers influence bulk and transit. Fermentable fiber supplies substrates for microbial metabolism but may aggravate bloating and pain in selected disorders. Cholesterol reduction from some fiber interventions is biologically compatible with altered bile-acid loss and hepatic cholesterol homeostasis. The mechanisms differ by molecular structure; calling all dietary fiber one substance conceals this variation.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The paradox emerges because binding, fermentation and transit can be beneficial in one state and troublesome in another. For example, fiber might alleviate constipation yet worsen bloating in a sensitive patient. A patient with bile-acid diarrhea requires a different conceptual assessment than one with fat malabsorption or obstruction. Effective exposure includes particle size, food matrix, fluid intake, medications, baseline transit and microbial context.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

There are at least three different claims hiding under the word “fiber”: an intestinal mechanical effect, a microbial metabolic effect, and an influence on absorption or enterohepatic reuptake. A viscous gel-forming fiber might modify LDL through one pathway, whereas a rapidly fermentable carbohydrate might provoke symptoms through another. A low-FODMAP response does not establish that dietary fiber in general is harmful, just as the population-level value of whole grains does not mean a person with severe gastrointestinal sensitivity must tolerate every fiber source. Chemistry and phenotype, not dietary ideology, determine the clinical interpretation.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Claims of “detoxification” commonly omit a named chemical, validated assay and demonstrated change in clinically meaningful elimination. Fiber-bound bile acids do not mean heavy metals or stored pollutants are being purged, and relief after stool passage is not proof of systemic toxin removal. Overrestriction can diminish dietary quality, while indiscriminate fiber supplementation can aggravate specific GI disorders.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Any claim of enhanced “detoxification” should specify the measured compound, where it was measured, the mass excreted and whether patient outcomes changed. Lowering a serum marker by shifting distribution is not the same as total-body elimination. The model is falsified if a proposed fiber intervention changes neither the relevant exposure nor a validated health outcome compared with a suitable control.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The useful intellectual challenge is to evaluate fibers by mechanism and phenotype rather than ideology. The outcome should be careful interpretation of human data on bowel symptoms, LDL cholesterol, microbial markers and nutrition—not a blanket instruction to avoid plant matter or to take high-dose fiber.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Bile acids: regulation of synthesis

2. Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19

Source lineage: Vegetables Are Toxic; Absurd Diet; bile and clearance investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Medication-Induced Biliary Dysfunction

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Drugs can affect liver cells, bile transporters, gallbladder function and intestinal motility. This paper examines medication-related biliary symptoms as a concrete and potentially overlooked part of differential diagnosis, but rejects the assumption that vague fatigue or mood change after a new medicine proves drug-induced “bile stagnation.”

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Mechanisms include hepatocellular injury, canalicular transporter inhibition, cholestatic patterns of drug-induced liver injury and changes in gallbladder emptying. Estrogen exposure, some antibiotics and other medication categories can be associated with distinct hepatobiliary complications, but incidence, latency and mechanism differ by compound. Relevant clinical data include chronological exposure, bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase, transaminases, imaging and symptoms. No single laboratory pattern identifies every form of injury.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A disciplined causality framework starts with timing relative to starting, stopping or changing dose, considers competing liver and biliary disease, and evaluates known drug reactions. Rechallenge is not appropriate when severe liver injury is suspected. The problem of multiple medications is especially important: hepatobiliary dysfunction may change drug handling, creating a feedback loop rather than a simple one-way adverse reaction.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Drug-related liver injury is especially vulnerable to causal error because it can appear after variable latency, mimic other disease and improve after both the medicine and some unrelated exposures change. The R ratio, cholestatic laboratory features and clinical course can help characterize injury, but no single observation proves drug causation. The mechanism of transporter interference can be distinct from immune-mediated or hepatocellular injury. The most defensible paper should distinguish well-characterized syndromes from hypothesized effects on subtle gallbladder timing or intestinal function. Without this distinction, every nonspecific adverse symptom becomes incorrectly categorized as a bile issue.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Cholestatic symptoms can come from gallstones, infection, autoimmune disease, pregnancy-related conditions or tumors. An improvement after discontinuation can be suggestive but does not by itself demonstrate causation. Attributing psychiatric symptoms to a hypothetical drug-induced biliary block without evidence may cause unnecessary withdrawal of effective treatment.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A strong case analysis would track the drug timeline, laboratory pattern, established known adverse-event profile and alternative causes. It would avoid recommending challenge-rechallenge when severe toxicity is possible. The question is not whether medicines can affect biliary physiology—they can—but when that mechanism has enough evidentiary support to explain an individual presentation.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper offers an evidence-minded alternative to generic “liver support”: identify the compound, mechanism and objective injury pattern. Suspected jaundice, persistent pale stools with dark urine, severe itching or escalating pain warrants medical assessment. This is a diagnostic concept, not a license for unsupervised medication changes.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [FXR signaling in the enterohepatic system](#)

Source lineage: Biliary clinical work; Covenant Psychiatry

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Life Without a Gallbladder

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 03 · Hepatobiliary, cholesterol and endocrine physiology · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Cholecystectomy changes bile storage and timed delivery, but it does not stop the liver from synthesizing bile acids. This paper explores the physiologic consequences of removing the reservoir, including altered enterohepatic timing, possible bile-acid diarrhea and food-related symptoms. It challenges two opposing misconceptions: that digestion is entirely unchanged and that the body becomes incapable of handling dietary fat.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The gallbladder concentrates and stores bile, releasing it during meals through hormonal and neural regulation. After removal, hepatic bile can enter the intestine more continuously, with adaptation over time. Some people develop diarrhea consistent with excess bile acids reaching the colon, while others have postoperative symptoms caused by unrelated functional or structural gastrointestinal conditions. Common laboratory and imaging findings often do not directly quantify bile-acid flux.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The mechanistic question is not merely how much bile exists but when and where it enters the intestinal lumen relative to food and small-bowel transport. Changes in meal size, fat quantity and transit may influence symptoms, though individual responses vary. Bile-acid sequestrants are used for properly diagnosed bile-acid diarrhea; that is mechanistically different from adding bile salts for assumed maldigestion. Some patients need investigation for retained stones, sphincter disorders or pancreatic disease.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The physiologic distinction between bile production and bile storage deserves emphasis. Cholecystectomy removes the concentrator and reservoir, not the hepatic production apparatus. Continuous bile delivery may be sufficient for ordinary digestion yet fail to match some eating patterns in certain patients. Conversely, excessive bile acids reaching the colon can drive diarrhea, meaning that simply increasing bile exposure would be the wrong intervention in that phenotype. These two directions illustrate why a single postoperative protocol cannot be biologically correct for everyone. A good paper should map symptoms onto actual digestive mechanisms rather than assume all complaints originate from deficient bile.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A frequent logical error is extrapolating from postoperative digestive symptoms to endocrine collapse or inevitable brain dysfunction. The body maintains multiple independent sources of cholesterol and hormones after cholecystectomy. Conversely, dismissing persistent symptoms as imaginary because surgery was technically successful can also be mistaken.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The clearest discriminating clinical observation is response to a correctly diagnosed bile-acid diarrhea treatment, considered alongside appropriate evaluation for structural complications or other gastrointestinal disease. A nonspecific symptom response after adding bitters or salts does not establish gallbladder-related hormone deficiency. Treatment should follow the identified mechanism.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper should explain normal adaptation, specific postoperative syndromes and why targeted evaluation matters. The core educational message is that the gallbladder is an important regulatory organ, but its absence does not establish systemic toxicity or mandate a particular animal-fat-heavy eating pattern.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)

Source lineage: Parkinson case discussion; gastrointestinal and biliary research

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Retinal Vein Occlusion as a Window into Systemic Vascular Disease

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Retinal vein occlusion is an eye emergency and a possible indicator of broader vascular vulnerability. Meta-analytic evidence links retinal vein occlusion with increased future stroke incidence, but an association is not a diagnosis of a particular systemic cause. This paper considers the retina as a visible microvascular bed that can prompt targeted attention to hypertension, diabetes, lipids, thrombosis and cardiovascular risk.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Retinal venous obstruction involves local vessel anatomy, flow and often arteriovenous crossing pathology. Branch and central retinal vein occlusions have different clinical courses. A retinal event may coexist with systemic hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes, glaucoma or less common hypercoagulable states. Distinguishing cause from correlated risk is essential: the event is a signal deserving assessment, not proof that all arterial beds contain the same clotting process.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A useful model includes vessel-level injury, blood viscosity and systemic metabolic exposure. Ocular imaging may provide evidence of local ischemia, edema and retinal perfusion, but cannot directly quantify coronary plaque or cerebral embolic source. The prognostic question is whether RVO adds information beyond measured cardiovascular risk factors. A published meta-analysis associated baseline RVO with later stroke, although observational biases and heterogeneity remain relevant.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The retina's appeal as a systemic sentinel derives from its accessible microvascular structure, not from a perfect analogy between the eye and the brain. Retinal vein compression, retinal arterial stiffness and intraocular pressure can contribute to local pathology, while systemic vascular risk factors affect multiple organs. Thus an ocular event can predict broader cardiovascular risk without necessarily sharing a specific thrombotic mechanism with an eventual stroke. A branch retinal vein occlusion also differs from a central occlusion in territory and clinical course; those distinctions influence interpretation of later vascular outcomes.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Not every retinal vascular event justifies indiscriminate coagulation panels or empiric anticoagulation. Younger patients with unusual histories may merit a different differential from older patients with typical hypertensive vascular disease. It is also critical not to confuse retinal vein occlusion with arterial occlusion, which has different emergency and vascular implications.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A useful research article would separate incident RVO as a risk marker from RVO as a causal factor for later stroke. If adjustment for age, hypertension, diabetes and smoking eliminates the association, the eye event is mainly revealing established risk. If independent predictive value remains, the retinal phenotype may add practical information. Either result could improve clinical care without justifying blanket antithrombotic treatment.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper proposes the retina as a practical window for systemic assessment, with care coordinated across ophthalmology and relevant medical specialties. It rejects marketing claims that a single eye photograph can reliably identify every form of underlying disease. Clear indications and validated risk models remain essential.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Impact of Retinal Vein Occlusion on Stroke Incidence: A Meta-Analysis](#)
2. [Retinal vein occlusion and stroke meta-analysis](#)

Source lineage: BRVO investigations and systemic vascular-risk discussions

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Patient with Normal Triglycerides but Elevated ApoB

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Standard lipid panels can conceal clinically relevant differences in lipoprotein particle number. This paper explains why apolipoprotein B can add information when LDL cholesterol, non-HDL cholesterol and triglycerides appear discordant. Its broader conceptual argument is that the quantity carried by particles and the number of particles transporting that cargo are different measurements of vascular exposure.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Most circulating atherogenic particles carry one apoB molecule, allowing apoB concentration to act as an approximate index of their number. LDL cholesterol measures cholesterol mass inside a particular lipoprotein fraction. Two people with similar LDL-C can have different distributions of particle size and number. Insulin resistance, metabolic syndrome, diabetes and specific lipid disorders can produce characteristic discordances, but no single profile proves plaque causation in an individual.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The transport analogy is useful because arterial-wall exposure depends partly on the number of atherogenic particles encountering the endothelium over time. Elevated apoB may better reflect that burden than LDL-C in selected discordant patients. However, apoB interpretation must fit age, baseline risk, medical history and treatment context. It is not a substitute for blood pressure management, smoking cessation or evaluation of secondary causes.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The difference between particle number and cholesterol mass is conceptually similar to counting delivery vehicles versus measuring the total cargo. The analogy is imperfect, since particles differ in composition and biological behavior, but it explains why two lipid panels with similar LDL cholesterol may not imply identical arterial exposure. Long-term risk also depends on exposure duration: a high concentration sustained for decades differs from a brief measurement during acute illness. Any “optimal panel” should consider time, inherited traits, secondary causes and the patient's absolute cardiovascular risk rather than rely on a single preferred ratio.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A low triglyceride value is not a general guarantee of vascular safety, and high cholesterol ratios cannot by themselves refute a high apoB measurement. Conversely, an isolated apoB result does not diagnose familial hypercholesterolemia or indicate the necessity of a specific drug without clinical context. Marker comparisons should reflect validated risk and treatment evidence.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A strong interpretation would compare apoB, LDL-C and non-HDL-C while asking where they disagree and whether the discrepancy changes risk assessment or care. When all measures tell a similar story, additional sophistication may not add much. ApoB is valuable not because it overturns lipid medicine but because it refines the measurement of atherogenic particles.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper encourages moving from good-versus-bad cholesterol rhetoric toward particle biology and cumulative exposure. It could support patient education about what standard labs measure, why discordance happens, and why measured risk is more valuable than assumptions about the moral quality of one dietary fat.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Sitosterolemia: Twenty Years of Discovery of ABCG5 ABCG8](#)
2. [Sitosterolemia: a review and update of pathophysiology, clinical spectrum, diagnosis, and management](#)

Source lineage: Clinical lipid-panel review; stroke and cholesterol transport

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When HbA1c and Fasting Glucose Disagree

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

HbA1c estimates glycemic exposure indirectly through hemoglobin glycation; fasting plasma glucose captures concentration at a particular moment. Disagreement between them need not be a laboratory error. This paper examines the biological reasons for discordance and argues that two measures answering different questions should not automatically be forced into a single diagnosis.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

HbA1c depends on both glucose exposure and red-cell lifespan. Hemolysis, recent blood loss, pregnancy-related changes, renal disease, iron deficiency, hemoglobin variants and transfusion can affect interpretation. Fasting glucose is influenced by fasting duration, stress, sleep, medications and hepatic glucose output. Postprandial hyperglycemia may be missed by a fasting value. Continuous glucose monitoring can reveal patterns but is not itself a universal diagnostic replacement.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The clinical concept is triangulation: compare the trajectory of fasting glucose, HbA1c, medication history, anemia and renal measures before drawing conclusions. A mismatch should trigger a question about assay biology, timing and glucose variability. This applies equally to reassuring A1c with unexpected high measured glucose and an elevated A1c with apparently normal home fasting measurements.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A single marker can be biologically accurate and clinically misleading when its assumptions fail. HbA1c assumes a relationship between erythrocyte exposure time and circulating glucose; conditions that shorten red-cell lifespan can lower measured glycation at the same glucose level, while others can raise it. Fasting glucose has an almost opposite limitation: it captures a narrow time point and may miss substantial postprandial excursions. The two tests therefore occupy different positions on the timeline of metabolic regulation. More data are not automatically better, however, when sensor inaccuracy or laboratory artifacts are ignored.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

There is danger in attributing discordance to occult insulin resistance or “terrain failure” without checking common laboratory and hematological causes. Home sensors have accuracy limitations, especially around rapidly changing glucose or sensor compression. Repeated testing and clinician-guided confirmation may be more informative than an elaborate unsupported endocrine theory.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The discriminating question is whether repeated measurements, renal and hematologic context and appropriately selected glucose testing converge on a coherent picture. If discordance is explained by iron deficiency or hemolysis, invoking a mysterious metabolic subtype adds little. If glucose excursions are genuine despite normal fasting values, the problem is temporal sampling rather than a failed laboratory system.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper offers a transferable lesson in diagnosis: a biomarker is not the illness itself, and discrepancies may reveal what the assay actually measures. The appropriate result is better selection and interpretation of measurements, not abandonment of standard glucose evaluation.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss

Source lineage: Metabolic consultations and clinical blood-work interpretation

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Endocrine Influences on Microvascular Function

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Microvessels respond to blood pressure, glucose, hematocrit, vascular tone and hormonal signals. This paper evaluates endocrine and hematologic contributors to microvascular vulnerability without suggesting that one “hormonal imbalance” explains retinal, renal and cerebral vascular disease. The aim is to articulate when thyroid, metabolic, sex-steroid or erythrocyte abnormalities plausibly alter vascular risk.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Thyroid hormones influence lipid handling, heart rate and hemodynamics; insulin resistance and diabetes change endothelial function and microvascular integrity. Elevated hematocrit can alter blood viscosity, while smoking and hypoxia interact with vascular function. Sex hormones affect coagulation and vascular physiology in context-dependent ways. These mechanisms are individually plausible but do not form a uniform endocrine fingerprint for retinal vein occlusion or stroke.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A layered framework separates upstream susceptibility (metabolic disease, altered endocrine state) from vessel events and downstream tissue injury. The physiologic link must be specific: elevated thyroid hormone may increase atrial arrhythmia risk, whereas hypothyroidism may contribute to dyslipidemia. The routes differ even if both ultimately intersect with vascular medicine. Proposed biomarkers should be chosen because they explain the patient's presentation, not because a panel is available.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The most powerful way to prevent endocrine overreach is to specify a hemodynamic or coagulation intermediate. Hyperthyroidism may influence atrial rhythm and subsequent embolic risk; some estrogen exposures can influence clotting risk; diabetes may damage retinal and renal microcirculation through prolonged glucose-related pathways. These examples are clinically different despite being grouped under endocrine medicine. A patient with retinal disease should not be presumed to have a hidden thyroid or estrogen disorder merely because these mechanisms exist in other contexts.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Associations between hormone concentration and vascular events are often confounded by obesity, medication use, age and systemic illness. A measured value within a broad reference interval cannot exclude every dynamic abnormality, but nor does it justify diagnosing occult endocrine disease. Excessive treatment based on unvalidated patterns can cause harm.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

An explanatory model has value when it predicts when additional endocrine testing alters diagnosis or management. It loses value when every vascular symptom triggers expansive unspecific hormone panels. The best paper should rank the plausibility of mechanisms by clinical phenotype and interpret test results against established reference frameworks.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper is a methodological guide to endocrine realism: identify the mechanism, evaluate objective evidence, and avoid conflating physiology with a causal diagnosis. In retinal and cerebrovascular medicine, this improves the discipline of differential assessment rather than displacing established risk reduction.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Impact of Retinal Vein Occlusion on Stroke Incidence: A Meta-Analysis](#)
2. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)

Source lineage: BRVO case; hormone–bile study; cardiovascular investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Nitric Oxide Is Not a Substitute for Stroke Prevention

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 04 · Microvascular and cardiometabolic risk · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Dietary nitrate can influence nitric-oxide pathways and some vascular measurements. That physiologic activity does not prove that beetroot or celery juice treats a prior stroke or prevents recurrence. This paper explains the evidentiary gap between changing an intermediate biomarker and altering clinical outcomes, using stroke prevention as a high-stakes example.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The nitrate-nitrite-nitric oxide pathway can modify vascular tone under certain conditions. Endothelial nitric-oxide synthase is also important for vascular biology. Yet stroke mechanisms differ: emboli from the heart, intracranial atherosclerosis, small-vessel disease and dissection do not all respond to the same intervention. Lowering measured blood pressure modestly is not equivalent to resolving a carotid thrombus or preventing cardioembolic stroke.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A valid prevention claim requires clinical-event data in a specified patient group, dose and treatment context. Meanwhile documented preventive options include blood pressure control, lipid management, antithrombotic therapy matched to stroke subtype, smoking cessation and selected procedural interventions. Treating one surrogate biomarker while ignoring the initial stroke's etiology confuses supportive lifestyle practice with disease-specific treatment.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Nitric oxide acts in vascular signaling but is not a general antithrombotic medication. Dietary nitrate can enter an enterosalivary pathway, undergoing conversion to nitrite and eventually nitric oxide under some conditions. This may influence vascular tone, yet it does not mechanically remove a cardiac embolus, repair a dissection or dissolve an established thrombus. Even in hypertension, a measurable change in systolic pressure from food does not automatically equal the magnitude and consistency of protection shown with effective long-term risk treatment. The critical mistake is translating a favorable mechanistic story into a claim about stroke recurrence without event-outcome data.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The opposite exaggeration would be to claim dietary nitrate has no physiological benefits. Food can affect vascular function; however, a favorable blood-pressure or flow measurement alone does not establish mortality, recurrent-stroke or disability benefit. Potential interactions, individual hypotension and renal factors also require attention. Neither enthusiasm nor dismissal should replace causal evaluation.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A meaningful comparative argument would ask about the precise prior stroke mechanism, absolute recurrence risk, and whether a dietary intervention adds benefit to established treatment. If the only evidence is a change in a surrogate signal such as nitric-oxide metabolites, the stroke-prevention claim remains unproven. This distinction protects both legitimate nutrition research and patient safety.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The best public message is that nutrition can complement appropriately indicated secondary prevention but cannot replace it. This framework also generalizes to supplements advertised through a single laboratory marker: ask which human clinical outcome improved, relative to which comparator, and whether the effect applies to this patient's vascular mechanism.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Impact of Retinal Vein Occlusion on Stroke Incidence: A Meta-Analysis

Source lineage: Poststroke beetroot and celery discussion

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When Fat Mobilization Exceeds Elimination

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Adipose tissue stores triglycerides and can accumulate certain lipophilic environmental contaminants. During weight loss, mobilization of tissue stores may alter circulating concentrations of some compounds. This paper proposes a rate-mismatch framework in which release, redistribution, metabolism and excretion occur on different timescales. It does not infer that rapid fasting universally “flushes toxins” or that all metals are stored in fat.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Mobilization of stored triglycerides changes plasma free-fatty-acid flux. Persistent organic pollutants can partition into adipose tissue and may be redistributed during weight loss; their measured blood concentrations can change for reasons that include reduced fat mass and altered volume of distribution. Metals such as lead have prominent skeletal storage, and other toxicants follow their own chemistry. Therefore, “stored toxins” must always name the actual substance and biologic compartment.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A useful model separates the amount mobilized from the amount metabolized, bound, excreted or redeposited. It predicts that accelerated fat loss may transiently change blood exposure for certain lipophilic pollutants without proving clinical toxicity or net clearance. Hepatic function, plasma proteins, kidney excretion, gut recycling and time since exposure complicate interpretation. The relationship could be nonlinear and pollutant-specific rather than determined by the number of pounds lost.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Redistribution can masquerade as elimination or new exposure, depending on which compartment is measured. A lipophilic compound may rise in plasma during changes in adiposity while its total body burden follows a different trajectory. Some toxicants partition into blood lipids; reporting their concentration without lipid adjustment may distort interpretation. A favorable clinical symptom change after fasting likewise does not prove that a named pollutant left the body. This creates a crucial distinction among release from stores, redistribution to another compartment, metabolism into a different species and final excretion. Each step may require a different assay to establish it.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Increased plasma concentration does not automatically establish new tissue injury, and a decline in total body fat does not guarantee removal of a chemical from the body. Studies of weight-loss exposures can be confounded by changing diet, background contamination and altered circulating lipid concentration. Claims that every symptom during fasting is “detox” risk missing dehydration, hypoglycemia, medication problems or electrolyte disturbances.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The hypothesis would gain substance from compound-specific measurements before, during and long after weight loss together with body composition and exposure controls. It would weaken if purported “detox” symptoms failed to correlate with any measurable chemical or recognized physiologic abnormality. Without those checks, refeeding complications or electrolyte problems could be dangerously mislabeled as evidence that elimination is progressing.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper's contribution is a disciplined model of toxicokinetics. It recommends neither extreme fasting nor “binders” as general detoxification treatment. If environmental exposure is suspected, species-specific testing, toxicology expertise and evidence-based management are needed; vague cleansing protocols cannot replace them.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)
2. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)

Source lineage: Absurd Fast; Resurrection Biology; environmental chemical storage investigation

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Biology of the Weight-Loss Plateau

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Weight loss often slows after an initial period of rapid change. This paper argues that a plateau is an interaction between expenditure, intake, body composition, hormonal adaptation and measurement rather than evidence that the body has “refused to burn fat.” It places experiences from disciplined restricted eating within modern energy-balance physiology and challenges overly simple interpretations of fasting results.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Early declines in scale weight often include glycogen-associated water and changing gut contents. As mass falls, resting and movement-related energy expenditure may decline, while appetite and reward signaling can encourage compensatory intake. Physical activity, sleep, dietary adherence, lean mass and measurement error all alter observed trends. A single day of stable weight is not a physiologic plateau; body-water variation can exceed short-term fat change.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Time-restricted eating may improve adherence for some but is not mechanically superior to an equivalent energy deficit for everyone. In a 12-month randomized trial, adding time restriction to prescribed calorie restriction did not significantly improve weight loss. The relevant question is whether a particular schedule improves sustainable energy intake, satiety, sleep and preservation of muscle in that person's context. Protein, resistance training and total nutrition matter as much as clock time.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A plateau is often a mismatch between expected and observed trend rather than absence of energy exchange. People may accurately follow a dietary schedule while underestimating portions, reducing spontaneous movement or experiencing changes in water retention that hide short-term fat loss. Energy expenditure may fall as body mass decreases, and hunger regulation can change. None of these requires intentional failure or a pathological “set-point lock.” Likewise, identical caloric intake can yield different rates of loss as weight, activity and body composition evolve. These changes are real physiology, not an indictment of motivation.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Neither “hormone resistance” nor an invisible bile blockage should be diagnosed merely from unchanged scale weight. Some medical conditions and medications contribute to gain, but a plausible mechanism must be supported by objective findings. Overly severe caloric restriction can increase lean-mass loss and medical risk without guaranteeing better long-term outcomes.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A meaningful assessment would distinguish a two-week stable scale from a months-long stable weight with verified intake and expenditure information. If the plateau disappears after accounting for water variation and reduced movement, occult biliary dysfunction becomes an unnecessary explanation. If significant symptoms or objective abnormalities suggest endocrine disease, targeted investigation remains appropriate.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper can help readers interpret their weight trend without oversimplification: measure rolling averages, waist circumference, intake patterns and activity while considering relevant medical causes. The goal is distinguishing ordinary adaptation from clinically meaningful pathology, not prescribing a universal 40-day intervention.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss

Source lineage: Personal weight-loss plateau investigations; Absurd Fast

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Fasting and the Brain: What Actually Changes?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Fasting alters peripheral fuel availability and can shift cerebral uptake toward ketones under certain conditions. Subjective clarity, fatigue, irritability or calm may occur, but these experiences cannot independently prove neurotransmitter regeneration, parasite eradication or improved neuroplasticity. This paper provides a metabolic interpretation of fasting-related mental changes that respects competing psychological and physiologic explanations.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Depletion of hepatic glycogen and lower insulin signaling can increase lipolysis and hepatic ketogenesis, while the brain continues to require and use glucose. Ketone transport rises with adaptation; energy availability, sleep changes, hydration and stress hormones also influence cognition. Peripheral ketone measurements are not direct measures of neuronal ATP or receptor function. Symptoms depend on nutritional intake, baseline metabolic health, medications and fasting duration.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The conceptual model separates substrate availability, cell signaling, subjective cognition and objectively tested performance. A person who reports unusual calm after fasting may be experiencing improved routine or changes in arousal rather than a named biochemical repair. Conversely, a person experiencing confusion or weakness may have a medical complication requiring care. Neurocognitive effects should not be inferred from weight reduction alone.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Personal experiences of clarity or serenity can be profound without identifying the mechanism that generated them. Changes in sleep, social routine, stimulation, perceived self-control, meal-related energy fluctuation and ketone availability can all co-occur. A clinician may document lower anxiety or better concentration, but inferring “regenerated neurotransmitters” requires a different level of evidence and often measurements not feasible in routine care. The neurobiological challenge is that metabolic state and psychological state interact bidirectionally: altered diet can influence mood, and mood can change the fasting experience itself.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Ketones have real biologic roles and certain ketogenic regimens have established uses in epilepsy, but that does not validate a claim of universal psychiatric healing from prolonged restriction. Study designs struggle with expectancy, selection bias and changes in total food quality. Without biochemical and cognitive measurements, testimony remains compelling as experience but limited as causal evidence.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Cognitive testing during and after the eating intervention would distinguish immediate performance effects from lasting improvement. If the same subjective benefits occurred with a less restrictive schedule that preserved nutrition and sleep, a prolonged fast would not be required to explain them. The most useful hypothesis is one that identifies a safe and necessary active ingredient rather than celebrating duration as an endpoint.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

A responsible paper can preserve the question that inspired the fasting books: Why do some people experience profound changes in attention, mood and appetite when food timing changes? It answers by mapping plausible mechanisms and specifying what would be needed to distinguish them—without inviting medically vulnerable people to undertake prolonged fasts.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)
2. [Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism](#)

Source lineage: Absurd Fast; Resurrection Biology; personal fasting observations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Electrolyte Physiology During Prolonged Dietary Restriction

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Prolonged dietary restriction changes renal sodium handling, body water, potassium balance, magnesium intake and acid-base physiology. This paper argues against a universal electrolyte ratio for all people fasting or eating very little. The key distinction is between plausible electrolyte requirements and individually safe replacement, which depends on kidneys, medication, disease state and measured abnormalities.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Declining insulin concentrations can alter renal sodium excretion; vomiting, diarrhea, sweating and diuretics create additional losses. Potassium concentration reflects complex intracellular and extracellular redistribution and is not a simple surrogate for total stores. Magnesium participates in neuromuscular and cardiac function, but excessive replacement can be dangerous in renal impairment. Hyponatremia may result from excessive free-water intake or other physiologic disturbances, even in someone diligently taking an electrolyte mixture.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Risk escalates with prolonged insufficient nutrition, diuretic use, advanced kidney disease, heart failure and some endocrine disorders. ECG abnormalities, orthostasis, weakness, confusion and arrhythmias demand evaluation rather than blind escalation of supplements. Refeeding is a separate phase in which insulin-mediated cellular uptake can rapidly change phosphate, potassium and magnesium. Normal levels before feeding do not guarantee low refeeding risk.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Electrolyte disorders are dynamic, and concentration is not the same as total body content. Serum potassium may remain temporarily normal despite evolving deficiency or shift dangerously with kidney dysfunction and medications. Phosphate depletion may become clinically visible during refeeding rather than during the preceding restriction. Sodium requirements depend on water handling, sweat, blood pressure and renal regulation, not on a fixed teaspoon target. Thus the idea that an individual can guarantee safety by taking a standardized powder reflects a misunderstanding of homeostasis. The monitoring problem grows when prolonged low energy intake is combined with bowel losses or drugs affecting electrolyte transport.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A particular blend may be practical in a narrow supervised protocol, but it is not scientifically sound to generalize a fixed sodium:potassium:magnesium ratio without clinical data. Excess potassium can cause life-threatening arrhythmia; excess sodium can worsen susceptible cardiovascular or renal conditions; excessive water intake can cause hyponatremia. Symptoms ascribed to detoxification may actually reflect dangerous imbalance.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A strong educational endpoint is recognition of symptoms and situations requiring laboratory assessment, especially prolonged malnutrition and refeeding risk. If someone becomes dizzy, confused, weak or develops palpitations, increasing an unknown electrolyte mixture is not a reliable diagnostic maneuver. The relevant medical question is which electrolyte, fluid compartment or cardiac process is actually disturbed.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

For publication, the paper should emphasize physiology and safety architecture rather than dosing instructions. The important conceptual discovery is that time without food does not eliminate the body's regulated electrolyte needs; it changes the conditions under which those needs must be managed. Medical monitoring matters particularly in extended fasting.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [ASPEN Consensus Recommendations for Refeeding Syndrome](#)
2. [Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)

Source lineage: Absurd Fast electrolytes protocol; Terrain Medicine Handbook

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Why Refed Foods Can Produce Unexpected Reactions

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

After prolonged food restriction, a meal may cause unexpected bloating, fatigue, nausea or changes in bowel function. This paper examines several competing mechanisms: altered gut motility, food load, pancreatic and biliary coordination, fermentable carbohydrate tolerance, glycemic fluctuation and expectation effects. It rejects the unsupported leap from an unpleasant food response to proof that the food is intrinsically toxic.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Digestive function adapts to nutrient patterns and meal timing. Reintroduction after a restrictive regimen changes luminal carbohydrate, fat and protein exposures simultaneously. A large rich meal may produce discomfort through ordinary gastric accommodation and intestinal transit. Fat malabsorption, pancreatic insufficiency, bile-acid disorders and established food allergies require specific criteria and may be unrelated to fasting. The physiological category matters far more than the ingredient's reputation.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Food-challenge interpretations improve when exposures are small, medically appropriate, standardized and recorded alongside timing, other foods, medication, sleep and activity. A reaction to beetroot after weeks of unusual eating does not prove beetroot-derived neurotoxicity; postprandial fatigue can have glycemic, sleep-related, caloric, autonomic and psychological explanations. Reproducibility alone is necessary but not sufficient for identifying a molecular culprit.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The controlled-variable problem is central. A person reintroducing beetroot may simultaneously increase meal volume, carbohydrate load, fiber, fermentable components and total calories while recovering from weeks of restriction. A reaction can be real and reproducible yet still be misattributed to one plant chemical. In addition, depletion or adaptation of digestive processes may change tolerance transiently; the fact that a food is uncomfortable after restriction does not establish lasting intolerance. One should also distinguish meal-induced sleepiness from neurologic impairment and ensure that serious refeeding abnormalities are not overlooked.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The most serious competing process after prolonged malnutrition is refeeding syndrome, which is not a benign sign of “gut resealing.” Weakness, edema, cardiopulmonary signs, confusion and marked electrolyte changes require urgent clinical assessment. People with significant restriction or weight loss should not infer from a popular elimination diet that supervised refeeding can safely be improvised.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Evidence would be stronger when symptoms are documented during a medically appropriate, controlled reintroduction with one variable changed at a time. A severe reaction is a reason for assessment rather than a challenge to repeat. If different foods with equivalent energy or fermentable carbohydrate generate similar symptoms, the proposed culprit may be meal physiology instead of a single named vegetable toxin.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper offers a mechanism-first approach to dietary reintroduction without constructing a hierarchy of “forbidden” vegetables. A clinician should distinguish ordinary discomfort from allergy, malabsorption, nutritional deficiency and metabolic emergencies. It connects personal observations to testable physiology while avoiding a false universal conclusion.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [ASPEN Consensus Recommendations for Refeeding Syndrome](#)
2. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)

Source lineage: Vegetables Are Toxic; Absurd Fast; food reintroduction research

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Does a Metabolic Reset Persist After Refeeding?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

“Reset” is a useful metaphor but an imprecise medical claim. Temporary ketogenesis, improved fasting glucose, altered appetite and weight loss may reverse when eating patterns change. This paper asks which adaptations endure after refeeding, which are proportional to weight change and which require continued behavioral or pharmacological support. It argues that lasting metabolic improvement must be demonstrated after the intervention ends.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Fasting changes substrate selection, circulating insulin, glucagon and some hepatic metabolic processes. The persistence of benefit depends on underlying disease, body composition, energy intake, physical activity, medicines and the duration of follow-up. A laboratory marker improving during restriction does not show that the body entered a permanently repaired state. The recovery phase may expose the difference between transient starvation biology and a sustained reduction in cardiometabolic risk.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Three categories help clarify outcomes: state markers such as ketones measured during fasting; intermediate markers such as body weight, triglycerides and glucose regulation after refeeding; and patient-important endpoints such as function, morbidity or medication need. A meaningful “reset” would require demonstrable long-term change in the second and third categories, not merely successful completion of a fixed fasting calendar.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The label “reset” invites an untested claim of permanence. A better typology distinguishes reversible state changes, learned behavioral changes and altered disease trajectories. Ketone availability may normalize within days of carbohydrate reintroduction; new meal habits may persist for years; a reduction in liver fat or blood pressure may persist only to the extent that body weight and behavior remain changed. The same before-and-after picture can therefore represent several different biological outcomes. The model needs to specify not only whether a marker improved, but when it was measured relative to fasting and refeed intake.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Claims of permanent “gut sealing,” universal hormone restoration or total elimination of cravings are not substantiated by a fast's duration. Follow-up studies can be affected by selective reporting and attrition: enthusiastic completers may be the only people whose outcomes are publicly visible. Refeeding, habit changes and medication adjustments are potential confounders.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The central disconfirming observation would be rapid loss of the proposed benefit once caloric intake returns, despite the narrative that an internal process had been permanently completed. Conversely, a sustained improvement independent of weight change would be worth examining for a distinct mechanism. Either outcome requires longitudinal measurement rather than relying on an endpoint during peak restriction.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper reframes the attractive idea of a reset into a rigorous question of durability. It helps readers distinguish immediate physiology from sustained recovery and encourages cautious interpretation of before-and-after photographs or short-term biomarker changes. No particular length of fast guarantees persistent metabolic health.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss

Source lineage: Resurrection Biology; 40-day fast and maintenance observations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Difference Between Losing Weight and Restoring Health

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 05 · Fasting, environmental exposure and metabolic recovery · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Scale weight is a convenient measurement, but it cannot summarize health. This paper distinguishes fat reduction from preservation of muscle, skeletal health, functional capacity, mental wellbeing and vascular risk. Its central claim is that dramatic weight loss may be a valuable intermediate outcome while remaining insufficient evidence of complete metabolic restoration.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Weight consists of adipose tissue, lean tissue, water, bone and transient contents. Rapid early losses can reflect shifts in glycogen-associated water and gastrointestinal mass. Severe dietary restriction can produce loss of fat and lean tissue together. Clinical consequences depend on baseline body composition, nutrient adequacy, activity, disease and maintenance. A person who loses substantial weight but becomes weak, dizzy or malnourished has not necessarily achieved a net gain in health.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The relevant measurement set includes weight trend, waist change, strength and functional capacity, nutritional adequacy, cardiovascular risk, glycemic status and safety events. Some improvements may occur without large weight loss; others can be reversed by weight regain. Patient priorities also matter: freedom from pain, improved sleep or medication reduction should not be attributed to a specific mechanism without evidence.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A good outcome framework must avoid privileging what photographs show over what a body can do. Weight reduction may lessen mechanical burden and improve some cardiometabolic measures, while inadequate protein, exercise and micronutrients can impair physical function. Restored health might include lower blood pressure, better glycemic control, improved daily activity and maintained muscle strength; it might also require ongoing management of conditions unrelated to weight. A dramatic cosmetic transformation cannot determine whether atherosclerotic plaque is stabilized or whether a psychiatric disorder has resolved. The distinction protects against both weight-centered stigma and overconfident treatment claims.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Extreme body-fat targets are not physiologically appropriate or maintainable for everyone, and the appearance of abdominal definition cannot establish hormone status, parasite clearance or cardiovascular protection. Standardized body-composition methods have measurement error, while short social-media transformations often combine dehydration, lighting and muscle-pumping effects.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Discriminating success requires functional and biochemical follow-up after the diet ends, not merely an impressive final-day measurement. If performance deteriorates despite rapid weight loss, the intervention's net benefit is questionable. If a patient feels better without major weight loss, this may reveal a valuable effect that the scale cannot register. Different outcomes deserve different instruments.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper gives Absurd Health a balanced metric for describing outcomes: weight loss can be meaningful without being the definition of healing. It favors health-function interpretation over extreme numerical promises and insists that reports of benefit and reports of harm deserve equal visibility.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss

Source lineage: Weight loss and 40-day fasting client communications

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When Infection Masquerades as Autoimmunity

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 06 · Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Some infections generate symptoms, inflammatory markers and organ manifestations that overlap with autoimmune disease. Others can coexist with autoimmune conditions and become dangerous during immunosuppressive therapy. This paper examines how immune stimulation, antigenic cross-reactivity, chronic tissue injury and diagnostic ambiguity can create genuine clinical confusion. It rejects the unsupportable generalization that most autoimmune illness is an overlooked parasitic infection.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Immune activation is not organism-specific. Fever, rash, eosinophilia, arthritis, cytopenias or neuropathy may arise through several causal pathways. Certain parasites cause tissue damage directly, while infections can produce postinfectious or immune-mediated syndromes. Autoantibodies themselves can be nonspecific or transient in infectious contexts. The clinician must relate symptoms to organism exposure, geography, incubation, laboratory patterns and confirmatory testing rather than treat an antibody result as a complete explanation.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The most useful overlap occurs at the decision to suppress immunity. *Strongyloides stercoralis* can persist for years and may cause life-threatening dissemination when corticosteroids are introduced in a susceptible patient. That is a specific and powerful example of why the infectious differential matters. It is not evidence that removing hypothetical parasites cures rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis or lupus.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The category “immune disorder” includes an enormous range of mechanisms, and the most compelling infection-related cases involve a demonstrable route to organ injury. Molecular mimicry, direct tissue invasion, circulating immune complexes and postinfectious inflammation are not synonymous processes. A patient with apparent autoimmune neuropathy after an infection presents a different question from a patient with chronic joint pain and no exposure risk. The risk of *Strongyloides* hyperinfection under corticosteroids highlights another issue entirely: an independent infection may make appropriate therapy hazardous without having caused the autoimmune disorder in the first place. Distinguishing these causal roles is a hallmark of sound medical reasoning.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Parasitic infection may be rare in an individual with no plausible exposure, while autoimmune disease may be supported by well-established clinical criteria. Repeated nonspecific stool tests or empiric antiparasitic protocols can distract from genuine organ-threatening disease. Conversely, corticosteroids can be appropriate and lifesaving in true inflammatory conditions; the issue is context-dependent infectious risk.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A high-quality paper should distinguish infection causing an autoimmune-like syndrome, infection coinciding with genuine autoimmune disease, and infection becoming dangerous because of immunosuppression. If an organism cannot be demonstrated and the exposure history is implausible, an expansive parasite theory has little diagnostic advantage. The objective is better recognition of definable intersections, not wholesale replacement of established autoimmune diagnoses.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This conceptual paper advocates organism-specific reasoning and risk recognition, especially before certain immunosuppressive therapies. It emphasizes testing when epidemiology and symptoms justify it, not indiscriminate parasite cleansing. A diagnosis gains credibility when an actual organism and plausible causal pathway can be documented.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Screening, prevention, and treatment for Strongyloides hyperinfection syndrome](#)
2. [Diagnosis and Treatment of Neurocysticercosis: IDSA/ASTMH clinical guidance](#)

Source lineage: Parasites: Hidden Epidemic; Autism and Parasites; Terrain Handbook

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Parasites, Seizures and Focal Brain Disease

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 06 · Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A parasite can produce neurological symptoms through discrete lesions rather than vague systemic “neurotoxicity.” Neurocysticercosis is a particularly clear example of an infection that can cause seizures and focal neurological abnormalities. This paper distinguishes organism-specific neuropathology from generalized speculation that unexplained seizures or psychiatric disorders usually reveal concealed parasitic burden.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Taenia solium larval cysts in neural tissue can provoke inflammation, especially during degeneration, and may contribute to epileptic seizures, edema or obstructive hydrocephalus depending on lesion location and stage. Other parasitic infections have distinct routes into the nervous system and different clinical patterns. Brain imaging, exposure history, serological testing and diagnostic criteria are essential; ordinary stool examination is not a sufficient test for all tissue infections.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A conceptual framework separates direct tissue invasion, host inflammatory response, intracranial pressure and long-term seizure susceptibility. The temporal relationship between lesion stage and symptoms can help explain why neurological episodes are intermittent. However, seizures also commonly arise from vascular events, tumors, developmental lesions, medication or metabolic disturbances; parasitic disease requires evidence rather than inference from episodic symptoms.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Neurocysticercosis illustrates why the location and life stage of an organism matter as much as its identity. A parenchymal cyst can be associated with seizure activity and inflammatory edema, whereas extraparenchymal disease may produce ventricular obstruction or subarachnoid complications. Antiparasitic treatment may intensify inflammation as lesions degenerate; management therefore depends on imaging phenotype and can require coordinated corticosteroid, antiepileptic or surgical decisions. A generic cleanse directed at “brain parasites” cannot account for these distinctions and may be hazardous. The specificity of the organism-lesion-syndrome relationship is the strongest feature of this paper.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The broad “parasites hijack neurotransmitters” narrative is often based on animal models or associations that cannot establish common human clinical causation. Not every CNS parasite infection produces seizures, and not every neurologic symptom in an exposed person is parasitic. Incorrect treatment can be dangerous when inflammation or obstruction requires specialist management.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A persuasive infection diagnosis should connect exposure, neuroimaging, confirmatory tests and the observed neurologic syndrome. If imaging instead shows vascular-territory infarction with no parasitic lesions, stroke may be the stronger explanation despite episodic abnormal movements. If a lesion is confirmed, its stage and location still determine whether it explains the symptom. Causal reasoning does not end with a positive test.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper invites precise differential diagnosis: name the organism, lesion, mechanism and appropriate confirmatory method. Neurological emergencies require urgent care, and antiparasitic drugs may need coordinated anti-inflammatory and seizure management. Its scholarly strength comes from anatomical specificity, not from an all-encompassing parasite theory.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Diagnosis and Treatment of Neurocysticercosis: IDSA/ASTMH clinical guidance](#)

Source lineage: Parasites epidemic; autism and neuroinflammation investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

When a Negative Stool Test Is Not the End of the Investigation

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 06 · Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A negative diagnostic test reduces the probability of disease according to its sensitivity and the pretest probability. It does not make infection impossible. This paper examines why stool-based parasite investigations can miss certain infections, while emphasizing that limitations are organism-dependent. It opposes the equally misleading assumption that every negative test proves a hidden infection.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Detection varies with specimen timing, number of samples, parasite shedding patterns, life-cycle stage, test technology and laboratory expertise. Microscopy, antigen assays, molecular panels and serology answer different questions. Stool studies may be irrelevant for some tissue-based parasitic diseases and may require repeated specimens for some enteric organisms. A test intended to find common intestinal pathogens is not a universal survey of every potential parasite.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Bayesian reasoning supplies a disciplined alternative to test absolutism. A patient with compatible symptoms, endemic exposure, eosinophilia or a distinctive organ syndrome may retain meaningful residual probability after one negative result. A person without compatible risk factors and with repeated properly selected negative tests has a different probability. The next test should follow a specific suspected organism, not merely the belief that “something is hiding.”

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The performance of a stool examination depends on what the laboratory was asked to find. A molecular enteric panel, ova-and-parasite microscopy and *Strongyloides* serology are not interchangeable instruments; some examine intestinal material, while others detect host response. Even serial negative stool samples may have different implications for a heavily shedding protozoan infection and a low-burden infection with intermittent larval output. The broader diagnostic lesson is that a negative result must always be interpreted in the context of test design and the suspected organism's biology. A test cannot disprove conditions it was never designed to detect.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Overdiagnosis causes harm. Low-specificity commercial panels, artifacts mistaken for worms and unvalidated biofilm tests can produce false positives; repeated empiric deworming can cause adverse reactions and delay other diagnoses. Common gastrointestinal symptoms have many nonparasitic explanations. Negative test interpretation must remain grounded in technical characteristics and real exposure risk.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The concept weakens when it becomes an unfalsifiable excuse to disregard every negative test. A credible diagnostic pathway must specify what additional evidence would eventually be sufficient to stop investigating a parasite. If the hypothesis generates endless testing while no compatible syndrome or exposure exists, it has ceased to be useful clinical reasoning.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper's practical question is what exactly was tested and how well the chosen method detects it. That is more useful than pronouncing all stool testing reliable or unreliable. An organism-specific diagnostic pathway preserves skeptical thinking and avoids turning diagnostic uncertainty into a permanent infection identity.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. *Strongyloides stercoralis*: there but not seen

Source lineage: Parasites: Hidden Epidemic; diagnostic parasite discussions

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Hidden Danger of Strongyloides During Immunosuppression

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 06 · Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Strongyloides stercoralis demonstrates how a chronic parasitic infection can remain clinically quiet yet become dangerous under altered host immunity. Because its autoinfective life cycle can maintain infection for years, corticosteroid exposure may precipitate hyperinfection or dissemination. This paper uses that specific relationship to explore the interplay between infection, immune state and clinical treatment risk.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The organism differs from most common intestinal helminths in its capacity for ongoing autoinfection. Some carriers have few symptoms, while others exhibit eosinophilia or intermittent gastrointestinal and pulmonary findings. Eosinophilia may be absent during hyperinfection, so its absence does not exclude severe disease. Immunosuppression—especially corticosteroids—can change the clinical trajectory dramatically. Geography, migration history and relevant exposure are essential to risk assessment.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The critical causal chain is demonstrable: persistent viable infection, host immune change, rapid parasite proliferation, and severe systemic complications. It shows why “terrain” can be translated into specific immunologic vulnerability rather than metaphysical explanations. Screening and treatment decisions depend on exposure and clinical urgency; in some settings specialist-guided presumptive treatment is considered when rapid steroids are needed and testing cannot be completed.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Strongyloides has a distinctive autoinfective mechanism that allows infection to continue long after initial acquisition. Corticosteroids can reduce elements of host control, and published reviews describe severe disseminated disease even after relatively short courses in susceptible individuals. That does not mean steroids should be broadly avoided; it means pre-existing epidemiologic risk should be considered. This is precisely the kind of concrete “host terrain” phenomenon worthy of attention: a real organism, a defined immune perturbation and a dramatic change in disease behavior. Its explanatory strength is that every link can be interrogated with recognized clinical methods.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

This example should not be generalized into the claim that most immunosuppression-related complications are parasites or that all autoimmune conditions result from worms. Common bacterial, fungal and viral infections remain important. Nor should fear of *Strongyloides* lead clinicians to withhold urgent steroid treatment without a plan when it is clearly needed.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A practical differentiator is lifetime exposure in endemic settings or other epidemiologic risk combined with planned immunosuppression. Absence of eosinophilia does not exclude infection, particularly during severe presentations. A paper about this topic should therefore explain where targeted screening matters, why negative stool microscopy may be insufficient in some situations, and why confirmed hyperinfection is a medical emergency.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The contribution is a clinically consequential example of host-pathogen interaction. Unlike an undefined hidden parasite burden, *Strongyloides* has a concrete life cycle, diagnostic options, epidemiology and evidence-based treatments. The paper underscores screening where appropriate, medical coordination and the danger of unstructured antiparasitic protocols.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Screening, prevention, and treatment for *Strongyloides* hyperinfection syndrome](#)
2. [Strongyloides stercoralis: there but not seen](#)

Source lineage: Parasites book; immune suppression and parasite life cycle discussions

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Chagas Disease and the Cardioembolic Stroke Pathway

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 06 · Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Trypanosoma cruzi infection can cause chronic cardiomyopathy, and cardiomyopathy may create a setting for embolic stroke. This paper traces that indirect route rather than attributing stroke to parasites directly blocking brain vessels. It offers a model for connecting chronic infection to vascular events through a defined intermediary organ.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Chronic Chagas cardiomyopathy can cause myocardial damage, chamber abnormalities, conduction disease, arrhythmias and thrombus formation. Left ventricular aneurysms or systolic dysfunction can predispose to intracardiac thrombi in selected patients. Emboli originating in the heart may then occlude cerebral arteries. The mechanism is not identical to carotid atherosclerotic stroke or small-vessel infarction, even though the neurological presentation may overlap.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The paper asks how infection geography, cardiac imaging, rhythm evaluation and serological diagnosis interact with stroke workup. Chronic infection may be missed when patients relocate from endemic regions and the clinician does not consider lifetime exposure. At the same time, a positive serology must be evaluated with the appropriate confirmatory strategy, and the stroke must still be assigned to a plausible vascular mechanism.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

This pathway provides a compelling example of an upstream biological insult acting through an intermediate organ. Parasite persistence and inflammatory cardiac injury may lead over time to arrhythmias, regional wall-motion abnormalities, ventricular dysfunction or aneurysm formation; these can support thrombus development and eventual brain embolization. The initial infection and the final cerebral infarct may be separated by decades. Yet the long interval does not justify skipping intermediate proof. Cardiac imaging or rhythm findings must make the proposed embolic source plausible. The model illustrates causation through a network without pretending that every node is equally important in every patient.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

It would be inappropriate to attribute strokes in the general population to Chagas disease without epidemiologic support. Some infected individuals never develop cardiomyopathy; some cardiac abnormalities have entirely unrelated causes. Antiparasitic treatment and anticoagulation address different stages of disease and are not interchangeable.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Evidence would be particularly persuasive when chronic *T. cruzi* infection is established and a characteristic cardiomyopathy or cardiac thrombus is demonstrated in a patient with embolic-appearing stroke. If the stroke instead maps to an unrelated arterial dissection, the infection may remain clinically important without being the proximate cause. A strong paper must be comfortable with that distinction.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This article can make the broader ABSURD thesis more precise: an upstream infection sometimes influences stroke risk through identifiable cardiac remodeling, not through an invisible generalized contaminant. Clinical significance comes from recognition of a treatable infection and appropriate cardiac and stroke care, not from universal parasite cleansing.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Cardioembolic stroke in Chagas disease: a systematic review

Source lineage: Parasites epidemic; stroke causes investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Parasites, Mast Cells and Eosinophilic Inflammation

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 06 · Parasitology, infection and neuroimmune disease · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Eosinophils, mast cells and type-2 immune responses participate in host defense against some parasitic infections, yet similar immune signatures can occur in allergy, medication reactions and primary immune disorders. This paper argues for a differential interpretation of eosinophilic and mast-cell phenomena rather than treating every histamine symptom or eosinophil elevation as proof of parasitism.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Helminths can elicit T-helper-2-associated cytokine patterns, IgE responses and eosinophilic recruitment; tissue-damaging inflammation can coexist with parasite-specific defense. Mast cells also respond to allergens and numerous other triggers. High blood eosinophils may suggest selected infections in an appropriate context, but tissue involvement, parasite biology and timing influence sensitivity. Some severe infections lack peripheral eosinophilia, while some noninfectious disorders cause striking elevations.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The proposed explanatory map begins with immune cell measurement, symptom organ distribution, epidemiologic context and organism-specific tests. It separates a response to infection from an immune syndrome that happens to share molecular mediators. Symptoms of flushing, abdominal pain, rashes or cognitive fog are nonspecific; no single one identifies parasitic etiology. The dynamics of mast-cell activation also require appropriate clinical criteria.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Immune cells cannot reveal their stimulus merely by being elevated. Eosinophils are involved in responses to helminths, but also in eosinophilic asthma, drug hypersensitivity and some hematologic conditions. Mast-cell mediator release can occur through IgE-mediated allergy and non-IgE pathways, among other processes. The same patient may have both an allergy and a parasite, creating a complex but not unresolvable differential. The clinical question is what combination of exposure, organ manifestations, cell counts and targeted testing makes a specific diagnosis likely. The strongest challenge to sweeping parasite claims is the lack of organism specificity.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

An overly expansive parasite hypothesis can cause repeated empiric drug exposure while missing clonal hematologic disease, allergic disorders, hypereosinophilic syndromes or medication toxicity. At the other extreme, assuming all eosinophilia is allergy can miss potentially dangerous tissue helminth infections. Both errors arise from replacing differential diagnosis with a favorite story.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A discriminating observation would be an independently established infection with a coherent time course and immune response, not merely a subjective reaction to food or a fluctuating eosinophil count. If treating the documented infection resolves a particular syndrome, that may add causal support. If symptoms persist despite confirmed eradication, other mechanisms deserve investigation rather than repeated blind cleansing.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper should give readers a precise principle: immune response patterns identify pathways, not necessarily the stimulus that initiated them. The highest-value medical application is appropriately targeted investigation with defined safety boundaries, especially before immunosuppression.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Screening, prevention, and treatment for Strongyloides hyperinfection syndrome](#)
2. [Strongyloides stercoralis: there but not seen](#)

Source lineage: Autism and Parasites; MCAS and immune-dysregulation research

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Does the Childhood Vaccination Schedule Have Adequate Combination-Level Safety Evidence?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A schedule consists of products, doses and timing relationships, not one medicine. This paper asks whether the evidentiary basis for licensed vaccines is supplemented by adequate evaluation of coadministration patterns and clinically meaningful outcomes across the actual schedule. It does not assume that a lack of one ideal trial proves harm. The aim is a product-specific audit of evidence types and remaining uncertainties.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Vaccines differ in platform, antigen, adjuvant, age eligibility and indication. Licensing studies, concomitant-administration studies, postauthorization safety surveillance and population cohorts can answer different questions. A randomized trial of each conceivable combination would be impractical and often unethical; this does not make existing safety evidence nonexistent. The central question is which combinations have direct interaction data, which are inferred from immunogenicity and safety comparisons, and which rare or late outcomes require population follow-up.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The proper audit unit is a vaccine pair, age window or schedule transition with a prespecified outcome. Evidence strength should be evaluated using actual trial protocols, control definitions, sample sizes, follow-up durations, active surveillance and confounding control. A coadministration study underpowered for a rare neurological event cannot exclude that rare outcome; equally, a spontaneous report does not prove such an interaction exists.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The phrase “the entire schedule was never tested” is less informative than a concrete inventory of what was studied. Some coadministered combinations have direct immunogenicity and reactogenicity data; other risks are inferred through postmarketing cohorts and safety surveillance. Each endpoint has different evidentiary requirements. A fever event may be apparent in a modest trial, while an exceptionally rare neurologic disorder requires very large denominators and validated case definitions. The number of children followed, the timing of exposure and the opportunity to detect delayed disease all matter. An honest audit should make these distinctions visible rather than issue a single verdict on the schedule.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The strongest objection to schedule-level criticism is that it can unfairly impose a standard of proof impossible for any complex medical regimen while overlooking extensive postlicensure evidence. The strongest objection to casual reassurance is that product-specific findings cannot always be generalized to every cumulative or coadministered scenario. Both objections deserve exact rather than rhetorical treatment. Baseline risks from preventable infectious diseases are essential comparators.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The paper should evaluate several named product combinations, identify whether active or nonactive comparators were used, and state what outcomes the studies can and cannot exclude. If well-powered cohorts consistently find no increase for a hypothesized outcome, that weakens the causal theory. If a rare product-specific signal survives repeated checks, it deserves more investigation. Neither finding establishes the fate of every other vaccine.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The publication should offer a transparent evidence matrix, not a claim that childhood vaccination schedules are either conclusively harmless or demonstrably injurious as a class. Readers gain a reproducible way to ask what is known for which outcomes and where uncertainty truly remains. Uncertainty alone is not evidence of net harm.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Hviid et al. Measles, Mumps, Rubella Vaccination and Autism: A Nationwide Cohort Study
2. Andersson et al. Aluminum-Adsorbed Vaccines and Chronic Diseases in Childhood: A Nationwide Cohort Study
3. Self-controlled case series design in vaccine safety: a systematic review

Source lineage: Vaccines manuscript; previous vaccine-safety methodological series

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Can Rare Vaccine Adverse Effects Remain Undetected?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Rare adverse reactions may escape prelicensure trials even when those trials are appropriately designed. Detection power depends on how many people receive the product, event incidence, time at risk and clinical outcome definition. This paper uses the documented myocarditis signal following certain COVID-19 vaccines to explain why rigorous postauthorization surveillance is a normal part of vaccine medicine rather than a concession that all vaccine harms are hidden.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

A trial enrolling thousands may identify common adverse events but have limited capacity to estimate an outcome occurring only a few times per hundred thousand doses. Passive reports can raise hypotheses but require verification; active linked-data systems and self-controlled case designs can help estimate associations. The analysis of myocarditis after particular mRNA products illustrates how age, sex and dose may substantially modify risk. The existence of a true rare adverse event does not establish all alleged events as causal.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Good signal evaluation specifies latency, case definition, background incidence, risk window and expected disease burden without vaccination. It also examines comparative infection risks and possible confounding by diagnostic intensity. Claims should report absolute as well as relative risks and note the difference between hospitalization, biomarker elevation, confirmed myocarditis and long-term outcomes.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

This question turns on denominators and inference rather than dramatic anecdotes. Suppose an event occurs at a rate far below one in ten thousand exposed people; a licensing trial of several thousand participants may observe none even if the risk is real. The appropriate response is active surveillance and linkage of medical outcomes to accurately dated exposures. Yet the inverse mistake is equally serious: among millions of vaccinated people, many strokes, seizures and new diagnoses will occur afterward by coincidence. A postvaccination event is evidence of temporal order, not necessarily of causation. The methodological task is to estimate excess above expected background risk.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The methodological danger runs in two directions. Uncritical dismissal of verified signals damages trust and delays risk mitigation; interpreting every temporally associated symptom as caused by vaccination generates misleading fear. Underreporting and stimulated reporting can coexist in passive systems. There is no fixed multiplication factor that converts all spontaneous reports into true incidence.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A robust investigation should identify a plausible risk window, adjudicate the clinical diagnosis and calculate absolute excess events with uncertainty intervals. The myocarditis experience shows how specific age and product patterns can emerge after deployment. A signal that disappears when ascertainment and background risk are controlled should not be retained as established harm.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper concludes that scientific confidence should increase when monitoring detects and quantifies real harms. The value of a surveillance system lies in its ability to revise product-specific understanding, not in defending a prior narrative. Individual vaccine decisions belong in a context of actual risks and benefits rather than class-wide generalization.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Patone et al. Risks of myocarditis, pericarditis, and arrhythmias associated with COVID-19 vaccination or SARS-CoV-2 infection
2. Self-controlled case series design in vaccine safety: a systematic review

Source lineage: Vaccine adverse event surveillance discussions

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Problem of Healthy-Vaccinee Bias

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Vaccinated and unvaccinated populations often differ before an injection is given. They may vary in health care access, healthcare-seeking behavior, prior infection, chronic disease, socioeconomic conditions and reasons for delaying treatment. This paper examines healthy-vaccinee and related selection biases as threats to both favorable and unfavorable observational associations, while recognizing that well-conducted observational studies remain essential for vaccine safety research.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Confounding by indication, contraindication, access and care utilization can produce distorted comparisons. A child with severe medical complexity may have a delayed schedule, while a family with consistent preventive-care attendance may be more likely to have developmental diagnoses recorded. Event detection depends on follow-up, coding practices and clinical contact. Time-varying vaccination introduces immortal-time and selection challenges if exposure histories are handled incorrectly.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The analytic toolkit includes careful eligibility criteria, target-trial emulation where appropriate, active-comparator designs, negative-control outcomes or exposures, prespecified covariates, sensitivity analyses and explicit missing-data handling. No one method makes causal inference automatic. The relevant question is whether the chosen design adequately addresses the bias that would most plausibly generate the observed association.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Healthy-vaccinee bias is not a single effect with one direction in every study. Families more engaged with preventive care may have healthier behavior yet also more frequent diagnosis of developmental or allergic conditions because they see clinicians more often. Patients who are severely ill may delay vaccination, falsely making the vaccinated population look healthier. Time-varying effects add further difficulty: being unvaccinated today may differ from remaining unvaccinated for years. If exposures are assigned incorrectly, individuals must survive long enough to enter a later exposure group, creating an artificial survival advantage. Sophisticated studies must define the target question and exposure window before analysis.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A selective critic may invoke healthy-vaccinee bias only when a study reports a benefit and ignore confounding when a study reports harm. This asymmetry is scientifically unacceptable. Conversely, dismissing large consistent associations merely because perfect randomization is absent misunderstands cumulative evidence. Observational findings deserve calibrated confidence based on design, replication, magnitude and biological plausibility.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A reliable critique should name the suspected confounder, indicate its expected direction, and demonstrate how large it would need to be to explain the reported effect. Simply saying “the study was observational” does not invalidate it. Conversely, a huge sample cannot rescue a systematically misclassified exposure or missing confounder. The institute should apply this rule consistently to studies finding harm and those finding reassurance.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper provides a methodological instrument that the institute can apply to every vaccine claim, including claims it would prefer to be true. Its strongest message is that bias is not a partisan tool; it is a measurable feature of study design. Credible criticism evaluates it symmetrically.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Characteristics of Vaccine Safety Observational Studies and Authors’ Attitudes: A Systematic Review](#)
2. [Self-controlled case series design in vaccine safety: a systematic review](#)

Source lineage: Vaccines project; methodological scrutiny of cohort studies

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Susceptible Host Hypothesis in Vaccine Adverse Reactions

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Population-average safety estimates cannot reveal every individual risk pattern. Certain recognized vaccine reactions vary by age, sex, product or medical history. This paper explores whether more refined immunologic or genetic host phenotypes could sometimes explain concentrated adverse-event susceptibility, while avoiding the claim that such phenotypes have already been validated for most disputed outcomes.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Host response depends on innate and adaptive immune activity, prior antigen exposure, inflammatory state, age and concurrent medical conditions. Some vaccine contraindications already reflect known susceptibility—for example, prior severe allergic reaction to a relevant component. Product-specific myocarditis patterns after mRNA vaccination demonstrate that aggregate rates can conceal meaningful demographic variation. Such observations justify stratification, but they do not prove a general “toxin-sensitive genotype.”

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

An interpretable susceptibility model specifies an outcome before searching for biomarkers. It must distinguish a cause of baseline disease from a cause of the vaccine-attributable increment in disease. A genetic association present in patients with spontaneous myocarditis may not be specific to postvaccination myocarditis. Discovery cohorts need independent replication and clinically meaningful discrimination before biomarkers guide individual care.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A plausible susceptibility model starts with an outcome known to vary across subgroups. For myocarditis, age and sex differences after certain vaccine products suggest that risk is not uniform. The next question is whether pre-existing biology adds reliable information beyond those obvious factors. Biomarkers might involve prior immune exposures, inflammatory history or other characteristics, but a biological story is not enough. Rare adverse events mean that even a test with good relative prediction could have poor positive predictive value. A risk marker must be sufficiently precise to help rather than simply label thousands of healthy people vulnerable.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

There are strong reasons for caution: multiple comparisons can produce spurious genetic signals, rare-event studies may be underpowered, and testing can generate needless anxiety. Population findings for one vaccine cannot be generalized to others with different components. The best current evidence does not support a simple inherited susceptibility profile for vaccine-caused autism, and vaccine-autism causation has not been established.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The hypothesis should be treated as weaker when researchers search retrospectively through hundreds of variables and report only the most attractive signals. Independent validation is nonnegotiable before using biomarkers to advise vaccine decisions. A known serious allergic reaction or a documented product-specific contraindication is qualitatively different from a speculative inherited “toxin-sensitive” phenotype. Precision means preserving that evidence distinction.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper should encourage product- and outcome-specific precision pharmacovigilance rather than blanket assertions about “vaccine-damaged children.” A host-risk model is credible only when it improves prediction beyond available demographic and clinical factors and when its use creates measurable benefit.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Patone et al. Risks of myocarditis, pericarditis, and arrhythmias associated with COVID-19 vaccination or SARS-CoV-2 infection
2. Andersson et al. Aluminum-Adsorbed Vaccines and Chronic Diseases in Childhood: A Nationwide Cohort Study

Source lineage: Vaccine book; autism and host-susceptibility investigations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Vaccination, Autoimmunity and Causal Attribution

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Autoimmune illness can begin around the same period as vaccination because both are common enough to coincide within large populations. The scientific question is whether incidence exceeds the expected background rate in a biologically and temporally plausible risk window for a specified vaccine and condition. This paper challenges both automatic reassurance and automatic attribution.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Immune activation is intrinsic to vaccination, but it is not equivalent to autoimmune pathology. Establishing a vaccine-attributable autoimmune outcome requires careful diagnostic verification, exposure timing, comparison groups and accounting for infectious triggers, genetics and other risk factors. Different vaccines and autoimmune phenotypes cannot be combined into one homogeneous category. Rare, well-characterized adverse reactions should be acknowledged on their own terms.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Signal assessment begins with a defined clinical syndrome and plausible biological latency. Investigators should estimate expected cases, examine active-comparator groups and evaluate laboratory or histologic evidence where appropriate. Natural experiments, self-controlled case series and registry linkage can strengthen inference, but each design has constraints. Immunological mechanisms demonstrated in animals or cell cultures do not settle population causality.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Autoimmunity is a family of diagnoses with different tissue targets, background incidences and biological routes. A theory concerning a specific neurologic demyelinating disorder cannot be defended merely by data on thyroid autoantibodies, and an autoimmune laboratory marker does not necessarily indicate disease. Vaccines activate immune processes by design, but immune activation is far broader than pathological self-directed immunity. When disease appears after vaccination, the most useful question is whether cases cluster in a plausible postexposure window beyond the expected background rate. Studies must also consider infections, new medication, ascertainment patterns and predisposition.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

A common mistake is to take immune similarity—such as autoantibodies appearing after an infection or a vaccine—and equate it with clinical autoimmune disease. Another is to demand a randomized placebo trial for a rare long-latency condition when high-quality observational strategies may be more informative. Safety findings should be weighed against the risks of the infections vaccines prevent.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A strong adverse-event hypothesis should specify the precise vaccine, immune-mediated clinical syndrome, latency distribution and validated diagnosis. If a proposed mechanism only works in extreme animal exposures or cannot explain the human timing, confidence should fall. Credible investigation has nothing to gain from treating all autoimmune diseases as one interchangeable outcome.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The strongest contribution is a transparent framework for handling disputed autoimmune claims, including those opposed to the institute's hypothesis. The paper defends investigation of reproducible signals while refusing a universal causal label. A causal inference is only as strong as the named vaccine, named outcome and design that support it.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Andersson et al. Aluminum-Adsorbed Vaccines and Chronic Diseases in Childhood: A Nationwide Cohort Study](#)
2. [Self-controlled case series design in vaccine safety: a systematic review](#)

Source lineage: Vaccines manuscript; immune dysregulation papers

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Comparing Vaccine Risks with Infection Risks

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A risk associated with a vaccine is never fully understood in isolation from the risk of the infection it aims to prevent. This paper argues for a dynamic comparison that varies by age, sex, baseline immunity, disease prevalence, time since vaccination and product. It challenges both the assertion that vaccination is risk-free and the opposite assertion that any measurable vaccine harm settles the net-benefit question.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Comparative risk involves absolute rates, severity, causal attribution and context. For example, a myocarditis signal after particular mRNA vaccine doses must be considered alongside myocarditis and other harms associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection, using comparable outcome definitions and risk windows. Results from early pandemic waves cannot be assumed to apply unchanged after widespread infection-acquired immunity, variant evolution or updated formulations. An older high-risk patient and a young healthy male may have different risk-benefit profiles.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A correct comparison distinguishes individual protection, transmission effects and broader public-health outcomes while avoiding simplistic claims from relative-risk ratios alone. Absolute excess cases per dose, hospitalizations prevented, serious complications and uncertainty intervals are more useful than dramatic percentages without denominators. Time horizon matters: short-term reactogenicity, rare acute harm and longer-term disease outcomes occupy distinct categories.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Risk comparison requires a denominator, population and time horizon. A high relative risk of a rare outcome may imply a small absolute excess, while a modest relative increase in a common severe outcome may carry substantial burden. Infection risk itself changes with circulating variants, prior immunity, exposure and available treatment; vaccine risks can vary with product formulation and dose. Therefore, a true statement about one season or age group can become misleading when quoted as a timeless rule for everyone. It is also possible for a vaccine to confer meaningful benefit overall while a particular subgroup faces a different balance.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Neither side may cherry-pick only favorable time windows, ignore prior infection or use noncomparable clinical endpoints. Evidence concerning one product cannot be generalized to all vaccines, and an observed benefit cannot erase a serious adverse effect in an identifiable subgroup. The relationship between population recommendation and individual preference deserves careful explanation.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The relevant analytic discipline is matching comparable outcomes and risk windows. Hospitalization due to documented myocarditis should not be compared with any self-reported chest pain, nor should a broad infection outcome be compared with an arbitrarily narrow vaccine outcome. The goal is an understandable absolute-risk table that can change when evidence changes, not a permanent ideological conclusion.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper offers readers a framework for making sense of changing evidence without retreating into blanket slogans. Its core standard is reciprocal rigor: the same causal scrutiny must be applied to the vaccine and to the infection. The medically relevant answer is product-, person- and time-specific.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Patone et al. Risks of myocarditis, pericarditis, and arrhythmias associated with COVID-19 vaccination or SARS-CoV-2 infection
2. Hviid et al. Measles, Mumps, Rubella Vaccination and Autism: A Nationwide Cohort Study

Source lineage: Vaccine risk-benefit and safety research

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Body as a Longitudinal Diagnostic Record

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A single photograph or laboratory result is a snapshot of physiology; a sequence of observations reveals change. This paper advances a longitudinal phenotype model in which images, symptoms, movement patterns and biometrics are interpreted relative to a person's baseline. It argues that detecting change may sometimes be more useful than comparing an individual with one fixed population threshold—provided that noise, bias and false alarms are explicitly modeled.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Human appearance varies with lighting, hydration, sleep, camera perspective, skin pigmentation, medications and ordinary aging. A facial color change cannot be interpreted as jaundice without controlling image capture and confirming clinical signs. Wearable signals vary by sensor placement and activity. A longitudinal model should therefore estimate the smallest reliable change for each modality before claiming that a new observation reflects disease. Preprocessing, calibration and consistent acquisition are central to causal credibility.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The conceptual architecture separates data quality, baseline estimation, deviation detection and clinical interpretation. A model might flag a new tremor pattern or sustained resting heart-rate shift, but it must distinguish benign variability from potentially concerning change. Multimodal agreement can improve confidence in some settings, yet correlated measurement errors can create false reassurance. Machine learning should support triage rather than pretend to know an underlying diagnosis from nonspecific features.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

A body generates signals at different temporal resolutions. Skin changes may evolve over weeks, resting heart rate can shift over hours, and movement patterns vary by task and medication timing. A longitudinal health record should therefore preserve the time scale and measurement reliability of each modality. Combining every feature into a single daily health score risks losing information and treating correlated artifacts as independent evidence. For example, travel can simultaneously change sleep, temperature, resting heart rate and lighting in photographs without producing a new disease. A model that attributes all changes to a systemic pathology would be sophisticated in appearance but wrong in practice.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The opposite hypothesis is that longitudinal accumulation mainly amplifies artifacts and spurious correlations. That concern is real: repeated monitoring increases the number of opportunities for a false-positive flag and can worsen anxiety. Good validation therefore requires longitudinal test-retest reliability, external cohorts, clinically meaningful outcomes and evidence that the alert improves decisions.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A scientifically serious system should define baseline stability, thresholds for sustained change and a strategy for periods when data quality is poor. It should also state whether a flagged deviation is merely interesting, requires routine clinical follow-up or warrants urgent care. The difference among those three actions is more important than an attractive dashboard. External prospective validation remains necessary.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper supplies a conceptual foundation for Signals as a research direction, not evidence that the current product can diagnose or predict any specific disease. Public claims should be limited to functions that have been independently validated. The promise is disciplined tracking of change, not medical clairvoyance.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Quer et al. Wearable sensor data and self-reported symptoms for COVID-19 detection](#)
2. [Esteve et al. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks](#)

Source lineage: Absurd Signals web app; Healthy Selfie; daily checks and trend comparison

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Can AI Recognize Disease Before the Patient Recognizes Illness?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Some diseases generate measurable changes before a person perceives symptoms, and digital systems may identify patterns earlier than casual human observation. Yet early detection is valuable only if predictions are accurate, actionable and ultimately beneficial. This paper evaluates the chain from subclinical signal to clinical intervention, challenging the assumption that more AI predictions automatically improve health.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The analytic sequence begins with a sensor, moves through feature extraction and a prediction threshold, and ends with confirmatory evaluation. Model discrimination alone does not indicate whether an alert's positive predictive value will remain acceptable in a low-prevalence population. A tool detecting a 1% disease at 90% sensitivity and 90% specificity yields far more false positives than true positives among unselected people. Prevalence and calibration therefore determine practical usefulness.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

An early warning can reflect emerging pathology, medication exposure, sleep disruption or ordinary behavior change. Distinguishing these states requires clinical outcomes and time-anchored data rather than retrospective labeling. Stronger studies would compare ordinary care against an AI-assisted strategy and ask whether serious diagnoses are reached earlier without excessive investigations, anxiety or inequitable performance.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Prediction should be separated from detection of disease already present but not yet recognized. If an algorithm flags a subtle physical sign of jaundice on Tuesday before the patient notices it on Thursday, the tool may have recognized an existing manifestation; it has not necessarily predicted a future illness. True prospective prediction means establishing a risk state before clinical disease onset, using information available at that time. Leakage of later laboratory values or retrospective clinical labels can create an illusion of foresight. The distinction should be explicit in every scientific or commercial statement about early AI diagnosis.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The cautionary case is substantial. Premature prediction can lead to overdiagnosis of abnormalities that would never cause harm. A model trained on tertiary-care patients may fail in general wellness populations, and image models may encode camera or demographic artifacts instead of disease biology. Apparent “prediction years ahead” can arise from retrospective information leakage.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The test of utility asks whether alerts change real care: do they improve time to appropriate treatment, reduce serious events or create a manageable volume of follow-up? A model that achieves excellent retrospective accuracy but produces thousands of unnecessary investigations in ordinary users has not demonstrated clinical benefit. The most powerful promise is earlier, safer action—not the largest number of predicted conditions.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The proposed contribution is a framework connecting prediction to benefit: analytical validity, clinical validity and clinical utility. Absurd Health can write responsibly about possibilities without claiming the performance of a system until rigorous prospective and externally validated evidence exists.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Mishra et al. Pre-symptomatic detection of COVID-19 from smartwatch data](#)
2. [Esteve et al. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks](#)

Source lineage: Signals app prediction concepts and multimodal detection

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Visible Signs of Systemic Illness

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Skin, eyes, nails and oral tissues can display clues to systemic disease. Jaundice, cyanosis, pallor, edema, mucosal abnormalities and certain movement findings are clinically useful in appropriate contexts. This paper asks how to digitize visible signs without confusing symptom recognition with definitive laboratory diagnosis. It emphasizes the difference between a clue that justifies examination and a pattern that uniquely identifies disease.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Visual signals arise through pigment chemistry, blood oxygenation, perfusion, inflammation, tissue growth and structure. Several are nonspecific and affected by ambient illumination and baseline pigmentation. Dermatology imaging research demonstrates that machine learning can classify selected lesions under controlled conditions, but a classifier trained on lesions is not evidence that selfies can detect internal cancers, endocrine disorders or thousands of unrelated diagnoses. Different disease targets require different labeled datasets and reference standards.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A responsible system should prioritize visible patterns with established clinical meaning, standardize image capture and clearly communicate uncertainty. For instance, possible scleral icterus warrants bilirubin assessment rather than automatic diagnosis of gallbladder blockage. A nail or oral finding may suggest anemia or nutritional illness but cannot measure micronutrient concentration. Multimodal input can improve differential reasoning while leaving confirmation to validated testing.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Visual medical diagnosis is strongest when the target is a validated pattern with a reliable reference standard. A dermoscopic image classified against biopsy-confirmed histology represents a fundamentally different task from guessing serum potassium or bile-acid levels from a selfie. Visible jaundice depends on bilirubin and illumination; pallor depends on pigmentation, anemia degree and light; peripheral edema is influenced by gravity and camera angle. Without controlling the image-formation process, AI may learn photographic context rather than human disease. The danger increases when one general classifier is asked to produce hundreds of precise internal diagnoses without independent clinical measurement.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Image models can underperform across skin tones, ages, cameras and clinical settings. The false-positive burden may be especially large when screening numerous low-prevalence diseases from one photograph. Photo interpretation can also miss disease when visible signs are absent, creating false reassurance. A product should disclose its validation population and tested indications.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A useful quality standard is disease-by-disease reporting of performance across skin tones, camera types and clinical settings, with explicit uncertainty and referral recommendations. If the sign is too subtle for reliable recognition or not visibly expressed at all, the model should abstain. An honest list of validated uses is more valuable than an expansive unvalidated promise.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The concept paper is a bridge between classical physical examination and digital observation. It offers an intellectually serious rationale for image-supported screening, while explicitly distinguishing research ambition from approved diagnostic capability. The correct endpoint is safer recognition of potentially meaningful signs, not algorithmic certainty.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Esteva et al. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks](#)

Source lineage: Signals Healthy Selfie and visual body signs

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Movement as a Neurological Biomarker

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Gait, tremor and fine motor movements are observable manifestations of nervous-system function. Video and wearable sensors may capture frequency, amplitude, speed and asymmetry more consistently than informal descriptions. This paper develops movement tracking as a longitudinal biomarker while warning that a measured tremor signal is not a diagnosis of Parkinson disease or another neurological disorder.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Movement disorders require phenomenology: rest versus action tremor, rhythmicity, posture, task dependence, accompanying slowness, stiffness or ataxia. Video can help document some features repeatedly, but camera angle, frame rate, lighting, background and voluntary effort influence analysis. Rigidity cannot be directly assessed in a standard video, and clinical bradykinesia involves decrement and neurological examination beyond mere movement speed.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A research-worthy device would standardize tasks, document the conditions of capture and compare measurements against specialist assessments. It could track within-person change during medication adjustment or rehabilitation, provided confounding from fatigue, anxiety and time of day is considered. Capturing a movement abnormality is a useful measurement; assigning its cause requires clinical history, examination and often additional testing.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Tremor frequency can sometimes be quantified more consistently from accelerometer or video signals than from memory, but frequency alone is rarely diagnostic. The same person may display different movement patterns during rest, posture, finger tapping and purposeful action. Camera-based tools may capture amplitude and velocity but cannot reliably infer every element of a neurological examination. Stress, caffeine, sleep deprivation and medication timing change movement. A standardized capture workflow is therefore inseparable from the meaning of the output. Without it, apparent disease progression might simply reflect different filming conditions.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Algorithm performance may look strong in a curated dataset of severe disease and fail among patients with subtle presentations, essential tremor or medication-induced symptoms. Labels inherited from inconsistent clinical diagnoses can further distort training. Even perfect recognition of a tremor frequency does not prove an underlying neurodegenerative pathology.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The critical validation question is whether the digital measurement corresponds to a clinically meaningful endpoint such as specialist-rated severity or longitudinal functional change. If a model accurately classifies tremor frequency but fails to distinguish essential tremor from parkinsonian tremor, it should be described as a measurement aid rather than a diagnostic system. Clear labeling protects patients and improves clinician trust.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The strongest application is objective, standardized description and follow-up, not unsupervised diagnosis. Signals could frame movement tracking as a way to help patients bring better longitudinal information to clinicians, with privacy, consent and clear escalation guidance for new neurological deficits.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Cerebrotendinous Xanthomatosis: Molecular Pathogenesis, Clinical Spectrum, Diagnosis, and Disease-Modifying Treatments
2. Recommendations for detection and diagnosis of Niemann-Pick disease type C

Source lineage: Signals movement video; Parkinson tremor investigation

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

Can Wearables Detect Physiological Deterioration Before Symptoms?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Consumer wearables can gather heart rate, movement, sleep estimates and in some devices temperature-related signals over long periods. Changes relative to baseline may precede recognized illness in selected contexts. This paper examines the benefits and pitfalls of applying anomaly detection to personal physiology and argues that actionable warning depends on specificity, sustained change and clinical context.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Resting heart rate may rise during fever, stress, dehydration, poor sleep or certain medications. Reduced activity can be both a cause and consequence of illness. Sleep staging from consumer devices is an algorithmic estimate, not the equivalent of full polysomnography. Sensor characteristics vary across hardware versions and body placement; missing data are often not random because people remove devices when uncomfortable.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The conceptual opportunity lies in within-person deviations sustained across multiple modalities. A brief rise in heart rate after exercise should be treated differently from an unexplained multi-day shift accompanied by increased temperature and reduced recovery. However, even converging signals rarely identify a unique disease; they primarily indicate that something has changed. The system should separate general wellness alerts from urgent clinical warning signs.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Wearable signals can shift in response to illness, but the most difficult part is deciding when a deviation becomes actionable. A nocturnal heart-rate elevation may reflect fever, alcohol, stress, dehydration, travel or poorly fitted sensors. Several changes occurring together may increase concern without identifying the disease. Because a user supplies many days of data, seemingly rare alerts can become common over a year. That creates a longitudinal false-discovery problem unlike a single clinic visit. Designs should incorporate sustained deviation, clinically relevant thresholds and the option for a neutral “watch and reassess” message rather than constant alarm.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

False alarms can accumulate rapidly in continuously monitored populations, and excessive attention to daily variability may increase health anxiety. A classifier trained to flag infection may also respond to travel, alcohol, medication or menstrual changes. Demonstrating detection before reported symptoms is not equivalent to demonstrating fewer hospitalizations or better outcomes.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

Evidence for pre-symptomatic pattern changes is not evidence that automatic alerts improve outcomes. Validation should examine lead time, false-alert frequency per person-year, subgroup performance, adherence and clinical consequences. The safest model is an assistant to observation and medical triage, not a replacement for symptom evaluation or urgent medical care.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper provides a safety-aware framework for Apple Watch, Oura and comparable device integrations without implying any specific data connector or product validation. Its strongest insight is that personal baselines can increase signal relevance only when robust uncertainty management and confirmation pathways are built into the system.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. Mishra et al. Pre-symptomatic detection of COVID-19 from smartwatch data
2. Quer et al. Wearable sensor data and self-reported symptoms for COVID-19 detection

Source lineage: Signals wearable integration; sleep and trend-check features

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Problem of False Positives in AI Health Screening

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A health-screening tool can have respectable sensitivity and specificity and still generate mostly false alarms when applied to rare conditions. This paper makes base rates, calibration and abstention central to medical AI. Its thesis is that restraint is a core performance feature: the ability to say “insufficient evidence” can be more protective than attaching a diagnosis to every image.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Positive predictive value depends on disease prevalence. Screening for hundreds of uncommon conditions multiplies the opportunity for incidental flags. Even if each model were independently well behaved, correlated outputs and repeated testing can create misleading cascades. Model confidence scores are not automatically calibrated probabilities, and external deployment can shift prevalence, camera conditions and patient mix. A ranking of 1,300 possible diagnoses may look impressive while being clinically unusable.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A trustworthy design should disclose which targets have validation evidence, reserve diagnostic labels for justified use and separate symptom education from screening. Low-confidence states should trigger abstention and recommendations for ordinary clinical evaluation. Calibration curves, precision-recall analysis, performance by demographic subgroup and prespecified referral thresholds matter more than a headline accuracy statistic from a balanced case-control dataset.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The mathematics deserves to be visible to the reader. At 1% disease prevalence, a test with 90% sensitivity and 90% specificity yields about 9 true positives and 99 false positives per 1,000 screened people; the positive predictive value is therefore only about 8%. That result is not evidence that the test is poorly engineered, but that screening rare disease is intrinsically difficult. Add repeated testing and hundreds of candidate diagnoses, and the number of incidental alerts can increase rapidly. A system must therefore prioritize carefully selected clinical targets and transparent thresholds.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The counterargument is that overcaution may miss early disease. That is a real tradeoff, but the solution is explicit threshold setting around known clinical harms, not universal maximal sensitivity. Emergency warnings such as sudden focal weakness should follow clinical safety rules regardless of model confidence, while nonspecific visual hints require different handling.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The model succeeds when it knows when not to claim. Calibration against real-world prevalence, explicit reporting of false alarms and the ability to abstain are indispensable. Independent external cohorts are necessary because impressive performance in a balanced research dataset may fail in an unselected population. This is an ethical and engineering requirement, not a cosmetic disclaimer.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

For Absurd Health this paper is strategically important because it sets an ethical standard for Signals. AI-supported attention to health is valuable when it reduces uncertainty and improves care pathways; an unvalidated disease count is not an achievement. The system's ability to avoid unwarranted certainty should be regarded as a clinical strength.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Quer et al. Wearable sensor data and self-reported symptoms for COVID-19 detection](#)
2. [Esteve et al. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks](#)

Source lineage: Signals predictive diagnostic claims and app design

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.

The Predictive Terrain Blood Panel

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 08 · Signals, measurement and responsible medical AI · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

A laboratory panel is a collection of measurements whose information value depends on how results are combined and interpreted. This paper examines whether longitudinal patterns in routine markers can produce more useful risk stratification than isolated thresholds. It challenges the tendency to describe every departure from a preferred “optimal” range as disease, and warns that adding more analytes does not necessarily improve prediction.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Common laboratory measures reflect multiple physiologic processes: inflammation, lipid transport, renal clearance, hematopoiesis, liver injury and glucose regulation. A changing marker may signal disease progression, treatment response or ordinary analytic variation. Multivariate models can potentially identify patterns that no single marker captures, but require outcome labels, appropriate modeling, external validation and clinical calibration. Repeated testing also raises the chance of incidental abnormal results.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

The conceptual sequence starts with an explicit endpoint—such as incident diabetes or cardiovascular event—and asks whether longitudinal laboratory trajectories improve discrimination and clinical decisions beyond age, blood pressure, medication history and established risk scores. A panel built around a vague category such as “terrain collapse” lacks a reference standard. A clear endpoint makes the model falsifiable and clinically interpretable.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Combining laboratory measures can be helpful only when the joint signal is not already captured by simpler clinical variables. A panel predicting cardiovascular risk should be compared with established risk estimates, while a panel purporting to detect “terrain collapse” must first define what that term means as an observable outcome. Otherwise, a complex score can appear scientific because it uses many numbers while remaining impossible to validate. Longitudinal change also requires attention to baseline variation: some analytes fluctuate across days or assay platforms in ways unrelated to disease.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Confounding from illness, fasting, hydration and laboratory platform shifts can generate spurious correlations. Thresholds optimized in one clinic may perform poorly elsewhere; more complex models may overfit. A blood-test association cannot demonstrate that supplementing the associated nutrient will prevent the predicted illness. Data governance and appropriate disclosure of analytical limitations matter as much as model sophistication.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A model that identifies risk retrospectively must demonstrate performance on later, untouched patients. Results should include discrimination, calibration, decision thresholds and the clinical cost of false positives. If a panel does not improve outcomes relative to a simpler approach, additional analytes may create more expense and anxiety without benefit. The strongest research program starts with one definable endpoint at a time.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper frames the panel as a research program in longitudinal risk interpretation, not as a validated diagnostic product. Its value lies in better questions about multivariate change, accuracy and utility. Public materials should avoid the promise that routine blood work can diagnose every hidden systemic disorder.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Liu et al. Calorie Restriction with or without Time-Restricted Eating in Weight Loss](#)
2. [Sitosterolemia: Twenty Years of Discovery of ABCG5 ABCG8](#)
3. [Bile acids: regulation of synthesis](#)

Source lineage: Signals bloodwork analyzer; Terrain Medicine Handbook; client blood work evaluations

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.