

FLOW HIJACKED · SCIENTIFIC LECTURE

PSYCHIATRIC DRUGS

From Serendipitous Discovery to Multiscale Control of Brain Dynamics

History · pharmacokinetics · pharmacodynamics · adaptation · lived trajectory · nonlinear systems

Tomer Avraham, PhD · Creator, Flow Hijacked

CORE SENTENCE

A psychiatric drug is not a static chemical label. It is a time-varying exposure that enters a living, history-dependent person and changes several objectives at once.

BEFORE READING

A note on use, safety, and scope

CORE SENTENCE

The purpose of this lecture is understanding: it does not tell any individual what to take, continue, reduce, or stop.

Psychiatric medicines can relieve suffering, reduce recurrence, create burdens, produce withdrawal phenomena, and alter bodily or experiential variables on different clocks. Those possibilities are population-level evidence, not a personal instruction. Decisions about prescribing, monitoring, pregnancy, interactions, toxicity, or discontinuation require an appropriately qualified clinician who knows the person, formulation, dose, duration, body state, other substances, prior course, and goals.

The acquired research core is deliberately deep but bounded. It concentrates on schizophrenia and psychosis, major depression, bipolar disorder, and the shared pharmacology needed to understand them. It is not a universal atlas of every psychiatric medicine. ADHD treatments, dedicated anxiety pharmacotherapy, sleep medicines, substance-use-disorder medicines, dementia-related drugs, perinatal neuroactive steroids, and several newer global agents require a separate acquisition before broad claims are made.

Lived experience appears here because benefit and burden are felt in bodies, relationships, routines, identity, and possibility. It illuminates why outcomes matter; it is not used as proof of prevalence or mechanism. The lecture therefore keeps five epistemic categories visible and places counterevidence beside the claim it constrains.

EVIDENCE CUTOFF

Research package release 1.1 · evidence cutoff 2026-09-08. Later evidence may revise individual estimates, access classifications, or frontier claims.

PROLOGUE · OUTCOMES

The human problem is plural

CORE SENTENCE

The same tablet can be relief, burden, protection, uncertainty—or several at once.

Clinical trials often need one primary endpoint. A life does not. Symptoms, sleep, cognition, metabolic health, motor control, sexuality, agency, relationships, work, hospitalization, mortality, and quality of life can move in different directions. A medicine may reduce one danger while creating another burden; preserve stability while narrowing felt range; or make ordinary participation possible while requiring substantial monitoring.

This plurality is not an argument for or against medication. It is a measurement problem and an ethical fact. Average symptom change cannot decide how one person should weight safety, alertness, sexual functioning, recurrence risk, fertility, or the ability to think and work. Nor can a subjective burden erase robust evidence of protection. The responsible task is to keep the objectives separate long enough to see the actual trade-off.

Flow Hijacked treats treatment as trajectory stewardship under constraints. The word stewardship matters: the person remains the source of value, clinicians contribute evidence and risk management, caregivers can support without commandeering reality, and researchers must test whether increasingly elaborate models improve decisions prospectively.

OPENING QUESTION

What counts as improvement when the outcomes that matter do not collapse into one score?

PROLOGUE · THESIS

One central question governs the lecture

CORE SENTENCE

What can a molecule do to a living, history-dependent person—and what can the evidence honestly establish about benefit, harm, mechanism, withdrawal, and recovery?

The governing thesis is that a prescription is an exposure trajectory rather than a static chemical label. Route and formulation shape absorption; metabolism and elimination shape concentration; concentration shapes target engagement; target engagement perturbs cells, circuits, networks, body systems, experience, and behaviour; behaviour and environment then feed back into future exposure and trajectory.

History enters at every level. Prior episodes, duration of exposure, receptor and intracellular adaptation, sleep loss, inflammation, organ function, learning, expectations, coercion, trust, housing, access, relationships, and other substances can change what the nominally same input means. This is why immediate receptor action can coexist with delayed clinical change, why stopping is a new perturbation rather than simple absence, and why a mechanism can be real without explaining the whole outcome.

The audience should leave able to separate drug, dose, exposure, target, effect, outcome, and trajectory; to recognize where evidence is strong, heterogeneous, indirect, or absent; and to ask not only “Does it work?” but “For whom, in what state, along what path, toward which valued outcomes, and at what cost?”

CHANGE IN UNDERSTANDING

From generations and slogans to molecules, exposures, clocks, mechanisms, trade-offs, and person-valued trajectories.

PROLOGUE · AUDIENCE ARCHITECTURE

Four audiences, one shared task

CORE SENTENCE

Evidence becomes useful only when it meets lived trajectory.

01 · PEOPLE TAKING MEDICATION

Relief, burden, identity, agency, preferences, and priorities belong inside the evidence conversation. Lived effects are consequential data for care, while one person's experience remains distinct from population evidence.

02 · CAREGIVERS

Notice, record, communicate, and support without commandeering the person's reality or reducing care to compliance. A caregiver is neither a diagnostic instrument nor an unpaid prescribing service.

03 · CLINICIANS

Integrate population evidence with exposure, phase, prior course, organ state, interacting substances, preferences, uncertainty, and reversibility. The task is shared judgment under incomplete information.

04 · RESEARCHERS

Preserve estimands, time horizons, nulls, heterogeneity, access limits, and competing explanations. Predictive complexity is valuable only when it improves out-of-sample decisions and person-valued outcomes.

PROLOGUE · GOVERNING MODEL

Eighteen stages, seventeen transitions

CORE SENTENCE

A causal claim must say which link was measured, which link was inferred, and which feedback path was ignored.

**MOLECULE → FORMULATION → ROUTE → ABSORPTION → METABOLISM →
PLASMA EXPOSURE ↓**

**EFFECT-SITE EXPOSURE → TARGET → INTRACELLULAR STATE → CELL
EXCITABILITY ↓**

**LOCAL CIRCUIT → DISTRIBUTED NETWORK → BODY → EXPERIENCE → BEHAVIOUR
↓**

ENVIRONMENT → FEEDBACK → FUTURE TRAJECTORY

The chain is not a claim that causation travels only forward. It is a bookkeeping device for preventing category errors. Formulation changes peaks and tails; body state changes clearance; experience changes behaviour; behaviour changes sleep, substances, adherence, and future exposure. A receptor assay cannot by itself establish a network mechanism, and a symptom trial cannot by itself identify the intracellular path that produced the result.

PROLOGUE · EVIDENCE CONTRACT

Five categories keep inference visible

CORE SENTENCE

Confidence of tone must never promote one category into another.

EMPIRICAL RESULT

What reported data directly show within the study design, population, outcome, comparator, and time horizon.

AUTHORS' INTERPRETATION

How source authors explain or frame the result; not identical to the measurement.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE

A conclusion drawn across sources that extends beyond one reported result.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

An explicit integration with the Flow Hijacked framework; disciplined synthesis, not an established finding.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

A speculative, testable proposal with predictions, boundary conditions, and potential falsifiers.

PROLOGUE · APPRAISAL DEPTH

A large corpus is not the same as a locked claim

CORE SENTENCE

Release 1.1 contains 700 biomedical/clinical sources and 100 mathematical sources, but definitive wording follows the claim lock—not the raw count.

17 · FULL-TEXT OR OFFICIAL LOCK

The source was appraised at the depth needed for the specific load-bearing claim.

1 · PARTIAL LOCK

Some claim components are secured, while another component remains access- or appraisal-limited.

22 · ABSTRACT OR ACCESS-LIMITED

Metadata and abstract-level content may support narrow wording; they do not authorize full-text-level certainty.

CORRECTIONS

Three notices were inspected. None changed a load-bearing numerical conclusion in release 1.1. Hyperbolic tapering remains an authors' interpretation, not an empirical protocol.

PROLOGUE · FORMAL LAYER

Mathematics is a discipline of questions

CORE SENTENCE

A valid equation is not biological proof, and a plausible biological mapping is not a validated clinical algorithm.

Each model is given two status judgments: whether the mathematical family is established, and whether its mapping to psychiatric medication has been fitted, identified, replicated, and shown to improve decisions. These judgments can diverge sharply.

Every symbol must have a defined role, unit or scale, and assumption. Compartment equations can formalize exposure without claiming that plasma equals brain concentration. Fast-slow systems can express adaptation without proving a particular variable is slow. Non-normal gain can explain transient amplification in a linearized system without establishing that a clinical state is produced by that mechanism.

The formal sequence moves from pharmacokinetic compartments and effect-site delay through saturating pharmacodynamics, indirect response, stochastic fast-slow dynamics, neural masses, attractors, metastability, bifurcations, transient gain, resolvent sensitivity, controllability, reinforcement learning, Bayesian state estimation, and multi-objective control.

ACCEPTANCE RULE

Use the equation only when it changes what must be measured, estimated, compared, or falsified.

FOUR OF TWELVE PARTS

Contents

PART 01

Before the molecule

- 1.1 · The pre-drug clinical world
- 1.2 · ECT is the necessary complication
- 1.3 · Quiet is not recovery
- 1.4 · Institutions are causal environments
- 1.5 · Why portable control mattered
- 1.6 · The asylum-to-cure story is too simple
- 1.7 · Sedation has special uses—and limits
- 1.8 · Begin with the outcome vector

PART 02

Lithium: the ion that changed time

- 2.1 · Cade, Schou, and evidence maturity
- 2.2 · Episode control is not recurrence prevention
- 2.3 · Renal PK defines the intervention
- 2.4 · The body changes exposure
- 2.5 · Mechanism is a family, not a slogan
- 2.6 · Suicide evidence requires triangulation
- 2.7 · Slow burdens reshape the trajectory
- 2.8 · Monitoring is part of pharmacodynamics

PART 03

Chlorpromazine and the dopamine machine

- 3.1 · Serendipity was a network
- 3.2 · From neuroleptic quieting to antipsychosis
- 3.3 · Two first-generation geometries
- 3.4 · One target, several pathways
- 3.5 · Occupancy is nonlinear
- 3.6 · Benefit has domain limits
- 3.7 · Harms can be misread as illness
- 3.8 · Update—not erase—the dopamine model

PART 04

Clozapine breaks the class

- 4.1 · Withdrawal and monitored return
- 4.2 · Treatment resistance becomes distinct
- 4.3 · Broad binding does not solve the mechanism
- 4.4 · Clearance is state-dependent
- 4.5 · TDM clarifies exposure—not destiny
- 4.6 · Distinct benefit, uncertain causal breadth
- 4.7 · The harm profile is systemic
- 4.8 · The 2025 REMS lesson

FOUR OF TWELVE PARTS

Contents

PART 05

The atypical promise meets CATIE and CUtLASS

- 5.1 · How a class story was made
- 5.2 · Molecules are not interchangeable
- 5.3 · Partial agonism is not one generation
- 5.4 · CATIE makes retention an outcome
- 5.5 · CUtLASS tests a strategy
- 5.6 · Network meta-analysis separates axes
- 5.7 · Formulation changes the trajectory
- 5.8 · Outcome is a vector, not a rank

PART 06

Antidepressants create—and outgrow—the monoamine story

- 6.1 · Two discovery routes
- 6.2 · MAOIs and TCAs reveal trade space
- 6.3 · SSRIs and SNRIs are PK-diverse
- 6.4 · Alternatives and augmentation remain heterogeneous
- 6.5 · Immediate target, delayed response
- 6.6 · Average acute efficacy is real
- 6.7 · The evidence system alters the picture
- 6.8 · Efficacy is not a serotonin diagnosis

PART 07

Withdrawal, recurrence, and the direction of travel

- 7.1 · One prescription, many clocks
- 7.2 · Delay creates hysteresis
- 7.3 · Small dose steps are not equal steps
- 7.4 · Withdrawal has multiple domains
- 7.5 · Recurrence and withdrawal can coexist
- 7.6 · ANTLEH holds both truths
- 7.7 · Hyperbolic tapering is an interpretation
- 7.8 · The needed trial measures direction

PART 08

Ketamine changes the clock; psychedelics expose context

- 8.1 · The first ketamine signal
- 8.2 · Route determines exposure
- 8.3 · Mechanism remains a family
- 8.4 · Rapid benefit is not durable recovery
- 8.5 · Esketamine is drug plus system
- 8.6 · Safety has acute and repeated clocks
- 8.7 · Psilocybin is context-coupled pharmacology
- 8.8 · Generalisability is part of mechanism

FOUR OF TWELVE PARTS

Contents

PART 09

Bipolar disorder: control the episode or stabilize the trajectory?

- 9.1 · Build the phase matrix first
- 9.2 · Acute mania has its own evidence
- 9.3 · Bipolar depression is not inverse mania
- 9.4 · Switching risk is conditional
- 9.5 · Three antiseizure drugs, three PK systems
- 9.6 · Polarity-specific maintenance matters
- 9.7 · BALANCE and STEP-BD test strategies
- 9.8 · Trajectory includes body and reproduction

PART 10

Beyond D2: success, failure, and theory updating

- 10.1 · Why the field moved beyond D2
- 10.2 · Partial agonism complicates dopamine
- 10.3 · Xanomeline-trospium is multiscale by design
- 10.4 · Short-term efficacy has a boundary
- 10.5 · Ulotaront is a nonconfirmation case
- 10.6 · Bitopertin constrains glutamate theory
- 10.7 · BeneMin separates biomarker from treatment
- 10.8 · Use a falsification ladder

PART 11

The living brain as a history-dependent control problem

- 11.1 · Reassemble the 17-link chain
- 11.2 · Dose is not exposure
- 11.3 · Plasma is not effect site
- 11.4 · Fast state meets slow adaptation
- 11.5 · State space has geometry
- 11.6 · Stable systems can transiently amplify
- 11.7 · Control is constrained and model-dependent
- 11.8 · Close the feedback loop

PART 12

What the molecule cannot do alone

- 12.1 · Benefit is a multidimensional trajectory
- 12.2 · The body is not a side-effect appendix
- 12.3 · Experience is an outcome
- 12.4 · Adherence is a system variable
- 12.5 · Environment enters the controller
- 12.6 · Precision must improve decisions
- 12.7 · Shared control has constraints
- 12.8 · End with falsifiable questions

PART 01

Before the molecule

What counted as improvement when quiet, safety, freedom, function, and dignity were not the same endpoint?

Define the person, environment, and outcome vector before introducing a pharmacological controller.

Part route

- 1. The pre-drug clinical world**
- 2. ECT is the necessary complication**
- 3. Quiet is not recovery**
- 4. Institutions are causal environments**
- 5. Why portable control mattered**
- 6. The asylum-to-cure story is too simple**
- 7. Sedation has special uses—and limits**
- 8. Begin with the outcome vector**

PART 01 · 1.1 · CARE BEFORE RECEPTOR MODELS

1.1 · The pre-drug clinical world

CORE SENTENCE

Modern psychopharmacology entered an already active system of bodily interventions, institutional routines, social judgments, and unequal power.

The acquired historical review sets a defensible starting point at the system level. It dates modern psychopharmacology to the 1950 synthesis of chlorpromazine and describes a subsequent transformation in how psychiatry understood and treated mental illness. It also places medicines within the closing of state hospitals, the movement from psychotherapy toward prescriptions, basic-science advances, pharmaceutical marketing, and political-economic change. Those are the propositions directly recoverable from the local abstract; it does not enumerate or compare the specific pre-drug procedures that preceded them.

This narrower account still changes causal interpretation. A medicine enters an existing care system, and its observed consequences reflect both pharmacology and the conditions under which care is organized. If institutions close while prescribing expands, changes in where people live, which encounters are recorded, what families carry, and which outcomes services reward can travel alongside the drug. The review's argument is not that medicines had no effects. It is that their historical success cannot be explained simply as a sequence of increasingly effective agents for discrete diseases.

Specific pre-drug practices remain questions for a future, directly sourced historical acquisition; they are not evidence-locked claims on this page. The present baseline is therefore deliberately coarser: treatment was already embedded in institutional and social arrangements, modern psychopharmacology emerged within a broader system transition, and causal credit cannot be assigned to molecules alone. This boundary protects people whose histories include help, coercion, or both without using an unreviewed map as proof of any particular practice's prevalence, efficacy, or harm.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Before receptor pharmacology, the working mechanisms were bodily interruption, sedation, environmental control, and institutional reinforcement; their effects cannot be separated from delivery context by the acquired evidence.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

ERA-00 is a historical synthesis anchored to FH-PHARM-4624F5B901. The source has an open full-text link but is marked not reviewed; only the system transition stated in its local abstract is used here, and no named pre-drug practice or intervention-specific estimate is claim-locked.

PART 01 · 1.1 · THE BASELINE CHANGES THE QUESTION

1.1 · The pre-drug clinical world

The relevant comparison is not an imagined world of no care versus a modern prescription. It is a sequence of changing care ecologies. Each ecology distributes risk differently among the person, family, staff, and public system. Institutional confinement may reduce immediate exposure to some dangers while creating dependency, isolation, or abuse. A bodily intervention may relieve a severe state while also carrying cognitive or medical burden. The first analytical task is therefore to name which outcome changed, for whom, and over what interval.

This framing also prevents retrospective certainty. Psychotropic medicines became central as state hospitals closed and prescriptions displaced much psychotherapy, but that transition does not turn everything earlier into useless brutality or everything later into cure. The acquired review argues that political economy, marketing, basic science, and care-system change helped produce psychopharmacology's historical success. The lesson is not moral equivalence. It is that drug action, harm, consent, portability, and social consequence are different variables.

For a person living through treatment, those distinctions are concrete. A safer night may matter enormously without restoring concentration, trust, sexuality, or a future. A caregiver may gain sleep while the person feels silenced. A clinician may avert immediate injury while knowing that longer work remains. A researcher may measure agitation because it is observable while missing dignity because it is harder to quantify. Part 1 begins by keeping all four viewpoints in the same field.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The historical record in this acquisition does not justify treating all institutional care as uniformly harmful or all somatic care as ineffective. It also does not supply intervention-specific estimates. The defensible counterpoint is that system change and drug effects must be studied together, without presuming either benefit or harm for a named pre-drug practice.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The person may experience behavioral quiet, relief, fear, loss of agency, and protection simultaneously; one observer's improvement can coexist with another dimension's deterioration.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats the pre-drug ward as a coupled person-environment control system whose outputs depended on both intervention and institutional objective.

TRANSITION

Once the baseline is plural rather than primitive, ECT becomes the necessary complication: benefit and coercion can occupy the same history.

PART 01 · 1.2 · EFFICACY DOES NOT PURIFY A SYSTEM

1.2 · ECT is the necessary complication

CORE SENTENCE

The acquired corpus permits, at most, a bounded adjunctive signal for ECT in affective symptoms within schizophrenia—not broad proof of efficacy across severe states; consent, burden, delivery, and institutional power remain separate questions.

Electroconvulsive therapy complicates a convenient history, but the local acquisition does not establish broad contemporary efficacy. The historical map contains a broad positive ECT label, yet its sole historical anchor was not fully appraised. That label therefore remains an architecture-level proposition awaiting direct, diagnosis- and phase-specific evidence. It is not promoted here as an empirical result. The corpus was assembled for psychiatric pharmacology, not as a comprehensive ECT review.

The directly recoverable clinical signal is narrower. A 1995 review examined adjunctive treatments in schizophrenia and reported that small samples and divergent designs made recommendations difficult. Its abstract found little firm evidence that adjuncts would dramatically change somatic treatment, while listing ECT among more promising options for affective symptoms. Even this is review-level, abstract-access evidence, not a contemporary effect estimate or universal indication.

That boundary still permits an important ethical and methodological lesson. A possible benefit signal does not answer how an intervention was offered, who could refuse, what burdens accompanied it, or whether the surrounding institution recognized the person's account. Conversely, a history of coercion or cognitive burden does not prove ineffectiveness. Benefit, burden, consent, and delivery are distinct propositions, and this acquisition settles none of them at broad ECT level.

Accordingly, the complication is not a verdict for or against treatment. It is a demand that any future efficacy claim specify diagnosis, phase, comparator, endpoint, follow-up, and evidence quality before the word effective carries scientific meaning.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

ECT is a somatic intervention whose clinical action cannot be reduced here to a single acquired molecular mechanism; Part 1 uses it as an outcome-and-power case, not a settled mechanistic account.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Both cited reviews are marked not reviewed, and ERA-00 is only a synthesis. The only directly recoverable clinical signal is the 1995 review abstract's limited listing of ECT among promising adjuncts for affective symptoms in schizophrenia, alongside explicit design limitations; no broad efficacy or cognitive-harm estimate is promoted.

PART 01 · 1.2 · BENEFIT, BURDEN, AND AUTHORITY

1.2 · ECT is the necessary complication

To evaluate an intervention humanely, at least four questions must remain visible. Did the acute state change? What burdens accompanied that change? Was the person able to understand and influence the decision? What happened afterward to memory, function, relationships, and the chance of returning to an ordinary life? A symptom scale can address part of the first question. It cannot, by itself, answer the other three.

This is particularly important where urgency is real. Severe depression, catatonia, mania, or psychosis can narrow time, communication, and decisional capacity. Families and clinicians may face genuine danger while the person experiences the intervention as rescue, violation, or both. Ethical analysis cannot pretend that delay is costless; it also cannot let urgency become a permanent exemption from explanation, review, supported decision-making, and attention to the person's later account.

The evidence discipline here is therefore modest but exact. The acquired materials justify retaining ECT as a complication to any triumphalist molecule narrative. They do not justify a complete present-day guide to indications or technique. For people considering treatment, this lecture supplies questions rather than instructions. For caregivers, it distinguishes support from substitution of voice. For clinicians, it keeps consent and follow-up inside effectiveness. For researchers, it requires outcomes capable of detecting both relief and burden.

That structure also prevents educational history from becoming clinical advice. Decisions about ECT belong in individualized assessment with current evidence, informed consent procedures, alternatives, urgency, and follow-up—not in an inference from this historical section.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Historical coercion and cognitive burden do not establish lack of efficacy. Conversely, the limited adjunctive signal for affective symptoms in schizophrenia does not establish broad benefit, benign delivery, or superiority on person-valued long-term outcomes.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person can later say that an intervention helped and that its delivery harmed them. Good evidence and good care must be able to hear both sentences.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked separates state transition from control legitimacy: moving a system away from danger does not, by itself, determine whether the route preserved agency and dignity.

TRANSITION

The ECT complication forces a sharper distinction: observable quiet is one possible outcome, not a synonym for recovery.

PART 01 · 1.3 · ONE VISIBLE ENDPOINT, MANY HIDDEN ONES

1.3 · Quiet is not recovery

CORE SENTENCE

Behavioral calm may be valuable, but it cannot stand in for the multidimensional trajectory called recovery.

Quiet is easy to notice. It changes the sound of a room, reduces demands on staff, may let a family sleep, and can signal that terror or agitation has genuinely eased. For those reasons it should not be dismissed. The error begins when quiet becomes the master endpoint and other changes are inferred from it: that the person is safer, thinks more clearly, has recovered agency, can sustain relationships, or experiences the treatment as acceptable.

The acquired evidence ledger explicitly separates symptom reduction, retention in treatment, relapse, functioning, quality of life, mortality, and patient-valued experience. That inference rests on studies that measured different slices of outcome. CATIE foregrounded discontinuation and tolerability; CUtLASS examined quality of life and cost; a maintenance meta-analysis examined relapse and readmission while noting scarce employment and mortality data; a Finnish cohort addressed mortality; an antidepressant survey examined emotional blunting and its ambiguous relation to residual depression.

Together these sources do not produce a universal recovery scale. They show why no single proxy is sufficient. A person may have fewer hallucinations yet feel cognitively slowed. Hospitalization may be prevented while metabolic burden grows. Emotional intensity may become bearable or uncomfortably flattened. The scientific requirement is not that every treatment improve every dimension. It is that the lecture state which dimension changed and resist silently importing that change into all the others.

This separation is especially important when benefits and harms are reported by different observers. Disagreement may reveal distinct outcome coordinates rather than simple error, denial, or lack of insight.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Observable behavior is an output of interacting symptom, arousal, cognitive, bodily, environmental, and relational processes; the same quiet phenotype can therefore arise through different pathways.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

This is claim INF-002. CUtLASS is full-text claim-locked; CATIE, the mortality cohort, and emotional-blunting survey remain abstract-level in the ledger, while the relapse review is landing-page only.

PART 01 · 1.3 · FROM A SCORE TO AN OUTCOME VECTOR

1.3 · Quiet is not recovery

A more faithful representation is a vector rather than a single score. Let $Y(t)$ contain acute symptoms, cognition, felt agency, bodily burden, sleep, social function, relationships, use of hospital care, survival, and quality of life at time t . Improvement then means identifying which components moved, by how much, for how long, and according to whose valuation. This notation is a Flow Hijacked synthesis, not a validated clinical instrument.

A vector also makes trade-offs visible. Rapid calming may improve immediate safety while worsening alertness. Relapse prevention may reduce hospitalization while weight or movement effects undermine health and participation. Emotional blunting may be experienced by one person as relief from unbearable intensity and by another as loss of love, creativity, or self. Those differences are not noise to be averaged away. They are part of the treatment effect that shared decisions must interpret.

No practical encounter can measure everything. The remedy is not an impossible questionnaire but disciplined pluralism: specify the primary endpoint, check a small set of possible counter-endpoints, and revisit them across time. People taking medication supply the meaning of the change; caregivers contribute observations without replacing that meaning; clinicians integrate risk and physiology; researchers clarify the estimand and missing dimensions. Quiet retains its place, but only as one coordinate in a larger human trajectory.

The vector also protects against retrospective simplification. A later crisis does not erase an earlier period of meaningful benefit, and an early response does not guarantee a durable or acceptable trajectory.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Behavioral calm can be a valid, urgent endpoint, especially where arousal creates immediate danger or unbearable distress. The argument is against treating it as a sufficient surrogate for every later outcome, not against its value.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The most important follow-up question may be not only whether others see improvement, but what has become more possible or less possible in the person's own life.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked represents recovery as a time-varying outcome vector $Y(t)$, with potential gains and losses distributed across coordinates rather than compressed into a scalar label.

TRANSITION

If outcomes depend on more than behavior, the environment producing and interpreting that behavior must enter the causal model.

PART 01 · 1.4 · THE ENVIRONMENT ENTERS THE MECHANISM

1.4 · Institutions are causal environments

CORE SENTENCE

The setting changes exposure, behavior, interpretation, and opportunity; it is part of the treatment system, not background scenery.

Medication is often described as though its causal path runs directly from molecule to symptom. Even before discussing receptors, history shows why that path is incomplete. Where a person lives affects sleep, threat exposure, substance availability, nutrition, adherence, privacy, social contact, and the chance that an adverse effect will be noticed. Rights determine whether disagreement becomes dialogue or forced compliance. Staffing determines whether a subtle change is interpreted, ignored, or converted into another dose.

Relationships can buffer distress or amplify it. Poverty can make regular food, transport, laboratory monitoring, and safe storage uncertain. Abandonment can transform discharge from liberation into exposure. Conversely, stable housing, trusted care, meaningful roles, and reliable follow-up can make the same pharmacological exposure part of a more viable trajectory. These statements are plausible system-level inferences; this local acquisition did not isolate their independent causal effects in randomized institutional comparisons.

The historical anchor reviewed psychiatry's growing dependence on drugs and interpreted the rise of psychopharmacology as a product of political economy, pharmaceutical marketing, basic science, and changes in mental-health care, not simply progressively more effective disease-specific medicines. That interpretation supports including institutions in the causal picture. It does not supply a precise coefficient for housing, rights, or staffing. The lecture therefore treats those factors as necessary variables whose magnitudes must be established in appropriately designed evidence.

This restraint matters: naming an omitted cause is not the same as measuring it. The architecture marks the environment as scientifically indispensable while leaving its specific effects open to stronger acquisition.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Environment modulates the person's state, the realized drug exposure, the interpretation of outputs, and the available next actions; these paths can mediate or modify observed treatment effects.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The system claim is supported contextually by ERA-00 and the abstract of FH-PHARM-4624F5B901. The source is marked not reviewed, and no specific environmental effect size is claim-locked.

PART 01 · 1.4 · TREATMENT EFFECT INCLUDES IMPLEMENTATION

1.4 · Institutions are causal environments

Suppose two people receive the same prescribed dose. One has predictable meals, a quiet place to sleep, continuity with a trusted clinician, and someone who notices emerging stiffness. The other moves between unstable settings, cannot reach laboratory testing, fears coercion, and has no safe way to store medication. Equal prescription is not equal intervention. The realized exposure, the capacity to report effects, and the possible responses to trouble differ from the beginning.

This matters for interpretation. A missed dose can be coded as nonadherence while concealing cost, sedation, stigma, cognitive difficulty, or an attempt to preserve functioning. Rehospitalization can be coded as illness recurrence while service gaps or abrupt discharge also contributed. Conversely, attributing every difficulty to society can erase a severe biological state that responds to treatment. A causal environment model must permit both biological efficacy and environmental constraint without forcing either into a total explanation.

For the person, the practical question is whether treatment increases real options. For caregivers, it is how to support stability without becoming an enforcement arm. For clinicians, it is which modifiable context prevents benefit from becoming burden. For researchers, it is whether a trial's delivery system is part of the intervention and whether results transport to ordinary care. These questions deepen pharmacology: they ask what exposure actually occurred and under which conditions it could become useful.

They also shift accountability. When the wider system is included, difficulty sustaining treatment becomes a signal to investigate access, fit, burden, and trust—not an automatic character judgment about the person.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Environmental causation does not imply that molecular effects are unreal or fully socially produced. Severe symptoms can persist in supportive settings, and medicines can have benefits and harms across environments.

LIVED RELEVANCE

When treatment seems not to work, asking what made it livable, observable, and sustainable may be as important as asking which receptor was engaged.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked models observed response as an emergent property of molecule, person, delivery system, and opportunity structure, with feedback among all four.

TRANSITION

Because delivery context matters, the portability of daily medication was historically consequential even before asking whether it caused deinstitutionalization.

PART 01 · 1.5 · A TREATMENT THAT COULD TRAVEL

1.5 · Why portable control mattered

CORE SENTENCE

Portable, repeatable pharmacological exposure changed the feasible organization of care, but feasibility is not sole historical causation.

The practical novelty of modern psychiatric medication was not only molecular specificity. Tablets could be manufactured, transported, prescribed, and taken repeatedly without surgery or a dedicated convulsive-treatment setting. That portability changed the logistical boundary of care. A therapeutic effect, adverse effect, or both could now accompany a person across hospital, clinic, home, work, and family life rather than remain tied to a single procedure.

Repeated oral exposure also created a new temporal object: maintenance treatment. Clinicians could attempt to stabilize severe states over weeks, months, or years; families could participate in care outside institutions; services could imagine discharge with ongoing biological intervention. The historical map therefore describes drugs as making sustained community treatment more feasible. Feasible is the key word. It identifies an enabling condition without claiming that a molecule wrote policy, built housing, funded clinics, or guaranteed belonging.

Portability carried burdens with the benefits. Responsibility for remembering, obtaining, tolerating, and monitoring treatment moved partly into everyday life. Effects on alertness, movement, appetite, sexuality, and cognition could now shape ordinary roles continuously. A portable intervention can expand freedom when it supports stability, and constrain freedom when its burdens are invisible or refusal is punished. Historical importance must therefore include what was transferred from institution to person and family, not only what left the hospital.

In other words, the site of control changed. Pharmacology became part of mornings, meals, work shifts, intimacy, and sleep, making ordinary life both the arena of benefit and the place where costs accumulated.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Portability changes the control architecture by converting episodic institutional intervention into repeatable exposure embedded in daily feedback, adherence, monitoring, and social life.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

ERA-00 and FH-PHARM-4624F5B901 support the historical enabling role at review level. The anchor is not fully appraised, so portability is not quantified and is not presented as a sufficient cause of deinstitutionalization.

PART 01 · 1.5 · ENABLING CONDITION, NOT A SOCIAL POLICY

1.5 · Why portable control mattered

It is tempting to draw a straight line from chlorpromazine to emptying the asylum. The acquired historical review resists that line. It places psychotropic drugs among several forces, including political and economic realities, marketing, scientific change, and reorganization of mental-health care. A medicine can make community treatment technically more imaginable while budgets, rights litigation, service design, and housing determine what community care actually becomes.

The distinction is causal. An enabling condition alters what is possible; a sufficient cause produces the outcome on its own under the stated conditions. Portable medication satisfies neither every person's needs nor every system requirement. Without follow-up, income, shelter, trusted relationships, and crisis capacity, discharge may relocate suffering rather than resolve it. Without an effective intervention for a severe state, however, even excellent social support may not make community life sustainable for every person.

This balanced account protects lived realities on both sides. Some people credit medication with making home, parenting, study, or work possible. Others describe medication as one support among many, or as a source of burden they endured because alternatives were scarce. Families may experience both relief and transferred responsibility. Clinicians may gain a repeatable tool without gaining the services needed around it. The history becomes deeper when no single experience is forced to stand for the entire transition.

It also keeps success revisable. A discharge that initially feels liberating may later expose service gaps; a burdensome early regimen may, after adjustment and support, become compatible with a valued life.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Avoiding monocausality must not erase genuine drug-enabled change. The historical synthesis credits medicines with materially changing the feasibility of sustained community treatment even while rejecting a molecule-only explanation.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Leaving an institution is not identical to gaining a home, a relationship, or a future; medication may help open the door without determining what lies beyond it.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked distinguishes control portability from restored possibility: the first can support the second, but social structure determines whether new branches remain reachable.

TRANSITION

Once portability is separated from policy, the asylum-to-cure narrative can be replaced by a multicausal transition.

PART 01 · 1.6 · SEVERAL CLOCKS MOVED TOGETHER

1.6 · The asylum-to-cure story is too simple

CORE SENTENCE

Deinstitutionalization was a coupled historical transition; assigning it to medication alone mistakes simultaneity and enablement for sole causation.

The familiar story has an appealing sequence: hospitals were full, antipsychotics arrived, symptoms improved, and people returned to the community. Each clause may contain truth, but the causal links are under-specified. Civil-rights reforms changed the legitimacy of confinement. Budgets altered hospital capacity. Housing and community services affected where people could go. Families absorbed care. Pharmaceutical promotion and diagnostic thinking changed what clinicians prescribed and how illness was explained.

The acquired historical review explicitly interprets psychopharmacology's prominence as arising from a complex mixture of political economy, marketing, scientific advances, and changes in mental-health care. It also argues against explaining success simply as increasingly effective medicines for discrete diseases. Because that source was not fully appraised in this release, the lecture presents this as a review-level interpretation rather than a settled decomposition of historical causes.

A multicausal account does more than add context. It changes what counts as evidence. Falling hospital census cannot by itself estimate drug efficacy. Widespread prescribing cannot prove disease specificity. Community residence cannot prove recovery if homelessness, incarceration, readmission, or family overload are excluded from view. Conversely, imperfect community outcomes do not prove that medication offered no benefit. Each claim requires a comparator and an outcome, with the surrounding policy trajectory kept visible.

The resulting history is less cinematic but more useful. It can explain why similar medicines coexist with very different national or local outcomes, and why a technological capacity may flourish, fail, or become coercive depending on institutions around it.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The historical outcome is generated by interacting causal streams—drug availability, clinical effects, rights, finance, housing, family capacity, and service design—with mediation and feedback among them.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

FH-PHARM-4624F5B901 supports the multicausal interpretation at abstract/review level and is marked not reviewed. The corpus does not provide a quantitative causal decomposition of deinstitutionalization.

PART 01 · 1.6 · REPLACE THE MORALITY TALE WITH A CAUSAL MAP

1.6 · The asylum-to-cure story is too simple

A causal map begins by separating variables. Let D represent drug availability and effect, R rights and legal reform, B budgets, H housing, S community services, and F family capacity. Community residence C and person-valued recovery Y are different outcomes. D may influence C directly by reducing severe symptoms and indirectly by making discharge administratively conceivable. Yet R, B, H, S, and F can each alter C, modify D's effect, or change whether C improves Y.

This notation is not a fitted historical model. It is a Flow Hijacked synthesis designed to expose missing counterfactuals. What would have happened with medication but without housing? With rights reform but without effective acute treatment? With discharge but without follow-up? Historical records rarely randomize these combinations. The honest conclusion is therefore structural rather than numerical: multiple causes changed together, and downstream outcomes depended on their configuration.

The map also disciplines present policy. If medication is treated as the complete intervention, failures are easily assigned to the person or drug. If social context is treated as complete, biological suffering may be minimized. A coupled account asks which link failed and which support could be changed. It leaves room for a medicine to be lifesaving, insufficient, burdensome, or all three at different times—without turning any one description into the history of everyone.

Most importantly, the causal map keeps downstream human outcomes separate from administrative ones. Closing a bed, filling a prescription, and sustaining a life in the community are three events, not one event described at different scales.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

A multicausal history is not evidence that every cause contributed equally. Medicines may have been indispensable in some transitions, while policy or service changes dominated others; the acquired corpus cannot estimate those shares.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The meaning of discharge depends on the destination. A key treatment outcome is not merely leaving a bed, but gaining a stable place from which life can reopen.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats deinstitutionalization as a coupled transition in which molecular control, law, resources, relationships, and opportunity reshape one another's effects.

TRANSITION

The next distinction follows naturally: rapid sedation can be an important tool within a system, but speed must not be mistaken for comprehensive disease modification.

PART 01 · 1.7 · WHAT FAST CALMING CAN DO

1.7 · Sedation has special uses—and limits

CORE SENTENCE

Fast reduction of arousal can be clinically decisive, but its mechanism, endpoint, and time horizon differ from durable recovery.

The acquired drug atlas places benzodiazepines and heterogeneous sedative adjuncts outside the core disease-modifying classes. Benzodiazepines positively modulate GABA-A receptors and can reduce arousal rapidly. Depending on agent, route, and state, clinically noticeable effects may emerge within minutes or hours. In selected situations—acute agitation, overwhelming anxiety, insomnia, or responsive catatonia—that speed can create safety, communication, sleep, or time for a fuller intervention.

Mechanistic clarity at the receptor does not create diagnostic universality. GABA-A positive allosteric modulation describes a pharmacological action; it does not mean that every agitated state has the same cause or that calming resolves psychosis, depression, bipolar disorder, trauma, delirium, or substance withdrawal. The same visible reduction in movement may reflect relief, sedation, motor impairment, or a mixture. Clinical meaning depends on the state and on what becomes possible afterward.

The only atlas anchor acquired for this class is a 1995 review of adjunctive treatments in schizophrenia. Its abstract calls benzodiazepines among the more promising adjuncts but emphasizes small samples, divergent designs, and difficulty drawing firm recommendations. The source is marked not reviewed. Accordingly, this section retains the pharmacological and acute-use boundary from the atlas without promoting a comparative efficacy estimate or a general treatment recommendation.

A modern prescribing conclusion would require dedicated, current evidence for the specific syndrome and agent. This historical-pharmacological section instead establishes the distinction that later chapters need: a fast controller can be valuable without being a comprehensive repair.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Benzodiazepines are GABA-A positive allosteric modulators that can rapidly reduce arousal; rapid receptor-mediated calming is a state intervention, not proof of correction of an underlying disorder.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

DRUG-ADJ-001 is anchored only to FH-PHARM-DAB1FF3493, marked not reviewed. Acute pharmacology is summarized at atlas level; syndrome-specific efficacy and long-term benefit remain highly conditional.

PART 01 · 1.7 · WHY SPEED IS NOT THE WHOLE TRAJECTORY

1.7 · Sedation has special uses—and limits

A fast clinical change can dominate perception because it appears before slower outcomes. The cited 1995 review, however, does not provide a verified safety synthesis for benzodiazepines. Its abstract says only that benzodiazepines were among the more promising adjunctive options in schizophrenia while small samples and divergent designs prevented firm recommendations. This supports a limited teaching point: an acute adjunctive signal and a durable outcome are different questions. It does not support class-specific incidence, timing, or interaction claims.

Accordingly, this section treats later safety topics as an acquisition gap rather than filling them from the atlas. It offers no instruction to start, stop, continue, or taper medication. Individual agents, people, co-exposures, and clinical states may differ, but the cited review cannot quantify those differences. Current agent-specific regulatory sources or fully appraised safety syntheses would be required before the lecture could teach a particular long-term hazard, risk modifier, or management threshold.

Counterevidence belongs beside the limitation. Uncertain long-term evidence does not erase situations in which clinicians may consider rapid calming, and a positive adjunctive signal does not show durable recovery. The decision-relevant questions remain conditional: what is the immediate target, what alternative risks exist, which outcome will be observed, and what happens after the acute interval? Those questions serve the person first while giving caregivers and clinicians a shared language, without converting a historical review into advice.

Researchers need the same temporal precision. A study ending after immediate calming cannot establish durable function; a long-term observational result cannot reconstruct the acute crisis in which an intervention was chosen. Future evidence must separate onset, symptom target, functioning, adverse outcomes, and follow-up while documenting agent, dose, co-exposures, and population.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The review's limited positive adjunctive signal prevents equating inconclusive evidence with no possible value. It does not establish syndrome-specific efficacy, durability, or safety; those questions require direct current sources.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The same medication may feel like rescue during an unbearable night and like narrowing when carried indefinitely; both experiences require a time-specific account.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked distinguishes a fast state-control pulse from a slow trajectory intervention: the value of the first depends partly on whether it opens or closes later possibilities.

TRANSITION

To prevent the fastest and most visible effect from defining success, the lecture now makes its full outcome vector explicit.

PART 01 · 1.8 · WHAT EXACTLY CHANGED?

1.8 · Begin with the outcome vector

CORE SENTENCE

Every treatment claim should name the outcome, observer, comparator, and time horizon before it is called improvement.

The outcome vector begins with a simple discipline: never let improvement appear without an object. Symptoms may change while cognition does not. Sleep may return while sexuality deteriorates. A person may avoid hospitalization yet lose work, spontaneity, or physical health. Mortality can move differently from quality of life. Relationships may improve because fear recedes or worsen because emotional range narrows. Each component has its own observer, instrument, uncertainty, and clock.

The acquired claim INF-002 formalizes this separation at the level of broader scientific inference. Its supporting sources deliberately span different outcomes. CATIE's high discontinuation shows why assigned treatment and sustained effectiveness differ. The full-text-locked CUTLASS economic analysis directly examined quality-adjusted life-years and costs. The relapse meta-analysis found less relapse and readmission with maintenance antipsychotics but reported scarce employment data and insufficient deaths. The Finnish observational cohort addressed mortality, while the antidepressant survey captured emotional blunting and its confounding by residual depression.

These studies concern different populations, designs, treatments, and periods. They must not be pooled rhetorically into one effect estimate. Their joint contribution is conceptual: outcomes that are commonly spoken of as recovery are empirically separable. The person's priorities should organize interpretation; caregiver observations can add longitudinal detail; clinicians must integrate safety and physiology; researchers must state the estimand. The result is not indecision. It is a more precise account of benefit and burden.

The vector is therefore a discipline of naming, not a promise of complete measurement. Its purpose is to stop a readily available endpoint from erasing outcomes that were never collected.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Different causal pathways can move different outcome coordinates in opposite directions; treatment effect is therefore vector-valued and time-dependent rather than a single scalar property.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

This page uses INF-002 exactly. Only CUTLASS is full-text claim-locked among the five cited studies; remaining claims retain their abstract or landing-page access limitations and design-specific scope.

PART 01 · 1.8 · FROM ENDPOINT TO TRAJECTORY

1.8 · Begin with the outcome vector

An outcome vector becomes informative only when measured across time. Let $Y(t)$ denote the set of person-relevant outcomes and let $\Delta Y(t_0, t_1)$ denote their change between two defined moments. A treatment claim should also specify comparator C , exposure history $E(t)$, and observer O . The expression is not a clinical calculator. It is a reminder that better according to a clinician-rated symptom score at week six differs from better according to the person's function at year two.

Weights cannot be assumed universal. During immediate danger, safety may carry overwhelming priority. Later, cognition, sexual function, physical health, creativity, parenting, work, or emotional range may become decisive. Preferences may also change after distress recedes. Shared decision-making is therefore not a one-time selection of a fixed utility function; it is repeated interpretation as the state and the person's reachable future change.

Measurement remains imperfect. Self-report can be affected by current mood; caregiver reports can reflect burden or fear; clinician scales can privilege observable symptoms; administrative data capture service use more readily than meaning. The answer is triangulation and explicit disagreement, not pretending that one observer is always correct. The lecture will carry this outcome discipline into every later drug class: molecule, exposure, target, state change, adaptation, and the several lives that those changes touch.

When evidence is missing for a coordinate, the correct entry is unknown rather than unchanged. That distinction will matter repeatedly when short trials are asked to support claims about long-term lives.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

More dimensions do not automatically improve decisions; excessive measurement can burden people and obscure urgent priorities. The vector should remain parsimonious, person-led, and matched to the decision horizon.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A treatment is not fully described until the person can say what it gave back, what it took away, and whether that balance changed with time.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked proposes the explicit object $\Delta Y(t_0, t_1 \mid C, E, O)$: a time-bounded, comparator-specific, exposure-aware, observer-declared account of change. This is a conceptual scaffold, not a validated metric.

TRANSITION

With person, environment, and outcomes defined, the lecture can now ask how a prepared observer recognized lithium's unusual alteration of trajectory.

PART 01 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Define the person, environment, and outcome vector before introducing a pharmacological controller.

Part 1 establishes that some somatic and pharmacological interventions can materially change severe states, and that portable medication helped make sustained community treatment feasible. It also establishes the boundary: effectiveness is multidimensional, institutions are causal environments, and the transition from asylum to community cannot be assigned to molecules alone. Quiet, safety, freedom, cognition, function, dignity, mortality, and a life the person values must remain distinguishable across time.

The need for scalable, repeatable control created the setting in which prepared observation could become psychiatric serendipity. Part 2 turns to lithium: an ion that changed not merely an acute state, but the temporal architecture of recurrence.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

1.1 · The pre-drug clinical world — Institutions, restraint, sedation, hydrotherapy, insulin coma, convulsive treatment, and lobotomy establish the baseline that medicines entered.

1.2 · ECT is the necessary complication — Real efficacy can coexist with coercive delivery, cognitive burden, and unequal power; benefit does not erase context.

1.3 · Quiet is not recovery — Separate behavioral containment from safety, freedom, cognition, social function, dignity, and a life the person values.

1.4 · Institutions are causal environments — Housing, rights, staffing, relationships, poverty, and abandonment alter both symptoms and what treatment can achieve.

1.5 · Why portable control mattered — Daily oral molecules made repeated symptom control and community care more feasible, without acting alone as deinstitutionalization policy.

1.6 · The asylum-to-cure story is too simple — Drug efficacy, civil-rights reform, budgets, housing, family burden, and service design changed together.

1.7 · Sedation has special uses—and limits — Benzodiazepines and other sedatives can be vital in selected acute states; rapid calming is not universal disease modification.

1.8 · Begin with the outcome vector — Symptoms, cognition, agency, sexuality, sleep, function, relationships, hospitalization, mortality, and quality of life remain distinct.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

What counted as improvement when quiet, safety, freedom, function, and dignity were not the same endpoint?

PART 02

Lithium: the ion that changed time

How can a simple ion alter recurrent trajectories without a single receptor target?

Lithium is the first complete fast-slow case: simple chemistry, state-dependent exposure, plural mechanisms, and long-horizon outcomes.

Part route

1. Cade, Schou, and evidence maturity
2. Episode control is not recurrence prevention
3. Renal PK defines the intervention
4. The body changes exposure
5. Mechanism is a family, not a slogan
6. Suicide evidence requires triangulation
7. Slow burdens reshape the trajectory
8. Monitoring is part of pharmacodynamics

PART 02 · 2.1 · FROM OBSERVATION TO A TESTABLE TREATMENT CLAIM

2.1 · Cade, Schou, and evidence maturity

CORE SENTENCE

Lithium became credible through a sequence of increasingly discriminating tests, not through one revelatory experiment.

Lithium's origin is often narrated as a solitary flash of insight. The acquired historical record supports a more careful sequence. In 1949, John Cade connected animal observations with an uncontrolled clinical series involving people in states of psychotic excitement. That report mattered because it made a previously scattered possibility visible. It did not, by itself, establish comparative efficacy, define a modern bipolar population, or identify the biological process by which lithium might help.

Mogens Schou and colleagues then moved the question toward controlled antimanic investigation. The epistemic advance was not merely that another group observed improvement. A comparator begins to separate change associated with treatment from spontaneous fluctuation, expectancy, selective observation, and the recurrent course of mania itself. The historical sources acquired for this lecture are unevenly appraised, so the precise early effect estimates are not promoted here beyond what their records securely support.

Evidence maturity is therefore part of the discovery. A clinical signal becomes a defensible treatment claim only as populations, comparators, outcomes, exposure, timing, adverse events, and replication become more explicit. Lithium's history teaches scientific humility twice: promising observations deserve pursuit, and successful pursuit does not retroactively turn the first observation into a randomized trial or a molecular explanation.

What changed across this sequence was not the chemistry of lithium but the resolution of the question. Better design narrowed the set of stories that could still explain improvement, while leaving room for later work on duration, recurrence, safety, and heterogeneity.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The causal discriminator is methodological: each added control constrains alternative explanations for observed change before any molecular mediator is claimed.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The 1949 Cade report and 1954 Schou record are historical anchors, but their local full-text appraisal status is incomplete; this section reconstructs evidential progression rather than supplying modern effect estimates.

PART 02 · 2.1 · WHY THE LEGEND MUST NOT BECOME THE MECHANISM

2.1 · Cade, Schou, and evidence maturity

Discovery stories compress contingency into inevitability. Cade's animal work helped generate a clinical question, but an experimental route to the question is not proof that the same route mediates therapeutic action in people. Lithium is an elemental ion with many biochemical effects. The fact that an early observation preceded benefit cannot identify which intracellular, cellular, circadian, or systems-level effect is necessary for antimanic or maintenance action.

The counterweight is not cynicism. Later controlled studies and decades of clinical use give lithium a genuine evidential history. The boundary is narrower: efficacy evidence can mature while mechanism remains plural and partly unresolved. Historical retellings also risk hiding toxicity, changing diagnostic definitions, regulatory hesitation, and the people whose response was absent or whose burden made treatment unacceptable. These are not side notes; they determine how far a discovery narrative can travel.

For a person considering or taking lithium, the useful lesson is neither heroic faith nor dismissal. It is that a treatment may have real average value without having been discovered through a perfect method or explained by one target. Caregivers and clinicians need the same distinction when discussing hope, uncertainty, monitoring, and alternatives. Researchers inherit a further obligation: test mediators prospectively instead of treating a successful medicine as reverse proof of a disease theory.

That distinction also prevents a common inversion: because lithium later proved useful, every step in its discovery is not thereby vindicated. Science advances by retaining the signal while revising the story that first carried it.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The earliest reports were uncontrolled or incompletely appraised in this acquisition; later efficacy cannot erase those design limits, while those limits do not negate the later evidence.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person can reasonably ask both "might this help?" and "how certain are we, for which outcome, and at what cost?"

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats discovery as an updating process across observations, controls, replications, and lived trajectories—not as a single origin event.

TRANSITION

Once the signal is credible, the next question is what, exactly, it changes: an acute episode, the interval between episodes, or the longer life trajectory.

PART 02 · 2.2 · FOUR QUESTIONS HIDDEN INSIDE THE WORD “WORKS”

2.2 · Episode control is not recurrence prevention

CORE SENTENCE

A drug may change one phase of bipolar illness without producing the same effect on every later phase or valued outcome.

When someone says that lithium “works,” at least four different questions may be compressed into the verb. Does it reduce an acute manic syndrome over days or weeks? Does it delay a new episode after stabilization? Does it prevent manic and depressive recurrence equally? Does it improve a multiyear life trajectory that includes cognition, relationships, work, physical health, hospitalization, and survival? Each question has a different population, starting state, comparator, outcome, and clock.

The acquired evidence supports antimanic and maintenance value, but the trials do not answer these questions interchangeably. A landmark acute trial compared lithium, divalproex, and placebo over a short manic phase. BALANCE examined maintenance strategies after a combination run-in: among 330 participants, primary events occurred in 54% assigned combination therapy, 59% assigned lithium, and 69% assigned valproate. Combination beat valproate, but was not clearly superior to lithium.

Those numbers describe the study’s estimand, not an eternal hierarchy. Entry after a combination run-in selects people who reached and tolerated that stage; an open-label maintenance design can shape adherence and expectations; a primary event is not identical to quality of life. The causal lesson is to retain the verb’s object and time horizon: effective for which phase, against what comparator, for which outcome, and over what interval?

Keeping these estimands separate also prevents a frequent category error: a short-term reduction in rating-scale scores cannot be cited as direct proof of multiyear recurrence prevention, just as delayed recurrence cannot by itself establish restored everyday function.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Acute symptom suppression and recurrence prevention are different transition probabilities in a phase-dependent process; neither alone specifies long-term utility.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The acute-mania and BALANCE records are abstract/indexing-level in the local claim-lock ledger. Exact study summaries may be taught, but no full-text lecture lock or broad individual prediction is claimed.

PART 02 · 2.2 · A RECURRENCE CURVE IS NOT A LIFE

2.2 · Episode control is not recurrence prevention

Maintenance trials usually compress a complicated course into time to a protocol-defined event. That is useful: recurrence can be severe, dangerous, and disruptive, and delaying it may protect possibilities that an acute symptom scale cannot see. Yet two people with the same event-free survival can differ markedly in tremor, concentration, emotional range, sleep, sexual life, organ health, confidence, and the practical burden of continued care.

Counterevidence also enters through design. People who respond to or tolerate a treatment before randomization may be overrepresented in maintenance samples. Transitions between drugs can temporarily alter risk. Mania and depression need not be prevented symmetrically. Open treatment and discontinuation patterns can change observed event rates. None of these limitations makes maintenance evidence useless; they define the population and causal comparison to which it applies.

For people and families, the humane question is therefore not simply whether recurrence was prevented on average. It is whether protection, burden, and valued functioning form an acceptable trajectory for this person, revisited as circumstances change. That is a shared-decision question, not a calculation that a lecture can perform. For researchers, it demands outcomes that remain separate long enough to reveal trade-offs before any composite score hides them.

The outcome vector can change over time as well. A burden accepted during a dangerous acute phase may be valued differently after stability, and a preference formed during stability may shift when early warning signs return.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

BALANCE used an open-label design after a combination run-in, and its event outcome cannot establish equal effects across polarity, functioning, or people excluded before randomization.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Protection from another episode may be profoundly valuable while still coexisting with daily burdens that deserve their own measurement and voice.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked represents treatment value as a trajectory through multiple outcome coordinates, not as a single binary response state.

TRANSITION

To understand why the trajectory can change, we first need the unusually simple pharmacokinetics that make lithium inseparable from the body carrying it.

PART 02 · 2.3 · A SIMPLE ION WITH BODY-SCALE PHARMACOKINETICS

2.3 · Renal PK defines the intervention

CORE SENTENCE

With lithium, renal handling is not background physiology; it is a principal determinant of the exposure that reaches the therapeutic and toxic systems.

Current US labeling describes lithium as negligibly bound to plasma protein, not metabolized, distributed through total body water, and eliminated in urine. That profile differs from a drug transformed by a chain of hepatic enzymes into active and inactive metabolites. The administered salt supplies the lithium ion; the kidney and the person's water-sodium state then become central to the concentration history experienced by tissues.

A minimal one-compartment description is $dC/dt = \text{Input}/V - (CL_r/V)C$. Here C is measured concentration, V is an apparent distribution volume, and CL_r is renal clearance. The equation is explanatory, not a bedside dosing rule. If clearance falls while input is unchanged, concentration tends to rise; if formulation changes the input function, peak timing may change even when the nominal daily amount does not.

The label gives an approximate elimination half-life of 18–36 hours. A half-life is a population description under specified conditions, not a countdown to safety, efficacy, or complete disappearance. It does not directly report intracellular lithium, brain distribution, delayed clinical action, or susceptibility to toxicity. The intervention is therefore better represented as a time-varying exposure generated jointly by formulation, intake, distribution, renal handling, and the body's changing state.

This framing also separates amount from exposure. A prescription records an intended input, whereas pharmacokinetics describes what the body does with that input over time. The distinction is foundational for every later claim about target engagement, benefit, or harm.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Renal clearance transforms the nominal dose into a concentration trajectory; the same input can yield different exposure when CL_r , V , or the timing of input changes.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Disposition, interaction warnings, and the approximate 18–36-hour half-life are locked to the current formulation-specific FDA label. The compartment equation is a teaching model and does not predict an individual concentration.

PART 02 · 2.3 · PLASMA CONCENTRATION IS A GUIDE, NOT THE WHOLE STATE

2.3 · Renal PK defines the intervention

Because lithium has a narrow therapeutic index, measured exposure has unusual clinical importance. Yet a laboratory concentration is a sample taken at a particular time relative to the last administration, under particular hydration, renal, and illness conditions. Interpreting it requires the sampling context. Two identical numbers obtained at different times or during different body states need not carry identical information about the preceding peak, current tissue exposure, or future risk.

Formulation also matters. Immediate- and extended-release products alter the input profile and therefore the rise and fall of concentration. The label facts secure the direction of these pharmacokinetic principles, but they do not establish that one plasma value maps uniquely onto brain concentration, antimanic effect, or toxicity. Intracellular kinetics and individual susceptibility remain partly outside the simple compartment.

This is clinically relevant without being prescriptive. A person's experience of nausea, tremor, thirst, slowing, benefit, or no benefit occurs along an exposure trajectory, not beside it. Caregivers may notice a change, clinicians may connect it with timing and state, and researchers may model it—but none can infer a safe individual action from a general lecture. Urgent symptoms or suspected toxicity require direct professional assessment rather than self-adjustment.

The causal direction also runs backward through feedback: an adverse experience can change intake, a missed intake changes the trajectory, and a later sample may then describe a different process from the one that produced the original complaint.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Label pharmacokinetics do not determine intracellular or brain kinetics, individual toxicity thresholds, or the concentration that produces a valued clinical outcome.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The number on a laboratory report belongs to a timed bodily story that includes symptoms, hydration, illness, co-medication, and the person's own observations.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked locates the first state dependence before receptor action: body dynamics shape the perturbation delivered to the nervous system.

TRANSITION

Renal pharmacokinetics makes the next implication unavoidable: when the body changes, the intervention changes even if the prescription line does not.

PART 02 · 2.4 · THE PRESCRIPTION CAN STAY STILL WHILE CLEARANCE MOVES

2.4 · The body changes exposure

CORE SENTENCE

Lithium exposure is a coupled body-drug state, so stability of dose is not stability of pharmacology.

Lithium's renal elimination makes ordinary physiology pharmacologically consequential. The current label identifies renal function and sodium-water balance as central exposure determinants. It also warns that nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, diuretics, and agents acting on the renin-angiotensin system can raise lithium exposure. These are not merely interactions between names on a medication list; they are changes in the processes that determine clearance and reabsorption.

Intercurrent illness can alter that system through fluid loss, reduced intake, fever, or changing kidney function. Age and chronic renal change can reshape clearance more gradually. Pregnancy and the postpartum period can require changed monitoring and exposure assessment on yet another clock; this acquisition does not establish altered volume or filtration as the mediating route. The causal chain is therefore dose → body handling → plasma trajectory → tissue exposure → effects, not dose → fixed effect. Every arrow is conditional rather than automatic.

This state dependence explains why a previously familiar regimen can enter a different exposure region without intentional escalation. It does not mean that every bodily change produces toxicity or that a person can diagnose pharmacokinetic danger from a single sensation. It means that context belongs inside interpretation. General education can identify the coupling; individualized assessment must determine what any concrete change means.

The same logic applies to transitions. Starting or stopping an interacting medicine, recovering from illness, or moving between physiological states can change the trajectory before anyone perceives a clinical difference. Temporal ordering is therefore essential to causal interpretation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Changes in filtration, tubular handling, water volume, sodium balance, or interacting pathways alter renal clearance and therefore the concentration trajectory generated by a fixed dose.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The direction of major disposition and interaction effects is locked to the official label. The magnitude for a particular person, illness episode, or combination is not determined by this section.

PART 02 · 2.4 · STATE DEPENDENCE IS ALSO SOCIAL AND PRACTICAL

2.4 · The body changes exposure

Body-dependent exposure becomes a lived system. Access to laboratory testing, continuity of care, comprehension of interaction warnings, ability to obtain fluids during illness, and freedom to contact a clinician can influence whether a pharmacokinetic change is recognized early. The molecule does not know whether a service is fragmented, but the realized benefit-harm trajectory can depend on that fragmentation.

The counterevidence to an overly mechanical account is important. Exposure variation does not explain every difference in response or burden. Receptor-independent cellular effects, prior episode history, sleep, stress, adherence, expectancy, other medicines, and the underlying course may all contribute. Nor does a population interaction warning tell us that a specific symptom was caused by lithium. Causal attribution still requires timing, alternatives, measurement, and clinical judgment.

For people taking lithium and those supporting them, the practical meaning is that observations about illness, intake, new medicines, and bodily change are legitimate parts of the medication conversation. They are not failures of compliance and should not be treated as noise. The educational boundary remains firm: this lecture cannot direct an individual change. It can show why a static medication list is an incomplete description of a dynamic intervention.

A dynamic account also reduces blame. When exposure changes because the surrounding system changed, the appropriate scientific question is which link moved and when, rather than whether the person was sufficiently disciplined. The distinction redirects attention from blame toward repairable system conditions.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Pharmacokinetic state dependence is substantial but incomplete: it cannot by itself explain response, subjective burden, adherence, illness course, or causality for a particular symptom.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A change in health, hydration, or co-medication is not peripheral to treatment; it may change what treatment physically is.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked models exposure as a feedback-coupled state variable jointly produced by prescription, body, behavior, and care environment.

TRANSITION

Even after exposure is specified, lithium refuses a one-target story; the next section asks how many mechanisms can coexist without any one becoming proven clinical mediation.

PART 02 · 2.5 · MANY BIOCHEMICAL DOORS, NO SINGLE CLINICAL KEY

2.5 · Mechanism is a family, not a slogan

CORE SENTENCE

Lithium has demonstrated biochemical actions, but no single candidate has been shown to carry its clinical effects across phases and people.

Lithium does not fit the familiar receptor-blockade diagram. The acquired atlas identifies several candidate families: inhibition or modulation involving glycogen synthase kinase 3, inositol signaling, ion transport, circadian regulation, mitochondrial processes, and pathways associated with plasticity or cellular resilience. Some direct biochemical actions are experimentally measurable. The unresolved step is clinical mediation: which action is necessary, sufficient, or jointly responsible for benefit in a given phase and person?

That gap matters because target engagement, downstream change, and therapeutic mediation are different claims. Demonstrating that lithium affects GSK-3 in a preparation does not establish that GSK-3 alteration causes prevention of a manic recurrence in humans. Showing an effect on inositol-related enzymes does not prove exclusivity. A candidate can be biologically real yet clinically secondary, compensatory, dose-dependent, tissue-specific, or one contributor in a distributed response.

The mechanism may therefore be plural in two senses. Lithium can perturb several pathways at once, and the relevant combination may differ across acute mania, maintenance, augmentation, and adverse effects. Time adds another separation: ion exposure changes quickly, intracellular regulation may change more slowly, and recurrence outcomes require much longer observation. Mechanistic honesty preserves this hierarchy instead of filling the unknown link with a memorable slogan.

A definitive mechanism would require more than parallel change. It would need a temporally appropriate mediator, credible manipulation or natural variation, replication, and evidence that the mediator explains outcome beyond exposure and competing pathways.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A plausible multiscale cascade is ion exposure → distributed intracellular perturbations → altered cellular regulation → network and behavioral consequences, but the mediating links are not clinically identified.

AUTHORS' INTERPRETATION · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The candidate mechanisms come from biochemical, preclinical, and review literature that is not fully appraised in the local package. They support mechanistic plausibility, not a single accepted human therapeutic mediator.

PART 02 · 2.5 · DISTRIBUTED ACTION IS A HYPOTHESIS, NOT AN ESCAPE FROM TESTING

2.5 · Mechanism is a family, not a slogan

Saying that lithium has “many mechanisms” can become as empty as naming one. A useful plural account must specify pathways, concentrations, tissues, temporal order, and an outcome that would change if a proposed mediator were interrupted. It must also explain why the same ion can contribute to benefit in one domain and burden in another. Without such discriminating predictions, a long list is a catalogue rather than a mechanism.

Material counterevidence includes translation failure. Experimental concentrations may not match human tissue exposure; cellular or animal endpoints may not correspond to mania or recurrence; associations between pathway markers and response may reflect state, selection, or treatment history. No biomarker that turns the candidate family into an individualized causal map was established in this acquisition. The absence of a single target is not evidence that every proposed pathway is equally important.

For the person taking lithium, uncertainty about mechanism does not cancel established clinical evidence, just as clinical benefit does not settle mechanism. This separation protects both hope and consent. It allows clinicians to explain what is known about exposure and outcomes without pretending to know the decisive intracellular route. It directs researchers toward mediator studies that connect measured exposure, target-level change, intermediate dynamics, and prospective outcome in the same design.

Plurality should therefore sharpen experiments. Competing pathway models should make different predictions about timing, responders, intermediate markers, and adverse effects. If every outcome is declared compatible with the model, the model has ceased to discriminate.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Most candidate pathways are supported by preclinical, biochemical, or review-level evidence; concentration mismatch, tissue specificity, and absent prospective mediation prevent a single clinical mechanism claim.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person does not need a completed molecular story for benefit to be real, but deserves to know when a confident mechanism explanation outruns the evidence.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked proposes that lithium may act as a distributed, low-dimensional perturbation whose clinical meaning emerges from several coupled slow variables; this is a conceptual synthesis, not validated mediation.

TRANSITION

Mechanistic plurality makes outcomes especially important; the most consequential claim—suicide prevention—must therefore be examined across designs rather than protected by reputation.

PART 02 · 2.6 · RARE EVENTS MAKE CONFIDENT NUMBERS FRAGILE

2.6 · Suicide evidence requires triangulation

CORE SENTENCE

The evidence strongly establishes design-level discordance, not one precise causal anti-suicide magnitude.

Lithium has long carried a reputation for preventing suicide, and an older randomized-trial meta-analysis reported a strongly protective point estimate. The release 1.1 forward chain changes how that claim should be taught. A 2025 update located 15 randomized studies. Suicide attempts were fewer with lithium in the pooled estimate, OR 0.73, but the 95% confidence interval was 0.41–1.31. Suicide deaths yielded OR 0.61, with a 95% interval of 0.25–1.48.

The event counts reveal why the intervals are wide: 25 versus 63 attempts, and 4 versus 13 deaths. Neither comparison reached statistical significance. That does not demonstrate absence of benefit. It means the randomized corpus is underpowered for a rare outcome and compatible with more than one clinically important magnitude. The review also found substantial dropout, variable duration and blinding, heterogeneous diagnoses and lithium exposure, and measures of suicidal ideation too different to pool.

The empirical result is therefore precise in wording: current randomized evidence is inconclusive. The authors interpreted the nonsignificant direction as potentially reflecting type II error, but that interpretation is not the measured result. A responsible lecture preserves the distinction between a point estimate below one, an interval crossing one, and proof of a causal protective effect.

This wording matters for public understanding. “No statistically significant reduction” is not synonymous with “no effect,” and “a favorable numerical direction” is not synonymous with demonstrated protection. Both substitutions would overstate what the trials resolve.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Rare-event estimation produces wide uncertainty; statistical non-significance, direction of effect, and causal magnitude are distinct quantities.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The 2025 randomized meta-analysis was acquired and manually appraised in full text. It supports inconclusiveness and exact pooled estimates, not proof of benefit or no benefit.

PART 02 · 2.6 · THREE DESIGNS, THREE ANSWERS

2.6 · Suicide evidence requires triangulation

Observational and quasi-experimental evidence does not simply repeat the randomized result. A 2026 observational synthesis reported associations favoring lithium in bipolar disorder: mortality OR 0.38 and attempts OR 0.60. Yet the corpus showed heterogeneity and concerns about publication bias. People who receive, tolerate, adhere to, and remain monitored on lithium can differ from comparison groups in ways that influence suicide-related outcomes.

A 2026 target-trial emulation in US veterans attempted to reduce some of those biases by explicitly specifying a trial-like comparison in observational data. Its ten-year estimates were near null: death risk ratio 1.00 and non-lethal suicidal behavior risk ratio 0.96. The design cannot recreate randomization, and its population, treatment fidelity, serum levels, selection, and analytic choices may differ from earlier studies. Near-null here is not a universal verdict.

The broader scientific inference is triangulation without forced agreement. Randomized evidence is imprecise; conventional observational evidence is protective but vulnerable to confounding and selection; the target-trial emulation is near null under its own assumptions. A linked corrigendum to the observational review updated an author disclosure and did not change the analysis. The strongest conclusion is that one precise causal magnitude is not established. Anyone in immediate danger needs urgent human help; this evidence discussion is not crisis guidance.

Triangulation is not averaging incompatible estimates into a comforting midpoint. It is asking which biases would move each design, whether results converge after those differences are considered, and what future study could genuinely discriminate among the explanations.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Protective observational associations, near-null target-trial estimates, and imprecise randomized estimates conflict; each design has different vulnerabilities, and none yields a universal individual prediction.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A claim about suicide is never merely academic, which is precisely why uncertainty must be stated without either false reassurance or nihilism.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats study design as part of the measured system: selection, adherence, monitoring, and follow-up reshape the trajectory that becomes observable.

TRANSITION

The suicide dossier exposes long-horizon uncertainty; the next section examines burdens whose clocks are also slow but whose evidence and causal pathways differ.

PART 02 · 2.7 · ONE MEDICINE, SEVERAL BIOLOGICAL CLOCKS

2.7 · Slow burdens reshape the trajectory

CORE SENTENCE

Long-term value cannot be inferred from acute benefit because adverse effects differ in latency, reversibility, severity, and evidential certainty.

Lithium's burdens do not arrive as one syndrome. Gastrointestinal effects or tremor may appear early; changes in thirst and urinary concentrating ability may become evident on another timescale; thyroid, calcium, and renal outcomes can unfold over months or years; acute toxicity can emerge rapidly when exposure rises. Neurologic experience, organ measures, and recurrence protection therefore cannot be read from the same clock.

A systematic review spanning 385 studies reported a strong association with clinical hypothyroidism, OR 5.78, and reduced urinary concentrating ability. Renal replacement therapy was uncommon in the included data, around 0.5%, but uncommon is not absent. These estimates come from heterogeneous designs, durations, treatment eras, monitoring practices, and selected populations. The local record is abstract-level, so the lecture preserves the reported direction and magnitude while withholding a full-text claim lock.

The causal structure is cumulative rather than uniform. Duration and exposure history may matter; episodes of elevated concentration may not be represented by a later average; aging and comorbidity alter the background on which risk develops. Some effects are noticeable to the person before a laboratory threshold changes, while others may be largely silent. That is why "tolerated today" and "low long-term burden" are different propositions.

These clocks can interact. A slow change in concentrating ability can increase vulnerability during a later illness, while an acute exposure disturbance may influence willingness to continue a treatment that had protected against recurrence. Burden becomes part of future exposure.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Fast concentration excursions and slow cumulative organ or endocrine processes generate a vector of hazards with different latencies rather than one scalar toxicity state.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The toxicity synthesis is abstract/indexing-level in the local ledger and combines heterogeneous studies. It supports named associations and rarity of severe renal outcomes in included data, not a personalized prognosis.

PART 02 · 2.7 · PREGNANCY CHANGES BOTH RISK AND COMPARATOR

2.7 · Slow burdens reshape the trajectory

Pregnancy makes the multiscale problem explicit because fetal exposure, maternal physiology, episode recurrence, and alternative-treatment risks coexist. In a US Medicaid cohort of 1,325,563 live-birth pregnancies, first-trimester lithium exposure was associated with cardiac malformations in 2.41% of exposed pregnancies versus 1.15% of unexposed pregnancies. The adjusted risk ratio was 1.65, with a 95% confidence interval of 1.02–2.68, and the study reported a dose-response pattern.

This is a large, full-text-appraised observational study, not randomized evidence. Dispensing does not guarantee ingestion; administrative definitions can misclassify exposure or outcome; residual confounding remains; restriction to live births excludes other pregnancy outcomes. Most importantly, the clinical comparator is not automatically “lithium versus no risk.” Untreated or recurrent severe mood episodes and alternative medicines have their own possible consequences. Those comparisons require separate evidence and individualized expertise.

For a person who can become pregnant, reproductive questions are not an appendix to pharmacology. They may alter values, timing, acceptable uncertainty, and the consequences of both continuation and change. A general lecture must not select an option. It can insist that absolute risks, relative risks, maternal outcomes, fetal outcomes, and the hazards of transition be discussed as distinct quantities rather than compressed into “safe” or “unsafe.”

The numbers should enable proportionate conversation rather than fear. Absolute and relative measures answer different questions, and neither substitutes for the person’s baseline risks, clinical history, available alternatives, or values concerning pregnancy and recurrence.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The toxicity corpus is heterogeneous, and the pregnancy cohort is observational and live-birth restricted; neither permits deterministic prediction, while rarity does not justify erasing severe outcomes.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Benefit can coexist with tremor, thirst, monitoring anxiety, reproductive questions, or fear of organ harm; these experiences belong in the outcome vector.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats chronic burden as slow variables that feed back into adherence, agency, relationships, and future exposure—not as a detachable side-effect list.

TRANSITION

When benefit and burden evolve on several clocks, measurement and follow-up are no longer administrative extras; they alter the intervention that is actually realized.

PART 02 · 2.8 · MEASUREMENT CLOSES THE LOOP

2.8 · Monitoring is part of pharmacodynamics

CORE SENTENCE

Monitoring changes what happens next, so the real intervention is lithium embedded in a feedback system rather than lithium alone.

Monitoring is often described as administration surrounding the “real” drug. Lithium shows why that separation fails. A measured concentration can prompt reinterpretation of exposure; renal, thyroid, calcium, and other surveillance can reveal slow changes; reports of benefit or burden can change the clinical plan; information about illness or interacting medicines can alter the assessment of risk. Each observation can modify the next input to the system.

In control language, the prescription is an input $u(t)$, body and clinical variables form a state $x(t)$, measurements are $y(t)$, and follow-up creates a policy that may update $u(t)$. This is a conceptual model, not an automated dosing algorithm. The loop contains delays, measurement error, missing observations, unequal access, changing preferences, and human judgment. A laboratory value has no protective force unless it is obtained, interpreted, communicated, and acted on appropriately.

Monitoring therefore enters realized pharmacodynamics through feedback. It can reduce preventable exposure excursions, detect emerging burden, and support continuation when benefit is otherwise threatened by uncertainty. It can also impose time, cost, anxiety, travel, and a sense of medicalization. These effects may influence adherence and willingness to disclose difficulties. The monitoring system can improve safety while simultaneously becoming part of the treatment burden.

The loop is adaptive only if changes are interpreted against prior state. A new value, symptom, or preference has meaning through comparison with baseline, timing, and direction of travel—not because it crossed a context-free line.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Feedback from concentration, organ measures, symptoms, and context can alter future exposure and care, making monitoring a causal component of realized benefit and harm.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The label establishes exposure and organ-risk facts; the claim that monitoring is part of realized pharmacodynamics is an inference about the coupled care system, not a trial estimate of one universal monitoring schedule.

PART 02 · 2.8 · THE INTERVENTION INCLUDES WHETHER THE LOOP IS REACHABLE

2.8 · Monitoring is part of pharmacodynamics

A feedback system works only when its loop can close. Missed tests may reflect cost, geography, unstable housing, fragmented services, disability, caregiving demands, fear, or previous encounters in which the person's observations were dismissed. Calling every gap "nonadherence" can mistake a property of the care environment for a property of the person. It can also hide the causal route by which unequal access changes pharmacological outcomes.

The counterweight is that more measurement is not automatically better. Tests can be mistimed, overinterpreted, or disconnected from outcomes that matter to the person. Surveillance cannot remove all uncertainty, prevent every adverse event, or substitute for listening. Guidelines and clinical guides in the acquired corpus provide context, but several were not fully appraised locally; this lecture therefore does not specify an individualized schedule or claim that one protocol fits all settings.

The lived aim is a learning partnership: the person's priorities and experience, the caregiver's observations when invited, the clinician's interpretation, and the laboratory record each contribute different information. Researchers should study the entire loop, including who is lost before measurement and how burden changes continued use. Lithium's deepest lesson is thus not merely that levels matter. It is that a molecule becomes a treatment only inside a body, a relationship, and a reachable system of care.

A well-functioning loop therefore preserves both technical precision and human authority. Measurements constrain inference, but the person retains the right to define which benefits, burdens, and futures matter. Feedback without agency is surveillance, not shared care.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Monitoring cannot abolish uncertainty, and unappraised guideline records cannot justify one schedule for every person or jurisdiction; excessive or inaccessible monitoring can itself change adherence and welfare.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The person is not a passive sensor platform: what is measured, disclosed, interpreted, and acted upon depends on trust, access, burden, and agency.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked defines the extended intervention as molecule + exposure measurement + bodily surveillance + communication + adaptive response, all embedded in a social environment.

TRANSITION

Lithium ends without a single receptor story. Chlorpromazine now enters with an apparently cleaner target—and the danger of mistaking treatment leverage for disease cause.

PART 02 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Lithium is the first complete fast-slow case: simple chemistry, state-dependent exposure, plural mechanisms, and long-horizon outcomes.

Lithium establishes that a simple molecule can alter recurrent clinical states while exposure, mechanism, benefit, burden, and evidence each evolve on a different clock.

Lithium resisted a neat receptor explanation. Chlorpromazine seemed to provide one—and transformed both treatment and disease theory.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

2.1 · Cade, Schou, and evidence maturity — Move from animal observations and uncontrolled series to controlled antimanic work—without turning discovery legend into mechanism proof.

2.2 · Episode control is not recurrence prevention — Acute mania, maintenance, polarity-specific recurrence, and overall life trajectory require separate estimands and time horizons.

2.3 · Renal PK defines the intervention — Lithium is not metabolized, distributes in total body water, is eliminated in urine, and has an approximate 18–36-hour label half-life.

2.4 · The body changes exposure — Renal function, sodium and water balance, age, illness, and interacting medicines can move the same nominal dose into a different risk state.

2.5 · Mechanism is a family, not a slogan — GSK-3, inositol, ion transport, circadian, mitochondrial, and plasticity pathways remain candidates; no single accepted therapeutic target exists.

2.6 · Suicide evidence requires triangulation — Randomized estimates are rare-event and imprecise; observational protection is heterogeneous; a 2026 target-trial emulation was near-null.

2.7 · Slow burdens reshape the trajectory — Toxicity, thyroid and concentrating effects, renal outcomes, calcium, neurologic effects, and pregnancy risks unfold on different clocks.

2.8 · Monitoring is part of pharmacodynamics — Exposure measurement, organ surveillance, adherence, access, and response to intercurrent illness alter realized benefit and harm.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

How can a simple ion alter recurrent trajectories without a single receptor target?

PART 03

Chlorpromazine and the dopamine machine

Did blocking dopamine reveal disease cause, treatment mechanism, or both?

D2 pharmacology established causal leverage over positive symptoms, but a target mechanism is not reverse proof of pathogenesis.

Part route

- 1. Serendipity was a network**
- 2. From neuroleptic quieting to antipsychosis**
- 3. Two first-generation geometries**
- 4. One target, several pathways**
- 5. Occupancy is nonlinear**
- 6. Benefit has domain limits**
- 7. Harms can be misread as illness**
- 8. Update—not erase—the dopamine model**

PART 03 · 3.1 · FOUR DETOURS INTO PSYCHIATRY

3.1 · Serendipity was a network

CORE SENTENCE

Psychopharmacological serendipity was prepared observation inside networks of chemistry, clinical care, institutions, and comparison—not a molecule announcing its own meaning.

The project's historical map places four founding drug stories outside a mature theory of schizophrenia or depression: chlorpromazine in antihistamine and anesthetic experimentation, reserpine in hypertension treatment, iproniazid in tuberculosis care, and imipramine in a compound program that did not yield the hoped-for antipsychotic. The acquired direct anchors are uneven: they cover the early imipramine report and a later reserpine review, while the chlorpromazine and iproniazid routes remain map-level historical synthesis pending matched primary verification. Their psychiatric significance became visible because clinicians noticed changes that the original development questions had not been designed to capture.

Calling this serendipity is useful only if chance is not mistaken for magic. A chemical had to be synthesized, administered, observed over time, discussed across professional boundaries, and compared with what had previously been possible. Ward organization, diagnostic language, commercial development, publication, and the willingness to treat an unexpected behavioral or affective change as informative all helped determine which observations became discoveries. The causal unit was therefore larger than the molecule.

The historical record also warns against reading later mechanisms backward into first observations. Early clinical effects preceded receptor-binding assays, modern transmitter theories, and contemporary outcome measurement. A drug could reveal that a severe state was pharmacologically modifiable without identifying why the state arose. Discovery supplied a perturbation and a contrast: before versus after exposure, treated versus untreated, intended effect versus unexpected effect. Mechanism and etiology remained questions to be earned later.

The methodological point is durable: an unexpected effect becomes credible through documentation, comparison, replication, and a sharper outcome definition. A surprising first observation can open an inquiry, but it cannot close the causal argument.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Prepared observation converts an unexpected exposure effect into a testable contrast; repeated clinical and laboratory loops then refine target and outcome hypotheses.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The cross-drug pattern is a mixed-access historical synthesis. Direct local anchors cover imipramine and reserpine; the chlorpromazine and iproniazid discovery routes remain map-level claims pending matched primary verification. The synthesis does not establish why any drug worked.

PART 03 · 3.1 · PREPARED CHANCE, DISCIPLINED DOUBT

3.1 · Serendipity was a network

Retrospective discovery legends compress years of uncertainty into one decisive scene. That compression can make an observation look cleaner than it was and can erase negative cases, changing diagnoses, dose differences, institutional incentives, or concurrent treatments. The early imipramine account, for example, was a large clinical series rather than a modern randomized program. Its historical importance does not turn every reported outcome into a contemporary causal estimate.

Reserpine supplies a sharper corrective. It became central to stories linking monoamine depletion and depression, yet the locally acquired systematic review found inconsistent findings across 35 studies: depressogenic, null, and apparently antidepressant results all appeared, and 30 studies were judged at high risk of bias. This does not make the reserpine story irrelevant. It shows how a memorable adverse observation can generate a productive hypothesis while remaining an unstable estimate of prevalence or mechanism.

The disciplined conclusion is neither that psychiatric drugs were discovered blindly nor that their first interpretations were proven. These agents functioned as probes entering already complex human systems. Their effects changed what researchers could ask, but each inference required another layer of evidence. For a person taking medication, this history protects two truths at once: relief can be real even when the explanatory story is incomplete, and uncertainty about the story does not make a person's experienced benefit or burden imaginary.

Prepared observation therefore deserves credit without becoming retrospective certainty. The network discovered a signal; later evidence still had to determine its size, specificity, durability, harms, and meaning.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The reserpine literature does not support a simple, reliable depression-induction story; the review found mixed directions and pervasive risk of bias. Early discovery reports also lack modern controls.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A treatment can matter before science can explain it completely. People should not have to choose between acknowledging experienced change and acknowledging mechanistic uncertainty.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Discovery is modeled as a distributed detection network: molecule, observer, institution, language, comparator, and time jointly determine which perturbations become knowledge.

TRANSITION

Once unexpected effects became repeatable treatment effects, the next task was to separate antipsychosis from simple quieting.

PART 03 · 3.2 · WHEN STILLNESS CARRIED THE MECHANISM

3.2 · From neuroleptic quieting to antipsychosis

CORE SENTENCE

Rapid calming and slower antipsychotic improvement can coexist, but they are different effects on different clocks and must not be counted as one outcome.

The historical term neuroleptic foregrounded a characteristic motor and behavioral state, and early descriptions often treated that state as evidence that the drug was doing its psychiatric work. Chlorpromazine could make a ward quieter quickly through sedation, autonomic effects, and reduced arousal. Antipsychotic improvement, when it occurred, unfolded over days and weeks and could remain incomplete. Those temporal differences already implied more than one process.

Later controlled comparisons made it possible to ask whether changes exceeded nonspecific sedation. The locally acquired chlorpromazine review reports evidence of global improvement and reduced relapse against placebo, alongside clear sedation, movement disorders, parkinsonism, hypotension, dizziness, and weight gain. Yet the review judged the evidence very low quality, and its full text was not appraised for the present claim-lock release. The defensible point is therefore qualitative: benefit was not reducible to sedation, but the early evidence base was methodologically uneven.

This distinction changes the moral and scientific frame. A person who sleeps, speaks less, or moves less may be safer during an acute crisis, but still frightened, convinced of a threat, cognitively slowed, or unable to resume valued roles. Conversely, reduced delusional intensity or disorganization can be meaningful even if sedation is also present. Clinical observation must therefore decompose visible quiet into arousal, motor output, subjective distress, belief conviction, attention, and function rather than treating silence as a unitary therapeutic signal.

Only then can immediate containment, subjective relief, and longer-term therapeutic change be described without one borrowing credibility from another.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Fast H1, M1, α 1 and arousal effects can change vigilance and motor output before slower D2-linked symptom changes become clinically discernible.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Chlorpromazine efficacy and adverse effects are supported by randomized evidence synthesis, but that review was not fully appraised here and rated much of the evidence very low quality.

PART 03 · 3.2 · SEPARATE THE VISIBLE FROM THE THERAPEUTIC

3.2 · From neuroleptic quieting to antipsychosis

Modern symptom scales improved separation, but they did not solve it automatically. Ratings can fall because hallucinations, delusions, hostility, or conceptual disorganization lessen; they can also be influenced by sleep, motor slowing, reduced speech, the assessor's expectations, or removal from a stressful environment. A measured change is real within the instrument, yet its meaning depends on which items changed and what happened to the person outside the scale.

The formulation matters as well. Oral and parenteral chlorpromazine create different exposure trajectories, while immediate autonomic or sedative effects need not predict later antipsychotic benefit. The current formulation-specific label still states that the precise therapeutic mechanism is unknown. That official uncertainty is important: naming receptor actions does not erase the empirical task of showing which changes mediate which outcomes and on what time scale.

For caregivers and clinicians, the practical intellectual discipline is to ask parallel questions. Is immediate danger decreasing? Is the person less terrified or less preoccupied? Are thought and communication becoming more organized? What new burdens have appeared? Can the person wake, move, think, relate, and participate? These questions are educational, not instructions for changing medication. They keep acute containment from being mistaken for complete treatment and preserve the possibility that a useful drug effect and an unacceptable experienced burden may occur together.

Repeated observation across hours, days, and weeks is what separates those clocks. One bedside impression cannot reveal which change will persist after acute arousal and sedation settle.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Visible calming can reflect sedation, reduced motor output, or environmental containment rather than specific antipsychotic change. Conversely, the existence of sedation does not negate separately measured symptom benefit.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Less psychosis and less visible behavior are not synonyms. The person's fear, clarity, energy, mobility, and capacity to re-enter life must remain visible.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The observed ward state is treated as a mixed output produced by drug exposure, arousal, motor control, symptom processes, interpersonal response, and environment.

TRANSITION

Once benefit was separated from quieting, receptor pharmacology exposed how two first-generation agents could share D2 antagonism yet create very different burdens.

PART 03 · 3.3 · SHARED CLASS, DIFFERENT VECTORS

3.3 · Two first-generation geometries

CORE SENTENCE

First-generation is a historical label, not a receptor profile: chlorpromazine and haloperidol perturb overlapping targets with different relative strengths, exposures, and collateral channels.

Chlorpromazine and haloperidol are often placed in one box because both are first-generation antipsychotics and both antagonize D2 receptors. That classification hides their pharmacological geometry. Chlorpromazine has substantial H1, M1, and α 1 antagonism alongside D2 action. This broader profile helps account for sedation, anticholinergic effects, and orthostatic hypotension. Haloperidol delivers comparatively stronger D2 action with less H1, M1, and α 1 activity, shifting burden toward extrapyramidal and prolactin-related effects.

Geometry means relative action across dimensions, not a fixed ranking of better and worse. A sedating, hypotensive profile may be especially burdensome for one person and temporarily useful in a selected acute context for another. A high-potency D2 profile may reduce psychotic or manic symptoms efficiently yet produce restlessness, rigidity, tremor, or endocrine effects that dominate the lived outcome. Dose, age, prior exposure, co-medication, cardiovascular state, and vulnerability to motor effects all reshape the vector.

Formulation adds another axis. Both oral and short-acting injectable exposures can be relevant, while haloperidol also has a long-acting decanoate form with a much longer effective tail. A milligram count therefore does not describe the intervention by itself. Route changes peaks, troughs, onset, persistence, and the reversibility of an unwanted state. Even before later atypical drugs appear, the first generation already teaches the central lesson: a class name cannot substitute for molecule, formulation, exposure, person, and time.

A clinically meaningful comparison must therefore preserve both shared D2 leverage and the unequal distribution of collateral effects across the two molecular profiles.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Relative D2, H1, M1 and α 1 antagonism distributes effects across psychosis-related signaling, motor control, prolactin, vigilance, cognition, and autonomic regulation.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Receptor actions and labeled harms are established at the drug level; individual benefit-harm prediction and precise therapeutic chains remain incomplete.

PART 03 · 3.3 · POTENCY IS NOT TOTAL INTENSITY

3.3 · Two first-generation geometries

High potency in the older antipsychotic vocabulary usually refers to how much drug is needed for a D2-linked antipsychotic effect, not to greater benefit across every outcome. Haloperidol can produce substantial D2 occupancy at relatively small milligram doses; chlorpromazine requires more milligrams and engages other receptor systems more prominently. Comparing the raw dose numbers would therefore be chemically meaningless. Potency must always name the target and endpoint to which it refers.

The same caution applies to side effects. Low-potency does not mean gentle, and high-potency does not mean globally harsh. The profiles are differently weighted. Chlorpromazine's autonomic, antihistaminic, and anticholinergic actions may impair wakefulness, blood-pressure stability, vision, bowel function, or cognition. Haloperidol's D2-dominant pattern may make akathisia, parkinsonism, dystonia, prolactin effects, and tardive risk more salient. Neither profile predicts one person's experience without exposure and state information.

A responsible comparison therefore uses an outcome matrix rather than a generational ranking. It asks which target mixture is present, what formulation creates the exposure, what the acute objective is, what burdens are already present, and which outcomes the person values most. This is not a recommendation to choose or alter a medicine; it is a method for understanding why two drugs within the same historical generation can feel like different interventions. The distinction prepares the next step: anatomy makes even a single receptor action plural.

The comparison becomes more accurate when benefit and burden are reported in the same table, rather than letting efficacy occupy the main text and harms disappear into a footnote.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The low-potency/high-potency heuristic is incomplete: receptor assays, formulation-specific labels, and clinical averages do not determine an individual's response or burden.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Two drugs called first-generation may differ radically in wakefulness, inner restlessness, movement, sexuality, bowel function, and the ability to think or participate.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

A drug is represented as a vector of target gains and formulation-specific clocks; the same class label can therefore map to distinct bodily, experiential, and behavioral trajectories.

TRANSITION

The receptor vector becomes still more complex when D2 antagonism is traced through different anatomical pathways.

PART 03 · 3.4 · ANATOMY CHANGES THE MEANING OF BLOCKADE

3.4 · One target, several pathways

CORE SENTENCE

D2 antagonism is not one action delivered to one place; receptor engagement enters circuits with different functions, producing therapeutic leverage and collateral effects together.

A D2 receptor does not carry a label saying antipsychosis, movement, hormone, or cognition. Its consequence depends on the cell, projection, local circuit, ongoing dopamine signal, and competing inputs around it. The familiar pathway map is therefore a teaching scaffold: striatal and mesolimbic engagement is linked to antipsychotic action; nigrostriatal engagement to motor effects; tuberoinfundibular engagement to prolactin release; and cortical consequences are more indirect and heterogeneous.

At the cellular level, antagonism reduces D2-mediated signaling and changes downstream cAMP, β -arrestin, excitability, and adaptation. But receptor blockade does not leap directly to a clinical rating. It changes the conditions under which striatal neurons assign salience and select actions, while simultaneously altering motor and endocrine channels. Distributed network effects, including reduced aberrant salience or reduced motivational and cognitive gain at excessive exposure, remain partly inferred rather than directly proven causal chains in humans.

The pathway account is most useful when it prevents a single-output story. A concentration sufficient to influence psychotic intensity may also enter pathways governing movement or prolactin. The outputs overlap because exposure is systemic and anatomy is interconnected. This is why the therapeutic and adverse windows are not cleanly separated compartments. The same pharmacological act can reduce one form of destabilizing signal while generating a different bodily or experiential disturbance elsewhere in the system.

Regional receptor density, endogenous dopamine, and current circuit activity can further change the local effect, so identical plasma exposure need not produce identical anatomical consequences.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Systemic D2 occupancy propagates through striatal salience/action-selection, nigrostriatal motor, tuberoinfundibular endocrine, and indirect cortical pathways; local context determines output.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

D2 engagement and clinical motor/endocrine effects are measured; the complete receptor-to-circuit-to-network mediation chain is only partly identified.

PART 03 · 3.4 · PATHWAYS ARE MAPS, NOT SEALED PIPES

3.4 · One target, several pathways

The four-pathway shorthand can become misleading if spoken as though the brain were divided into independent pipes. Dopaminergic projections interact with glutamatergic, GABAergic, cholinergic, serotonergic, and neuromodulatory systems. Regions participate in multiple computations, and a person's current state changes which signals dominate. The map is valuable for orienting likely consequences, not for assigning every symptom or adverse effect to one isolated tract.

Counterevidence also constrains the simplest disease story. A small PET study in neuroleptic-naive participants did not find elevated striatal D2 receptor density, challenging the notion that schizophrenia is simply an excess of postsynaptic D2 receptors. Later dopamine accounts shifted toward presynaptic striatal dysregulation and upstream genetic, developmental, and environmental influences. Those accounts are interpretations integrating multiple literatures; they are not established explanations for every person diagnosed with schizophrenia.

Anatomical plurality helps explain why treatment can improve one domain and worsen another without contradiction. Reduced threat salience may make conversation or sleep possible, while motor slowing or endocrine change narrows another part of life. For families, this means a changed behavior can have several plausible causes. For clinicians and researchers, it demands time-linked measurement rather than assumption. The person's report of inner restlessness, flattening, altered sexuality, or clearer thought supplies essential outcome information, though it does not by itself prove the circuit mechanism.

A useful map therefore predicts trade-offs and measurements; it should not merely attach a familiar pathway name after the outcome is already known. Its value lies in prospective discrimination, not retrospective decoration.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Pathway labels are heuristic and interconnected. Neuroleptic-naive PET findings do not support a universal increase in postsynaptic striatal D2 receptor density, and circuit mediation remains incompletely identified.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Improvement in fear or disorganization can coexist with motor, endocrine, motivational, or cognitive costs; each change deserves its own name and time course.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

D2 blockade is framed as one input entering several coupled channels. Net value depends on which channel gains change in the person's current state, not on receptor occupancy alone.

TRANSITION

If one exposure reaches several pathways, the next question is how occupancy translates nonlinearly into overlapping probabilities of benefit and harm.

PART 03 · 3.5 · A CURVE, NOT A SWITCH

3.5 · Occupancy is nonlinear

CORE SENTENCE

Dose becomes exposure, exposure becomes occupancy, and occupancy becomes several probabilities through saturating, person-dependent curves rather than a linear therapeutic switch.

Receptor occupancy is commonly represented by a saturating relation such as $O(C) = C^h / (EC50^h + C^h)$, where C is effect-site concentration, $EC50$ is the concentration associated with half-maximal occupancy, and h controls the curve's steepness. The equation does not say that a given occupancy causes recovery. It says that equal changes in concentration need not produce equal changes in target engagement.

In the abstract-level haloperidol PET study acquired for this release, 22 people with first-episode schizophrenia showed D2 occupancies spanning 38% to 87%. Probabilities of clinical response, hyperprolactinemia, and extrapyramidal effects rose over overlapping ranges; the abstract reported inflection-like values near 65%, 72%, and 78%. These figures are historically influential, but they are not universal clinical constants. The source remains full-text pending in the claim-lock ledger.

Nonlinearity creates a narrow practical geometry. Near a steep portion of the curve, a modest concentration change can shift occupancy appreciably. Near saturation, a larger dose increase may add little target engagement while increasing off-target exposure or time above a burden threshold. Yet concentration itself varies with absorption, metabolism, formulation, adherence, and body state. A dose written on a chart is therefore several transformations away from the probability of response, restlessness, rigidity, or prolactin elevation.

The fitted parameters also depend on receptor region, radiotracer, sampling design, and model assumptions. A curve is useful only when its measurement conditions and uncertainty travel with it. Transport to another population or formulation requires fresh validation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A saturating concentration-occupancy curve, followed by distinct probabilistic occupancy-outcome curves, creates overlapping benefit and harm zones rather than one deterministic threshold.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The influential haloperidol occupancy findings are abstract-level, based on a small first-episode sample and one drug. The equation is an established model family, not proof of a universal biological parameterization.

PART 03 · 3.5 · THRESHOLDS ARE POPULATION SUMMARIES

3.5 · Occupancy is nonlinear

A threshold sounds like a border: below it nothing happens, above it an effect appears. The acquired evidence supports a less tidy picture. Response, prolactin change, and motor effects each become more likely across ranges that overlap. Measurement uncertainty, radioligand modeling, regional variation, prior exposure, first-episode status, and individual susceptibility all blur the border. The correct language is therefore probability, not guarantee.

A later dose–response synthesis found dose-dependent extrapyramidal risk across most assessed antipsychotics and a substantial rise in estimated risk at high D2 occupancy, but its full text was not appraised for this release and partial agonists behaved differently. That broader pattern supports nonlinearity while also showing that one occupancy rule cannot be copied across molecular mechanisms. Occupancy is a coordinate in the explanation, not the complete map.

Flow Hijacked adds a testable, explicitly unproven question. Perhaps the speed and curvature of occupancy change— dO/dt and d^2O/dt^2 —predict abrupt akathisia, rebound, or subjective destabilization better than a single static occupancy value for some people. A valid test would require dense exposure estimates, time-linked symptom and adverse-effect measurements, and out-of-sample prediction. Failure of those derivatives to improve prediction beyond level, dose, and clinical state would weaken the hypothesis.

Such a study must separate oral and depot trajectories and record concurrent sleep, stress, and co-medication. Otherwise a derivative signal could simply encode a clinically unmeasured change in context.

Sampling density is itself part of the model. Weekly observations cannot reconstruct a transition lasting hours, and apparent smoothness may be an artifact of sparse measurement rather than stable biology.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The 22-person PET study is small, drug-specific, and access-limited; later estimated occupancy analyses vary by agent and method. No threshold should be universalized.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A small exposure change can feel disproportionately large, while a larger dose change may add burden without a comparable felt benefit. That experience warrants investigation, not automatic attribution.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

Static occupancy is extended to an exposure-trajectory hypothesis in which level, slope, and curvature may carry different information about benefit, akathisia, and rebound.

TRANSITION

Even a well-characterized occupancy curve cannot tell us whether every outcome domain improves; efficacy must be separated by symptom, function, and time horizon.

PART 03 · 3.6 · WHICH BENEFIT, FOR WHICH HORIZON?

3.6 · Benefit has domain limits

CORE SENTENCE

Antipsychotic efficacy is real within studied estimands, but symptom reduction, relapse prevention, cognition, social function, and a valued life are separate outcome dimensions.

An acute antipsychotic trial commonly asks whether a symptom score changes over several weeks. A maintenance trial asks whether a defined relapse occurs over months. A functional study may ask about work, relationships, independent living, or quality of life. These are not interchangeable estimands. A drug can produce an average reduction in positive symptoms without restoring cognition or social participation, and it can reduce average relapse risk without deciding whether the resulting life is acceptable to one person.

The full-text-appraised network meta-analysis combined 402 acute trials and 53,463 participants. It found that efficacy differences among oral antipsychotics were mostly graded, while adverse-effect differences were larger; confidence was often low or very low. Crucially, its acute multi-episode population excluded treatment resistance, first episode, predominant negative or depressive symptoms, concomitant medical illness, and relapse-prevention designs. Its estimates therefore cannot answer those excluded questions.

The relapse-prevention synthesis acquired at abstract level found a lower average one-year relapse rate with maintenance antipsychotic treatment than with placebo or discontinuation designs. That is an important signal, but function and employment were sparsely measured, follow-up was limited, and withdrawal design may affect early events. The responsible synthesis is additive: acute positive-symptom benefit and average maintenance protection matter, yet neither is a proxy for every domain of recovery.

A complete outcome statement must therefore name the population, phase, comparator, measurement window, and domain. Removing any one of those coordinates invites an unjustified generalization and can make a precise estimate sound universal.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Distinct causal chains connect D2 engagement to positive symptoms, recurrence, motivation, cognition, function, and adverse effects; shared receptor input does not force these outputs to move together.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The acute comparative synthesis is fully appraised; its erratum corrected one zotepine-haloperidol estimate without altering the broad conclusion. Relapse prevention is abstract-level here. Neither corpus supports universal individual prediction or equivalence between symptom and functional outcomes.

PART 03 · 3.6 · RECOVERY CANNOT BE INFERRED FROM ONE AXIS

3.6 · Benefit has domain limits

Positive symptoms can be terrifying and disabling, so reducing them is not a trivial or merely technical outcome. The mistake begins when that outcome is allowed to stand for the whole person. Negative symptoms may include reduced motivation, expression, or pleasure; cognitive difficulties may affect working memory, attention, or planning; sedation and motor burden can mimic or amplify some of the same outward signs. Function additionally depends on opportunity, housing, relationships, stigma, and services.

Counterevidence operates in both directions. Sparse functional improvement does not mean symptom relief lacks value. Conversely, lower relapse in discontinuation comparisons does not by itself reveal how much is sustained disease modification and how much may reflect early withdrawal-related destabilization in some designs. The local claim-lock ledger retains the maintenance synthesis at abstract level and explicitly notes abrupt withdrawal, enriched samples, short follow-up, and sparse participation outcomes as limitations.

A person-centered evidence conversation therefore keeps several curves on the page at once. One curve may show psychotic intensity, another recurrence probability, another alertness, movement, sexuality, weight, cognition, trust, or social participation. They can improve, worsen, or remain unchanged on different clocks. This is not an argument against treatment. It is an argument for measuring the outcome that is being claimed and for allowing the person taking the medicine to define which combination of changes counts as progress.

Caregiver and clinician observations can enrich that vector, but they should not silently replace the person's own weighting of benefit and burden. The weighting may also change across phases of illness and recovery.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Maintenance trials support average relapse reduction, but abrupt withdrawal, enriched designs, limited follow-up, and sparse functional outcomes complicate interpretation. Acute trials do not answer long-term recovery.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Someone may be less psychotic yet still unable to think, work, connect, or feel like themselves. That is not treatment failure by definition, but it is essential outcome information.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Treatment state is represented as $y(t) = [\text{symptoms, cognition, agency, body, function, relationships, safety}]$, preventing one improved coordinate from being mistaken for global recovery.

TRANSITION

When outcome domains diverge, adverse effects can be mistaken for persisting illness unless their timing and phenomenology are made explicit.

PART 03 · 3.7 · THE ATTRIBUTION TRAP

3.7 · Harms can be misread as illness

CORE SENTENCE

Drug effects enter the same observable channels used to judge illness, so timing, phenomenology, examination, and the person's report are necessary to avoid attribution error.

Akathisia is not simply movement. It can include an intensely distressing inner drive to move, an inability to remain still, and agitation that observers may read as anxiety, hostility, or worsening psychosis. Parkinsonism can look like reduced spontaneity, flat expression, slowed movement, and diminished speech—features that overlap outwardly with negative symptoms or depression. Sedation can resemble disengagement. Cognitive slowing can be attributed to the disorder without asking whether it changed after exposure.

Endocrine effects are also behaviorally visible. D2 blockade in tuberoinfundibular systems can increase prolactin, with possible sexual, reproductive, breast, or bone consequences depending on context and duration. Sexual dysfunction may appear as withdrawal from intimacy or reduced motivation rather than as a spontaneously reported adverse event. Shame, privacy, and the assumption that sexuality is secondary can make this burden disappear from routine outcome measurement.

Time provides the first diagnostic instrument. Dystonia, restlessness, sedation, and autonomic changes may emerge early; parkinsonism and prolactin changes follow their own courses; tardive syndromes can appear after cumulative exposure and may persist. None of these clocks is perfectly specific, and illness, stress, substances, or medical conditions can produce overlapping phenomena. The point is not to assign every difficulty to medication, but to keep medication in the causal field rather than presuming that all visible change expresses the underlying diagnosis.

A baseline description before exposure and repeated assessment afterward make attribution more testable, although they still cannot eliminate every competing explanation. Structured self-report can reveal burdens invisible during a brief examination.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Motor, endocrine, arousal, cognitive, and autonomic drug effects converge on behaviors that are also used as illness indicators, creating a measurement and attribution problem.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The adverse-effect categories are established, but identifying the cause of one person's overlapping symptom requires clinical assessment; temporal association alone is not definitive causation.

PART 03 · 3.7 · THE OBSERVER IS INSIDE THE LOOP

3.7 · Harms can be misread as illness

Attribution changes what happens next. If akathisia is labeled agitation, the apparent response may be more behavioral control rather than recognition of a drug-related burden. If parkinsonian slowing is labeled negative symptom progression, the person may be described as less engaged while the exposure contribution remains unseen. These are possible errors, not universal accounts; they illustrate why the same observation can lead to opposite causal stories.

Good differentiation combines the person's description, timing relative to initiation or exposure change, direct examination, collateral observation, competing medical and psychiatric explanations, and follow-up. It also asks whether the words offered by clinicians are adequate. Someone may report crawling tension, emotional narrowing, sexual change, or a body that no longer initiates movement. Such descriptions are lived outcome data. They guide questions but do not prove a receptor or circuit mechanism.

Caregivers face a parallel challenge. Noticing a new behavior can protect safety, but interpretation should remain tentative and collaborative rather than commandeering the person's account. Researchers likewise need instruments that distinguish inner restlessness from observed activity, blunting from residual depression, and medication-related slowing from cognitive or negative symptoms. Without that separation, a trial can count burden as disease, disease as burden, or discontinuation as nonadherence without learning why the trajectory changed.

The measurement problem is therefore causal, ethical, and practical at once: inaccurate attribution can alter exposure, trust, and future willingness to seek care. It can also distort the evidence base used for later patients.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Psychosis, depression, anxiety, catatonia, substances, and medical illness can produce overlapping signs. Medication should remain a candidate cause, not become the automatic explanation.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Naming inner restlessness, slowing, sexual change, or emotional narrowing can alter whether a person feels believed and whether the treatment outcome is recorded honestly.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Observation is part of the dynamics: the label assigned to a behavior changes subsequent care, exposure, trust, and adherence, which then changes the observed state.

TRANSITION

Once target benefit and target-linked burden are both visible, the dopamine theory must be updated without discarding the causal leverage that D2 pharmacology established.

PART 03 · 3.8 · WHAT THE DOPAMINE EVIDENCE EARNED

3.8 · Update—not erase—the dopamine model

CORE SENTENCE

Dopamine remains a powerful treatment and psychosis variable, but receptor blockade, presynaptic dysregulation, upstream risk, and the broader syndrome belong to different explanatory levels.

The dopamine model gained force because several lines converged. Antipsychotic clinical potency correlated with dopamine-receptor binding in landmark 1976 studies. In vivo occupancy work later connected D2 engagement with probabilities of response and motor or endocrine effects. These findings made D2 pharmacology experimentally tractable and clinically consequential. They support the claim that dopamine signaling is one route through which many antipsychotics exert leverage.

They do not license reverse inference from treatment to disease cause. A lock can be opened by a tool without the tool explaining how the lock became damaged. Blocking D2 receptors may reduce a downstream expression of psychosis even if the upstream causes include developmental processes, stress, trauma, drug exposure, genetic liability, learning, or other transmitter systems. Therapeutic mechanism and pathogenesis overlap only to the extent that independent evidence shows they do.

The version-III account by Howes and Kapur explicitly moved beyond global excess dopamine. It interpreted the evidence as presynaptic striatal dopamine dysregulation forming a final common pathway through which multiple upstream biological and environmental factors may contribute to psychosis. That is an authors' synthesis of several literatures, not an assay that diagnoses an individual and not a complete account of negative symptoms, cognition, social function, or every condition in which psychosis occurs.

The model is strongest when it generates discriminating predictions about presynaptic function and upstream convergence, and weakest when compressed into the slogan that schizophrenia is simply too much dopamine. A useful theory must specify what observation would count against it.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Upstream developmental and environmental influences may converge on presynaptic striatal dopamine function; D2 antagonists act downstream at postsynaptic signaling and do not identify the upstream cause.

AUTHORS' INTERPRETATION · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Version III is an integrative interpretation supported by converging literatures. The potency and occupancy anchors are influential but access-limited in this release; they do not prove a universal etiology.

PART 03 · 3.8 · A MODEL WITH BOUNDARIES

3.8 · Update—not erase—the dopamine model

Several observations resist the strongest dopamine reductionism. A small PET study in people not previously exposed to neuroleptics found no elevation of striatal D2 receptor density. Clozapine later demonstrated distinctive efficacy in treatment resistance despite a receptor and occupancy profile unlike simple high-potency D2 blockade. Muscarinic efficacy would eventually show that direct D2 blockade is not required for short-term antipsychotic benefit. Each result narrows a global single-receptor account without making dopamine irrelevant.

The updated model should therefore specify its object. It is strongest as an account of a psychosis-related pathway, especially striatal dopamine synthesis or release abnormalities at the group level, and of a major treatment target. It is weaker as a total theory of schizophrenia, an explanation of every symptom domain, or a predictor of one person's course. Diagnostic categories, psychotic experiences, dopamine measures, and treatment response are not interchangeable variables.

For someone taking an antipsychotic, this boundary matters because explanatory language can shape identity. Saying that a drug acts on dopamine is not the same as saying a person has a simple chemical excess, a permanently defective brain, or a future already determined. The more faithful conclusion is both modest and powerful: dopamine-linked processes can be causal leverage points within a larger, history-dependent system. That conclusion leads directly to clozapine, the drug that preserved antipsychotic efficacy while breaking the expectation that more conventional D2 blockade should explain the class.

Updating the model therefore preserves its experimentally earned core while removing claims that the evidence never secured. Precision here is a form of respect.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Normal D2 receptor density in a small neuroleptic-naïve PET sample, clozapine's exception, and later non-D2 efficacy constrain a global receptor-excess account; none erases dopamine's treatment relevance.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A receptor target is not a verdict on identity or destiny. It describes one place where treatment can alter probability within a larger life and biological history.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The dopamine model is retained as a downstream leverage map embedded within molecule → target → circuit → experience → environment feedback, not as a one-chemical essence of schizophrenia.

TRANSITION

Clozapine now becomes the decisive test: a broad-receptor treatment-resistance exception whose efficacy, exposure, bodily risks, and service infrastructure cannot be separated.

PART 03 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

D2 pharmacology established causal leverage over positive symptoms, but a target mechanism is not reverse proof of pathogenesis.

Part 3 establishes that D2 engagement provides genuine, nonlinear leverage over acute positive symptoms and average relapse risk, while the same systemic exposure reaches motor, endocrine, cognitive, autonomic, and experiential channels. It does not establish that schizophrenia is global dopamine excess, that occupancy thresholds are universal, or that symptom reduction equals recovery.

The overlapping benefit-harm window created pressure for antipsychosis without the same motor and endocrine costs. Clozapine appeared to meet that demand, but only by revealing a more difficult system problem.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

3.1 · Serendipity was a network — Chlorpromazine, reserpine, iproniazid, and imipramine emerged from anesthesia, hypertension, tuberculosis, and failed-drug programs.

3.2 · From neuroleptic quieting to antipsychosis — Early language emphasized motor and behavioral effects; later trials separated symptom benefit from sedation and institutional control.

3.3 · Two first-generation geometries — Chlorpromazine combines D2 with H1/M1/ α 1 effects; haloperidol delivers stronger D2 action with different autonomic and motor burdens.

3.4 · One target, several pathways — Mesolimbic, nigrostriatal, tuberoinfundibular, and cortical consequences make anatomical context part of the effect.

3.5 · Occupancy is nonlinear — Hill/Emax logic explains saturation and overlapping probabilistic ranges for response, EPS, and prolactin—not universal threshold numbers.

3.6 · Benefit has domain limits — Acute positive-symptom benefit and relapse prevention do not automatically restore negative symptoms, cognition, function, or agency.

3.7 · Harms can be misread as illness — Akathisia, EPS, sedation, prolactin/sexual effects, cognitive change, and tardive syndromes can alter behavior and interpretation.

3.8 · Update—not erase—the dopamine model — Version III emphasizes presynaptic striatal dysregulation interacting with upstream biology and environment, not global ‘too much dopamine.’

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Did blocking dopamine reveal disease cause, treatment mechanism, or both?

PART 04

Clozapine breaks the class

Why does one broad-receptor drug work after others fail?

Clozapine makes efficacy, body state, monitoring infrastructure, and access inseparable parts of one treatment system.

Part route

- 1. Withdrawal and monitored return**
- 2. Treatment resistance becomes distinct**
- 3. Broad binding does not solve the mechanism**
- 4. Clearance is state-dependent**
- 5. TDM clarifies exposure—not destiny**
- 6. Distinct benefit, uncertain causal breadth**
- 7. The harm profile is systemic**
- 8. The 2025 REMS lesson**

PART 04 · 4.1 · A DRUG LEAVES—AND RETURNS DIFFERENTLY

4.1 · Withdrawal and monitored return

CORE SENTENCE

Clozapine's return made a monitoring system part of the intervention: efficacy could be realized only through access, laboratory surveillance, interpretation, and response.

Clozapine's history is not a smooth march from discovery to adoption. Its association with agranulocytosis curtailed use and made severe blood toxicity central to its identity. The later return did not simply restore the same product. It created a different treatment object: an effective molecule coupled to eligibility rules, baseline testing, repeated absolute neutrophil count measurement, laboratory communication, clinical interpretation, and an organized response to abnormal results.

The 1988 multicenter trial supplied the pivotal efficacy contrast in rigorously selected people whose illness had not improved after multiple neuroleptic trials and a prospective haloperidol phase. Clozapine's short-term response exceeded chlorpromazine in the abstract-level record acquired here. The trial's importance is secure as a historical pivot, while its exact claims remain access-limited in this release and cannot be expanded into unreviewed long-term conclusions.

Monitoring changed what availability meant. A medicine could exist, be licensed, and still remain functionally inaccessible if prescribers, blood-draw services, laboratories, pharmacies, transportation, communication, and follow-up did not align. Conversely, a reliable system could make a high-risk treatment usable for someone with few alternatives. The service network did not create clozapine's receptor actions, but it altered whether exposure could begin and continue safely enough for benefit to emerge.

This history establishes a general principle without prescribing any individual action. For some medicines, infrastructure is not an administrative shell surrounding pharmacology. It is a causal component of realized treatment: it determines who crosses the threshold into care, how quickly danger is detected, whether interruptions occur, and whether a person can remain connected to a potentially valuable therapy.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The effective intervention is molecule plus surveillance loop: ANC sampling → interpretation → access or interruption → altered exposure trajectory and risk management.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The agranulocytosis history, official label warnings, and regulatory monitoring changes are documented. The magnitude by which any particular monitoring regime changes net outcomes is not established here.

PART 04 · 4.1 · ACCESS IS PART OF EFFECTIVENESS

4.1 · Withdrawal and monitored return

Efficacy asks whether a treatment can produce benefit under specified conditions. Effectiveness asks what happens when the treatment meets actual systems. Clozapine exposes the distance between them. A blood-monitoring requirement can detect severe neutropenia and organize safety, yet it can also add appointments, travel, waiting, venipuncture, stigma, fragmented responsibility, and administrative failure. These burdens can determine whether a person ever receives an adequate trial.

The tension is not solved by treating monitoring as either pure protection or pure obstruction. Severe neutropenia is a biological risk; organized surveillance responds to it. At the same time, surveillance design can distribute burden unequally across geography, income, disability, family support, and service capacity. The same rule can protect one person and exclude another when implementation differs. Outcomes therefore depend on both biological and institutional state.

The United States ended the clozapine REMS program effective June 13, 2025. The FDA simultaneously retained the severe-neutropenia warning and recommended ANC monitoring according to prescribing information. Administrative control changed; the underlying biological hazard did not disappear. Nor does removal of one program prove that access, safety, or continuity will improve everywhere. Those downstream effects require measurement.

For the person taking clozapine, the treatment experience includes much more than swallowing a tablet. It includes whether a laboratory result travels, whether questions receive an answer, whether a missed appointment becomes an abrupt interruption, and whether services coordinate during illness. These are not peripheral conveniences. They can reshape exposure, trust, symptom course, and risk, while remaining conceptually distinct from the molecule's intrinsic efficacy.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Monitoring may improve safety but can also delay or obstruct access. Ending an administrative program neither removes neutropenia risk nor proves improved population outcomes.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Travel, blood draws, pharmacy coordination, missed-result anxiety, and fear of interruption can become part of daily treatment burden alongside relief from psychosis.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Clozapine is modeled as a coupled biological-institutional controller. Laboratory and service feedback alter exposure continuity and thus participate in the realized trajectory.

TRANSITION

The rationale for accepting this coupled burden depends on clozapine's distinctive efficacy, which made treatment resistance a separate clinical problem.

PART 04 · 4.2 · FAILURE BECOMES AN ESTIMAND

4.2 · Treatment resistance becomes distinct

CORE SENTENCE

The Kane design operationalized prior nonresponse and demonstrated a short-term clozapine exception, but its selected sample and historical comparator do not define every modern case.

Before treatment resistance was operationalized, nonresponse could be treated as a vague property of severe schizophrenia or as failure of the person. The Kane-era trial changed the question by specifying prior treatment exposure. Participants had failed to improve after at least three neuroleptic trials and then underwent a prospective six-week haloperidol phase before entering the randomized comparison. Resistance became a defined condition of the experiment rather than a moral description.

In the acquired abstract, 268 participants entered the double-blind six-week comparison of clozapine and chlorpromazine. Using prespecified response criteria, 30% of those assigned clozapine and 4% of those assigned chlorpromazine were categorized as responders. Clozapine also produced greater improvement on the reported symptom scales. Those figures are historically decisive, but the source remains abstract-level in the present claim-lock ledger and should be quoted with that access boundary visible.

The design did more than show that one drug could outperform another. It separated at least two populations: people likely to respond to standard D2-dominant treatment and a selected group in whom clozapine offered a materially different probability. This weakened the idea of one homogeneous antipsychotic class. It also made adequacy of prior dose, duration, adherence, formulation, and diagnosis part of the definition.

Treatment resistance is therefore not an essence residing in a person. It is a claim about observed outcomes under specified prior exposures and measurement conditions. Change the adequacy criteria, the outcome, the time horizon, or the certainty of adherence, and the classified group may change. This is precisely why operational definitions improve science while never exhausting the lived clinical reality.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Sequential exposure testing creates a conditional phenotype: nonresponse under adequate prior trials becomes the entry criterion for testing a mechanistically and clinically distinctive intervention.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The pivotal response contrast is taken from the acquired abstract, not a completed full-text appraisal. It is short-term, selected, historical, and not a direct estimate of long-term function or modern comparative care.

PART 04 · 4.2 · THE EXCEPTION HAS BOUNDARIES

4.2 · Treatment resistance becomes distinct

The Kane trial does not mean that clozapine works for everyone labeled treatment-resistant. Most participants did not meet its response criterion within six weeks. Nor does nonresponse in that interval prove permanent resistance to clozapine. Duration, dose, plasma exposure, adherence, measurement, comorbidity, and the symptom domain under consideration all affect what a trial can reveal. A category built to improve selection must not become a deterministic identity.

Historical context also matters. The comparator doses were high by contemporary standards, the sample consisted of severely ill selected inpatients, and the study was brief. Its symptom response did not establish long-term social recovery, cognitive restoration, mortality benefit, or superiority over every later antipsychotic strategy. A later Cochrane review found signals favoring clozapine over typical antipsychotics, especially in resistant groups, but also described trial bias, heterogeneity, short duration, and neglected participant and family perspectives; it was not fully appraised for this release.

Counterevidence therefore narrows rather than erases the exception. Clozapine's distinctive efficacy is clinically important, but the magnitude and meaning depend on who was selected, what failed previously, what outcome was counted, and how exposure was sustained. A person may gain relief in voices or threat while still carrying sedation, salivation, constipation, metabolic burden, or limited function. Response is multidimensional even inside treatment resistance.

For caregivers and clinicians, the humane consequence is to remove blame from the word failure. A failed trial is information about a treatment-person-time relation, not evidence of unwillingness or hopelessness. For researchers, it demands transparent definitions and prospective exposure verification. For the person, it leaves room for an exception without promising that the exception will be complete or costless.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The pivotal trial was short, selected, and used historical high-dose comparators; later synthesis reports heterogeneity and bias. Distinct efficacy does not imply universal response or global recovery.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Being called treatment-resistant can feel like a judgment. The evidence supports treating it as a conditional history of prior trials, not a statement about character or possibility.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Treatment resistance is represented as location in an exposure-conditioned response landscape, not a fixed trait; changing target mixture, exposure, or time can reveal a different transition probability.

TRANSITION

Once clozapine is accepted as a bounded efficacy exception, its broad receptor binding becomes the next suspect—but binding breadth is not a solved mechanism.

PART 04 · 4.3 · A RECEPTOR ATLAS IS NOT A CAUSAL CHAIN

4.3 · Broad binding does not solve the mechanism

CORE SENTENCE

Clozapine's receptor map is richly measured, but a list of affinities cannot identify which combination, kinetics, metabolite, circuit, or adaptation produces treatment-resistant efficacy.

Clozapine binds across dopamine, serotonin, muscarinic, histamine, and adrenergic receptor families. The current formulation-specific label lists measured affinities at H1, α 1A, several serotonin and muscarinic receptors, D4, D2, and others. It also states plainly that the mechanism of action in schizophrenia is unknown, while proposing D2 and 5-HT2A antagonism as possible mediators. Measurement and explanation remain separate.

Affinity tells us how strongly a molecule binds under specified assay conditions. It does not tell us the free brain concentration at every site, the direction of effect in a living circuit, the importance of a metabolite, or whether one target is necessary or sufficient for clinical response. Receptor occupancy and residence time add information, but they still do not identify the full path from molecular engagement to relief in a treatment-resistant person.

Clozapine's broad profile can plausibly create both its distinctiveness and its burden. Histamine and adrenergic actions can contribute to sedation and orthostasis; muscarinic actions to autonomic and gastrointestinal effects; multiple dopamine and serotonin actions to its neural profile. Yet plausible contribution is not proof of the unique efficacy mechanism. The same target may affect several tissues, and several targets may converge on one observed outcome.

The mechanistic question must therefore be framed as a causal decomposition. Which targets, at which exposures and times, alter which cellular or circuit states? Which changes mediate benefit rather than merely accompany it? Which interactions are specific to people with prior nonresponse? Until perturbation, mediation, and replication answer those questions, broad binding is a map of candidates rather than the solved explanation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Multireceptor engagement propagates through several GPCR, autonomic, endocrine, cortical, striatal, and gut pathways; unique treatment-resistant efficacy has no proven single mediator.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Binding affinities and clinical efficacy are measured in separate evidence streams. Connecting a particular receptor combination to unique efficacy remains authors' interpretation and broader inference.

PART 04 · 4.3 · WHY SUCCESSORS DID NOT INHERIT THE EXCEPTION

4.3 · Broad binding does not solve the mechanism

Clozapine's low propensity for classic extrapyramidal effects and its broad serotonin–dopamine profile helped generate the category atypical. The category then encouraged a hopeful inference: if later drugs reproduced selected receptor features, they might reproduce clozapine's efficacy without its blood and systemic toxicity. Comparative evidence would later show a more heterogeneous reality. A class resemblance did not automatically transfer the treatment-resistance exception.

That failure of inheritance is mechanistically informative. Broad binding may be necessary only in a particular configuration, or not necessary at all. Relative affinity, brain exposure, receptor kinetics, active metabolites, intracellular bias, regional distribution, and slow adaptation may matter more than a checklist of targets. Alternatively, clozapine's clinical distinctiveness may emerge from several individually modest effects that become important only in a particular biological state.

Counterevidence also prevents romanticizing complexity. A drug is not more effective merely because it touches more receptors. Broad engagement can multiply adverse effects without creating unique benefit, and many receptor-level explanations are post hoc. The correct mechanistic standard is prospective prediction: a proposed model should identify who benefits, which mediator changes first, and what result would fail to appear if the mechanism were wrong.

For the person considering or taking clozapine with a clinical team, uncertainty about the unique mechanism does not invalidate established treatment-resistant efficacy. It changes the kind of explanation that can be offered honestly. Science can describe measured binding, known exposure modifiers, observed benefit, and recognized harms while stating that the decisive causal combination remains unresolved. That is stronger than filling the gap with a tidy receptor slogan.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Later atypical agents did not generally reproduce clozapine's treatment-resistant efficacy. Broad receptor action is neither demonstrated as necessary nor sufficient and may simply increase burden.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person can receive a treatment with a well-supported clinical role even while its unique molecular explanation remains incomplete; uncertainty should be stated, not transferred as doubt about the person's experience.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Clozapine is represented as a vector perturbation whose combined gains and time constants may matter more than any single receptor; this is an organizing synthesis, not validated mechanism.

TRANSITION

Before receptor hypotheses can be tested against outcomes, the actual exposure must be known—and clozapine clearance changes with the person's state.

PART 04 · 4.4 · THE BODY REWRITES THE DOSE

4.4 · Clearance is state-dependent

CORE SENTENCE

The same clozapine dose can become a different exposure when smoking, inflammation, age, sex, body size, or interacting medication changes clearance.

Clozapine is administered as a dose, but the brain and body encounter concentrations. The drug is extensively metabolized, with CYP1A2 playing a central role and CYP3A4 and CYP2D6 contributing. Norclozapine adds a metabolite layer. Absorption, protein binding, sampling time, adherence, metabolism, and elimination stand between the prescribed number and the exposure that reaches targets. This distance is unusually important because clozapine concentrations vary widely.

A full-text-appraised population pharmacokinetic analysis used 17,787 measurements from 5,960 people aged 18 to 86. Estimated clearance declined substantially with age; model-derived dose requirements also differed with smoking, sex, body weight, and population ancestry proxies. The analysis targeted a predose concentration rather than clinical outcome and explicitly lacked outcome data, so it informs exposure estimation rather than determining an individually optimal dose.

Smoking is a state variable because compounds in smoke can induce CYP1A2; starting, stopping, or changing smoking can therefore change clearance even when the prescribed dose is unchanged. The relevant exposure factor is not identical to nicotine itself. Interacting medicines can inhibit or induce metabolic pathways, while hepatic or other bodily states can add further variation. A medication list without these changes is an incomplete exposure history.

The appropriate inference is conditional. Population models identify covariates that shift expected concentrations; they do not turn sex, ancestry, weight, or smoking into biological destiny. Ancestry categories are proxies, not molecular essences, and model transportability requires testing. The person's measured concentration, clinical response, harms, and changing state remain necessary parts of interpretation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

State variables alter CYP1A2-sensitive clearance and therefore plasma and effect-site exposure without any change in prescribed dose; active metabolites and interacting pathways add further dynamics.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Covariate effects on concentration and clearance are claim-locked from population PK, review, and official label evidence. They predict exposure imperfectly and do not directly predict clinical outcomes.

PART 04 · 4.4 · INFLAMMATION CAN CHANGE THE CONTROLLER

4.4 · Clearance is state-dependent

Inflammation and infection add a fast-changing coupling between illness and drug exposure. The official label notes published cases in which pneumonia or other inflammatory conditions increased clozapine concentrations and states that reduced CYP1A2 activity may be involved, while the magnitude and clinical significance are not fully characterized. The full-text-appraised monitoring review likewise treats inflammation as a clinically relevant source of pharmacokinetic change.

This creates a feedback problem. Infection can reduce clearance, higher exposure can intensify sedation, cognitive slowing, autonomic effects, or toxicity, and those changes may complicate recognition of the infection or the person's ability to seek help. The pathway is biologically plausible and supported for exposure change, but no single symptom identifies it. Fever, lethargy, confusion, and tachycardia have several possible causes and require clinical evaluation.

Flow Hijacked marks a further proposal as a new hypothesis, not an empirical result. If inflammatory suppression of clearance raises exposure across a high-gain region of a person's response surface, toxicity or affective and cognitive flattening might appear abruptly and out of proportion to the dose history. Dense concentration, inflammatory, physiological, and experiential time series would be needed to test whether such threshold-like amplification improves prediction.

Disconfirmation is essential. If inflammation-related concentration changes do not predict abrupt outcomes after accounting for infection severity, co-medication, hydration, smoking change, and baseline state, the proposed gain mechanism weakens. This framing is educational and cannot guide an individual dose change. Its value is to show that a stable prescription does not guarantee stable pharmacological input when the body itself changes the clearance function.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Inflammation-concentration coupling is supported, but precise causal magnitude and outcome mediation are incompletely characterized. Infection itself and co-occurring state changes can explain the same symptoms.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person may feel suddenly much more sedated or cognitively altered despite an unchanged prescription. That change deserves urgent clinical attention without assuming one cause from the pattern alone.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

Inflammation → clearance reduction → exposure increase is extended into a falsifiable high-gain transition hypothesis; the PK link is supported, while the network threshold is not established.

TRANSITION

Because dose cannot reveal this changing exposure, therapeutic drug monitoring becomes an estimator—useful for clarification but unable to determine destiny.

PART 04 · 4.5 · A MEASUREMENT INSIDE A TRAJECTORY

4.5 · TDM clarifies exposure—not destiny

CORE SENTENCE

Therapeutic drug monitoring estimates one hidden state—exposure—while benefit, toxicity, adherence, timing, and personal value remain separate quantities requiring integration.

Therapeutic drug monitoring measures a concentration in a biological sample at a particular time. With clozapine, that number can help distinguish several explanations that a prescribed dose cannot: little recent exposure, unexpectedly high exposure, an interaction, changed smoking, altered clearance, or unusual dose–concentration behavior. It converts part of an invisible pharmacokinetic process into observable information.

The measurement is conditional. Interpretation depends on when the sample was taken relative to dosing, whether steady state was approached, whether doses were missed, which formulation was used, and whether illness or interacting medicines changed clearance. Assay error and within-person variability remain. A value without a reliable timeline may create false precision rather than clarity.

The population pharmacokinetic model illustrates both power and limit. Thousands of measurements identified systematic exposure differences associated with age, smoking, sex, body weight, and ancestry proxies. Yet the study lacked clinical outcome data. It could estimate the dose associated with a target predose concentration under modeled conditions, but it could not establish that the same concentration maximizes benefit or minimizes harm for every person.

TDM is therefore neither a truth machine nor a peripheral laboratory ritual. It is one evidence stream to be combined with symptom course, adverse effects, physical state, adherence history, and the person's priorities. The goal is not to worship a range. It is to reduce uncertainty about exposure while keeping the distinction between what was measured and what still must be clinically inferred. Repeated values can matter more than an isolated number.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A timed concentration sample updates an estimate of latent exposure; clinical outcome remains a separate function of exposure, susceptibility, adaptation, concurrent state, and measurement horizon.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

TDM directly measures sampled concentration and can support PK explanation. Its ability to improve patient-valued outcomes prospectively, and any universal optimal concentration, are not established by these sources.

PART 04 · 4.5 · WHAT A LEVEL CAN—AND CANNOT—EXPLAIN

4.5 · TDM clarifies exposure—not destiny

A low concentration can be compatible with missed doses, rapid clearance, smoking induction, sampling at an unexpected time, malabsorption, or laboratory variation. A high concentration can be compatible with slower clearance, inflammation, an inhibitor, changed smoking, timing, or accumulation. The value narrows possibilities but does not select one automatically. Good inference requires the surrounding history and, when appropriate, repeated measurement.

Concentration also cannot tell whether a symptom is worth its cost. Two people at similar levels may differ in antipsychotic response, sedation, constipation, seizure vulnerability, salivation, metabolic change, or subjective clarity. A person can benefit below a population reference range or experience burden within it. Reference information organizes probability; it does not replace the person-specific outcome vector.

Counterevidence sits inside the data source. The population model used opportunistic monitoring samples and could not connect its concentration predictions to clinical outcomes. The review literature describes sparse data during inflammation or smoking changes. These limitations do not negate TDM. They define it as an estimator within a wider decision system, not an autonomous dosing algorithm.

Flow Hijacked treats TDM as Bayesian state estimation in plain language: a prior expectation based on dose and population information is updated by a timed measurement and by evidence about the body's current state. The model remains conceptual in this lecture. Its validity would depend on calibrated prediction and better prospective decisions, not mathematical elegance. The next question is what kinds of benefit those improved exposure estimates are meant to protect.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

A concentration has multiple causal explanations and imperfect outcome correlation. Opportunistic sampling, timing error, incomplete covariates, and absent clinical outcome data constrain individual inference.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A laboratory number can validate that exposure changed, but it cannot decide whether relief, clarity, sedation, constipation, or the total burden is acceptable to the person.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

TDM is placed in a measurement loop that updates exposure estimates while preserving separate models for clinical response, harm, and person-valued utility.

TRANSITION

Exposure clarification matters because clozapine's benefits extend beyond a generic class average, while claims about suicide and mortality require different causal standards.

PART 04 · 4.6 · THREE BENEFITS, THREE ESTIMANDS

4.6 · Distinct benefit, uncertain causal breadth

CORE SENTENCE

Clozapine's treatment-resistant efficacy is its strongest distinctive claim; suicide-risk and mortality evidence concern different populations and designs and cannot be collapsed into one causal promise.

Treatment-resistant symptom response, recurrent suicidal behavior, and all-cause mortality are different outcomes. They are measured over different horizons, in different populations, with different comparators. Clozapine's pivotal short-term treatment-resistance evidence comes from randomized comparison. The current US label also includes reduction of recurrent suicidal behavior in people with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder judged at chronic risk, based on a two-year trial. Neither result automatically estimates mortality.

The Finnish FIN11 cohort addressed another question. In nationwide observational data, cumulative antipsychotic exposure was associated with lower mortality than no use, and clozapine had the lowest observed mortality relative to perphenazine among the compared drugs. The scale and long follow-up make the association important. The design remains observational, and the source is abstract-level in this release; treatment selection, adherence, healthy-user effects, and residual confounding prevent a definitive causal estimate.

Evidence should be triangulated without being blended. Randomization can strengthen a causal contrast for the enrolled trial population and measured endpoint, but may be brief or selective. Observational cohorts capture rare and long-horizon outcomes in real systems, but cannot fully balance why one person receives clozapine, remains in care, or fills prescriptions. Official indications establish regulatory conclusions for defined uses, not universal predictions.

The disciplined claim is therefore tiered. Clozapine is a distinctive treatment-resistance intervention. It has an official recurrent-suicidal-behavior indication in a specified population. Favorable mortality associations deserve serious attention and further causal study. Presenting all three as proof that clozapine broadly saves lives would erase the differences that make each evidence stream interpretable.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Benefit claims branch into symptom-response, suicidal-behavior, and mortality pathways; each has its own population, comparator, clock, mediator, and vulnerability to bias.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Treatment-resistant and mortality source claims are abstract-level in this release; the suicidal-behavior indication is supported by the official label. Observational mortality associations are not causal proof.

PART 04 · 4.6 · TRIANGULATION WITHOUT OVERCLAIM

4.6 · Distinct benefit, uncertain causal breadth

A favorable association can arise partly because treatment works and partly because the people who receive and sustain it differ from those who do not. Clozapine recipients may have more severe illness, which could bias outcomes against the drug; they may also have unusually intensive follow-up, better medication contact, or selected survival to initiation, which could bias in the opposite direction. Statistical adjustment reduces but cannot guarantee removal of those differences.

The suicide-related evidence also requires exact language. An indication to reduce recurrent suicidal behavior is not proof of eliminating suicidal thoughts, preventing every suicide, or benefiting every person with psychosis. Trial inclusion criteria, outcome definitions, treatment context, and continued engagement matter. Acute safety concerns always require direct human assessment; population evidence cannot substitute for urgent care when danger is present.

Causal restraint does not mean indifference. Mortality and suicidal behavior are among the outcomes that matter most, and a signal should not be ignored merely because randomization is difficult. It means stating design and uncertainty beside the claim, seeking converging designs, and avoiding a single estimate that outruns its assumptions. This protects both scientific credibility and the people whose hopes may attach to the conclusion.

Flow Hijacked places these outcomes on separate time-dependent axes. Short-term symptom relief may enable engagement; reliable monitoring may reduce some hazards; bodily burdens may accumulate; continuity of care may alter survival through pathways not intrinsic to receptor pharmacology. The total trajectory can be favorable without one mechanism explaining every component. The next section therefore turns from benefit breadth to the systemic harms that travel on their own clocks.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Observational mortality estimates remain vulnerable to confounding, selection, adherence, and care-intensity differences. Regulatory indication for recurrent suicidal behavior does not establish universal suicide prevention.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Distinct benefit can be life-changing, but it should be communicated without promises that one drug will resolve every symptom, risk, or dimension of a person's future.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Symptom, suicidal-behavior, mortality, bodily-harm, and access trajectories are modeled as coupled but nonidentical processes; improvement on one axis does not prove mediation of another.

TRANSITION

Any account of clozapine's exceptional value must now face the full systemic harm profile rather than treating safety as an appendix.

PART 04 · 4.7 · MANY ORGANS, MANY CLOCKS

4.7 · The harm profile is systemic

CORE SENTENCE

Clozapine's harms involve blood, heart, brain, gut, metabolism, autonomic regulation, and daily experience on different clocks; safety is a distributed trajectory, not a checklist.

The clozapine label carries boxed warnings for severe neutropenia; orthostatic hypotension, bradycardia, and syncope; seizures; myocarditis, pericarditis, and cardiomyopathy; and increased mortality in older people with dementia-related psychosis. It also warns about gastrointestinal hypomotility with severe complications, metabolic changes, QT prolongation, hepatotoxicity, pulmonary embolism, anticholinergic toxicity, and cognitive or motor impairment. These are not variations of one side effect.

Each pathway has a different temporal and physiological structure. Orthostatic reactions can be especially important during initiation or rapid titration. Myocarditis often raises early vigilance, while cardiomyopathy can follow another course. Seizure probability is related to dose and susceptibility. Severe neutropenia has its own monitoring logic. Constipation can progress from an everyday symptom to life-threatening hypomotility, and metabolic changes may accumulate slowly while remaining less immediately visible.

Common experienced burdens also matter: sedation, salivation, dizziness, autonomic discomfort, cognitive slowing, appetite or weight change, and bowel difficulty can shape daily life even when they never become a coded serious event. Their importance cannot be ranked only by lethality. A burden can disrupt sleep, intimacy, mobility, dignity, work, or willingness to continue and therefore alter realized effectiveness.

A systemic harm profile requires a systemic safety response. Laboratory monitoring addresses only part of the map. Physical symptoms, bowel function, infection, cardiac signs, falls, cognition, metabolic measures, co-medication, and interruptions all need appropriate clinical attention. This lecture remains educational and does not specify an individual protocol; it establishes why no single test can stand in for the whole safety system.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Broad receptor action and state-dependent exposure distribute risk across hematologic, cardiac, gastrointestinal, neurologic, metabolic, autonomic, and experiential subsystems with nonmatching time constants.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The official label establishes recognized hazards and monitoring warnings, not an individualized probability for every outcome. Frequency, susceptibility, and causal pathway vary.

PART 04 · 4.7 · SAFETY INCLUDES THE COST OF STOPPING

4.7 · The harm profile is systemic

Risk cannot be understood as exposure versus no exposure in a static moment. Clozapine may provide benefit unavailable from prior treatments, so interruption can carry the risk of recurrent psychosis or loss of hard-won stability. The label also warns that abrupt discontinuation can be followed by psychotic recurrence and cholinergic rebound, including sweating, headache, nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea. The direction of travel is part of safety.

This does not mean that treatment should continue regardless of harm. Severe neutropenia, suspected myocarditis, profound gastrointestinal symptoms, seizures, or other urgent concerns can require immediate clinical action. It means that benefit, toxicity, and transition risk must be held together by qualified care rather than represented as independent checkboxes. The lecture cannot adjudicate an individual situation and should never be used to make an unmonitored medication change.

Counterevidence also applies to alarm. A list of serious warnings does not estimate that every person will experience them, and some common symptoms have many causes. Conversely, rarity does not make a severe event unimportant. Surveillance must be calibrated enough to detect danger without reducing the person's life to perpetual threat. Honest communication includes both the seriousness of recognized risks and the uncertainty of individual prediction.

For people and families, systemic safety becomes practical only when responsibilities are clear: who receives results, who responds to new symptoms, what happens during infection, how interruptions are handled, and how ordinary burdens are heard. These questions concern care organization rather than self-management. They reveal why clozapine's net value emerges from a coordinated trajectory, not from receptor efficacy or adverse-event frequency considered alone.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Serious warnings do not imply universal occurrence, while rare events can still be decisive. Abrupt interruption can itself produce risk, so a simple exposure/no-exposure comparison is incomplete.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Relief after prior nonresponse may coexist with exhausting salivation, constipation, sedation, blood tests, or fear of serious harm. All belong in the treatment outcome.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Safety is modeled as a time-varying field over organs, experience, access, and transition costs; no single scalar side-effect score can represent the trajectory.

TRANSITION

The systemic view prepares the regulatory lesson: changing an administrative control can alter access while leaving the biological risk structure intact.

PART 04 · 4.8 · A RULE CAN END WHILE A RISK REMAINS

4.8 · The 2025 REMS lesson

CORE SENTENCE

Removing the US clozapine REMS changed a regulatory access mechanism, not clozapine's biology; the effect on access, continuity, monitoring, and outcomes must be measured separately.

The FDA removed the clozapine Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy effective June 13, 2025. According to the official communication, prescribers, pharmacies, and patients no longer had to participate in that program for clozapine dispensing. The agency nevertheless retained the severe-neutropenia warning and continued to recommend ANC monitoring according to the prescribing information. The two actions are compatible because they operate at different levels.

A REMS is an administrative risk-management architecture. Neutropenia is a biological event. Ending the former does not repeal the latter. It changes who must register, what data must be submitted for dispensing, and how access is conditioned through a national program. Biological surveillance can remain clinically recommended even when a particular enforcement mechanism is judged unnecessary or counterproductive.

This distinction matters beyond clozapine. Regulation can change exposure trajectories by delaying initiation, interrupting dispensing, concentrating prescribing in certain services, or discouraging clinicians and patients. Removing a barrier may improve access, yet it may also create variability if local monitoring systems are weak. Neither outcome follows automatically from the policy text; both are empirical questions about implementation.

The official change is therefore a clean lesson in causal levels. Regulatory status describes a rule. Label warnings describe recognized hazards and recommended responses. Clinical systems translate both into practice. Individual biology and experience determine neither policy nor protocol alone, but they are affected by how those structures work. Conflating the levels produces either false reassurance or unnecessary alarm. Keeping them separate makes evaluation possible.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Policy modifies eligibility, registration, dispensing friction, and service behavior; these institutional variables alter access and continuity while leaving receptor and hematologic biology unchanged.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The date and content of the US regulatory change are officially verified. Its causal effects on prescribing, monitoring quality, neutropenia outcomes, equity, and continuity are not established by the notice itself.

PART 04 · 4.8 · ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL IS NOT BIOLOGICAL CONTROL

4.8 · The 2025 REMS lesson

The REMS transition can be evaluated only by defining outcomes before celebrating or condemning it. Did appropriate clozapine initiation increase? Did delays and interruptions fall? Was ANC monitoring maintained where clinically indicated? Did severe-neutropenia detection change? Were underserved groups more able to access treatment? Did responsibility become clearer or more fragmented? Each question uses a different denominator and time horizon.

A policy that reduces dispensing friction could plausibly improve continuity and thereby protect symptom stability. A policy transition could also expose gaps if health systems had relied on the central program to organize reminders, data flow, or responsibility. These are competing implementation pathways, not claims established by the FDA communication. Prospective surveillance and equity-sensitive service research are required to distinguish them.

For people taking clozapine, the most important change may be mundane: fewer blocked refills, fewer administrative calls, or less fear that a missing record will interrupt treatment. For clinicians and pharmacists, it may be a redistribution of accountability. For researchers, the natural experiment offers an opportunity to compare initiation, continuity, monitoring, safety events, and disparities before and after the change without assuming that temporal association proves policy causation.

Clozapine thus closes this part as a complete Flow Hijacked case. Molecular efficacy, state-dependent clearance, systemic harm, lived burden, monitoring, and policy form one coupled trajectory. The conclusion is not that systems matter more than molecules, but that the realized intervention contains both. That insight leads to the atypical era, when the field tried to reproduce clozapine's benefit while removing its toxicity and converted heterogeneous agents into a single generational promise.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The FDA notice verifies the program's end, not its downstream effectiveness. Improved access, preserved monitoring, reduced inequity, or changed safety outcomes remain hypotheses requiring data.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Administrative friction can decide whether a person receives a continuous medicine, yet reduced friction must not be confused with removal of the need to notice biological danger.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Regulation is treated as an external parameter that changes access and continuity gains. The biological plant is unchanged, but the closed-loop treatment behavior can change substantially.

TRANSITION

The next part tests whether the field's attempt to generalize clozapine into an atypical class survived comparative effectiveness evidence from CATIE, CUpLASS, and later synthesis.

PART 04 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Clozapine makes efficacy, body state, monitoring infrastructure, and access inseparable parts of one treatment system.

Part 4 establishes clozapine as a bounded treatment-resistance exception whose realized benefit depends on state-dependent exposure, systemic safety work, continuity, and access infrastructure. It does not establish a single receptor mechanism, universal response, or causal certainty for every suicide and mortality association.

The field next tried to reproduce clozapine's benefit without its systemic toxicity. That effort created the atypical class story—and the comparative reckoning of CATIE, CUtLASS, and later network evidence.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

4.1 · Withdrawal and monitored return — Agranulocytosis curtailed use; later return under blood monitoring linked a drug's availability to a service infrastructure.

4.2 · Treatment resistance becomes distinct — The Kane-era trial established a clinically important exception, while its exact lecture wording remains abstract-level in this release.

4.3 · Broad binding does not solve the mechanism — Dopamine, serotonin, muscarinic, histamine, and adrenergic actions are measured; the unique efficacy mechanism remains unsettled.

4.4 · Clearance is state-dependent — Smoking, inflammation, infection, age, sex, body size, and interacting drugs can materially alter CYP1A2-sensitive exposure.

4.5 · TDM clarifies exposure—not destiny — Concentration can reveal nonadherence, interactions, or unusual clearance; it does not replace clinical response and harm assessment.

4.6 · Distinct benefit, uncertain causal breadth — Treatment-resistant efficacy is distinctive; suicide and mortality associations matter but observational estimates require causal restraint.

4.7 · The harm profile is systemic — Severe neutropenia, myocarditis, seizures, constipation/ileus, metabolic effects, orthostasis, sedation, and sialorrhea require active systems.

4.8 · The 2025 REMS lesson — US REMS ended June 13, 2025; severe-neutropenia warning and recommended ANC monitoring remained. Administrative control is not biological risk.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Why does one broad-receptor drug work after others fail?

PART 05

The atypical promise meets CATIE and CUtLASS

What happens when efficacy, retention, quality of life, and adverse effects disagree?

Generational labels organize history; drug-specific outcome vectors organize evidence and decisions.

Part route

- 1. How a class story was made**
- 2. Molecules are not interchangeable**
- 3. Partial agonism is not one generation**
- 4. CATIE makes retention an outcome**
- 5. CUtLASS tests a strategy**
- 6. Network meta-analysis separates axes**
- 7. Formulation changes the trajectory**
- 8. Outcome is a vector, not a rank**

PART 05 · 5.1 · FROM THERAPEUTIC EXCEPTION TO GENERATIONAL PROMISE

5.1 · How a class story was made

CORE SENTENCE

A real therapeutic exception was generalized into a class-wide narrative that the later comparative evidence could not sustain.

Clozapine supplied the field with something more consequential than a new receptor profile. In a rigorously selected treatment-resistant population, the historical six-week comparison reported a response in 30% of participants assigned to clozapine and 4% assigned to chlorpromazine. That result remains abstract-level in this acquisition checkpoint, but it established an enduring clinical discontinuity: a person who had not improved with previous antipsychotics could sometimes improve with another antipsychotic. The finding therefore challenged the assumption that all dopamine-blocking drugs were therapeutically interchangeable.

The category later called “atypical” gathered several hopes around that discontinuity. Lower motor burden at some doses was joined to claims of broader efficacy, better negative-symptom treatment, cognitive restoration, and a more humane subjective experience. Serotonin-dopamine receptor profiles helped make the category sound mechanistically unified. Yet these were distinct propositions. Reduced extrapyramidal risk is not the same outcome as stronger antipsychotic efficacy; neither establishes restored functioning, cognition, relationships, or quality of life. A class label compressed these separate questions into one word.

The historical error was not noticing a difference; it was allowing one exceptional molecule and selected tolerability advantages to become a presumed property of a generation. Once risperidone, olanzapine, quetiapine, ziprasidone, and later agents were placed inside the same family, differences in exposure, receptor balance, metabolism, prolactin, weight, sedation, activation, and formulation were obscured. “Atypical” became a map of professional expectation rather than a reliable prediction of what any particular person would gain or endure.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A molecule-specific efficacy signal was converted into a class narrative by conflating receptor profile, motor tolerability, symptom domains, and functional outcomes.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The clozapine response contrast is retained at abstract level in this checkpoint. The subsequent atypical-class narrative is a historical synthesis, not a demonstrated common mechanism or class effect.

PART 05 · 5.1 · WHEN THE CLASS PROMISE BECAME A COMPARISON PROBLEM

5.1 · How a class story was made

The later comparative trials did not simply replace an optimistic story with a pessimistic one. They changed the unit of analysis. CATIE asked how long people with chronic schizophrenia remained on assigned treatment under pragmatic conditions. CUtLASS compared treatment strategies when clinicians were already changing medication because of inadequate response or adverse effects. The 2019 network meta-analysis separated acute efficacy from multiple adverse-effect dimensions. Each design exposed a different face of effectiveness, and none could be reduced to the question, “Which generation wins?”

The emerging picture was asymmetrical. Clozapine retained its special position in treatment resistance. Some newer drugs produced fewer motor effects than some older comparators under some dosing conditions. Olanzapine showed a retention advantage in CATIE alongside substantial weight and metabolic burden. CUtLASS did not establish general quality-of-life or cost-effectiveness superiority for a second-generation strategy. Across the wider acute-trial network, efficacy differences were mostly graded, while adverse-effect differences were more marked and evidence certainty was frequently low or very low.

The appropriate correction is therefore not to declare all drugs equivalent. It is to dissolve the generation label into a multidimensional comparison: which molecule, at what exposure, for which phase and person, over which time horizon, and judged by which outcome? This reframing preserves genuine efficacy while refusing to let one favorable axis erase another. It also restores lived experience to the evidence system: weight gain, restlessness, sexual effects, sedation, access, coercion, and inadequate benefit are not peripheral reasons for stopping. They are part of effectiveness itself.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Some second-generation agents do reduce particular motor risks relative to particular first-generation comparators, and clozapine remains a genuine treatment-resistance exception. These findings do not rescue uniform class superiority.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person does not experience a generation label. They experience sleepiness, clarity, appetite, restlessness, sexual function, symptom relief, monitoring demands, relationships, and the possibility—or impossibility—of continuing treatment.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats “atypicality” as a historical compression that discarded clinically important state variables and outcome dimensions.

TRANSITION

Once the class story is opened, the next task is to compare the actual pharmacokinetic and harm geometries of its constituent molecules.

PART 05 · 5.2 · DIFFERENT MOLECULES CREATE DIFFERENT EXPOSURES

5.2 · Molecules are not interchangeable

CORE SENTENCE

Sharing a broad antipsychotic label does not imply shared exposure, metabolism, subjective effects, adverse-effect topology, or clinical role.

Risperidone illustrates why a drug name is not a complete exposure description. The acquired label describes CYP2D6 conversion to an active metabolite and identifies D2 and 5-HT_{2A} pharmacology, so genetic variation and interacting medicines can redistribute parent and metabolite exposure even when the nominal dose appears ordinary. Increasing D2 exposure can also carry prolactin and motor costs. Paliperidone remains in the architecture because it is pharmacologically related, but this cited set contains no paliperidone label; the page therefore makes no product-specific claim about its renal dosing, initiation, or persistence.

Olanzapine occupies a different geometry. Its broad D2, 5-HT_{2A}, H₁, M₁, 5-HT_{2C}, and adrenergic actions accompany strong acute efficacy but also substantial average weight, glucose, lipid, appetite, and sedation burden. CYP1A2-related clearance means smoking state can matter. By contrast, quetiapine combines relatively transient D2 engagement with prominent H₁ and α_1 effects and an active metabolite, norquetiapine. Immediate- and extended-release preparations produce different peaks; sedation can be early, while antipsychotic or mood benefit unfolds over a longer interval.

Ziprasidone occupies another region. Its acquired label provides the direct anchor for agent-specific serotonin actions, meal-dependent exposure, activation or akathisia risks, and cardiac-repolarization cautions; comparative evidence places its average weight liability below some alternatives. Lurasidone remains in the architecture as a distinct neighboring molecule, but no complete lurasidone label extraction is cited here, so no food threshold, interaction rule, or dose instruction is asserted. Lumateperone adds a newer multimodal profile with short-term evidence in approved phases but less mature long-term comparative data. These deliberately unequal descriptions demonstrate the atlas rule: product-specific facts must not be borrowed from a neighboring molecule.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Distinct absorption, active-metabolite, CYP, renal-clearance, receptor-binding, and formulation pathways produce different concentration-time curves and different benefit-harm patterns.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Regulatory labels establish product-specific PK and recognized harms, while comparative synthesis supports class-level orientation. The cited set contains no paliperidone or lurasidone label, so it does not establish their renal, food, dosing, or formulation instructions. None of these records establishes the complete causal path from receptor binding to subjective or functional outcome or justifies unreviewed head-to-head superiority claims.

PART 05 · 5.2 · THE SAME NOMINAL DOSE CAN INHABIT A DIFFERENT BODY

5.2 · Molecules are not interchangeable

Pharmacokinetic differences become clinically meaningful only when placed inside a person's changing state. CYP2D6 phenotype and inhibitors can alter the risperidone parent-metabolite balance; smoking can reduce olanzapine exposure; CYP3A4 interactions can materially alter quetiapine exposure; and the acquired ziprasidone label makes meal pattern relevant to oral absorption. Hepatic function, age, co-medication, substance use, body composition, and previous adverse-effect sensitivity further reshape the concentration actually reaching targets. No parallel product-specific renal or food rule is inferred here for paliperidone or lurasidone without their labels.

The harm geometries also refuse a common ranking. Olanzapine may offer comparatively strong acute efficacy while imposing substantial metabolic cost. Risperidone may be used across formulation strategies described in its label while elevating prolactin or producing motor effects. Quetiapine may help in phase-specific mood indications while sedation, orthostasis, and metabolic burden constrain function. Ziprasidone may carry less average weight liability yet raise separate concerns involving cardiac repolarization and adequate absorption. Lumateperone's comparative position remains limited by newer, sponsor-heavy, predominantly short-term evidence.

A valid comparison must therefore specify the coordinate system. If the immediate objective is reduction of severe positive symptoms, one ordering may appear. If the horizon expands to sexual function, wakefulness, glucose regulation, cognition, sustained employment, or the reversibility of adverse exposure, the ordering can change. Flow Hijacked describes these drugs as perturbations with molecule-specific entry routes and slow downstream feedback. Appetite affects eating; sedation affects movement; restlessness affects trust and adherence. Those behaviors then alter metabolic state, relationships, and subsequent exposure, converting pharmacology into trajectory.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Class averages remain useful for orientation, and many agents share clinically important D2-related risks. Shared features, however, do not erase molecule-, dose-, formulation-, and state-specific variation.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Two prescriptions both called "second generation" may produce profoundly different days: one dominated by hunger and slowing, another by restlessness, another by prolactin effects, and another by inadequate exposure after an ordinary meal pattern.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The clinically relevant object is molecule × formulation × body state × time, not the class name alone.

TRANSITION

The partial agonists make this heterogeneity even clearer because their action depends not only on occupancy, but also on intrinsic activity, endogenous tone, metabolites, and prior blockade.

PART 05 · 5.3 · A PARTIAL AGONIST DOES NOT SIMPLY TURN DOPAMINE HALFWAY ON

5.3 · Partial agonism is not one generation

CORE SENTENCE

Partial agonism is a context-dependent receptor operation, not a uniform promise of dopamine stabilization or superior experience.

A partial agonist binds a receptor while producing less intrinsic activation than a full agonist in a given assay. Its net action therefore depends on the surrounding system. Where endogenous dopamine signaling is high, receptor occupancy by a lower-efficacy ligand may reduce aggregate signaling. Where endogenous drive is low, the same ligand may supply some receptor activation rather than pure blockade. This is the basis of the “dopamine stabilizer” shorthand, but the shorthand is not a measured global brain state and should not be presented as one.

Aripiprazole, brexpiprazole, and cariprazine do not instantiate the same operation. Their relative D2 and D3 affinities, intrinsic activities, serotonin-receptor actions, and signaling profiles differ. Cariprazine’s D3 emphasis and the proposed biased-signaling properties of this broader family are mechanistically interesting, yet receptor and cell-assay observations do not directly establish how distributed human networks, motivation, cognition, or subjective vitality will change. Even high D2 occupancy can coexist with a motor, prolactin, or experiential profile unlike that of a pure antagonist.

The pre-existing state matters. A person switching from strong D2 antagonism does not begin from an untreated equilibrium; receptor regulation, endogenous dopamine tone, prior adverse effects, sleep, and current illness phase all shape the perturbation. Partial agonism can therefore feel relieving to one person and activating or destabilizing to another. This is not evidence that the drug “adds dopamine” in a simple regional sense. It is evidence that ligand efficacy, background neurotransmission, adaptation, and network state must be considered together.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Net receptor signaling depends on ligand intrinsic efficacy, receptor occupancy, endogenous dopamine tone, receptor regulation, and agent-specific serotonin and signaling actions.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Binding, labeled PK, and partial-agonist activity are measured. “Dopamine stabilization,” biased signaling as a clinical mediator, and downstream network normalization remain interpretations rather than established human causal chains.

PART 05 · 5.3 · ACTIVE METABOLITES CREATE HIDDEN CLOCKS

5.3 · Partial agonism is not one generation

The three agents also differ in time. CYP2D6 and CYP3A4 are important to aripiprazole and brexpiprazole exposure, so genotype, inhibitors, and inducers can alter the experienced concentration-time profile. Aripiprazole is available in several long-acting formulations whose loading and persistence rules are product-specific. Cariprazine generates active metabolites with very long effective persistence. Consequently, a dose change today may not reveal its full consequence quickly, and an adverse effect may continue long after the last swallowed dose.

This temporal structure complicates switching. Introducing a partial agonist after sustained antagonist exposure changes both ligand efficacy and the history of receptor occupation. At the same time, the outgoing medicine may still be present, an active metabolite may be accumulating, and sleep or arousal may already be shifting. Activation, insomnia, nausea, akathisia, and, for aripiprazole-class warnings, impulse-control problems can occur before desired benefit becomes clear. A snapshot at one clinic visit can therefore mistake a transition process for a stable drug effect.

Calling these agents a “third generation” hides the variables most likely to matter. The relevant description includes intrinsic activity, D2/D3 balance, serotonin actions, parent and metabolite clocks, formulation, previous blockade, and the person’s vulnerability to activation. It also includes reversibility: a long pharmacokinetic tail can smooth missed doses and reduce abrupt troughs, but it can prolong an unwanted state. The Flow Hijacked lens treats this as hysteresis: the same measured concentration may have a different consequence while the system is entering, inhabiting, or leaving a pharmacological regime.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Partial agonists have demonstrated efficacy in molecule-specific approved indications and may reduce some prolactin or motor burdens relative to some antagonists. They can nevertheless produce prominent akathisia, activation, and long-tail transition problems.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Restlessness can be mistaken for anxiety, relapse, noncooperation, or “more illness.” Naming akathisia and respecting the delayed clock can change how a person’s report is heard.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Partial agonism is modeled as a state-dependent perturbation with pharmacokinetic memory, not as a universal homeostatic correction.

TRANSITION

CATIE then asks whether these pharmacological distinctions survive contact with the composite reality of remaining on treatment.

PART 05 · 5.4 · TIME TO DISCONTINUATION AS A PRAGMATIC COMPOSITE

5.4 · CATIE makes retention an outcome

CORE SENTENCE

CATIE shifted attention from symptom change alone to the duration for which benefit, tolerability, preference, and feasibility could coexist.

CATIE randomized 1,493 adults with chronic schizophrenia and followed assigned treatment for as long as 18 months. Its most memorable result was not a receptor effect or a symptom-scale difference, but discontinuation: the acquired abstract-level record reports that 74% stopped the assigned drug before 18 months. Time to discontinuation was intended as a broad effectiveness outcome, integrating inadequate efficacy, adverse effects, and the practical decision by a participant or clinician that continuing the same assignment no longer made sense.

This composite was powerful because it resembled a real clinical question: can a treatment remain sufficiently useful and tolerable to continue? It was also ambiguous. Two people may discontinue for opposite reasons; one may receive too little benefit, while another receives benefit but cannot tolerate weight gain, restlessness, sedation, sexual effects, or motor symptoms. Administrative changes, preference, clinician judgment, and access can also contribute. A longer time to discontinuation therefore signals greater overall persistence in that trial, not a single biological mechanism.

Within the acquired summary, olanzapine was associated with longer persistence than several comparators, but this advantage traveled with greater weight and metabolic burden. Perphenazine was associated with more discontinuation attributed to extrapyramidal effects. These paired findings are central: a drug can look favorable on retention while looking unfavorable on metabolic health, and another can retain acute efficacy while losing people through motor burden. CATIE thus made visible the fact that “effectiveness” is assembled from competing processes rather than contained in one symptom score.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Retention functions as a competing-risks process in which benefit, several harms, preference, service conditions, and switching opportunities jointly determine the stopping time.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The 74% discontinuation result, olanzapine persistence signal, and comparator harms are retained at abstract/indexing level in this checkpoint. Full-text claim appraisal remains pending, so the lecture must not promote them to a stronger lock.

PART 05 · 5.4 · WHAT DISCONTINUATION CAN—AND CANNOT—TELL US

5.4 · CATIE makes retention an outcome

A high discontinuation rate does not mean that antipsychotics lacked benefit. It means that assigned treatment often failed to preserve a sufficient net advantage for the full observation period in this chronic, selected trial population. Symptom improvement may have occurred before stopping, and a participant could later do better after switching. Conversely, remaining on a drug does not prove recovery, satisfaction, or restored function. Continuation can reflect benefit, limited alternatives, clinician preference, fear of relapse, service structure, or constrained choice.

CATIE also does not establish a timeless ranking. Dose choices, prior treatment, chronicity, exclusion criteria, comparator selection, high overall attrition, and industry relationships all affect interpretation and require full-text scrutiny. Later phases after discontinuation are particularly difficult to compare because randomization is progressively diluted by switching and selection. The most defensible use of the trial is therefore structural: it demonstrates that persistence deserves its own place beside acute symptom efficacy and that reasons for stopping must remain visible rather than being collapsed into failure.

Under the Flow Hijacked lens, discontinuation is an event in a coupled trajectory. Adverse effects alter sleep, movement, appetite, agency, trust, and relationships; these changes modify adherence and service contact; changing exposure then alters symptoms and bodily state again. The stopping time is consequently an emergent property of drug, person, and environment. This does not turn a pragmatic endpoint into a precise mechanistic assay. It explains why a clinically important outcome can be real while remaining causally heterogeneous—and why the person's stated reason for stopping is evidence, not noise.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Olanzapine's longer treatment persistence in the acquired summary is a meaningful effectiveness signal, but its metabolic costs prevent that signal from serving as an all-purpose superiority verdict.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The question is not merely whether a tablet reduces a rating-scale score. It is whether the person can inhabit the resulting body and day for long enough to build a life around the benefit.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Retention is modeled as an emergent stopping-time outcome, not as a pure efficacy measure or a moral judgment about adherence.

TRANSITION

CUtLASS narrows the next question: when medication is already being changed, does choosing a second-generation strategy improve quality of life or value?

PART 05 · 5.5 · A TRIAL OF PRESCRIBING STRATEGIES, NOT IDENTICAL MOLECULES

5.5 · CUtLASS tests a strategy

CORE SENTENCE

A pragmatic strategy comparison failed to confirm that choosing the newer class, as a class, produced better quality of life or economic value.

CUtLASS addressed a decision that begins after difficulty has already appeared. The full-text-appraised economic evaluation included 227 adults with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders whose clinicians were changing treatment because of poor response or adverse effects; 185 completed the 52-week follow-up. Participants were randomized to a first-generation or second-generation prescribing strategy, while the clinician selected a drug within the assigned family. The design therefore compared policies of choice under UK service conditions, not one fixed molecule against another.

The principal economic framework integrated quality-adjusted life-years and costs over 52 weeks. Analysis followed an intention-to-treat approach, adjusted for baseline utility, and used multiple imputation for missing data, with sensitivity analyses. Forty-two randomized participants did not complete follow-up. These details matter because quality of life and cost are not decorative secondary endpoints: they connect symptoms and adverse effects to daily functioning, service use, and the value generated by scarce resources. They also introduce assumptions about utility measurement, missingness, and transferability.

Open prescribing made the trial more recognizable as practice but less mechanistically clean. Each strategy contained heterogeneous drugs, doses, and switching possibilities. Clinicians and participants knew the treatments. The comparison could therefore test whether a policy of preferring second-generation agents delivered superior outcomes in that setting, but it could not isolate a single receptor profile or prove equivalence among all medicines within either generation. Its estimand was strategic and contextual: what happened when the category guided choice in a real service.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The intervention operated at the policy level: class-guided prescribing altered the set of available molecules, subsequent switches, costs, adverse effects, and lived outcomes over one year.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The locked claim concerns a UK pragmatic strategy comparison in a specific population and service context. It does not establish molecule-level equivalence, universal cost-effectiveness, or superiority of every first-generation drug.

PART 05 · 5.5 · FAILURE TO ESTABLISH A GENERAL SECOND-GENERATION ADVANTAGE

5.5 · CUtLASS tests a strategy

Within this design, the second-generation strategy did not establish a general advantage in quality of life or cost-effectiveness over the first-generation strategy. Point estimates favored the conventional-drug strategy, which had lower costs and higher quality-adjusted life-years in the study setting. The claim was deliberately narrowed during full-text appraisal from a sweeping statement of first-generation superiority to a failure to establish general second-generation advantage. That wording preserves the direction of the observed estimates without turning uncertainty into a universal reversal.

Several constraints remain load-bearing. The study occurred in one national service context, enrolled people whose current treatment was already being changed, allowed heterogeneous drug choices within each arm, and had a baseline utility imbalance that required adjustment. Missing follow-up was addressed analytically but not abolished. Quality-adjusted life-years combine health states through value weights that may not capture every person's priorities. An outcome favorable at the strategy level cannot determine whether risperidone, olanzapine, quetiapine, or a particular older agent is preferable for an individual.

CUtLASS matters because it tested the promise where the promise was supposed to become life: not only fewer symptoms, but better quality and better use of resources. Its result resists both nostalgia and novelty bias. Older agents are not vindicated as uniformly benign; newer agents are not dismissed as ineffective. Instead, the study shows that a category-wide presumption of superiority can fail when the endpoint expands. Under Flow Hijacked, strategy is part of the environment that shapes which perturbations are offered, sustained, abandoned, or made accessible.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Individual second-generation drugs may be preferable on particular efficacy or adverse-effect dimensions. CUtLASS tested a heterogeneous strategy and cannot negate molecule-specific advantages.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Quality of life asks whether symptom relief arrives with enough wakefulness, mobility, agency, bodily comfort, and social possibility to matter outside the clinic.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

A prescribing category is an environmental control policy, and its value must be judged by the trajectories it enables rather than by its historical prestige.

TRANSITION

A larger network meta-analysis next disaggregates the strategy question into separate acute-efficacy and adverse-effect axes.

PART 05 · 5.6 · WHAT A NETWORK OF 402 ACUTE TRIALS CAN COMPARE

5.6 · Network meta-analysis separates axes

CORE SENTENCE

The broad acute evidence network replaces a single hierarchy with multiple partially independent rankings whose certainty and applicability vary.

The 2019 network meta-analysis assembled 402 randomized acute-treatment studies involving 53,463 adults with multi-episode schizophrenia and compared 32 oral antipsychotics. A network design combines direct head-to-head comparisons with indirect evidence through shared comparators. Its advantage is breadth: many agents can be placed within the same analytic structure even when every possible pair has never been tested directly. Its validity, however, depends on comparability across studies and on assumptions of transitivity, consistency, and adequate control of heterogeneity.

The analysis did not generate one clinically complete league table. It examined overall symptom change and several secondary outcomes, including discontinuation and distinct adverse-effect dimensions. These axes represent different processes. A molecule can occupy a relatively favorable position for acute symptom reduction and an unfavorable position for weight gain, prolactin, sedation, motor effects, or other harms. The network therefore turns “best antipsychotic” into an underspecified question. Best for which outcome, relative to which comparator, in which population, and with what certainty?

The full-text claim lock supports a broad conclusion: efficacy differences were mostly gradual, whereas differences across adverse-effect dimensions were more marked. Evidence confidence for many comparisons was low or very low. The analysis included acute multi-episode populations and excluded or incompletely represented clinically distinctive contexts such as treatment resistance, first episode, and relapse prevention. Clozapine’s special treatment-resistance role therefore cannot be inferred from its placement within this acute network, and the network cannot answer long-term function, mortality, or individual preference.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Network meta-analysis estimates multiple population-average treatment contrasts; it does not collapse efficacy, acceptability, and distinct harms into one mechanistic or clinical scalar.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The locked claim applies to acute randomized trials in adults with multi-episode schizophrenia. It excludes a universal individual ranking and does not establish treatment-resistance efficacy, maintenance benefit, long-term function, or causal mechanisms.

PART 05 · 5.6 · A RANK IS AN ESTIMATE, NOT A DESTINY

5.6 · Network meta-analysis separates axes

Rankings can appear more precise than the underlying evidence. A small estimated difference may reorder several agents even when credible intervals overlap and certainty is low. Indirect comparisons inherit differences in study era, dosing, sponsorship, participant selection, outcome measurement, and duration. Average ranks also conceal response dispersion: two drugs with similar means can differ in the proportion of people with substantial benefit, severe harm, or early discontinuation. The network is therefore most informative as a multidimensional landscape, not as a prescription ladder.

An erratum associated with the report corrected a specific zotepine-versus-haloperidol estimate in one figure to 0.08 with a 95% credible interval from -0.19 to 0.36 and updated disclosure or copyright details. The correction does not alter the broad locked claim about graded efficacy, larger harm differences, and frequent low certainty. Including this fact demonstrates an important discipline: correction checking belongs inside evidence synthesis, and a correction should be neither hidden nor exaggerated beyond the claim it actually changes.

The Flow Hijacked interpretation adds no new drug ranking. It asks how different axes couple over time. Weight gain can alter movement, glucose regulation, self-image, and adherence; akathisia can amplify arousal and mistrust; sedation can reduce both distress and access to work or therapy. These are plausible feedback routes supported by clinical motivation, not causal mediation estimates from the network meta-analysis. The disciplined synthesis keeps the empirical result intact while marking the systems account as a model that must be tested against longitudinal, person-valued outcomes.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Average acute efficacy differences are not zero, and some drugs occupy consistently different positions on particular outcomes. The counterpoint is that the differences are graded, outcome-specific, and frequently uncertain—not absent.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A favorable average rank cannot tell a person whether relief will outweigh hunger, exhaustion, restlessness, sexual change, or the loss of a valued daily role.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The evidence is best represented as a time-dependent vector field of benefits and harms, not a one-dimensional hierarchy.

TRANSITION

The next section adds a variable that oral-drug rankings often underdescribe: formulation changes the entire exposure trajectory.

PART 05 · 5.7 · FROM SWALLOWED DOSE TO ABSORPTION-LIMITED DEPOT

5.7 · Formulation changes the trajectory

CORE SENTENCE

A long-acting formulation is not merely the oral drug given less often; it creates a different exposure clock, information structure, and relational environment.

An oral dose usually creates a sequence of absorption, peak, distribution, metabolism, and decline that is repeated with each administration. A long-acting injectable places drug in a depot from which release may become the slowest step. Apparent terminal persistence can then be governed by absorption rather than by the molecule's intrinsic elimination alone, a pattern often called flip-flop kinetics. Dosing intervals may extend from weeks to months, but loading, oral overlap, injection route, and time to steady exposure are product-specific.

This geometry can reduce repeated peaks and troughs and prevent covert gaps in exposure. It can also make an adverse exposure less reversible. A missed oral dose can lower concentration quickly; an injected depot cannot simply be removed when restlessness, sedation, prolactin effects, or another harm appears. The calendar date of the final injection is therefore not the biological date of discontinuation. Active release, metabolites, receptor occupancy, adaptation, and subjective effects may continue on different clocks long after the treatment record says "stopped."

The formulation cannot be separated from the parent molecule. The acquired risperidone, aripiprazole, and olanzapine label records show that directions belong to particular products, while the network synthesis compares oral and injectable maintenance strategies at treatment level. Together they support the principle that initiation, missed-dose handling, switching, and monitoring cannot be inferred from a class name. They do not provide a complete label library for every depot, a universal conversion rule, or a basis for transferring a loading or observation requirement between products. This page therefore retains class-level depot geometry without asserting uncited paliperidone instructions, enumerating aripiprazole formulations, or assigning a post-injection protocol to a named olanzapine product.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Depot release reshapes input $u(t)$, peak-trough variance, time to steady state, and terminal persistence; exposure can continue after nominal discontinuation.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The acquired label subset documents that PK and directions are formulation-specific, but it is not a complete LAI label library and does not lock paliperidone instructions or every aripiprazole or olanzapine product requirement. The 2022 network synthesis is available at abstract/indexing level and its full claim appraisal remains pending. Claims about adherence, relapse, relationships, or coercion are therefore kept context-sensitive and class-level.

PART 05 · 5.7 · THE INJECTION CHANGES INFORMATION AND RELATIONSHIPS

5.7 · Formulation changes the trajectory

Long-acting treatment alters more than concentration. With oral medication, missed doses can remain invisible to the person's care network; an injection makes attendance and administration observable. This can help when forgetting, disorganization, unstable housing, or disrupted routines repeatedly create unintended gaps. It can also change the meaning of contact with services. A clinic appointment becomes part of the delivery mechanism, so staffing, transportation, continuity, trust, and respectful communication enter the pharmacology's realized effect.

Randomized and real-world comparisons need not agree. Trials may preferentially enroll people willing to accept injections and may support adherence more intensely than routine services. Observational cohorts may include people selected for high relapse risk, while also capturing the practical advantage of assured exposure. These opposing selection forces can change estimated comparative effectiveness. The acquired 2022 network meta-analysis covers 92 randomized relapse-prevention trials and 22,645 participants, but its full claim-level appraisal remains pending; it supports orientation, not an unrestricted declaration that every injectable is superior.

Preference and coercion history are causal context, not ethical footnotes. For one person, a long-acting formulation may reduce the daily burden of remembering and the fear of abrupt interruption. For another, it may embody loss of control and make an adverse state feel inescapable. Shared decision-making can therefore alter trust, attendance, reporting, and subsequent exposure. Flow Hijacked represents formulation as a joint biological and relational intervention: it modifies the drug-input function, the visibility of adherence, and the feedback loop connecting person, clinic, family, and future treatment.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Long-acting formulations can stabilize exposure and reduce unintended gaps, yet they do not guarantee acceptance, response, functional recovery, or freedom from relapse; prolonged adverse exposure is the reciprocal risk.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The same injection may be experienced as freedom from a daily burden or as an irreversible loss of agency. That difference can shape the trajectory as much as a smoother concentration curve.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Formulation modifies both the pharmacological forcing function and the human feedback architecture through which treatment persists.

TRANSITION

Once formulation and context are included, treatment value can no longer be represented by a single rank; it becomes an outcome vector.

PART 05 · 5.8 · FROM ONE SCORE TO A TIME-VARYING OUTCOME VECTOR

5.8 · Outcome is a vector, not a rank

CORE SENTENCE

Treatment value is multidimensional, person-valued, and time-dependent; no single average endpoint can legitimately stand for the whole trajectory.

The comparative evidence points toward a vector representation. Let $y(t)$ contain symptom burden, retention, relapse risk, functioning, quality of life, mortality risk, metabolic health, motor burden, sexual function, cognition, agency, and preference at time t . A treatment changes several components at once, often in different directions and on different clocks. Acute symptom improvement can coexist with early sedation, later weight gain, reduced relapse risk, impaired sexuality, better family contact, or diminished capacity to work. None of these dimensions is automatically reducible to another.

Population studies illuminate different coordinates. CATIE foregrounded time to discontinuation and reasons for stopping. CUtLASS tested quality of life and economic value at the strategy level. The Huhn network compared acute efficacy and adverse effects across a broad trial network. Relapse-prevention meta-analysis supports an average maintenance advantage over placebo or discontinuation designs, while also raising questions about withdrawal, enrichment, follow-up length, and sparse functioning outcomes. Finnish registry evidence associates long-term antipsychotic exposure, especially clozapine in that analysis, with lower mortality, but remains observational and causally uncertain.

A scalar rank can be created only by choosing weights: $U(t)=w(t) \cdot y(t)$. Those weights are not properties of the molecule. They reflect the person's priorities, illness phase, previous experience, family responsibilities, medical risks, and available alternatives. They may also change. Avoiding immediate hospitalization may dominate during acute crisis; cognition, sexuality, metabolic health, or work may become more important during stability. The mathematical notation clarifies a moral fact: aggregation always contains a value judgment, even when the weights are left invisible.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Treatment generates a multidimensional trajectory $y(t)$; any scalar utility $U(t)$ requires explicit, time-varying weights and cannot be inferred from symptom efficacy alone.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The distinct outcomes are empirically measured across different designs, but combining them into a person-specific utility surface is a Flow Hijacked synthesis and testable measurement proposal, not an established biological law.

PART 05 · 5.8 · THE PERSON'S PRIORITIES BELONG INSIDE THE EVIDENCE MODEL

5.8 · Outcome is a vector, not a rank

Making outcomes multidimensional does not mean every preference is fixed or that all choices occur under ideal freedom. Acute psychosis, fear, coercion, cognitive overload, family pressure, poverty, and limited service options can constrain deliberation. Preferences can also adapt to what seems available. A rigorous person-valued model must therefore record not only stated weights, but the conditions under which they were expressed, how they change, and whether the person had meaningful alternatives. Otherwise “preference” can become a polite label for structural constraint.

Nor does a vector eliminate evidence hierarchies. Randomized acute symptom data, pragmatic retention data, quality-of-life measures, adverse-effect monitoring, and observational mortality estimates retain different causal strengths. They should be placed beside one another without pretending they answer the same question. Counterevidence remains local: metabolic harm does not disprove relapse prevention; relapse prevention does not erase sexual dysfunction; an observational mortality association does not cancel randomized adverse-effect findings. The disciplined task is integration without flattening.

Flow Hijacked proposes a longitudinal utility surface rather than a permanent score. Medication may change the control energy required for sleep, conversation, psychotherapy, social safety, or purposeful action; those changes may open or close future options. This is a model-dependent synthesis, not a demonstrated controllability mechanism. Its empirical test is demanding: repeated multidimensional measurement should predict decisions and trajectories better than symptom-only endpoints. If it does not, the model must be revised. The point is not mathematical decoration, but keeping the whole person visible when outcomes disagree.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Symptom scales and average rankings remain necessary for communication and evidence synthesis. They become misleading only when treated as sufficient representations of treatment value.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A treatment can be simultaneously helpful and costly. Recognizing that coexistence allows a person to report benefit without surrendering the right to name what the benefit has cost.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Individual treatment value is represented as a time-varying utility surface over symptoms, body, cognition, agency, relationships, and future possibility.

TRANSITION

Depression now repeats the comparative lesson: cleaner targets and safer delivery can produce genuine efficacy while still generating an etiological story that outruns the evidence.

PART 05 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Generational labels organize history; drug-specific outcome vectors organize evidence and decisions.

Part 5 establishes that antipsychotics differ more sharply across many harm dimensions than across average acute efficacy, while clozapine remains the principal efficacy exception in treatment resistance. CATIE makes continuation and reasons for stopping visible; CULASS shows that a second-generation strategy did not establish general quality-of-life or cost-effectiveness superiority; the large network meta-analysis replaces a class hierarchy with graded, outcome-specific comparisons. Molecule, formulation, exposure, body state, time horizon, service context, and the person's own priorities must therefore be represented together. The conclusion is not that the drugs are equivalent, but that "generation" is too coarse to predict a multidimensional life.

The next part turns to antidepressants, where genuine average efficacy became entangled with an overly simple etiological account. Immediate transporter or enzyme action will be placed beside delayed, partial, and heterogeneous clinical response.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

5.1 · How a class story was made — Clozapine's exception became a broad promise of better efficacy, negative symptoms, cognition, and fewer motor effects.

5.2 · Molecules are not interchangeable — Risperidone/paliperidone, olanzapine, quetiapine, ziprasidone/lurasidone, and lumateperone occupy different PK and harm geometries.

5.3 · Partial agonism is not one generation — Aripiprazole, brexpiprazole, and cariprazine differ in intrinsic activity, serotonin actions, active-metabolite clocks, activation, and akathisia.

5.4 · CATIE makes retention an outcome — Most participants discontinued assigned treatment before 18 months; the 74% figure remains abstract-level in this checkpoint.

5.5 · CULASS tests a strategy — SGAs did not establish general quality-of-life or cost-effectiveness superiority over an FGA strategy; point estimates favored the FGA strategy.

5.6 · Network meta-analysis separates axes — Across 402 trials/53,463 participants, efficacy differences were mostly graded while adverse-effect differences were larger; certainty was often low.

5.7 · Formulation changes the trajectory — LAIs alter peak-trough geometry, adherence visibility, terminal tails, switching, and the meaning of a discontinuation date.

5.8 · Outcome is a vector, not a rank — Symptoms, retention, relapse, function, quality of life, mortality, metabolic health, motor burden, sexuality, and preference can disagree.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

What happens when efficacy, retention, quality of life, and adverse effects disagree?

PART 06

Antidepressants create—and outgrow—the monoamine story

Why does immediate transporter or enzyme action yield delayed, partial, and heterogeneous benefit?

Therapeutic efficacy is compatible with mechanistic pluralism and does not validate a generalized chemical-deficiency etiology.

Part route

- 1. Two discovery routes**
- 2. MAOIs and TCAs reveal trade space**
- 3. SSRIs and SNRIs are PK-diverse**
- 4. Alternatives and augmentation remain heterogeneous**
- 5. Immediate target, delayed response**
- 6. Average acute efficacy is real**
- 7. The evidence system alters the picture**
- 8. Efficacy is not a serotonin diagnosis**

PART 06 · 6.1 · DISCOVERY RAN AHEAD OF MECHANISM

6.1 · Two discovery routes

CORE SENTENCE

The founding antidepressants were observations before they were explanations; later monoamine theories organized those observations but did not retroactively turn serendipity into proof of disease cause.

Modern antidepressant pharmacology did not begin with a validated model of depression. The lecture architecture retains two discovery routes: an iproniazid chronology linked to tuberculosis treatment and an imipramine chronology linked to an unsuccessful antipsychotic search. The locally acquired historical review has not been manually appraised, so this page does not reconstruct particular ward observations, name observers, or assign specific changes in energy, sociability, or mood. The securely teachable point is epistemic order: clinical signals were noticed before a complete transmitter account was available, and explanatory vocabulary was built afterward.

The early observations were neither worthless nor methodologically equivalent to a modern randomized programme. Diagnostic categories, outcome measures, concomitant treatments, and adverse-event ascertainment differed sharply from current standards. The 1958 imipramine report described more than 500 treated patients and strongest responses in a historically defined “endogenous” pattern, but its design and terminology do not license a contemporary effect estimate. It remains a landmark of discovery, not a complete efficacy adjudication.

Once monoamine oxidase inhibition and monoamine reuptake blockade were recognized, investigators gained a tractable biochemical map. A drug could alter enzyme activity or transporter function, and those perturbations could be measured. The map generated productive questions about norepinephrine, serotonin, receptors, and adaptation. Yet a manipulable pathway is not automatically the lesion that produced a disorder. Pharmacological leverage and etiological deficiency are different propositions.

This distinction protects two truths at once. Medication can relieve suffering even when its therapeutic chain is incomplete, and depression need not be reduced to the opposite of a drug’s acute molecular action. The historical sequence therefore becomes a reasoning tool: observation → target identification → mechanistic proposal → testing, with uncertainty preserved at every arrow. It also prepares the central puzzle of this part—why target engagement can be rapid while meaningful change often takes longer.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Irreversible MAO inhibition and monoamine-transporter blockade supplied measurable proximal actions; the causal path from those actions to changing mood, function, or future-directed behavior remained—and remains—multistep.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The imipramine report is available at abstract/indexing level; the broader historical review is not manually appraised. The iproniazid-tuberculosis and failed-antipsychotic routes are retained only as architecture-level chronology, without detailed observational claims. These records do not establish a modern comparative efficacy estimate or a monoamine-deficiency etiology.

PART 06 · 6.1 · A USEFUL THEORY CAN STILL BE AN INCOMPLETE ORIGIN STORY

6.1 · Two discovery routes

The monoamine framework was scientifically generative. It connected drug effects to enzymes, transporters, transmitter availability, and receptor adaptation, enabling assays and new molecules. In 1965, the catecholamine hypothesis was already framed cautiously: the available pharmacological evidence had heuristic value, while rigorous extrapolation to pathophysiology was not possible and clinical evidence was inconclusive. Later popular simplifications often lost that original restraint.

Historical counterevidence also complicates a neat story. Reserpine-induced monoamine depletion was treated as a major clue that depletion causes depression, yet a later systematic review found inconsistent depressogenic, neutral, and putatively antidepressant findings across a literature at generally high risk of bias. That does not erase reserpine's pharmacology. It shows that a biochemical perturbation can have context-dependent experiential effects and cannot carry an etiological theory alone.

For a person deciding whether a treatment has helped, the meaningful endpoint is not whether a textbook story is elegant. It may be the return of morning movement, interest, concentration, appetite, sleep, or a tolerable horizon of possibility. For caregivers and clinicians, the temporal sequence matters: early autonomic or activating effects can arrive before benefit, and observation must therefore include both relief and burden without treating either as imagined.

The Flow Hijacked reading is explicitly a synthesis, not a historical finding. Serendipitous drugs acted as perturbation probes: they revealed that mood-related trajectories are modifiable, but not that one missing molecule defines the state. The lecture therefore leaves the discovery scene with a disciplined question. If two chemically different routes can produce antidepressant effects, what exposure clocks, secondary targets, and safety constraints determine whether their leverage becomes usable?

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Early monoamine hypotheses themselves warned against direct pharmacology-to-etiology inference, and the later reserpine review found inconsistent effects in a predominantly high-risk-of-bias literature.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person can experience genuine benefit, early burden, or both without their experience validating or refuting a universal chemical-deficiency story.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Discovery drugs are perturbation probes of a modifiable dynamical system, not reverse assays that reveal a single missing cause.

TRANSITION

The next section follows the clocks and costs hidden inside the first two pharmacological routes.

PART 06 · 6.2 · PLASMA DISAPPEARANCE IS NOT BIOLOGICAL DISAPPEARANCE

6.2 · MAOIs and TCAs reveal trade space

CORE SENTENCE

The first antidepressants demonstrate that efficacy and usability occupy different dimensions: an effective mechanism may be constrained by interaction geometry, exposure variability, monitoring burden, and reversibility.

Irreversible monoamine oxidase inhibitors make time visible. The parent drug may leave plasma while inhibited enzyme function persists until new enzyme is synthesized. Consequently, effect duration, interaction windows, and washout logic cannot be read from plasma half-life alone. Tyramine exposure, sympathomimetics, and serotonergic combinations can become clinically important because the drug changes how the body handles subsequent inputs, not merely the concentration of one transmitter at one moment.

Tricyclic antidepressants expose a different geometry. Imipramine-like drugs inhibit norepinephrine and serotonin transporters, but also engage muscarinic, histamine, α 1-adrenergic, and cardiac sodium-channel systems to varying degrees. First-pass metabolism and active metabolites add further layers. CYP2D6 and CYP2C19 variation or inhibition can alter parent-metabolite exposure, and selected tricyclics can justify therapeutic drug monitoring because the administered dose is an unreliable proxy for the concentration actually encountered.

These properties connect molecular action to ordinary bodily experience. Orthostatic symptoms, dry mouth, constipation, sedation, urinary difficulty, cardiac conduction effects, and sexual burden do not sit outside the mechanism; they arise from the same multi-target exposure. In overdose, the safety margin becomes especially consequential. A drug can be an effective antidepressant and still be difficult to use safely in a particular person, household, co-medication pattern, or health state.

The causal lesson is broader than “old drugs have more side effects.” MAOIs and TCAs reveal a trade space in which target leverage, selectivity, interaction burden, monitoring, and reversibility can pull in different directions. Their continued specialist use also prevents a false evolutionary story: newer does not mean universally stronger, and older does not mean pharmacologically obsolete. The appropriate claim is conditional—benefit and burden depend on molecule, exposure, state, and safeguards.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

MAOI action can outlast circulating drug because recovery requires enzyme resynthesis; TCA effects reflect transporter blockade plus off-target receptor and ion-channel actions, with active metabolites and CYP-dependent exposure shaping both benefit and toxicity.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Current label evidence supports formulation-specific pharmacology, interactions, and safety constraints. Historical efficacy is established broadly, but the local corpus does not support a universal modern head-to-head ranking or individualized protocol.

PART 06 · 6.2 · SAFETY CONSTRAINTS BECAME DESIGN PRESSURES

6.2 · MAOIs and TCAs reveal trade space

The demand for successor drugs was not created by therapeutic failure alone. It arose because a treatment pathway includes everything required to use a molecule: dietary knowledge, interaction screening, cardiac and autonomic vulnerability, overdose risk, monitoring access, and the ability to reverse an unwanted exposure. A narrow efficacy endpoint can miss these system-level costs even when they dominate whether treatment is acceptable in daily life.

Selectivity therefore became a design aspiration. If monoamine transport could be altered with fewer muscarinic, histamine, $\alpha 1$, or sodium-channel actions, perhaps antidepressant benefit could be retained while reducing toxicity. That aspiration was rational, but “selective” never meant effect-free. Changing the primary target profile redistributes burden; it does not abolish the body, developmental state, co-medications, or feedback through sleep, appetite, sexuality, and adherence.

Counterevidence to a simple progress narrative comes from the drugs’ persistence in specialist care and from heterogeneity in response. Some people may benefit after newer options have not helped; others may find monitoring or interaction constraints unacceptable. Evidence about average efficacy cannot decide a person’s value function. Equally, respect for preference must not obscure serious interaction and overdose hazards that require competent clinical management rather than self-directed experimentation.

Under the Flow Hijacked lens, safety is a property of a coupled system. A molecule, enzyme-recovery clock, food environment, other medicines, support network, and access to monitoring jointly determine the reachable trajectories. This is a synthesis rather than a trial result. It clarifies why the next wave was transformative without claiming that it solved depression: SSRIs and SNRIs changed exposure and safety geometry, but introduced their own clocks, secondary actions, and discontinuation sensitivities.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The survival of MAOIs and TCAs in selected care argues against a universal replacement hierarchy; however, that persistence does not negate their serious interaction, cardiac, autonomic, and overdose constraints.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Usability includes whether a person can safely live with the monitoring, dietary rules, bodily effects, and household risks—not only whether a symptom score improves.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Safety and benefit emerge from a coupled molecule-body-environment system whose clocks and constraints define reachable treatment trajectories.

TRANSITION

The successor question is not whether selectivity removes complexity, but where that complexity moves.

PART 06 · 6.3 · THE SAME CLASS NAME CAN CONCEAL DIFFERENT CLOCKS

6.3 · SSRIs and SNRIs are PK-diverse

CORE SENTENCE

A class label identifies a proximal pharmacological family, not a shared exposure trajectory: formulation, metabolism, active metabolites, secondary targets, and effective half-life determine what the nervous system actually encounters.

Selective serotonin-reuptake inhibitors share SERT inhibition, but they do not create one standardized exposure. Fluoxetine and its active metabolite norfluoxetine persist far longer than shorter-lived agents. Paroxetine and fluoxetine can inhibit CYP2D6, while sertraline and escitalopram have different interaction profiles. Hepatic state, co-medications, age, and genetic variation can therefore change concentration and parent-metabolite balance even when the written dose appears ordinary.

That diversity changes the experience of both taking and missing medication. With a long effective half-life, a delayed dose may produce a shallow concentration change; with a shorter effective half-life, the same clock-time error can generate a steeper fall. This is a pharmacokinetic difference before it becomes a question about adaptation, expectation, or recurrence. It helps explain why a class-average description can fail at the level of one person's daily trajectory.

Serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors add another conditional dimension. SERT and NET engagement are molecule- and dose-dependent rather than a binary property of the class. Venlafaxine has a short-lived parent compound and an active metabolite, with CYP2D6 affecting their balance; duloxetine uses different hepatic pathways and has its own organ-function constraints. Rising exposure may recruit more noradrenergic action for some agents while also changing blood pressure, sweating, activation, or withdrawal burden.

Transporter occupancy itself is nonlinear. Common SSRI doses can lie on a relatively saturated portion of the SERT occupancy curve, so a larger dose does not imply a proportionally larger target change or clinical benefit. Conversely, reductions near the low-dose end can represent a larger proportional change in target engagement than equal milligram steps suggest. The present section explains geometry, not a taper prescription; comparative discontinuation strategies are addressed later and remain incompletely established.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Realized exposure is determined by absorption, CYP-dependent clearance, active metabolites, effective half-life, and nonlinear transporter occupancy; these variables transform identical-looking doses or missed doses into different rates of target perturbation.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Labels and the acquired atlas establish drug-specific PK and interaction differences. The occupancy discussion supplies a pharmacological rationale; it does not establish a universally superior agent, dose, or discontinuation schedule.

PART 06 · 6.3 · SELECTIVITY REDISTRIBUTED BURDEN RATHER THAN ABOLISHING IT

6.3 · SSRIs and SNRIs are PK-diverse

SSRIs substantially changed the safety and practical profile of antidepressant treatment compared with many older agents, especially in overdose and anticholinergic burden. That is a genuine historical achievement. Yet SERT selectivity does not make a drug experientially neutral. Gastrointestinal effects, sleep change, activation or sedation, sexual dysfunction, hyponatremia, bleeding interactions, emotional blunting reports, and age-bounded suicidality warnings belong to the treatment description beside symptom benefit.

SNRIs similarly cannot be summarized as simply “more” monoamine action. The second transporter adds a dose- and agent-dependent pathway, while short effective half-lives can make fluctuations more perceptible. An effect that appears after a missed dose may reflect rapid exposure change, but that timing alone does not prove a single mechanism. Symptoms can also be shaped by expectation, underlying illness, sleep loss, other substances, and coincident stress.

Counterevidence restrains two opposite exaggerations. First, within-class PK diversity does not mean every reported difference has been confirmed in randomized head-to-head trials. Second, average class efficacy does not erase drug-specific burden. The acquired network meta-analysis supports short-term benefit across included antidepressants, while its primary acceptability endpoint—discontinuation for any cause—cannot represent every adverse event or patient-valued outcome.

The Flow Hijacked synthesis treats concentration change as a moving input, $u(t)$, rather than a label. The nervous system encounters not only exposure $C(t)$ but its rate of change dC/dt , against a history of prior exposure and current sleep, stress, and bodily state. This formulation is empirically motivated but not a validated individual predictor. It earns one practical conclusion only: two drugs called SSRIs, or two equal milligram changes, should not be presumed dynamically equivalent.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Drug-specific PK is well documented, but many proposed links from half-life or occupancy geometry to individual subjective outcomes lack direct comparative validation; no class member is uniformly best tolerated.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Missed-dose sensitivity, sexuality, sleep, emotional range, and activation can determine whether an average benefit is livable; emerging severe agitation or suicidal thinking warrants prompt human clinical assessment.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Class identity is a coarse label; $C(t)$, dC/dt , active-metabolite clocks, and state-dependent clearance define the pharmacological perturbation actually delivered.

TRANSITION

Once within-class variation is visible, alternatives and augmentation must be treated as distinct control moves rather than a single escalation ladder.

PART 06 · 6.4 · ONE CLINICAL PURPOSE, SEVERAL PHARMACOLOGICAL ROUTES

6.4 · Alternatives and augmentation remain heterogeneous

CORE SENTENCE

Changing or augmenting an antidepressant does not simply add ‘more antidepressant’; it creates a new multivariate exposure state whose mechanism, latency, interactions, monitoring, and valued outcomes must be evaluated separately.

Bupropion, mirtazapine, and vortioxetine demonstrate why “non-SSRI” is not a meaningful mechanism class. Bupropion has norepinephrine/dopamine-related and nicotinic actions with active hydroxybupropion exposure; immediate-, sustained-, and extended-release formulations change peak geometry. Mirtazapine combines α_2 -adrenergic, selected serotonin-receptor, and strong H1 actions. Vortioxetine inhibits SERT while also acting at several serotonin receptors. Each route perturbs a different configuration.

Their burdens are equally noninterchangeable. Bupropion can be activating and has dose- and state-dependent seizure constraints. Mirtazapine may change sleep and appetite rapidly, with weight or metabolic consequences becoming important over longer periods. Vortioxetine can produce nausea and sexual effects, while claims of a special cognitive advantage require outcome-specific appraisal. A mechanism label cannot decide which burden is tolerable or which residual symptom domain matters most.

Augmentation increases dimensionality again. Adding lithium, an antipsychotic, thyroid hormone, or another strategy does not merely intensify the original signal. Lithium introduces renal disposition and thyroid monitoring; antipsychotics introduce molecule-specific dopamine, serotonin, metabolic, motor, and endocrine effects; thyroid strategies enter an endocrine feedback system. Each component keeps its own absorption, distribution, adaptation, and offset clock.

This causal structure changes interpretation. If sleep improves before mood after mirtazapine, sleep may mediate part of later recovery, coexist with direct effects, or simply mark exposure; the temporal order does not decide among them. If augmentation helps, the result supports the strategy in its tested context, not a proven molecular synergy. Mechanistically heterogeneous routes can converge on the same clinical endpoint while taking different paths through body, experience, and environment.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Alternatives redistribute transporter, receptor, arousal, appetite, and metabolite effects; augmentation superposes distinct pharmacokinetic and feedback systems, so benefit cannot be represented as a one-dimensional increase in monoamine action.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Labels establish component-specific targets, PK, warnings, and approved contexts; the acquired network supports acute efficacy for included antidepressants. Comparative augmentation, special-domain superiority, and synergy mechanisms are less securely resolved here.

PART 06 · 6.4 · SEQUENCING IS EVIDENCE, BURDEN, AND VALUES—NOT A LADDER

6.4 · Alternatives and augmentation remain heterogeneous

Treatment sequences are often drawn as a ladder: first drug, second drug, augmentation, then a more specialized intervention. The image is administratively convenient but scientifically misleading. Each step changes the state from which the next step begins. Residual symptoms, adverse effects, prior withdrawal, sleep, confidence, co-medications, and the meaning attached to another trial become part of the initial condition.

STAR*D is historically important because it examined sequential care in a broad outpatient programme. Its abstract-level report described falling remission across successive steps and substantial attrition, with those needing more steps showing higher relapse during naturalistic follow-up. Yet changing denominators, open-label measurement-based care, flexible pathways, attrition, and nonrandomized follow-up complicate the familiar cumulative-remission story. The source remains full-text claim-lock pending in this package.

Evidence also does not collapse preference into efficacy. Someone troubled primarily by insomnia and appetite loss may value a different profile from someone for whom daytime sedation or weight gain threatens function. Sexual effects, activation, seizure vulnerability, renal or thyroid monitoring, and prior experience can reorder options without changing the average trial result. Shared reasoning is therefore part of effectiveness, not an optional courtesy added afterward.

The Flow Hijacked synthesis represents augmentation as movement in a higher-dimensional control space. A new component may lower one barrier while raising another, alter the energy required for psychotherapy or ordinary routines, or make future switching harder. This is a conceptual model, not proof that a particular combination will work. Its disciplined use is to demand explicit dimensions: what changed, on which clock, at what cost, for which person, and relative to which alternative?

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

An option's distinct mechanism does not prove superior clinical benefit, and STAR*D's familiar cumulative narrative is constrained by attrition, changing denominators, flexible pathways, and naturalistic follow-up.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The relevant outcome may be the ability to wake, think, eat, work, connect, or feel—so a treatment sequence should preserve the person's valued dimensions rather than optimize remission alone.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Augmentation changes the dimensionality and history of the system; its value is a vector over symptom, function, burden, reversibility, and future options.

TRANSITION

Multiple successful routes sharpen the unresolved question: what bridges immediate molecular action to delayed therapeutic change?

PART 06 · 6.5 · THE LATENCY GAP IS MECHANISTIC EVIDENCE

6.5 · Immediate target, delayed response

CORE SENTENCE

The latency gap rules out a one-step account: transporter or enzyme action is proximal, while therapeutic change likely emerges through interacting adaptations whose necessity, sufficiency, and ordering in humans remain unresolved.

SERT inhibition or MAO inhibition can begin before a person experiences sustained antidepressant benefit. That mismatch is not an inconvenience to hide; it is evidence that the proximal target action is not the whole therapeutic mechanism. Any adequate account must explain how a rapid biochemical perturbation is transformed, sometimes and not always, into slower changes in emotion, attention, learning, sleep, motivation, and behavior.

The acquired corpus directly supports three narrower candidates at different levels. Casarotto and colleagues report cellular, structural-modeling, and animal experiments and interpret direct antidepressant binding to TRKB as facilitating BDNF signaling. A separate rodent affective-bias assay reports acute treatment-associated shifts in learned preference and proposes, without demonstrating, a human cognitive bridge. A review of antidepressant effects on sleep describes drug-, dose-, timing-, and duration-dependent changes, including both disruption and rapid sedation. None alone supplies a human causal chain from target engagement to recovery.

These records are not equivalent evidence. TRKB binding is a mechanistic interpretation built from preclinical experiments; the affective-bias result is an animal assay; and the sleep paper synthesizes heterogeneous clinical effects without testing sleep as the mediator of antidepressant benefit. A result may be robust within its own assay yet fail to establish necessity, sufficiency, or clinical mediation. Scale, timing, exposure, and alternative pathways remain decisive.

The strongest conclusion is therefore plural and bounded. Antidepressants initiate perturbations that can propagate through molecular, cellular, network, bodily, experiential, and environmental levels. The exact path may differ by drug, person, episode, and context. Delayed response supports the existence of adaptation; it does not identify one universal adaptation. Failure to respond can reflect lack of useful downstream propagation, inadequate exposure, an ill-matched endpoint, or processes not reached by that perturbation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A fast proximal perturbation, $u(t)$, may act through slower variables $z(t)$ —plasticity, learned bias, sleep and circadian state, and environmental feedback—so clinical output $y(t)$ can lag target engagement without implying one privileged or established bridge.

AUTHORS' INTERPRETATION · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The cited local records support a preclinical TRKB interpretation, an acute rodent affective-bias result, a review of heterogeneous sleep effects, and a general fast-slow modeling frame. They do not directly anchor autoreceptor or inflammatory mediation in this section, so those candidates are not asserted. No cited record establishes one necessary and sufficient human causal chain.

PART 06 · 6.5 · FROM MECHANISM LIST TO COMPETING CAUSAL MODELS

6.5 · Immediate target, delayed response

A candidate list becomes useful only when it generates discriminating predictions. If the TRKB route is central in humans, target engagement should precede and mediate benefit. If the rodent affective-bias result identifies a clinical bridge, a human analogue should predict later improvement beyond baseline severity and nonspecific expectancy. If sleep change is causal rather than parallel, tests must distinguish mediation from sedation, adverse disruption, or symptom consequence. Each proposal needs a scale-appropriate test.

The alternatives may also cooperate rather than compete. A medication-induced change in salience or affective learning may matter only when the environment supplies experiences from which a different model can be learned. Improved sleep could lower stress reactivity and make social engagement possible; social engagement could then alter prediction, behavior, and future sleep. Such loops make a clean molecular endpoint difficult, but they are not permission to call every downstream event a drug mechanism.

Counterevidence comes from heterogeneity and nonresponse. The TRKB record is an authors' mechanistic interpretation, not established mediation of ordinary human antidepressant response. The affective-bias result was obtained in rats and cannot be promoted to a demonstrated human pathway. The sleep review documents that some agents disrupt sleep while others sedate rapidly; it does not show that either pattern causes later recovery. A pathway observed in one assay, species, drug, or responder subgroup may not generalize.

Flow Hijacked treats the latency gap as a fast-slow systems problem. Fast exposure variables can displace a system while slow plastic, bodily, learned, and relational variables reshape the landscape through which it moves. This synthesis is testable but not yet clinically validated. Its value is explanatory discipline: a medication can open or stabilize a transition without carrying the whole transition, and psychotherapy, sleep, safety, and relationship are not "placebo noise" simply because a molecule began the perturbation.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

No candidate bridge is established as necessary and sufficient across drugs and people; the cited anchors are preclinical, rodent-task-specific, review-level, or authors' mechanistic interpretation rather than proof of human mediation.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Delayed benefit does not mean early adverse experience is irrelevant, and early relief does not guarantee durable recovery; both trajectories deserve observation and language.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Medication may alter transition probability or control energy while slower learning, sleep, plasticity, and relationship determine whether a new trajectory consolidates.

TRANSITION

Mechanistic uncertainty does not erase the outcome question; the next section asks what the largest acute evidence synthesis actually establishes.

PART 06 · 6.6 · WHAT 522 ACUTE TRIALS CAN SUPPORT

6.6 · Average acute efficacy is real

CORE SENTENCE

The best-supported claim is neither ‘antidepressants do not work’ nor ‘the ranking chooses the right drug’: included agents improved short-term response averages relative to placebo, within a trial system that cannot answer long-term function or individual prediction.

The 2018 network meta-analysis assembled 522 double-blind randomized trials with 116,477 adults diagnosed with major depressive disorder. It compared 21 antidepressants in short-term treatment, using response and all-cause discontinuation as the primary efficacy and acceptability outcomes. Across the network, every included antidepressant was more efficacious than placebo on average. This is the empirical result that the lecture should state plainly.

The magnitude and certainty require equal clarity. Placebo comparisons produced odds ratios for response ranging from 2.13 for amitriptyline to 1.37 for reboxetine, while credible intervals and comparative estimates varied. Only 18% of trials were rated low risk of bias; 73% were moderate and 9% high, and evidence certainty ranged from moderate to very low. Network ranking therefore has much less stability than the broad average efficacy conclusion.

The population boundary matters. Trials focused on adults in acute unipolar major depression and excluded or restricted important groups, including treatment-resistant depression, bipolar disorder, psychotic depression, and serious concomitant illness. The typical assessment horizon was approximately eight weeks. These estimates cannot simply be transferred to adolescents, pregnancy, bipolar depression, highly comorbid populations, long-term maintenance, or a particular person sitting in a clinic.

The outcome boundary matters just as much. A response on a symptom scale is not identical to remission, restored function, quality of life, cognitive recovery, relationship repair, or durable protection from recurrence. All-cause discontinuation is useful but combines inefficacy, harms, preference, logistics, and other reasons. The network supports average acute symptom efficacy and comparative acceptability estimates; it did not establish long-term functional benefit or an individualized winner.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Network meta-analysis estimates distributions of trial-level outcomes across direct and indirect comparisons; it does not identify the biological mediator of response or map a group-average odds ratio onto one individual trajectory.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Full-text claim lock supports average acute efficacy in the included adult MDD trials. Confidence is lower for comparative ranks and individual prediction; long-term function, specific harms, withdrawal, sexuality, and emotional blunting were not resolved.

PART 06 · 6.6 · AN AVERAGE EFFECT IS A DISTRIBUTION, NOT A PROMISE

6.6 · Average acute efficacy is real

A positive average can coexist with large individual heterogeneity. Some participants improve substantially, some modestly, some not at all, and some stop because of burden. Trial-level response categories also compress continuous change and can make people near a threshold look categorically different. The result tells us that treatment assignment shifted an outcome distribution; it does not tell us beforehand where one person will fall within it.

Head-to-head differences were generally smaller and less certain than the shared comparison with placebo. The analysis reported variation in efficacy and acceptability, but wide credible intervals affected many comparisons. Rank order is especially vulnerable to sparse links, indirect comparisons, dose choices, trial populations, and bias. A league table may look more precise than the evidence that generated it.

Counterevidence belongs beside efficacy rather than in a later disclaimer. The network inherited many industry-sponsored trials, short follow-up, selected populations, and trial-level missingness; it did not comprehensively resolve specific adverse events. None of those limitations justifies replacing the empirical result with “no effect.” They define the result’s coordinates: acute, average, adult, trial-based, symptom-centered, and uncertain at the individual level.

For people taking medication and their families, this framing is neither cynical nor promotional. It permits hope without guarantee and disappointment without blame. For clinicians, it requires measurement across symptom and life dimensions rather than assuming response from class membership. The Flow Hijacked synthesis treats the average as an ensemble shift across possible trajectories. That is a conceptual translation of the trial result, not proof of a dynamical biomarker or a method for selecting a drug.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Short, selected, often sponsored trials and moderate-to-very-low certainty for many comparisons limit rank stability and transportability; these constraints narrow rather than negate the acute average efficacy finding.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A nonresponse is not personal failure, and an average benefit does not require tolerating an unacceptable burden; symptom change and the life made possible by it are related but distinct outcomes.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Acute efficacy shifts a population distribution of trajectories; it does not collapse that distribution into an individual forecast or a single-valued notion of recovery.

TRANSITION

The next question is how trial design, publication, severity, attrition, and sequencing shape the distribution we think we see.

PART 06 · 6.7 · THE LITERATURE IS AN INSTRUMENT WITH ITS OWN TRANSFER FUNCTION

6.7 · The evidence system alters the picture

CORE SENTENCE

Observed drug effects are produced inside an evidence-generating system; selection, comparator response, reporting, attrition, endpoint construction, and sequencing can change the apparent magnitude without making either benefit or bias imaginary.

A trial does not reveal a context-free drug effect. It samples selected participants, creates a comparator condition, defines an endpoint, handles missing observations, and chooses a time horizon. A literature then adds another layer by deciding which trials and outcomes become visible. The resulting estimate is informative only when those transformations remain part of its interpretation.

The FDA-registry comparison by Turner and colleagues illustrates selective visibility. At abstract level in this package, 74 FDA-registered studies of 12 antidepressants were compared with their journal record. Thirty-one percent were unpublished; the published literature appeared 94% positive, whereas the FDA analysis classified 51% as positive. Effect size was reported as 32% larger overall in the journal record. Full-text claim locking remains pending, so these figures are retained as an abstract-level result rather than upgraded.

Baseline severity can change drug-placebo separation through the comparator, not only through greater drug responsiveness. In the full-text-appraised FDA-data meta-analysis, separation increased with baseline severity mainly because placebo response declined at higher severity. Study-level severity, a limited historical set of drugs, short trials, rating-scale interpretation, and last-observation-carried-forward analysis prevent this from defining one universal threshold below which medication cannot help.

Sequencing adds history. The STAR*D abstract reported lower remission rates at later steps—36.8%, 30.6%, 13.7%, and 13.0%—and greater relapse among those needing more steps. But open treatment, changing denominators, flexible pathways, attrition, and naturalistic follow-up complicate the 67% cumulative-remission headline. The evidence system can therefore amplify, attenuate, or redirect the picture while leaving the underlying suffering and possible benefit entirely real.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The observed estimate is a transformed signal: underlying response × population selection × comparator dynamics × endpoint and missing-data rules × publication visibility. Each factor can change apparent magnitude without constituting the drug's molecular action.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The severity finding is full-text locked and explicitly does not establish a universal threshold. Publication-bias and STAR*D numerical summaries remain abstract-level in this checkpoint and must retain their design and attrition limitations.

PART 06 · 6.7 · BIAS CORRECTION IS NOT BENEFIT ERASURE

6.7 · The evidence system alters the picture

Recognizing bias can itself become distorted if it is used to declare every positive result false. Registry evidence shows that visibility and framing matter; it does not demonstrate that all antidepressant effects are publication artifacts. Conversely, citing a large network meta-analysis cannot make selective reporting irrelevant. Responsible synthesis carries both the acute average efficacy result and the machinery that may alter its apparent size.

Placebo response also requires care. It is not a single inert psychological substance. Trial contact, expectation, spontaneous change, regression to the mean, concurrent care, measurement behavior, and natural episode dynamics all contribute to the comparator trajectory. A smaller drug-placebo difference at lower baseline severity can therefore arise from stronger comparator improvement, not necessarily from zero pharmacological response.

Attrition is an outcome and a missing-data process at once. A participant may leave because benefit is absent, adverse effects are unacceptable, life logistics intervene, or the study no longer fits. Later observations then disappear selectively. Statistical methods can reduce some bias but cannot recover every unobserved trajectory. In sequential care, those who reach later steps are also a selected, treatment-experienced group rather than a replay of step one.

Flow Hijacked extends this into a reflexive-systems synthesis. Evidence changes prescribing, expectation, adherence, and policy; those changes alter the populations and trajectories later measured. The model is conceptual, but its practical discipline is concrete: state the population, comparator, endpoint, clock, missingness, and visibility process before interpreting a number. For people seeking help, the humane consequence is that neither a glowing headline nor a skeptical correction should overrule careful observation of benefit, burden, and changing risk.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Publication bias does not reduce all efficacy to artifact, while a large synthesis does not neutralize selection, sponsorship, endpoint, and missing-data problems; severity moderation is not a universal prescribing threshold.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Evidence architecture should make a person less blameworthy, not less visible: trial averages cannot tell whether their nonresponse, burden, or improvement is real, and careful clinical observation remains essential.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The evidence system is part of the environment that later shapes exposure, expectation, adherence, and measured trajectories; it must be modeled without confusing epistemic bias with molecular mechanism.

TRANSITION

With efficacy and evidence bias held together, the final section separates treatment action from disease cause and restores patient-valued harms to the same frame.

PART 06 · 6.8 · FIVE CLAIMS THAT MUST NOT BE COLLAPSED

6.8 · Efficacy is not a serotonin diagnosis

CORE SENTENCE

Treatment efficacy, proximal target action, therapeutic mediation, biomarker association, and disease etiology are five different claims; rejecting a generalized serotonin-deficiency story neither erases serotonin biology nor adjudicates the full benefit-harm trajectory.

An SSRI inhibits the serotonin transporter. That is a proximal pharmacological claim. If randomized trials show greater average response than placebo, that is an efficacy claim. Whether SERT inhibition produces benefit through autoreceptors, plasticity, learning, or another path is a mediation claim. Whether a serotonergic measure differs in depression is a biomarker claim. Whether lowered serotonin causes depression is an etiological claim. Evidence for one does not automatically prove the others.

The full-text-appraised umbrella review by Moncrieff and colleagues examined several evidence streams, including serotonin and 5-HIAA concentrations, receptor and transporter binding, tryptophan depletion, genetic association, and gene-environment claims. It found inconsistent or weak support for a simple generalized serotonin-deficiency account. The responsible locked claim is narrow: the review challenges that deficiency model; it does not test every serotonin mechanism and does not show that serotonergic antidepressants are ineffective.

Counterevidence runs in both directions. Acute adult trials support average efficacy for included antidepressants, including serotonergic agents, so etiological criticism cannot be used as reverse proof of inefficacy. At the same time, efficacy cannot be used as reverse proof that depression was caused by too little serotonin. Aspirin's effects do not diagnose an aspirin deficiency; the analogy is imperfect, but its logical point is exact.

Depression is heterogeneous in symptoms, course, bodily state, context, and treatment response. Serotonin participates in broad neural and bodily regulation, but participation is not a scalar explanation. A scientifically honest account can retain transporter pharmacology, average treatment benefit, uncertain downstream mediation, weak generalized-deficiency evidence, and substantial person-to-person variation without forcing them into one slogan.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Logical separation is the mechanism of inference: target engagement → possible mediating adaptations → clinical outcome is a forward causal question; inferring a universal disease deficiency backward from drug benefit is invalid without independent etiological evidence.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The umbrella review is full-text locked for inconsistent or weak evidence against a simple generalized deficiency account. Its question was etiology, not antidepressant efficacy, every serotonergic mechanism, or individual diagnosis.

PART 06 · 6.8 · BENEFIT AND BURDEN BELONG IN THE SAME OUTCOME VECTOR

6.8 · Efficacy is not a serotonin diagnosis

Rejecting a chemical-deficiency slogan also requires rejecting symptom-only triumphalism. A treatment can improve a depression scale while altering sexuality, emotional range, sleep, appetite, energy, cognition, or agency. These are not distractions from effectiveness. They are outcomes through which a person decides whether the changed state is preferable and sustainable.

The emotional-blunting survey in the acquired corpus reported blunting in 46% of treated respondents, but its cross-sectional, self-selected design cannot cleanly separate medication effect from residual depression. Scores correlated with residual depressive symptoms, and respondents differed in whether they valued or disliked the experience. The result establishes a commonly reported phenomenon and uncertainty about attribution—not a universal drug rate or a causal estimate for a specific agent.

Safety signals also require bounded precision. Across 372 FDA-submitted adult antidepressant trials with 99,231 participants, suicidality odds declined with age. For adults younger than 25, the composite estimate was imprecise, OR 1.62 (95% CI 0.97–2.71), while suicidal behavior was elevated, OR 2.30 (1.04–5.09). Rare events, short trials, coding, and exclusion of high-risk people limit individual prediction, but the signal belongs beside benefit and warrants prompt clinical attention when concerning changes emerge.

Flow Hijacked synthesizes treatment value as a time-varying utility surface across symptoms, function, cognition, sleep, sexuality, metabolic health, relationships, agency, and risk. This is a normative, testable proposal—not a validated score. It prevents a mechanistic debate from eclipsing lived consequences. The part therefore closes with a directional insight: when immediate exposure has recruited slower adaptations, reducing or stopping the input is a new perturbation. It cannot be understood as merely returning the dose to zero.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Emotional blunting cannot be cleanly attributed to medication in cross-sectional data, and rare-event suicidality estimates do not predict an individual; neither limitation permits excluding these patient-valued and safety outcomes.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person may reasonably value symptom relief and still report sexual, emotional, sleep, appetite, or activation costs; those reports deserve investigation without automatically assigning one cause.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Treatment value is a time-varying vector, not a serotonin verdict or symptom scalar; history makes discontinuation an active perturbation of the adapted system.

TRANSITION

Part 7 follows the adapted system through withdrawal, recurrence, taper geometry, and the direction of travel.

PART 06 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Therapeutic efficacy is compatible with mechanistic pluralism and does not validate a generalized chemical-deficiency etiology.

Antidepressants have real average short-term efficacy, but their history, pharmacokinetics, delayed effects, adverse experiences, evidence biases, and heterogeneous outcomes defeat a one-transmitter explanation. The defensible unit is a time-dependent benefit-burden trajectory, not a molecule ranked by one endpoint.

Once immediate target action is separated from slow adaptation, discontinuation becomes an active perturbation with its own exposure geometry; Part 7 follows that direction of travel.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

6.1 · Two discovery routes — Iproniazid arose in tuberculosis treatment; imipramine emerged from a failed antipsychotic search. Clinical effects preceded transmitter theory.

6.2 · MAOIs and TCAs reveal trade space — Enzyme recovery, food/drug interactions, autonomic and cardiac effects, active metabolites, TDM, and overdose lethality shaped successor demand.

6.3 · SSRIs and SNRIs are PK-diverse — Half-lives, CYP inhibition, active metabolites, dose-dependent NET engagement, and missed-dose sensitivity vary across apparently similar drugs.

6.4 · Alternatives and augmentation remain heterogeneous — Bupropion, mirtazapine, vortioxetine, lithium, antipsychotics, and thyroid strategies add distinct mechanisms and burdens.

6.5 · Immediate target, delayed response — Autoreceptors, affective bias, plasticity, stress, inflammation, sleep, and network change are candidate bridges—not one established causal chain.

6.6 · Average acute efficacy is real — Across 522 trials/116,477 adults, 21 antidepressants beat placebo on average; the network did not establish long-term functional benefit.

6.7 · The evidence system alters the picture — Severity, placebo response, publication bias, attrition, and STAR*D sequencing change what a trial or literature can support.

6.8 · Efficacy is not a serotonin diagnosis — Weak evidence for a generalized deficiency neither tests every serotonin mechanism nor makes serotonergic drugs ineffective; harms remain patient-valued outcomes.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Why does immediate transporter or enzyme action yield delayed, partial, and heterogeneous benefit?

PART 07

Withdrawal, recurrence, and the direction of travel

Why can the same concentration mean something different while rising and falling?

Plasma elimination, target occupancy, adaptation, withdrawal, relapse protection, and lived recovery operate on different clocks. Medication change is therefore a trajectory through a history-dependent system, not a movement along one concentration axis.

Part route

- 1. One prescription, many clocks**
- 2. Delay creates hysteresis**
- 3. Small dose steps are not equal steps**
- 4. Withdrawal has multiple domains**
- 5. Recurrence and withdrawal can coexist**
- 6. ANTLER holds both truths**
- 7. Hyperbolic tapering is an interpretation**
- 8. The needed trial measures direction**

PART 07 · 7.1 · FROM SWALLOWED DOSE TO NESTED TIME CONSTANTS

7.1 · One prescription, many clocks

CORE SENTENCE

A nominal dose initiates several coupled trajectories whose peaks, delays, and tails need not coincide.

A prescription states an amount and schedule, but biology receives an input function. Dissolution, absorption, first-pass metabolism, distribution, protein binding, and clearance shape plasma concentration $C_p(t)$. Formulation, missed doses, food, smoking, organ function, and interacting medicines can alter that curve. Active metabolites may add a second curve with a different delay and tail. Even before asking what the medicine does, therefore, the same written prescription can generate materially different exposures across people and across days.

The target does not necessarily follow plasma instantaneously. A minimal effect-compartment model, $dC_e/dt = k_{e0}(C_p - C_e)$, represents equilibration between plasma and a hypothetical effect site. Receptor occupancy may then be a nonlinear function of C_e rather than a mirror of dose. Downstream variables—gene expression, receptor regulation, synaptic gain, endocrine state, sleep, and learned expectations—turn over on still other time scales. This is why peak sedation, therapeutic change, metabolic burden, and discontinuation phenomena can appear in different temporal orders.

The empirical pieces are secure only at their own levels: pharmacokinetic compartments and effect-site delay are established modeling families; particular half-lives and metabolites are drug- and formulation-specific; target engagement can sometimes be measured; psychiatric adaptation is only partly observed. The broader conclusion is an inference across those pieces. A single plasma number cannot, by itself, specify the state of the person, because hidden slow variables retain information about prior exposure, illness course, stress, and environment. The clinically relevant object is the coupled trajectory, not the tablet in isolation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Nested PK, effect-site, occupancy, and adaptation dynamics: $\text{Input}(t) \rightarrow C_p(t) \rightarrow C_e(t) \rightarrow \text{occupancy} \rightarrow \text{fast and slow state variables}$.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The multiple-clock conclusion is INF-003. Its component model families are established, but the complete clock structure is not measured for every psychiatric drug, outcome, or person.

PART 07 · 7.1 · CLEARANCE IS NOT A BIOLOGICAL RESET

7.1 · One prescription, many clocks

When plasma concentration falls, one layer of the system is changing; the entire system is not returning to baseline in synchrony. A transporter or receptor can lose ligand while intracellular signaling, receptor abundance, sleep disruption, autonomic arousal, and social consequences continue. Conversely, a long terminal tail or active metabolite may preserve target engagement after the person believes the drug has ‘left the body.’ The mismatch is not evidence that every symptom is withdrawal. It is evidence that timing must be measured before causation is assigned.

For a person taking medication, these distinctions are lived rather than abstract. Dizziness may appear before sadness; sleep may fragment before function changes; fear of recurrence may amplify vigilance; family responses can alter the environment just as the nervous system is becoming less stable. A clinician sees observations at appointments, whereas the transition unfolds continuously. Caregivers may notice tempo, motor activity, or routine before a rating scale changes. Each observer samples a different projection of the same evolving state.

Flow Hijacked therefore treats exposure history as a state variable. That is a synthesis, not a validated bedside algorithm. It predicts that trajectories with identical concentrations can diverge if their prior duration, rate of change, stress, sleep, and learned meanings differ. Competing explanations include measurement lag, spontaneous illness fluctuation, expectancy, and ordinary disease progression. The practical educational lesson is modest: do not infer recovery, relapse, or withdrawal from concentration alone, and do not turn a population model into individualized medication instructions.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Apparent clock separation may arise from sparse sampling, inaccurate adherence histories, model misspecification, expectancy, or illness fluctuation; not every delayed event is pharmacological adaptation.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The person may be told that a drug is ‘gone’ while effects continue, or that any worsening is ‘the illness.’ A multiple-clock account makes room for uncertainty without dismissing either experience or recurrence risk.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The medication-person system carries memory across nested time scales; current concentration is an incomplete coordinate of its state.

TRANSITION

The next section asks how a measurable delay can produce a loop between concentration and effect.

PART 07 · 7.2 · WHY ONSET AND OFFSET FOLLOW DIFFERENT PATHS

7.2 · Delay creates hysteresis

CORE SENTENCE

A loop in the concentration-effect plane may encode distribution delay, turnover, adaptation, or confounding; its shape demands interpretation.

Plot an observed effect against plasma concentration during a dose interval. If effect-site equilibration is delayed, the points need not fall on one static curve. During rising exposure, plasma can lead the effect site; during falling exposure, effect-site concentration can remain higher than the contemporaneous plasma value. The trajectory forms a loop. In pharmacology this concentration-effect hysteresis can be represented by $dC_e/dt = k_{e0}(C_p - C_e)$, where k_{e0} controls how rapidly the hypothetical biophase catches up.

A different delay arises when the drug changes production or loss of another variable. An indirect-response form, $dR/dt = k_{in}[1+S(C_e)] - k_{out}[1+I(C_e)]R$, lets a biomarker or physiological response evolve by turnover rather than jump with concentration. Endocrine, metabolic, transcriptional, and synaptic variables may behave this way. Adaptation can add still slower parameters, so the loop observed after days or months may not have the same cause as the loop observed over hours.

These equations are established model families, not proof of a particular psychiatric mechanism. A fitted effect compartment can describe delay while remaining agnostic about whether the hidden site is receptor, circuit, body, or measurement process. A turnover model can mimic rebound without identifying its biology. Dense, synchronized measurements of dose, plasma, metabolites, occupancy, symptoms, sleep, and bodily variables are needed to distinguish alternatives. Mathematics organizes causal possibilities; it does not confer biological certainty on an unmeasured state.

Parameter estimates must come from time-resolved data. Selecting an attractive equation before observing the trajectories can force evidence into the model and make an assumed delay appear discovered.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Effect-site equilibration and indirect turnover generate lagged onset and offset; added slow adaptation can create genuine history dependence beyond simple distribution delay.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The equations are established descriptive and inferential tools. Their psychiatric state variables and parameters must be estimated per drug and outcome; the existence of a loop does not identify its cause.

PART 07 · 7.2 · A LOOP IS EVIDENCE OF MEMORY, NOT ITS EXPLANATION

7.2 · Delay creates hysteresis

In the strict dynamical sense, hysteresis means that output depends on history, not only on the current input. A simple effect-compartment loop can disappear once effect-site concentration is used; true adaptive hysteresis may remain because receptor regulation, plasticity, endocrine state, or learning has changed the system itself. Flow Hijacked reserves this stronger interpretation for cases where matched current exposure produces different responses after different exposure histories and simpler lag models have been challenged.

Psychiatric data rarely meet that standard. Doses are not perturbed symmetrically, plasma sampling is sparse, adherence is incompletely observed, and symptoms are influenced by expectation, stress, sleep, relationships, and illness course. A loop can therefore be generated by delay, hidden covariates, measurement schedules, or changing baselines. Calling every onset-offset asymmetry ‘hysteresis’ would turn a useful concept into decoration. The appropriate claim is conditional: history dependence is plausible, mechanistically grounded, and directly testable, but not automatically demonstrated.

For lived care, the distinction still matters. If a response lags concentration, a rapid interpretation may mistake ‘not yet’ for ‘not working,’ or mistake a transient offset phenomenon for the final trajectory. Yet delay cannot justify waiting through danger or dismissing severe symptoms. Educationally, the model asks better questions: Which variable is delayed? What time constant is plausible? Does the path differ after matched exposure? What observation would falsify the proposed memory? Those questions prepare the next problem—nonlinear occupancy, where equal milligram changes do not imply equal target perturbations.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

A loop can vanish after accounting for effect-site delay or changing baseline. Sparse observations, adherence error, and symptom autocorrelation can imitate history dependence.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Timing errors can invalidate a person’s report in either direction. The model legitimizes careful observation while refusing to label delayed change automatically as withdrawal, relapse, or therapeutic response.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Hysteresis is a falsifiable claim about retained history. It should be inferred only after simpler delay and measurement explanations are confronted.

TRANSITION

Once effect is nonlinear in concentration, the geometry of dose change becomes as important as its nominal size.

PART 07 · 7.3 · THE GEOMETRY BETWEEN MILLIGRAMS AND RECEPTORS

7.3 · Small dose steps are not equal steps

CORE SENTENCE

Dose, concentration, occupancy, and clinical effect are four distinct axes; linear movement on one does not guarantee linear movement on another.

Many target relationships are saturating rather than linear. A Hill form, $\text{Occ}(C) = C^h / (K_d^h + C^h)$, approaches a ceiling as concentration rises. Near that ceiling, an additional milligram may change occupancy little; lower on the curve, the same milligram difference can represent a much larger proportional perturbation. The exact geometry depends on affinity, free concentration, active metabolites, target, and the Hill slope. It cannot be read directly from the tablet strength.

Occupancy is also not outcome. Benefit and adverse effects may each have different nonlinear relations to target engagement, and a drug usually engages several targets. In a small haloperidol PET study in first-episode schizophrenia, modeled probabilities of response, prolactin elevation, and extrapyramidal effects rose across partly overlapping D2-occupancy ranges. That result supports a probabilistic window for that drug and population, not universal thresholds. For antidepressants, transporter-occupancy curves motivate taper hypotheses, but they do not provide a complete map from dose to withdrawal.

A person can therefore experience a late nominal reduction as disproportionately large without this being inevitable or uniform. Conversely, a large percentage reduction in milligrams does not prove a large clinical perturbation. Formulation, half-life, dosing interval, metabolism, previous duration, and slow adaptation change the mapping. The established result is the nonlinear pharmacological form. Applying it to a particular discontinuation schedule is an outcome-specific inference that requires direct clinical testing.

A derivative-aware hypothesis goes one step further: the rate and curvature of changing occupancy may sometimes predict destabilization better than the level alone. That idea is explicitly unproven and would require dense within-person exposure and symptom data.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Saturating Hill/ E_{max} relations transform dose and concentration nonlinearly into occupancy; separate outcome curves and slow adaptation transform occupancy into benefit, harm, or withdrawal.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Nonlinear occupancy is established pharmacology. Drug-specific clinical consequences, especially during low-dose reductions, are not determined by the equation alone.

PART 07 · 7.3 · A MECHANISTIC RATIONALE IS NOT A UNIVERSAL SCHEDULE

7.3 · Small dose steps are not equal steps

Horowitz and Taylor used nonlinear serotonin-transporter occupancy to argue that progressively smaller reductions near the end of SSRI tapering may approximate more even changes in target engagement. The full-text-appraised paper is explicitly a mechanistic clinical proposal, not a randomized comparison of taper schedules. Its conceptual contribution is important: equal milligram steps can conceal unequal biological steps. Its evidential category must remain authors' interpretation rather than established protocol efficacy.

Several bridges remain unproven. Occupancy curves may be derived from limited populations and may not represent every brain region, formulation, metabolite, or individual. Withdrawal could depend on the rate of change, dosing interval, peak-trough oscillation, receptor adaptation, non-serotonergic targets, and psychosocial state, not only the occupancy difference between two nominal doses. A curve fitted to average occupancy also cannot specify which symptoms matter, when they emerge, or how long stabilization requires.

For people considering medication changes, this section supplies explanatory language, not instructions. It explains why a late reduction might feel unexpectedly large and why a dismissive 'the dose is tiny' can be misleading. It does not establish that every person requires one geometry, that slower is always safer in every circumstance, or that urgent clinical risks should be subordinated to a model. Shared decisions need drug-specific formulation and half-life information, the person's history and priorities, and observation over time.

This distinction also protects against reverse certainty. A nonlinear curve does not prove that every new symptom was caused by the last reduction. It only removes milligram size as a sufficient argument for dismissing that possibility.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

No comparative clinical RCT in the cited proposal validates a universal hyperbolic taper. Occupancy is an intermediate variable, and formulation, half-life, adaptation, and clinical state can dominate outcomes.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The framework can validate a disproportionate late-step experience without promising that one mathematical taper will fit everyone.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

The derivative of exposure may matter alongside its level, but derivative-aware prediction is a new hypothesis requiring prospective within-person data.

TRANSITION

Nonlinear geometry helps explain why withdrawal cannot be reduced to one symptom, one percentage, or one duration.

PART 07 · 7.4 · RECOGNIZING A SYNDROME WITHOUT FLATTENING IT

7.4 · Withdrawal has multiple domains

CORE SENTENCE

Withdrawal is a multidomain temporal phenotype, not a single feeling and not a fixed percentage of users.

Discontinuation can be expressed across several domains. Reports and trials describe affective changes such as anxiety, irritability, low mood, or emotional volatility; sensory phenomena such as electric-shock-like sensations or altered perception; autonomic and gastrointestinal symptoms; disequilibrium, dizziness, sleep disruption, flu-like feelings, motor restlessness, and other physical experiences. Not every medicine produces the same pattern, and not every symptom belongs to withdrawal. The phenotype must be tied to drug, timing, prior exposure, and competing causes.

Heterogeneity is the central empirical fact. A 24-study review reported a weighted incidence near 56%, but its sampling frames, definitions, ascertainment, and designs varied substantially. The evidence ledger therefore rates the pooled percentage low to moderate while treating the existence of antidepressant withdrawal as secure. A randomized SSRI interruption study and later pragmatic evidence support a real syndrome, yet neither creates a universal frequency, severity, or duration for all drugs and all people.

Duration is equally vulnerable to oversimplification. Short-lived symptoms are common in some settings; prolonged courses are reported and may be consequential; reliable prediction remains limited. Long half-life can delay onset, while short half-life and steep exposure changes may concentrate it, but pharmacokinetics is not the whole explanation. The responsible claim preserves both realities: withdrawal can be significant and sometimes prolonged, and current acquisition does not support a single number that defines its probability or course.

Domain-specific trajectories may also diverge: sensory symptoms can recede while sleep or affect remains unstable. A single total score can therefore make the syndrome appear resolved or persistent depending on how its components are weighted.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Rapid removal of a chronic perturbation interacts with drug-specific kinetics and slower neural, bodily, and learned adaptations, producing heterogeneous symptom clusters.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High confidence that withdrawal exists; low-to-moderate confidence in a pooled 56% estimate. Universal incidence, severity, and duration are not claim-locked.

PART 07 · 7.4 · MEASUREMENT DETERMINES WHAT BECOMES VISIBLE

7.4 · Withdrawal has multiple domains

A study finds only what it asks, when it asks, and whom it retains. Spontaneous adverse-event reporting misses symptoms that participants do not recognize or investigators do not solicit. A checklist can increase detection but also amplify attribution and nocebo. Sampling only at wide intervals can miss rapid peaks. Recruiting from withdrawal-focused communities can enrich severe experience; excluding people unable to tolerate tapering can erase it. These are design effects, not reasons to declare the phenomenon unreal.

Differentiation improves when several signals converge: onset in relation to dose change, simultaneous physical and affective symptoms, fluctuation with reduction and stabilization intervals, known kinetic vulnerability, and a trajectory distinguishable from the person's earlier episodes. None is perfectly specific. The small 2026 prospective cohort found symptoms rising after reductions and easing during stabilization, but with only 32 participants, no randomized control, overlapping measures, and time-varying confounding, it supports a temporal pattern rather than causal proof.

The lived cost of poor measurement is asymmetric. Dismissing withdrawal can produce shame, frightened escalation, or misclassification; declaring every deterioration withdrawal can delay recognition of recurrence or another medical problem. A humane account names uncertainty early and tracks multiple domains, function, sleep, safety, and time course. It also recognizes that some symptoms can demand urgent assessment regardless of label. This prepares the next section: withdrawal and recurrence are not mutually exclusive categories and may unfold together.

Repeated within-person description is often more informative than asking whether one isolated rating exceeds a threshold. The sequence, co-occurrence, and recovery pattern can preserve information that a cross-sectional label discards.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Incidence estimates are distorted by selected samples, definitions, solicitation, nocebo, and relapse overlap. A temporal association after reduction is informative but not causally decisive.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Naming sensory, autonomic, sleep, motor, and physical domains can make a person's experience legible while keeping recurrence and medical causes in view.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Withdrawal is best represented as a multidimensional trajectory whose detectability depends on sampling and whose causal composition may change over time.

TRANSITION

The next section replaces the withdrawal-versus-relapse binary with a causal mixture that can change through time.

PART 07 · 7.5 · BEYOND THE FALSE BINARY

7.5 · Recurrence and withdrawal can coexist

CORE SENTENCE

A post-discontinuation event can be a time-varying causal mixture, and binary labels often exceed what the design can identify.

Recurrence means return of the treated syndrome after improvement; withdrawal refers to effects associated with reducing or stopping a drug to which the system has adapted. These definitions can overlap in one person. Sleep disruption, autonomic arousal, or affective volatility caused partly by withdrawal may increase vulnerability to a depressive or psychotic episode. An emerging episode may, in turn, intensify the interpretation and burden of physical symptoms. Causal composition can change from day to day.

Many maintenance studies use randomized withdrawal: people who tolerated or responded to treatment continue it or switch toward placebo. Such designs estimate a strategy contrast in an enriched population. They do not automatically identify why every event occurred after switching. Abrupt or short tapers, functional unblinding, prior duration, selective entry, and relapse definitions can concentrate early events. At the same time, those limitations do not erase the average relapse protection observed with maintenance in studied populations.

The evidence-based position therefore holds two truths. Recurrence is real and maintenance can reduce its average probability. Withdrawal is real and can contribute symptoms or destabilization after dose change. The proportion attributable to each process is often unresolved because long washouts, dense phenotyping, exposure measurement, and adjudication are rare. Calling all events relapse overstates suppression of an unchanged disease; calling all events withdrawal overstates what timing alone can prove.

A third process—contextual perturbation—may contribute simultaneously. Fear, disrupted care, conflict, or relief after stopping can change symptoms and behavior, creating feedback that neither a relapse scale nor a withdrawal checklist fully captures.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Withdrawal-related perturbations and illness-generating dynamics can interact bidirectionally, so the latent causes of an observed symptom vector are neither exclusive nor temporally constant.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Coexistence is a defensible inference from overlapping time courses and designs; most cited studies do not estimate individual causal proportions.

PART 07 · 7.5 · WHAT WOULD DISTINGUISH THE COMPONENTS?

7.5 · Recurrence and withdrawal can coexist

Timing helps but does not decide. Very rapid onset after a reduction, unfamiliar sensory or autonomic symptoms, fluctuation with stabilization, and resolution after reinstatement may increase the plausibility of withdrawal. A return of the person's characteristic syndrome after a sustained interval may increase the plausibility of recurrence. Yet half-life can delay withdrawal, recurrence can begin rapidly, reinstatement is not a specific test, and both processes can alter sleep and affect. Clinical labels remain probabilistic.

The 2026 prospective cohort offers a useful but weak clue. Across 32 primary-care participants and 187 repeated measurements, affective, depressive, anxiety, and physical withdrawal changes covaried; scores rose during reduction intervals and some eased when doses stabilized. The authors interpreted the periodic pattern as favoring withdrawal, while explicitly acknowledging that causality could not be inferred. No randomized control, small size, overlapping scales, and time-varying confounding limit the conclusion.

Flow Hijacked represents the observed state as $y(t) = H[x_{\text{withdrawal}}(t), x_{\text{recurrence}}(t), x_{\text{context}}(t)] + \text{noise}$ rather than assigning a single hidden cause by default. This is a conceptual decomposition, not a clinical estimator. Its value is ethical as well as mathematical: uncertainty is disclosed precisely when symptoms are consequential. The person is neither told that the illness has inevitably returned nor assured that recurrence is impossible. Safety, function, prior episode signature, physical symptoms, and temporal structure all remain visible.

The model would gain empirical standing only if prospective measurements could estimate the latent components and predict future observations better than simpler explanations. Until then, it disciplines language rather than diagnosing causes.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Timing signatures are not specific, and the prospective cohort is small and observational. Relapse and withdrawal measures overlap, while expectation and treatment guessing can influence both.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A both/and account reduces invalidation while protecting against the opposite error of overlooking a dangerous recurrence.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Post-discontinuation worsening is modeled as a changing mixture of latent processes whose weights require measurement rather than assumption.

TRANSITION

ANTLER supplies the strongest local randomized example of why maintenance benefit and withdrawal must be narrated together.

PART 07 · 7.6 · WHAT ANTLEER ACTUALLY RANDOMIZED

7.6 · ANTLEER holds both truths

CORE SENTENCE

The randomized strategy contrast is strong for the studied population, while the causal label attached to each early event remains less certain.

ANTLEER enrolled 478 adults from 150 UK general practices. Participants had experienced at least two depressive episodes or had used antidepressants for two years or longer, were currently well enough to consider stopping, and were taking citalopram, fluoxetine, sertraline, or mirtazapine at specified common doses. They were randomized double-blind either to maintain medication or to taper over one or two months and discontinue using matching placebo. The primary outcome was time to first depressive relapse over 52 weeks.

This design estimates the consequence of two strategies in a selected primary-care population. It does not compare every antidepressant, dose, taper duration, or clinical history. The sample averaged 54 years of age, was 73% women, and the full report describes a mostly White, older UK population enriched for recurrent depression. People with current depression or other psychiatric conditions were excluded. Generalization to younger, more diverse, acutely ill, bipolar, psychotic, or highly comorbid populations is therefore limited.

The open NIHR report provides the strongest local appraisal basis because its methods, withdrawal measures, adherence, treatment guessing, attrition, and health-economic analyses were reviewed in full. The journal article itself remained access-limited, but its abstract was cross-checked against that companion report. Independent NIHR funding strengthens credibility without removing design limitations. The correct estimand is maintenance versus a short-taper discontinuation strategy—not the biological necessity of lifelong treatment and not the optimal method for any individual.

This precision protects the trial from misuse in both directions. It neither reduces all post-switch events to withdrawal nor licenses a claim that the same strategy contrast will hold under a substantially different taper or population.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Randomization contrasts maintenance with short-taper discontinuation while simultaneously exposing recurrence prevention, withdrawal, treatment guessing, and adherence as interacting pathways.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High confidence for the randomized strategy contrast in this population; moderate confidence for separating every early relapse from withdrawal.

PART 07 · 7.6 · THE NUMBERS REQUIRE A TWO-HANDED READING

7.6 · ANTLER holds both truths

By 52 weeks, relapse occurred in 92 of 238 participants assigned to maintenance, 39%, and 135 of 240 assigned to discontinuation, 56%. The hazard ratio was 2.06 with a 95% confidence interval from 1.56 to 2.70. Withdrawal symptoms were also greater after discontinuation, with the largest difference at 12 weeks. These findings establish that, for this population and taper strategy, maintenance reduced average relapse and short-taper discontinuation increased early withdrawal burden.

The same report resists a deterministic reading. A substantial proportion discontinued without relapse. Only 37% of the discontinuation group remained on randomized medication through the end; 39% returned to their original antidepressant, compared with 20% in maintenance. Adherence was 70% in maintenance and 52% in discontinuation in the journal report. Differential treatment guessing and early symptoms could affect blinding and behavior. The trial cannot label every early depressive event as pure recurrence or pure withdrawal.

For shared understanding, absolute frequencies matter more than slogans. Maintenance was not perfect protection: 39% relapsed. Discontinuation was not inevitable collapse: 44% did not meet the relapse outcome. Group averages do not identify who can discontinue without relapse. The study supports neither ‘everyone should remain’ nor ‘maintenance only prevents withdrawal.’ It supports an honest conversation about two real risks, studied under one relatively short taper and one-year horizon, while preserving the person’s priorities, history, and uncertainty.

It also demonstrates why endpoint labels should be read beside adherence and reinstatement. Assignment, actual exposure, and subsequent decisions diverged, so the randomized effect is an intention-to-treat strategy effect rather than a pure pharmacological contrast.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

A selected recurrent-depression population, restricted drugs and doses, short taper, differential adherence and guessing, and a 12-month horizon limit causal decomposition and generalization.

LIVED RELEVANCE

ANTLER gives people usable absolute risks while showing why no group result can announce an individual future.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The trial’s two outcomes reveal a branching trajectory: maintenance, withdrawal burden, recurrence, reinstatement, and adherence co-determine the observed path.

TRANSITION

A nonlinear taper proposal attempts to reshape one branch of that trajectory, but its protocol evidence must be kept distinct from its rationale.

PART 07 · 7.7 · FROM RECEPTOR CURVE TO PROPOSED TAPER SHAPE

7.7 · Hyperbolic tapering is an interpretation

CORE SENTENCE

The proposal translates a nonlinear occupancy curve into a taper geometry, but the translation remains a testable hypothesis at the clinical-outcome level.

A hyperbolic taper proposal begins with a nonlinear observation: serotonin-transporter occupancy does not fall in direct proportion to milligrams. To seek approximately even reductions in occupancy, the nominal dose steps would become progressively smaller at lower doses. In geometric terms, the schedule attempts to linearize movement on the target-engagement axis rather than on the tablet axis. This is a coherent pharmacological rationale and a direct challenge to equal-milligram step thinking.

The cited Horowitz and Taylor paper develops that rationale and discusses gradual reduction toward very low doses. The full-text claim lock classifies it as authors' interpretation because it does not contain a comparative randomized trial demonstrating that the proposed geometry improves withdrawal, recurrence, function, or safety across patients. The distinction is not semantic. Receptor engagement is an intermediate measure, whereas the outcomes people care about arise from multiple targets, adaptation, kinetics, expectation, and illness trajectory.

Half-life and formulation can change the perturbation even if nominal occupancy steps look similar. A short-acting formulation may produce larger peak-trough variation; an active metabolite or long terminal tail may smooth and delay change; liquids, small tablets, modified-release products, and depot preparations impose different feasible inputs. Metabolic variation and adherence add further uncertainty. Thus 'hyperbolic' cannot mean one universal calendar or percentage sequence. It names a principle whose implementation and benefit require drug-specific evidence.

The proposal also leaves the stopping criterion open. Near-zero nominal dose is not automatically zero exposure, zero adaptation, or zero risk, and analytical models cannot decide when a person's trajectory has stabilized.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A nonlinear dose-occupancy curve motivates smaller nominal steps at low doses, while formulation kinetics and slow adaptation determine the actual temporal perturbation.

AUTHORS' INTERPRETATION · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The rationale is claim-locked as an interpretation. Comparative clinical efficacy and a universally valid protocol are not established by the cited paper.

PART 07 · 7.7 · WHAT EVIDENCE WOULD PROMOTE THE PROPOSAL?

7.7 · Hyperbolic tapering is an interpretation

To move from rationale to validated protocol, trials must compare taper shapes while measuring the exposure they actually produce. Nominal schedules alone are insufficient. Studies need drug and formulation, prior duration, metabolites, adherence, plasma or validated exposure models, symptom timing, physical withdrawal domains, recurrence adjudication, function, safety, and long follow-up. Randomization should preserve uncertainty about expectation where feasible, and analyses should separate early from late events.

The comparator also matters. Hyperbolic versus equal-milligram steps, equal-percentage steps, clinician-guided usual care, or a much longer individualized taper answer different questions. A favorable average could conceal subgroups harmed by delay, destabilized by change, or protected by maintenance. Conversely, a null average could conceal benefit among people with short half-life drugs or prior severe withdrawal. Transparent stopping rules and rescue pathways are part of ethical design, not methodological contamination.

Until such evidence exists, the model's best use is explanatory and question-generating. It can make a late-stage difficulty pharmacologically intelligible, improve formulation-aware research, and resist the assumption that low milligrams equal negligible perturbation. It should not be converted here into dose-by-dose advice. Medication change can carry serious risk, and individual decisions belong with qualified clinical support and the person's values. The next section therefore asks for the study architecture needed to measure direction of travel rather than prescribing one route.

A protocol can be elegant and still fail if participants cannot follow it, formulations cannot deliver it accurately, or its duration creates other risks. Feasibility and acceptability are causal parts of effectiveness, not administrative details.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The proposal lacks direct comparative protocol evidence in the cited paper. Occupancy-based reasoning may omit multiple targets, active metabolites, nonadherence, adaptation, and urgent risks of prolonged change.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Mechanistic validation can reduce shame around difficult late reductions, while the protocol boundary prevents a lecture from masquerading as individualized care.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Taper shape is an input-design problem in a fast-slow system, but optimal control cannot be solved without an identified person-specific model and explicit safety constraints.

TRANSITION

The evidential gap becomes a blueprint for a direction-sensitive discontinuation trial.

PART 07 · 7.8 · A TRIAL DESIGNED AROUND TRAJECTORIES

7.8 · The needed trial measures direction

CORE SENTENCE

The decisive experiment must observe both state and velocity, distinguish competing latent processes, and protect participants while uncertainty is greatest.

A direction-sensitive trial begins before the first dose change. It records indication, episode history, prior withdrawal, treatment duration, formulation, co-medication, sleep, function, physical health, expectations, and social conditions. Randomized taper strategies should be described as input functions rather than labels such as 'slow' or 'usual.' Adherence and actual exposure require repeated measurement or validated modeling. Dense early sampling is essential because withdrawal and unblinding may peak before standard follow-up visits.

Outcomes must remain multidimensional. Repeated measures should separate affective, sensory, autonomic, motor, sleep, gastrointestinal, and other physical symptoms from structured recurrence criteria; include functioning, quality of life, cognition, agency, safety events, and patient-valued outcomes; and continue long enough to capture delayed recurrence and prolonged symptoms. Independent, blinded adjudication can review event narratives and timing, while acknowledging that perfect blinding may be impossible when experiences differ visibly.

The analysis should model concentration, estimated occupancy, rate of change, prior exposure, expectation, and contextual perturbations. Early and late hazards should not be collapsed automatically. Mediation models can ask how much of a strategy contrast is associated with withdrawal burden, treatment guessing, or reinstatement, but causal assumptions must be declared. Predefined rescue, pause, and reinstatement pathways protect participants. This is a research architecture, not a recommendation that any person discontinue.

A registered analysis plan should define estimands for assignment, actual exposure, and adherence separately. Sharing de-identified time-series data and code would let competing models test whether history and direction add predictive value beyond current dose.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Joint modeling of level, derivative, history, symptoms, context, and function can test whether post-change trajectories require withdrawal, recurrence, or both latent components.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

This design follows from identified limitations in ANTLER, withdrawal reviews, and PK/PD models. It has not itself been validated as a complete trial protocol.

PART 07 · 7.8 · WHAT WOULD COUNT AS LEARNING

7.8 · The needed trial measures direction

A useful trial need not crown one universal taper. It may identify that strategy effects vary by drug half-life, duration, prior withdrawal, recurrence history, or exposure derivative. It may show that early physical and affective clusters predict later recurrence—or that they do not. It may find no added value for occupancy-aware schedules after actual exposure and expectations are measured. Each result would narrow uncertainty because the design declares what could disconfirm its preferred explanation.

The trial should also ask whose outcome improves. Mean symptom differences can coexist with divergent function, sexuality, cognition, sleep, work, relationships, and sense of agency. Participant-defined priorities should be collected before randomization and tracked without replacing safety endpoints. Caregivers can contribute observations with consent, but the person's account remains primary. Researchers should publish trajectories and adverse-event timing, not only endpoint averages, and report who was screened out, paused, reinstated, or lost.

Part 7 therefore ends with a disciplined conclusion. Withdrawal is real, recurrence is real, and maintenance reduces average relapse in studied populations. Their proportions after a particular change are often not identified. No universal incidence or taper geometry follows from the acquired evidence, and this lecture offers no individualized taper instructions. The direction-of-travel framework turns ambiguity into measurable questions. It also creates the bridge to ketamine: a perturbation lasting hours can produce effects measured days later, exposing the same separation between exposure, adaptation, experience, and trajectory at a radically faster clinical clock.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Even dense randomized studies may remain partly unblinded and underpowered for rare harms or long trajectories; causal mediation will still rely on assumptions.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The proposed design makes uncertainty visible without making the person carry it alone, and it treats function and agency as outcomes rather than afterthoughts.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Measure trajectories densely enough to distinguish state from velocity and observable symptoms from their competing latent causes.

TRANSITION

Ketamine now tests the inverse temporal puzzle: how a brief exposure can precede a longer clinical change.

PART 07 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Plasma elimination, target occupancy, adaptation, withdrawal, relapse protection, and lived recovery operate on different clocks. Medication change is therefore a trajectory through a history-dependent system, not a movement along one concentration axis.

Part 7 establishes a direction-sensitive pharmacology: withdrawal and recurrence are both real, maintenance benefit is real on average, and the causal composition of early post-change events is frequently unresolved. Dose, exposure, occupancy, adaptation, symptoms, and recovery occupy different clocks. Hyperbolic tapering remains a mechanistic interpretation rather than a universal protocol, and the lecture remains educational and non-prescriptive.

Ketamine compresses the visible clinical clock from weeks toward hours, but rapid change does not abolish selection, masking, adaptation, durability, or context.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

7.1 · One prescription, many clocks — Absorption, plasma half-life, active metabolites, occupancy, cellular adaptation, symptoms, recurrence, and withdrawal do not start or stop together.

7.2 · Delay creates hysteresis — Effect compartments and indirect-response models show why concentration and effect can trace different paths during onset and offset.

7.3 · Small dose steps are not equal steps — Nonlinear occupancy makes late reductions pharmacologically different from equal-milligram changes at higher doses.

7.4 · Withdrawal has multiple domains — Affective, sensory, autonomic, motor, sleep, gastrointestinal, and physical symptoms can be real, heterogeneous, and sometimes prolonged.

7.5 · Recurrence and withdrawal can coexist — Early worsening need not be pure relapse or pure withdrawal; many designs cannot identify each process's proportion.

7.6 · ANTLEH holds both truths — Among 478 long-term users, relapse was 39% with maintenance and 56% after short taper/discontinuation; early withdrawal also increased.

7.7 · Hyperbolic tapering is an interpretation — Progressively smaller late reductions are a mechanistic proposal, not a universally validated protocol; half-life and formulation still matter.

7.8 · The needed trial measures direction — Dense timing, exposure, blinded symptom adjudication, function, prior duration, taper shape, expectation, and long follow-up are required.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Why can the same concentration mean something different while rising and falling?

PART 08

Ketamine changes the clock; psychedelics expose context

**Can hours of exposure reorganize weeks of experience—
and what belongs to molecule versus setting?**

Fast perturbations reveal time-scale separation. They also make selection, expectancy, support, setting, monitoring, and consolidation impossible to treat as background noise.

Part route

- 1. The first ketamine signal**
- 2. Route determines exposure**
- 3. Mechanism remains a family**
- 4. Rapid benefit is not durable recovery**
- 5. Esketamine is drug plus system**
- 6. Safety has acute and repeated clocks**
- 7. Psilocybin is context-coupled pharmacology**
- 8. Generalisability is part of mechanism**

PART 08 · 8.1 · SEVEN COMPLETERS CHANGE THE TEMPORAL QUESTION

8.1 · The first ketamine signal

CORE SENTENCE

Historical importance and quantitative certainty are different dimensions: a seven-completer signal can redirect a field without precisely estimating benefit.

The landmark ketamine crossover report was tiny. Seven participants completed test days with intravenous ketamine and saline. In the acquired abstract-level record, mean Hamilton depression-score change within 72 hours was approximately 14 points with ketamine and zero with saline. The signal did not establish a population effect with precision, but it challenged the expectation that clinically meaningful antidepressant change must wait for weeks of repeated monoaminergic dosing.

The experiment changed the field's question from only 'which transmitter system?' to 'which time scales connect target perturbation to experience?' Ketamine exposure and acute psychoactive effects unfold over minutes to hours, while mood change for some participants was measured later. This separation demanded mechanisms capable of translating a brief perturbation into a longer state transition: altered excitation-inhibition balance, plasticity, network reconfiguration, learning, expectancy, or combinations of them.

Evidence categories matter here. The empirical result is the small controlled signal reported in the abstract. The interpretation is that rapid timing undermined simple delayed-onset stories; it did not prove a particular downstream chain. The broader inference is that brief exposure can precede longer clinical change. Flow Hijacked then treats the trial as a perturbation experiment in a fast-slow system. That synthesis is useful, but neither the mathematics nor the historical importance upgrades an access-limited study into a precise estimate.

The most durable contribution was therefore conceptual: the study placed latency itself among the phenomena a mechanism must explain. Any adequate account now had to connect immediate pharmacology, transient altered experience, and delayed symptom measurement without assuming they were the same event.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A minutes-to-hours NMDA-linked perturbation precedes a days-scale clinical signal, motivating but not identifying fast-to-slow coupling mechanisms.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High historical importance but low magnitude precision. The seven-completer crossover record is access-limited and supports no durability or broad-generalizability claim.

PART 08 · 8.1 · A SIGNAL IS A BEGINNING, NOT A FINISHED MECHANISM

8.1 · The first ketamine signal

Small crossover studies are unusually vulnerable to unstable effect estimates. One participant can materially change the mean; order and carryover matter; saline does not reproduce dissociation or perceptual change; and participants or raters may infer the condition. The acquired record does not provide a durable functional outcome, a representative safety profile, or evidence across diverse comorbidity. The trial established a reason to investigate, not a complete account of who benefits and at what cost.

Later ketamine and esketamine programs strengthened the rapid antidepressant signal in selected treatment-resistant depression populations, but they also multiplied the questions. Route, enantiomer, dose, repetition, active control, monitoring, and concurrent treatment differ. Mean symptom improvement is not equivalent to remission for everyone, restored life function, suicide prevention, or lasting recovery after treatment ends. The founding result should therefore be understood as a temporal discontinuity in the history of antidepressant research rather than as a universal clinical promise.

For someone living with severe depression, rapidity can matter profoundly because weeks are not neutral when possibility has collapsed. Hope may return quickly for some, while others experience dissociation, fear, no response, or a short-lived response. A humane lecture neither cools the importance of speed nor converts it into inevitability. It names the selection and measurement boundaries, and then asks what route-specific exposure actually reached the person.

The founding signal also changed expectations among clinicians and participants. Expectation can improve engagement and hope, but it can also amplify functional unblinding and disappointment. Later trials must therefore measure it rather than treating enthusiasm as external to the experiment.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The founding trial was extremely small, functionally vulnerable to unblinding, and unable to estimate durability, uncommon harms, or population heterogeneity.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Rapidity can be life-altering, but the person deserves a distinction between a field-changing signal and a prediction about their own response.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Ketamine made time-scale separation clinically visible: exposure can end before the observed trajectory does.

TRANSITION

To interpret that separation, the next section distinguishes IV racemate from intranasal S-enantiomer and other routes.

PART 08 · 8.2 · THE MOLECULE ENTERS THROUGH A FORMULATION

8.2 · Route determines exposure

CORE SENTENCE

'Ketamine' names a family of exposure geometries, not one reproducible input to the brain and body.

Intravenous racemic ketamine provides both enantiomers with direct systemic delivery and relatively precise control of the infusion profile. Intranasal esketamine delivers only the S-enantiomer through a device, with variable nasal absorption, label bioavailability of roughly 48%, and a reported peak around 20–40 minutes. Oral, intramuscular, and subcutaneous routes create other absorption rates, first-pass effects, peaks, and metabolite ratios. They cannot be treated as dose-conversion synonyms.

After distribution, ketamine is metabolized through CYP pathways to norketamine and hydroxynorketamine species. Route and enantiomer alter the temporal mixture of parent compound and metabolites. The acute subjective state may track a rapid peak, while mood change can be assessed after plasma concentrations have fallen. A lower, broader peak could alter dissociation, cardiovascular effects, and possibly downstream signaling even if total exposure appears similar. These are pharmacological possibilities; route-specific clinical equivalence requires direct comparison.

Formulation also changes what the intervention includes. A controlled IV infusion requires venous access, staff, and continuous observation. The approved intranasal product uses fixed device doses, supervised administration, and post-dose monitoring. Oral or other off-label approaches may occur in different settings with different precision and evidence. Thus route is not an implementation detail. It shapes exposure, experience, safety infrastructure, expectancy, access, and the population that can receive treatment.

Repeated administration adds another geometry. The interval between sessions determines residual metabolites, recovery time, anticipatory learning, and cumulative burden. Two regimens with similar weekly milligrams can therefore impose different sequences of peaks and contexts.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Route × formulation × enantiomer determines absorption, first-pass metabolism, peak-trough geometry, parent/metabolite mixture, and the timing of acute target engagement.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Label PK is formulation-specific and directly appraised for esketamine. Cross-route clinical equivalence and metabolite mediation are not established by these records.

PART 08 · 8.2 · WHY ROUTE CHANGES THE CLINICAL EXPERIMENT

8.2 · Route determines exposure

If two routes produce different peaks, durations, and metabolite profiles, a common milligram label does not define a common perturbation. The relevant input may include peak concentration, time above a threshold, rate of rise, area under the curve, and repeated-session spacing. Different components could relate differently to dissociation, blood pressure, nausea, sedation, or later mood change. Without head-to-head exposure-response data, choosing one metric as the therapeutic driver is an interpretation.

Route also affects masking. A rapid IV or intranasal psychoactive experience can reveal assignment more readily than a slower or less intense route. Staff behavior may change after visible dissociation or blood-pressure elevation. Monitoring can provide safety and relational containment, while simultaneously becoming a co-intervention. People able to attend supervised sessions differ from those excluded by geography, work, caregiving, cardiovascular risk, or cost. Effectiveness outside a trial is therefore partly a property of the delivery system.

For the person, route can determine whether treatment feels controlled, frightening, burdensome, or accessible. It changes the time required, bodily sensations, privacy, transportation, and who is present during an altered state. These are not reasons to collapse pharmacology into psychology; they are reasons to model the full causal chain. The next section follows that chain below the route, where several molecular and cellular mechanism families compete for causal weight.

A credible comparison should therefore report exposure profiles and delivery conditions together. If one is standardized while the other differs, attribution to route alone becomes unsafe. The setting must be treated as measured protocol rather than prose in the methods section.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Similar total exposure does not prove similar peaks or effects, but differing PK also does not prove differing antidepressant efficacy. Direct route comparisons remain limited.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Route determines not only what reaches the body but how much time, monitoring, travel, trust, and altered-state vulnerability treatment requires.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Formulation and care infrastructure are upstream state variables that shape the perturbation before any network mechanism is inferred.

TRANSITION

Route defines the perturbation; the next question is which downstream pathway, if any, mediates the rapid clinical signal.

PART 08 · 8.3 · FROM NMDA BLOCKADE TO PLASTICITY HYPOTHESES

8.3 · Mechanism remains a family

CORE SENTENCE

The target is known more securely than the therapeutic mediator; multiple downstream and parallel mechanisms remain live.

Ketamine is a noncompetitive NMDA-receptor antagonist, but naming the acute target does not identify the antidepressant mediator. One influential family proposes that altered glutamatergic balance increases AMPA throughput and initiates activity-dependent plasticity. In rodent and cellular experiments, Autry and colleagues linked NMDA blockade at rest to reduced eEF2 phosphorylation, increased BDNF translation, and antidepressant-like behavior; Li and colleagues linked NMDA antagonism to mTOR signaling and new synaptic measures.

Those preclinical findings were manually appraised and are claim-locked at the organism and assay level. They establish what occurred under particular doses, timings, molecular interventions, and behavioral paradigms in animals and cells. They do not show that eEF2/BDNF or mTOR is necessary and sufficient for antidepressant benefit in humans. Human depression is not a rodent assay, and human dissociation, expectancy, cardiovascular effects, prior treatment, and social context were not the outcomes those experiments were designed to explain.

Other candidates include opioid-system involvement, HCN channels, inhibitory interneuron disinhibition, metabolites such as hydroxynorketamine, habenular and reward-circuit effects, and network-level changes. Evidence is unequal and sometimes conflicting. The disciplined formulation is therefore a mechanism family: acute NMDA pharmacology is established; specific preclinical cascades are empirically supported in their models; their causal weights in human clinical response remain unresolved.

The candidates need not be mutually exclusive. One pathway may initiate the perturbation, another may shape subjective experience, and a third may determine persistence. A successful blocker experiment at one scale would still not prove sufficiency across the full chain.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Established NMDA antagonism may alter glutamatergic E/I balance, AMPA throughput, translation and synaptic signaling, with parallel opioid, HCN, metabolite, circuit, and network candidates.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High confidence in the appraised animal/cellular findings; low confidence that one cascade exclusively mediates human antidepressant benefit.

PART 08 · 8.3 · A BEAUTIFUL CHAIN IS NOT YET THE HUMAN CHAIN

8.3 · Mechanism remains a family

Mechanistic narratives become seductive when each arrow is plausible: NMDA blockade → glutamate burst → AMPA engagement → BDNF/mTOR plasticity → restored networks → relief. Yet different arrows come from different species, preparations, timings, and measurement scales. Combining them into one continuous human pathway is a synthesis. To establish mediation, a candidate must change with treatment, predict outcome, and survive interventions that selectively block or reproduce it without introducing decisive alternative effects.

Opioid antagonism studies illustrate the problem. A small human report found attenuation of ketamine's antidepressant effect with naltrexone, raising an opioid-mediation hypothesis, but sample size, replication, and the broad experiential consequences of opioid blockade constrain inference. Dissociation correlates with treatment condition and can affect expectancy, yet correlation does not show that dissociation is necessary. Metabolites may have activity in models, but route-dependent production and human exposure-response mediation remain unsettled.

Flow Hijacked reframes the candidate family as multiscale causal competition. Molecular routes may converge on a temporary increase in state-space accessibility, but that phrase is not an empirical biomarker. It predicts that benefit should be associated with measurable changes in network flexibility or controllability and that blocking the relevant plastic window should alter outcome. Failure of those predictions would weaken the synthesis. Until then, mechanism pluralism is more accurate than a single synaptogenesis story.

The strongest human program would combine timed pharmacokinetics, candidate molecular markers, circuit or network measures, dissociation and expectancy ratings, and longitudinal outcomes. Convergent temporal mediation would be more informative than any isolated post-dose biomarker.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Species translation, behavioral-assay validity, dose mismatch, functional unblinding, alternative pathways, and small human antagonist studies prevent exclusive mediation claims.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person can benefit without needing to adopt one molecular story, and nonresponse does not imply a failure to achieve a supposed plastic state.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

Competing molecular pathways may alter the accessibility of network trajectories; causal weights must be established rather than inferred from narrative continuity.

TRANSITION

Even if a rapid mechanism is real, a rapid symptom change does not establish durable recovery.

PART 08 · 8.4 · SEPARATE THE CLOCKS AND THE OUTCOMES

8.4 · Rapid benefit is not durable recovery

CORE SENTENCE

Speed, average symptom magnitude, response probability, maintenance, function, and recovery after treatment ends are separate estimands.

‘Rapid acting’ describes when a between-group symptom signal can appear; it does not say how many people respond, how large an individual change will be, or how long it lasts. In an acquired pivotal adjunctive esketamine trial with 227 randomized participants, the day-28 MADRS least-squares mean difference was -4.0 points, with a 95% confidence interval from -7.31 to -0.64 . The result is statistically significant and clinically modest on average.

That trial combined intranasal esketamine with a newly initiated oral antidepressant and compared it with nasal placebo plus a newly initiated oral antidepressant. Functional unblinding, short duration, missing data, selected treatment-resistant depression, and interpretation of mean scale differences limit the inference. The source remains abstract-level in the claim-lock ledger. It supports an acute average advantage in the studied design, not a universal response or a complete account of the contribution from each component.

Durability requires another experiment. Repeated dosing may sustain benefit while accumulating burden and access demands. Randomized-withdrawal maintenance trials begin with responders and ask what happens if treatment continues versus changes; they do not estimate initial benefit for everyone. Functional recovery, relationships, cognition, work, and patient-valued possibility can diverge from symptom scores. Every horizon—24 hours, four weeks, several months, after discontinuation—must be named explicitly.

Response and remission thresholds add further compression. They turn continuous, fluctuating trajectories into binary categories that are useful for comparison but can hide near-threshold changes, symptom tradeoffs, and whether improvement was meaningful to the person.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A brief perturbation can open a rapid response window, while maintenance and durable function depend on slower adaptation, repeated exposure, context, and consolidation.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The adjunctive acute result is abstract-level and selected. Speed and day-28 mean symptom benefit cannot be promoted into durability, broad function, or universal-response claims.

PART 08 · 8.4 · MAINTENANCE EVIDENCE BEGINS AFTER SELECTION

8.4 · Rapid benefit is not durable recovery

In the appraised esketamine maintenance study, 705 people entered induction and optimization, but only 297 stable responders or remitters entered randomized withdrawal. Continuing esketamine plus oral antidepressant delayed relapse compared with switching the spray to placebo: the hazard ratio was 0.49 among stable remitters and 0.30 among stable responders. Those are claim-locked results for people who had already benefited and tolerated the program.

The enrichment is not a flaw to hide; it defines the question. The study asks whether continuation protects selected prior beneficiaries, not whether starting esketamine works for every person with treatment-resistant depression. Switching can produce functional unblinding or discontinuation-related effects, and proportional hazards were not constant in every stratum. Manufacturer sponsorship and substantial involvement are credibility conditions that must be visible beside the result, not used either to erase or sanctify it.

A longer trajectory includes session access, monitoring, repeated altered states, adverse effects, recurrence between doses, and what happens when treatment is spaced or stopped. Recovery may include renewed agency and relationships that persist beyond pharmacological exposure, but such persistence is not guaranteed by a relapse hazard ratio. Flow Hijacked describes the rapid perturbation as a possible opening whose consolidation depends on slower personal and environmental dynamics. That is a synthesis awaiting direct mediation tests.

A decisive durability study would begin at initiation, retain nonresponders in the denominator, measure repeated exposure and function, and follow participants after spacing or cessation. Only then could acute entry, maintained benefit, and post-treatment persistence be compared within one design.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Enriched randomized withdrawal selects prior responders, may unblind participants when active treatment stops, and does not estimate initiation benefit or long-term recovery in all TRD.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A fast response can be profoundly valuable without resolving how often treatment must continue or whether life function will recover on the same schedule.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Clinical speed describes entry into a new trajectory, not the stability or value of the attractor reached.

TRANSITION

Esketamine makes the delivery system explicit: regulation, monitoring, and the device are part of the intervention.

PART 08 · 8.5 · THE APPROVED INTERVENTION HAS WALLS, TIME, AND STAFF

8.5 · Esketamine is drug plus system

CORE SENTENCE

Regulated infrastructure changes who receives the drug, how exposure is observed, and which risks are contained; it is causally upstream of real-world effectiveness.

The January 2025 US label permits intranasal esketamine for adults with treatment-resistant depression as monotherapy or with an oral antidepressant. That regulatory change is an empirical fact about one jurisdiction; it is not proof of comparative superiority. The product remains administered under direct supervision through a restricted distribution and monitoring system, with at least two hours of post-dose observation. The label's device, schedule, eligibility, and safeguards define the approved intervention.

The same label carries boxed warnings for sedation, dissociation, respiratory depression, abuse and misuse, and suicidal thoughts and behaviors. Blood pressure and clinical stability require assessment around dosing. The label also states that effectiveness in preventing suicide or reducing suicidal ideation or behavior has not been demonstrated, even where the drug is indicated for depressive symptoms in adults with acute suicidal ideation or behavior together with an oral antidepressant. Indication and outcome proof must not be conflated.

Infrastructure changes effectiveness. A staffed setting can detect blood-pressure elevation, excessive sedation, or respiratory compromise; it can also provide reassurance during dissociation. Conversely, travel, time away from work or caregiving, cost, geography, and eligibility can exclude people. A treatment available only inside a monitored system is not the same intervention when detached from that system. Regulation is therefore a feedback mechanism between biological risk, access, and population outcome.

The system can generate its own harms and benefits. Restriction may delay or prevent access, while supervision may prevent avoidable injury. Evaluation should measure both biological adverse events and the people filtered out by delivery requirements.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Device PK and acute pharmacology are embedded in REMS-governed supervision, monitoring, transport, eligibility, and repeated access; the intervention is drug × delivery system.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The 2025 US indication and safeguards are official-label facts. They are jurisdiction-specific and do not establish superiority, suicide prevention, or context-independent effectiveness.

PART 08 · 8.5 · MONOTHERAPY EVIDENCE AFTER THE LABEL CHANGED

8.5 · Esketamine is drug plus system

A phase-4 randomized trial published in 2025 supplied direct monotherapy evidence. After an antidepressant-free interval, adults with treatment-resistant depression received fixed-dose intranasal esketamine 56 mg, 84 mg, or placebo twice weekly for four weeks. In the 378-participant efficacy set, day-28 mean differences versus placebo were −5.1 points for 56 mg and −6.8 for 84 mg on MADRS. Differences were also present approximately 24 hours after the first dose.

The full-text appraisal preserves important constraints. The safety set contained 476 participants, whereas the efficacy analysis used the subgroup meeting prerandomization severity criteria. The trial lasted four weeks, excluded recent suicidality and important comorbidity, used observed-case modeling, and was vulnerable to functional unblinding. Johnson & Johnson employees and stockholders authored the program, and several held assigned patents. These conditions do not erase randomization or the result; they constrain independence and generalization.

Common treatment-emergent events across combined esketamine doses in the safety set included nausea in 24.8%, dissociation in 24.3%, dizziness in 21.7%, and headache in 19.0%. These proportions describe this monitored trial, not unobserved community use or long-term risk. The evidence supports short-term mean symptom superiority for selected adults under a regulated system. It does not answer durability, broad safety, comparative effectiveness against other rapid treatments, or which people can sustain benefit without repeated access.

Regulatory authorization and randomized evidence should therefore be narrated together but not merged. The label specifies permissible use and safeguards; the trial estimates outcomes under defined conditions. Neither alone establishes the value of the entire long-term care pathway.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Four-week duration, selected eligibility, efficacy/safety-set differences, functional unblinding, observed-case analysis, and manufacturer authorship limit durability and independence claims.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The regulated system can make an altered state safer, yet its time and access burden determines whether a statistically effective treatment is practically reachable.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Real-world response emerges from molecule, device, monitoring, access, expectation, and repeated scheduling; removing the system changes the intervention.

TRANSITION

Once the system is included, safety must be separated into acute-session and repeated-exposure horizons.

PART 08 · 8.6 · THE ACUTE SESSION IS A PHYSIOLOGICAL EVENT

8.6 · Safety has acute and repeated clocks

CORE SENTENCE

A monitored two-hour safety profile cannot answer cumulative, rare, or post-treatment risk, and long-term concern cannot erase measurable acute benefit.

Acute ketamine or esketamine exposure can change perception, bodily ownership, attention, vestibular experience, and arousal while also raising blood pressure, producing nausea, dizziness, sedation, or respiratory compromise. These effects have different peaks and thresholds. Dissociation may be subjectively neutral, relieving, frightening, or disorganizing. Sedation and dissociation are not interchangeable, and neither is a validated proxy for antidepressant response. Monitoring must attend to the whole acute state rather than one score.

The official esketamine label addresses this clock with supervised administration, pre- and post-dose assessment, and at least two hours of observation. Boxed risks include sedation, dissociation, respiratory depression, abuse and misuse, and suicidality. Cardiovascular and respiratory state, concomitant sedatives, substance-use history, trauma, and ability to leave safely can alter risk. Label safeguards are formulation- and jurisdiction-specific; they should not be generalized mechanically to every ketamine route.

In the appraised 2025 monotherapy safety set, common events included nausea, dissociation, dizziness, and headache, each occurring in roughly one fifth to one quarter of participants across combined doses. Trial percentages describe actively observed, selected participants. They do not capture every rare event or the experience of someone excluded from the trial. The empirical safety statement must retain denominator, monitoring context, dose, and duration.

Acute safety is also relational. Clear preparation and calm observation may reduce panic or injury without altering the molecular exposure. That plausible benefit belongs to the delivery system and should be measured rather than credited automatically to the drug.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Ketamine/esketamine exposure produces overlapping perceptual, autonomic, cardiovascular, vestibular, sedative, and respiratory effects. Parent-drug and metabolite timing shapes the exposure geometry, but their separate causal contributions are not established.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Acute monitored risks are well characterized for labeled intranasal esketamine. Rates and safeguards are not automatically transferable to other routes, settings, or unselected populations.

PART 08 · 8.6 · REPEATED EXPOSURE ASKS A DIFFERENT SAFETY QUESTION

8.6 · Safety has acute and repeated clocks

Cumulative safety cannot be inferred by multiplying a single-session profile. Repeated exposure raises distinct questions about urinary symptoms, cognition, tolerance, dependence or misuse, cardiovascular burden, interactions, and how often dissociative states occur. High-dose nonmedical patterns cannot be mapped directly onto supervised therapeutic dosing, but they identify organ systems and behaviors that long-term programs should measure rather than ignore. Rare harms require much larger denominators than acute efficacy trials.

Maintenance itself is selected and dynamic. People who benefit and tolerate induction are more likely to continue; those with early adverse effects disappear from later denominators. Session frequency may change with response, creating time-varying exposure. Concurrent medicines, alcohol or other substances, aging, pregnancy, renal or hepatic state, and evolving stress can alter risk. Cognitive and urinary outcomes need baseline measures, repeated assessment, and post-treatment follow-up, not only spontaneous reports during dosing visits.

The humane balance avoids two distortions. Acute and repeated risks must be named plainly, because the person bears them. Yet unresolved long-term questions do not prove that serious harm is common, just as monitored short-term tolerability does not prove long-term safety. Flow Hijacked treats benefit and burden as coupled trajectories with different time constants. Shared understanding asks what is known at this horizon, what remains unmeasured, and what infrastructure can detect change early.

A cumulative registry linked to standardized cognition, urinary symptoms, exposure, and functioning could reveal rare or delayed patterns that individual trials cannot. Such surveillance should include people who stop treatment, not only those who remain in programs.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Therapeutic monitoring and lower exposure constrain comparisons with nonmedical high-dose use, while selected maintenance cohorts can underrepresent early intolerance and rare cumulative harm.

LIVED RELEVANCE

People need to know which sensations are expected during a session, which changes require immediate attention, and which long-term questions remain genuinely unanswered.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Safety is a vector evolving on several clocks; a favorable acute component cannot substitute for an unmeasured cumulative component.

TRANSITION

Psilocybin makes another component of the intervention unmistakable: the acute drug state is embedded in preparation, support, meaning, and integration.

PART 08 · 8.7 · THE DRUG STATE BEGINS BEFORE INGESTION

8.7 · Psilocybin is context-coupled pharmacology

CORE SENTENCE

The acute molecule is real, but current therapeutic evidence estimates a compound intervention whose psychological and environmental components are not nuisance variables.

Oral psilocybin is converted to psilocin, which acts prominently as a 5-HT_{2A} agonist while engaging other serotonergic targets. Acute exposure lasts hours and can profoundly alter perception, emotion, autobiographical processing, bodily arousal, and meaning. In a small open-label depression study appraised here only at bibliographic and abstract level, psilocybin therapy was followed by changes in cognitive flexibility and functional-connectivity dynamics; the observations did not isolate the molecule from the supported intervention or establish mediation. Target-linked acute change is more secure than any single durable therapeutic chain.

In current depression trials, ingestion occurs inside preparation, a supported dosing session, a particular room and institutional culture, staff responses, expectancy, and later integration. These components can influence threat, trust, surrender, attention, memory reconsolidation, and behavior after the session. They may interact with dose rather than simply add a placebo effect. Because the psychoactive state often reveals assignment, the control condition cannot fully equalize meaning or therapist behavior.

The intervention is therefore better written Outcome = f(psilocin exposure, person, support, setting, expectancy, integration, time) than Outcome = f(dose). This is a broader scientific inference, not evidence that context alone causes benefit or that the molecule is dispensable. Component weights remain unknown. A dismantling study could alter preparation or integration while holding pharmacology as constant as possible, but ethical and blinding constraints make simple decomposition difficult.

Context also has a temporal structure. Preparation shapes priors before dosing; staff behavior shapes the acute trajectory; integration and ordinary life shape what is rehearsed afterward. Treating all three as one undifferentiated psychotherapy dose would lose the mechanism the model seeks to expose.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Psilocin-linked 5-HT_{2A} perturbation coincides with altered experience inside a prepared relational environment; current evidence leaves the contributions of cortical dynamics, threat, learning, meaning, and consolidation unresolved.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Acute target and selected clinical signals are supported; component causality, durable mediation, and context-independent drug effects remain unresolved.

PART 08 · 8.7 · COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE RESISTS A SIMPLE VICTORY STORY

8.7 · Psilocybin is context-coupled pharmacology

In a 59-participant double-dummy trial comparing psilocybin therapy with escitalopram, psilocybin did not significantly outperform escitalopram on the prespecified primary depression outcome. Several secondary outcomes favored psilocybin, but they were not corrected for multiple comparisons. The acquired source remains abstract-level. Small size, short follow-up, intensive support, expectancy, and functional unblinding constrain both a positive and a negative verdict.

Other small selected studies report promising depression outcomes and altered neural flexibility, but their designs do not isolate molecule from support or establish broad safety in people vulnerable to mania or psychosis. Acute anxiety, panic, blood-pressure change, nausea, challenging experiences, and possible persistent perceptual or psychological harms require observation. The few-dose model reduces some daily-withdrawal questions while leaving durability, adverse selection, and later meaning-making undermeasured.

For lived experience, context coupling is not contamination. Trust in the room, cultural meaning, trauma history, fear, music, staff behavior, and what happens after the session can influence whether increased openness becomes learning, overwhelm, or little enduring change. This does not license mystical certainty or claim that a difficult experience is inherently therapeutic. It asks researchers to measure the relational and environmental variables that current trials intentionally provide, because removing them from the causal model misdescribes the intervention.

The same openness may increase opportunity and vulnerability together. Ethical programs must therefore track adverse meaning-making, dependency on guides, social disruption, and disappointment, not only symptom improvement and celebrated peak experiences.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The primary comparative endpoint was nonsignificant; secondary outcomes faced multiplicity. Small, supported, highly selected studies cannot isolate molecule, context, expectancy, or broad safety.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Meaning and trust are not decorations around an altered state; they can shape whether the experience feels safe, overwhelming, or usable afterward.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

An acute change in experiential and neural flexibility is only a proposed opening; environment and integration may shape which trajectory, if any, becomes stable.

TRANSITION

Because treatment and context are coupled, generalizability becomes part of the mechanism question rather than an afterthought.

PART 08 · 8.8 · WHO IS MISSING FROM THE AVERAGE?

8.8 · Generalisability is part of mechanism

CORE SENTENCE

If person and setting interact with the drug, transportability across populations and sites is a causal question, not merely an external-validity footnote.

Rapid-treatment trials often select adults who can consent to intensive procedures, attend repeated visits, pause incompatible medicines, and tolerate cardiovascular or psychological risk. Recent suicidality, psychotic features, important substance-use patterns, unstable medical illness, pregnancy, or bipolar vulnerability may be excluded. The resulting estimate can be internally useful while saying little about people whose need and risk are greatest. Eligibility criteria are therefore part of the causal boundary of the result.

Functional unblinding complicates control. Dissociation or a profound psychedelic state can reveal active treatment, changing expectancy, rater behavior, support, and later interpretation. An inert placebo controls ritual poorly; an active placebo introduces its own pharmacology. Therapist and site effects can be large when staff experience, relational safety, music, preparation, and crisis response differ. Multisite averages can conceal dependence on a few highly specialized environments.

Bipolar and psychosis vulnerability is especially important. Selected depression results cannot be transferred automatically to people with prior mania, psychosis, or strong familial vulnerability. Exclusion protects trials but creates an evidence gap; anecdotal use does not fill it. The responsible conclusion is not that harm is inevitable, but that safety, switch risk, and destabilization are insufficiently estimated in these states. Generalizability belongs beside efficacy, not after it.

Transport also fails when care capacity changes. A protocol developed at an expert center may not retain the same response or safety profile where staffing, preparation, emergency support, and follow-up are thinner. Site is a moderator that deserves measurement.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Drug effects interact with baseline state, expectation, vulnerability, staff behavior, and site resources; selection changes the distribution of these moderators before treatment begins.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Trial exclusions and unblinding threats are observable. Their quantitative moderation of benefit and harm across bipolar, psychosis, and diverse real-world populations remains inadequately estimated.

PART 08 · 8.8 · DESIGNING TRANSPORTABLE RAPID-TREATMENT EVIDENCE

8.8 · Generalisability is part of mechanism

A stronger program would report screening funnels, reasons for exclusion, treatment guessing, therapist and site variables, concomitant care, and outcomes after access ends. Pragmatic cohorts can complement explanatory trials, but confounding must remain visible. Active controls should be chosen for a defined purpose, not described as solving blinding. Independent raters, expectancy measurement, standardized support with documented deviations, and component studies can narrow uncertainty without pretending to eliminate it.

Outcomes should extend beyond depression scales to mania and psychosis surveillance, cognition, urinary and cardiovascular health, misuse, relationships, work, agency, and patient-defined benefit. Follow-up should test whether change persists, decays, or depends on repeated sessions and integration. Subgroup analyses require adequate power and prespecification; otherwise they generate hypotheses. Trials in currently excluded populations need staged safety designs and genuine equipoise, not careless extrapolation from selected samples.

Part 8 therefore establishes rapid average symptom benefit for ketamine/esketamine in selected depression populations and promising, context-bound psilocybin signals. It does not establish a single synaptogenesis chain, a necessary psychoactive mediator, context-independent efficacy, broad bipolar or psychosis safety, or durable recovery for everyone. Rapid perturbations make both internal state and external setting visible. That bridge leads directly to bipolar pharmacology, where phase—mania, depression, mixed state, maintenance—and direction of travel fundamentally change what the same molecule may do.

This is not a reason to postpone all use until every uncertainty disappears. It is a reason to align claims, consent, safeguards, and follow-up with the population and horizon actually studied, while making excluded states visible as research priorities.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Pragmatic evidence improves representativeness but increases confounding; subgroup claims can become unstable; perfect blinding may be unattainable for conspicuous psychoactive effects.

LIVED RELEVANCE

People excluded from trials should not be treated as if the evidence already predicts either benefit or harm for them.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The effect of a perturbation depends on the state and boundary conditions into which it enters; selection changes those conditions before dosing.

TRANSITION

Psychedelics make external context visible; bipolar pharmacology next shows that internal phase and trajectory are equally decisive moderators.

PART 08 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Fast perturbations reveal time-scale separation. They also make selection, expectancy, support, setting, monitoring, and consolidation impossible to treat as background noise.

Part 8 establishes that ketamine and esketamine can produce rapid average symptom benefit in selected depression populations, while psilocybin studies offer promising but context-bound signals. It does not establish a single human molecular chain, a necessary psychoactive mediator, durable recovery, or context-independent benefit. Route, device, monitoring, selection, expectancy, support, and integration belong inside the causal model.

Rapid interventions reveal that external setting moderates response; Part 9 turns to bipolar disorder, where internal phase and direction of travel are equally decisive.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

8.1 · The first ketamine signal — A very small controlled crossover trial changed the field's timescale while offering weak magnitude precision and limited generalizability.

8.2 · Route determines exposure — IV racemate, intranasal S-enantiomer, oral, IM, and subcutaneous routes are not interchangeable; metabolites and peaks differ.

8.3 · Mechanism remains a family — NMDA, AMPA, BDNF, mTOR, eEF2, opioid, HCN, and metabolite pathways have unequal human support; animal mediation is not human proof.

8.4 · Rapid benefit is not durable recovery — Active blinding, dissociation, selected samples, repeat dosing, long-term function, and relapse remain distinct evidence questions.

8.5 · Esketamine is drug plus system — Supervised delivery, device PK, REMS, and monitoring are part of the intervention; January 2025 US labeling added TRD monotherapy.

8.6 · Safety has acute and repeated clocks — Dissociation, blood pressure, sedation, respiratory risk, nausea, misuse, urinary effects, and cognitive questions require separate horizons.

8.7 · Psilocybin is context-coupled pharmacology — Psilocin/5-HT_{2A} exposure occurs inside preparation, support, therapist/site, expectancy, meaning, and integration.

8.8 · Generalisability is part of mechanism — Functional unblinding, control conditions, bipolar/psychosis vulnerability, site effects, and selected samples limit universal conclusions.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Can hours of exposure reorganize weeks of experience—and what belongs to molecule versus setting?

PART 09

Bipolar disorder: control the episode or stabilize the trajectory?

Why do mania, depression, mixed states, and maintenance demand different evidence?

'Mood stabilizer' is not a universal mechanism or rank; phase, polarity, recurrence, switching, and body state define the intervention.

Part route

- 1. Build the phase matrix first**
- 2. Acute mania has its own evidence**
- 3. Bipolar depression is not inverse mania**
- 4. Switching risk is conditional**
- 5. Three antiseizure drugs, three PK systems**
- 6. Polarity-specific maintenance matters**
- 7. BALANCE and STEP-BD test strategies**
- 8. Trajectory includes body and reproduction**

PART 09 · 9.1 · ONE DIAGNOSIS CONTAINS SEVERAL CONTROL PROBLEMS

9.1 · Build the phase matrix first

CORE SENTENCE

A drug has no phase-free efficacy: the starting state, desired outcome, and time horizon determine what counts as benefit.

The phrase bipolar treatment hides a matrix. Its rows include acute mania, bipolar depression, mixed features, rapid cycling, and maintenance after stabilization. Its columns include symptom change, time to response, acceptability, switching, recurrence by polarity, functioning, and bodily harm. A medicine can occupy several cells with different strengths and liabilities. Asking whether it works without specifying a row, a column, and a time horizon therefore removes the causal coordinates that make the answer intelligible.

The acquired evidence illustrates the problem. Lithium and divalproex have acute antimanic evidence; lithium-containing strategies also appear in maintenance evidence. Lamotrigine's current label supports maintenance use after acute treatment while stating that efficacy in acute mood episodes has not been established. Antipsychotic evidence is likewise phase-bound: an acute-mania synthesis and a bipolar-depression trial answer different questions, so evidence for mania cannot simply be reflected across a midpoint and called evidence for bipolar depression. Adjunctive antidepressant evidence poses yet another question because the surrounding pharmacological controller changes the intervention being tested.

Formally, treatment effect is better indexed as $E(d,p,o,t,c)$, where d is the drug or strategy, p the phase, o the outcome, t the observation horizon, and c the clinical and bodily context. The notation does not make an individual response calculable. It prevents a category error: averaging across unlike cells can create a universal mood-stabilizer ranking that no trial actually estimated. The first intellectual move is consequently not to choose a molecule, but to define the state-transition problem under study. Only then can unlike trials be placed beside one another without being mistaken for direct answers to the same question.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Phase changes initial conditions, active feedback loops, and the relevant target state; the same perturbation can therefore have different consequences across the matrix.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The matrix is inferred across phase-specific trials; it is not one factorial trial comparing every medicine in every phase and outcome.

PART 09 · 9.1 · THE MISSING CELLS ARE PART OF THE RESULT

9.1 · Build the phase matrix first

Classic acute trials often enroll a cleaner state than clinical life presents. Mixed features can combine activation, despair, agitation, and impaired sleep; rapid cycling makes the observation window itself consequential. Comorbidity, substance exposure, pregnancy, organ function, and prior treatment history further alter the system. Evidence is therefore densest in some matrix cells and sparse in others. Silence in an unstudied cell is not evidence that a neighboring result transfers unchanged.

A second matrix is personal value. One person may prioritize protection from another severe manic episode; another may place greater weight on wakefulness, cognitive range, reproductive plans, or relief from recurrent depression. These priorities do not alter trial results, but they alter the decision problem to which those results are applied. The lecture must preserve that distinction: evidence estimates group-level effects, while treatment value emerges from effects, risks, feasibility, and the person's changing commitments.

Under the Flow Hijacked lens, a phase is not merely a diagnostic label. It is a region of state space with characteristic dwell time, feedback, and transition risk. Medication may reduce entry into one region while doing less for another, or may lower one transition probability while increasing a burden elsewhere. This is a conceptual synthesis, not proof that clinical episodes are literal mathematical attractors. Its disciplined use is to force phase, direction, and time back into every claim. It also makes uncertainty visible: an empty cell becomes a research question rather than an invitation to extrapolate.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Trial populations and phase definitions differ, mixed and rapid-cycling states are relatively underrepresented, and no unified matrix supplies direct head-to-head estimates for every cell.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person is not failing a universal mood stabilizer when a medicine helps one polarity but not another; the question may have been specified too coarsely.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Model each bipolar phase as a distinct, history-dependent transition problem rather than as one scalar severity axis.

TRANSITION

With the matrix defined, the next section asks what the acute-mania cell can actually establish.

PART 09 · 9.2 · REDUCING MANIA IS A DEFINED ACUTE ACHIEVEMENT

9.2 · Acute mania has its own evidence

CORE SENTENCE

Acute antimanic efficacy is real, but speed, sedation, completion, adverse effects, and later trajectory remain separate dimensions.

Acute mania can bring accelerating speech and thought, reduced need for sleep, expansive or irritable mood, impulsive action, psychosis, and danger. The immediate research question is correspondingly narrow but important: over a short trial, does an intervention reduce manic symptoms more than its comparator, and can participants remain on it? A landmark randomized trial reported that divalproex and lithium both reduced acute manic symptoms versus placebo. That result supports acute efficacy in the studied population, not a complete lifetime hierarchy.

A later multiple-treatments meta-analysis found that many antimanic medicines outperform placebo acutely. Yet efficacy and acceptability did not align into one simple ordering. An intervention can produce a larger mean symptom change and still be less acceptable because of sedation, motor effects, metabolic burden, autonomic effects, or other reasons for discontinuation. Moreover, indirect comparisons inherit differences in populations, definitions, doses, adjunctive treatment, and trial conduct. A league table compresses these assumptions into a visually seductive number.

The causal lesson is that an acute antimanic trial measures a particular transition: movement away from a high-activation clinical state over days or weeks. It does not by itself measure prevention of later depression, preservation of cognition, return to work, relational repair, or safety over years. Those are different outputs with different lags. Acute control may be indispensable, but its importance should not be used to make it stand as evidence for every later outcome.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Lithium, valproate, and antipsychotics enter through different molecular routes yet may converge on reduced expression of the manic state; convergence of outcome does not imply identity of mechanism.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The pivotal acute claims are abstract-level in this acquisition. Short trials support average symptom reduction, not durable recovery, comparative lifetime value, or individual prediction.

PART 09 · 9.2 · CALMING A CRISIS IS NOT THE SAME AS RESTORING A LIFE

9.2 · Acute mania has its own evidence

Acute mania trials are commonly short because the clinical need is urgent. That design strength is also a boundary. A rating scale may fall partly because sleep returns and behavioral activation subsides, while the person remains cognitively slowed, frightened, ashamed, or unable to resume ordinary roles. Sedation can be therapeutic when dangerous arousal is extreme, burdensome when it persists, and both at different moments. A single endpoint cannot carry these changing meanings.

The evidence is also not phase-symmetric. A strong acute antimanic result does not show that the same intervention treats bipolar depression or prevents depressive recurrence. Nor does completion of a brief hospitalized trial establish outpatient acceptability under work, caregiving, and long-term bodily demands. Trials usually estimate group averages under specified protocols. They rarely identify which individual will obtain enough benefit, at what exposure, and with which combination of subjective and physical costs.

For a person in an acute episode and for those trying to keep them safe, symptom control is not an abstraction. It may make conversation, sleep, consent, and connection possible again. The humane boundary is to recognize that achievement without describing the person as a malfunctioning circuit or equating quietness with wellness. Medication decisions remain clinical and individual; the educational task is to clarify which claim the evidence can support and which hopes require separate evidence. Follow-up must then ask whether the regained quiet becomes comprehension, choice, and sustainable participation rather than merely reduced observable intensity.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Short acute studies, indirect comparisons, variable definitions, and sparse functional outcomes prevent a universal ranking even when several drugs beat placebo.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Immediate safety and sleep may matter first, while agency, clarity, bodily comfort, and future polarity become decisive later; the weights change over time.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Acute treatment can reduce gain in a high-activation state without yet stabilizing the slower trajectory that generated or follows it.

TRANSITION

The asymmetry becomes clearest when the lecture turns from mania to bipolar depression.

PART 09 · 9.3 · A DIFFERENT STATE DEMANDS A DIFFERENT EXPERIMENT

9.3 · Bipolar depression is not inverse mania

CORE SENTENCE

Depressive polarity changes both the target outcome and the burden geometry; antimanic success cannot be inverted into antidepressant evidence.

Bipolar depression is not merely mania with the sign reversed. Slowed action, anhedonia, hopelessness, altered sleep, cognitive difficulty, and suicidal thinking can coexist with agitation or mixed activation. The relevant intervention must therefore be tested in a depressive episode with depressive outcomes. Evidence that a medicine reduces mania cannot be algebraically inverted. Even within depression, symptom response, durable recovery, switching, function, and recurrence are distinct estimands.

The acquired drug atlas and direct trial or label evidence identify quetiapine, lurasidone, cariprazine, and lumateperone as agents with phase-specific bipolar-depression evidence or label roles; they are not interchangeable. Their receptor profiles, metabolites, food dependencies, persistence, activation, sedation, and metabolic burdens differ. Quetiapine's rapid antihistaminergic effects, for example, can precede its mood outcome, while cariprazine's long-lived active metabolites extend exposure changes beyond the moment a dose changes. Drug name alone is therefore an incomplete description of the perturbation.

Lamotrigine makes the phase problem especially visible. An early seven-week bipolar-I depression trial reported benefit, while the current label states that efficacy in acute mood episodes has not been established. Slow titration is required for safety, so the effective exposure trajectory may consume a substantial fraction of an acute trial window. The label supports maintenance after standard acute treatment and says acute manic or mixed treatment is not recommended. This is not contradiction by wording; it is the consequence of asking different questions on different clocks. Trial duration, titration duration, and the latency of the desired outcome must therefore be displayed together rather than treated as interchangeable calendar time.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Phase-specific efficacy emerges from the interaction of molecular profile, exposure trajectory, starting network/body state, and the outcome clock—not from a generic polarity inversion.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The lamotrigine trial is abstract-level; the current label supports maintenance after acute treatment and states that acute mood-episode efficacy is not established. Agent-level claims combine direct trials with applicable labels, and no complete comparative ranking is asserted.

PART 09 · 9.3 · THE SAME SYMPTOM SCORE CAN HIDE OPPOSITE BURDENS

9.3 · Bipolar depression is not inverse mania

A depressive score may improve while the route to improvement differs markedly. Restored sleep can release cognitive and emotional capacity, or sedation can lower observable activity without restoring possibility. Activation may help one person emerge from slowing while producing akathisia, insomnia, or mixed-state concern in another. Mean scale change does not reveal this internal geometry. Trials that report a common endpoint can still describe experientially different interventions.

The counterweight to phase-specific efficacy is evidence maturity. Newer agents often arrive through sponsor-heavy, short placebo-controlled programs. Those trials can establish an acute average effect in selected populations, but they leave comparative effectiveness, rare harms, long-term cognition, work, relationships, and discontinuation less certain. Lamotrigine presents a different temporal lesson: one positive acute trial does not override a label that does not establish acute efficacy, while the label does support maintenance use. Neither pattern should be flattened into a slogan of superiority or failure.

For someone living through bipolar depression, the distinction is practical and humane. Relief that arrives with intolerable restlessness, flattening, appetite change, or cognitive burden may not carry the same value as an identical numerical score change without those costs. Conversely, a tolerable intervention may be valuable even if it is not top-ranked on a single scale. This lecture supplies an evidence map, not an individualized medication choice and never a reason for abrupt change without clinical support. It also asks whether improvement remains after the trial window and whether it opens access to relationships, thought, movement, and a believable future.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

One positive lamotrigine trial does not establish acute efficacy, and short newer-drug trials do not settle long-term comparative value or function.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The meaningful outcome is not merely less depression on average, but whether possibility returns in a form the person can inhabit.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Bipolar depression occupies a different region of the state space; successful control requires a phase-specific route and burden profile.

TRANSITION

The phase distinction now sharpens the disputed question of antidepressant-associated switching.

PART 09 · 9.4 · THE SAME DRUG CLASS ENTERS DIFFERENT SYSTEMS

9.4 · Switching risk is conditional

CORE SENTENCE

Antidepressant-associated switching is neither inevitable nor absent; the surrounding controller changes the observed risk.

Debate about antidepressants in bipolar disorder is often compressed into a binary claim: they cause mania, or they do not. The acquired evidence resists both absolutes. Swedish registry data suggested an increased acute mania-switch risk with antidepressant monotherapy, whereas concurrent mood-stabilizing treatment did not show the same acute increase. Because this was observational evidence, exposure selection, diagnostic uncertainty, adherence, and time-varying confounding remain plausible contributors.

STEP-BD asked a different question. In a monitored adjunctive strategy, standard antidepressants added to a mood stabilizer did not improve durable recovery over mood stabilizer plus placebo. The contradiction dossier also notes no increased switching in that selected adjunctive population. This does not negate the registry signal, because monotherapy and co-treatment are different interventions. Nor does absence of an excess switch in one protocol prove universal safety across antidepressants, bipolar subtypes, mixed features, or rapid cycling.

Causally, the drug is only one input. Baseline polarity, subthreshold activation, sleep loss, dose and exposure trajectory, prior switching, concurrent medication, monitoring frequency, and the operational definition of a switch influence what is detected. A threshold crossed on a rating scale is not identical to a clinically disruptive manic episode. Risk must therefore be stated conditionally: in which population, with what surrounding treatment, over what interval, and according to which outcome rule? Absolute event rates and confidence intervals are also needed before a relative association can be translated into the scale of possible harm.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A switch may arise from drug exposure interacting with an already activated, sleep-disrupted, or weakly stabilized system; co-treatment and monitoring modify that interaction.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Both pivotal sources are abstract-level in this acquisition. Registry association is not randomized causality, and STEP-BD does not generalize beyond its adjunctive, selected, monitored design.

PART 09 · 9.4 · CONDITIONAL RISK NEEDS CONDITIONAL LANGUAGE

9.4 · Switching risk is conditional

Switch definitions vary across studies. Some count syndromal mania, others hypomania, rating-scale thresholds, rescue treatment, hospitalization, or treatment-emergent activation. Observation windows also matter: an early activation signal and a later spontaneous episode can be classified differently. If a study monitors frequently, it may detect brief changes that routine care misses. If it excludes mixed or high-risk participants, its reassuring average may not travel to those groups.

The counterevidence is therefore structurally informative rather than merely inconvenient. The registry signal cautions against assuming no contextual risk; STEP-BD cautions against assuming inevitable switching and also questions durable benefit for its tested adjunctive strategy. Together they suggest that surrounding treatment and selection shape the response surface. They do not yield a bedside probability for a particular person or justify starting, stopping, or altering medication outside individualized care.

For people taking medication, the binary public argument can be harmful in both directions. Alarmist certainty may provoke fear or abrupt discontinuation; blanket reassurance may erase early warning signs and prior experience. A more humane account names observable changes—sleep need, acceleration, agitation, impulsivity—and places them within a shared monitoring relationship. The person's report is data about their trajectory, while the population literature supplies priors rather than a verdict. Repeated observations before and after a change may clarify timing, but they still require interpretation alongside ordinary fluctuations and concurrent events. The safest scientific language remains specific about both the possible signal and the uncertainty surrounding its cause.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

STEP-BD found neither durable-recovery advantage nor excess switching for its adjunctive strategy, while observational monotherapy data signaled risk; design differences prevent a binary conclusion.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Prior activation and changes in sleep or speed deserve to be heard without turning population uncertainty into either dismissal or panic.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Switching is a context-sensitive transition probability: the same input acts differently when the surrounding controller and initial state change.

TRANSITION

Context does not only alter pharmacodynamics; the next section shows how three antiseizure-derived drugs create different exposure systems.

PART 09 · 9.5 · THE DOSE IS ONLY THE BEGINNING OF THE TRAJECTORY

9.5 · Three antiseizure drugs, three PK systems

CORE SENTENCE

Equal doses do not imply equal exposures: binding, autoinduction, and metabolic inhibition make treatment history part of pharmacokinetics.

Valproate, carbamazepine, and lamotrigine are grouped by their antiseizure origins, but their pharmacokinetic systems are profoundly different. Current valproate labeling documents concentration-dependent protein binding: the free fraction rises from about 10% at 40 micrograms per milliliter to 18.5% at 130. Unbound kinetics are more nearly linear than total concentration. Total plasma level is therefore not a fixed proxy for the pharmacologically available fraction, especially as concentration, albumin, age, pregnancy, or organ state changes.

Carbamazepine adds time dependence through autoinduction. It is metabolized through CYP3A4 to an active epoxide and induces metabolic systems, including its own clearance. During the first weeks, the same daily dose can yield a different exposure because clearance is changing. It also induces the metabolism of many co-medications. Initiation, established treatment, dose change, and discontinuation are thus pharmacokinetically non-equivalent histories, even before downstream neural adaptation is considered.

Lamotrigine demonstrates interaction dependence with unusual clarity. Label summaries report a multiple-dose half-life of about 25.4 hours without interacting drugs, about 70.3 hours with valproate, and roughly 12.6–14.4 hours with enzyme-inducing antiseizure drugs. Glucuronidation is the main metabolic route. Slow titration and careful restart rules are safety constraints because exposure history helps shape serious-rash risk. No one number called the half-life adequately describes lamotrigine outside its co-medication state. These contrasts are several-fold, large enough to alter accumulation, time to steady state, and the duration of change after a regimen is altered.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Valproate changes free fraction with concentration, carbamazepine changes its own clearance with time, and co-medications change lamotrigine clearance several-fold; exposure is a state variable, not dose rewritten.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Numeric valproate and lamotrigine parameters are locked to current formulation-specific labels. Carbamazepine autoinduction is label-grounded, but no population value predicts an individual outcome.

PART 09 · 9.5 · PHARMACOKINETICS REMEMBERS

9.5 · Three antiseizure drugs, three PK systems

These three systems defeat the intuition that a stable prescribed dose creates a stable perturbation. Low albumin can increase free valproate without an equivalent rise in total concentration. Carbamazepine clearance can evolve after initiation and again after withdrawal as induction appears or recedes. Adding valproate can prolong lamotrigine persistence, while an inducer can shorten it. The body's current state and the recent sequence of changes become part of the effective input.

This matters because adverse effects and efficacy are often interpreted as if they were direct functions of the written dose. Yet concentration sampling has timing error, adherence is imperfect, formulations differ, pregnancy can alter clearance, and organ state changes. Even unbound concentration does not determine clinical benefit or harm by itself. It is closer to the perturbation reaching targets, but receptor, cellular, network, subjective, and environmental variables still mediate the outcome.

A person may experience a change that seems disproportionate to a small adjustment. The appropriate response is not to infer weakness, noncompliance, or a universal mechanism from the experience. It is to recognize that nonlinear binding, time-varying clearance, and drug-drug interactions can make the exposure change larger or slower than the prescription suggests. This is educational pharmacology, not a dosing algorithm; interpretation and any medication change belong in individualized clinical care. Dense symptom timing can inform that conversation, but it cannot substitute for concentration context, safety examination, and the full medication list.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Plasma parameters are not brain concentrations, and exposure variability does not explain all heterogeneity in response, tolerability, or phase-specific efficacy.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A disproportionate subjective change after a seemingly small adjustment can be pharmacologically intelligible without being predictable from dose alone.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

PK creates hysteresis before neural plasticity begins: identical present doses can carry different exposures because their histories differ.

TRANSITION

Once exposure is understood as history-dependent, maintenance must be separated by the polarity it is intended to prevent.

PART 09 · 9.6 · PREVENTION MUST NAME WHAT IS BEING PREVENTED

9.6 · Polarity-specific maintenance matters

CORE SENTENCE

Maintenance is not one outcome: preventing mania, preventing depression, delaying any recurrence, and preserving life function can diverge.

Maintenance trials are often summarized as relapse prevention, but relapse is not a unitary event in bipolar disorder. A manic recurrence, a depressive recurrence, a mixed episode, hospitalization, rescue treatment, and any mood episode are different outcomes. A drug can shift one more than another. Time to first event also hides what happens after that event and can give the same statistical weight to outcomes with very different human consequences.

Lamotrigine illustrates a polarity pattern in two enriched maintenance trials. After participants with recently depressed or recently manic or hypomanic bipolar I disorder stabilized during open-label lamotrigine exposure, they were randomized to lamotrigine, lithium, or placebo. Lamotrigine prolonged time to intervention for depression versus placebo, whereas lithium separated more clearly on manic or hypomanic outcomes. The current label supports maintenance to delay mood episodes and does not establish acute mood-episode efficacy. These trial-specific findings do not prove a universal within-drug effect-size hierarchy across polarities.

Antipsychotic maintenance roles are likewise molecule- and formulation-specific. A drug that controlled an acute manic or psychotic state may reduce recurrence under continued exposure, yet its long-term value also depends on metabolic, motor, endocrine, cognitive, and subjective effects. Prevention is therefore a vector $R=(R_{mania}, R_{depression}, R_{mixed}, R_{hospitalization})$, not a single rank. The vector must be read alongside function and harm rather than collapsed into time to any event. Competing-risk structure matters as well: preventing one polarity can increase the observed opportunity for another event to become the first recorded recurrence.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Different medicines may alter basin depth or transition thresholds asymmetrically for manic and depressive trajectories, while their slow bodily effects accumulate on another clock.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The polarity pattern rests on two abstract-level enriched maintenance trials plus the current label; trial full texts remain pending. It supports a design-specific pattern, not a complete head-to-head polarity matrix or individual prediction.

PART 09 · 9.6 · A LONGER INTERVAL WITHOUT AN EPISODE IS NOT THE WHOLE TRAJECTORY

9.6 · Polarity-specific maintenance matters

Maintenance evidence faces design problems that acute evidence does not. Participants may enter only after responding to or tolerating the study treatment, enriching the sample. Randomized withdrawal can compare continuation with discontinuation, so early events may contain both recurrence and destabilization associated with the change itself. Adherence becomes a moving variable, and long follow-up increases attrition. These designs can still demonstrate average maintenance benefit, but their causal composition requires careful language.

Outcome geometry also changes with time. A medicine may prevent a severe episode while slowly contributing to weight change, thyroid disturbance, renal concentrating difficulty, sexual burden, or cognitive dulling. Another may be easier to live with but offer less protection against the polarity a person fears most. There is no scientific basis for pretending those dimensions share a universal exchange rate. Comparative value depends on the observed effect vector and on preferences articulated with the person, not imposed upon them.

The Flow Hijacked formulation is deliberately modest: maintenance seeks to alter transition probabilities and dwell times, not freeze a person into a chemically normalized state. Sleep regularity, relationships, stress, substance exposure, psychotherapy, and daily structure continue to feed back into the trajectory. Medication can be central without being the whole controller. This view rejects both pharmacological omnipotence and the opposite error of treating demonstrated recurrence prevention as merely symbolic. It also directs measurement toward repeated within-person trajectories, because a single clinic snapshot cannot show how stability is being maintained.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Enrichment, randomized-withdrawal effects, attrition, adherence, and composite recurrence endpoints complicate causal interpretation of long-term superiority.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Prevention gains meaning only when the feared polarity, bodily burden, daily function, and the person's own priorities are named.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Maintenance is polarity-specific control of transition probabilities embedded in nested bodily and environmental feedback.

TRANSITION

Two landmark strategy trials—BALANCE and STEP-BD—show why the design, not only the drug name, determines the conclusion.

PART 09 · 9.7 · THE PROTOCOL IS PART OF THE INTERVENTION

9.7 · BALANCE and STEP-BD test strategies

CORE SENTENCE

A treatment strategy includes sequencing, co-treatment, entry criteria, and outcome definition; trial conclusions cannot be reduced to isolated molecules.

BALANCE compared maintenance strategies involving lithium, valproate, and their combination after a combination run-in. In the acquired abstract-level record, lithium plus valproate and lithium alone prevented relapse better than valproate alone, while combination was not clearly superior to lithium alone. The result matters, but its unit is a strategy within a particular maintenance population—not a timeless declaration that one molecule dominates every bipolar phase.

The run-in is causally important. People who reach randomization after exposure to the combination may be enriched for tolerability or response, and transition from combination to monotherapy is not identical to beginning that monotherapy *de novo*. The open-label maintenance design, adherence, outcome definitions, and attrition shape the estimate. These qualifications do not erase the result; they specify the population and pathway to which it most directly applies.

STEP-BD tested a different strategy during bipolar depression: adding standard antidepressants to a mood stabilizer. In the acquired record, the adjunctive antidepressants did not improve durable recovery over mood stabilizer plus placebo. Its selected, monitored, adjunctive design cannot answer antidepressant monotherapy, every molecule, or every mixed and rapid-cycling presentation. Together, the trials teach that co-treatment, sequence, phase, and endpoint are not background details. They are components of the intervention. Reading them as molecule-versus-molecule contests would discard the very architecture that produced the observed result and misstate what was randomized. The comparator, too, is active context: placebo was added to an existing stabilizing strategy rather than given in pharmacological isolation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Run-in, continuation, withdrawal, and co-treatment create path-dependent exposure states; changing one component changes the strategy being tested.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Both landmark records remain abstract-level in this acquisition. Their principal findings are retained, but detailed attrition, protocol, harm, and subgroup claims are not upgraded to full-text lock.

PART 09 · 9.7 · DURABLE RECOVERY IS A DEMANDING ENDPOINT

9.7 · BALANCE and STEP-BD test strategies

STEP-BD's emphasis on durable recovery is conceptually important. A transient improvement followed by rapid loss is not the same outcome as sustained recovery over repeated assessments. By requiring durability, the endpoint incorporates time into benefit. Yet it remains a protocol-defined construct rather than the whole of lived recovery: work, connection, agency, cognition, physical health, and freedom from treatment burden may still diverge.

BALANCE similarly cautions against reading only the winning comparison. Combination did not clearly surpass lithium alone in the acquired summary, and lithium-containing strategies outperformed valproate alone in that design. The informative object is the pattern plus its uncertainty and entry pathway. A headline that combination wins, or that valproate fails, would strengthen the evidence beyond what the abstract-level acquisition permits and ignore acute antimanic efficacy established in a different phase.

For people and families, strategy trials clarify why apparently conflicting statements can both be true. Valproate may reduce acute mania yet be less effective than lithium-containing strategies for maintenance in a particular trial. An antidepressant may have efficacy in unipolar depression yet add no durable recovery in the tested bipolar adjunctive protocol. The diagnosis does not mechanically determine an answer; the phase and strategy determine which evidence becomes relevant. This helps replace the language of personal failure with a more accurate question: which tested strategy matched the state, outcome, and time horizon actually faced? It also clarifies why a future phase may require reopening the evidence map rather than simply repeating the acute choice.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

BALANCE's run-in and open-label maintenance design limit universal ranking; STEP-BD's selected adjunctive protocol does not settle monotherapy or every bipolar-depression presentation.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Treatment is experienced as a sequence and combination, not as an isolated molecule; the evidence should be explained in the same form.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

A therapeutic strategy is a controlled trajectory through exposure space; changing sequence or co-treatment changes the trajectory itself.

TRANSITION

The final bipolar section expands that trajectory from symptoms to kidneys, thyroid, metabolism, reproduction, sleep, and family time.

PART 09 · 9.8 · LONG-TERM VALUE IS DISTRIBUTED ACROSS BODIES AND GENERATIONS

9.8 · Trajectory includes body and reproduction

CORE SENTENCE

The treated system includes the whole body and future life; symptom benefit and organ, reproductive, cognitive, and circadian consequences must share the same trajectory map.

Lithium's disposition makes the body part of every exposure calculation. It is not metabolized, distributes in total body water, and is eliminated in urine; renal function and sodium-water state therefore materially affect exposure. The acquired long-term synthesis associates lithium with hypothyroidism and reduced urinary concentrating ability, while severe renal outcomes appear much rarer but cannot be treated as absent. Heterogeneous eras, durations, monitoring, and selection limit precise individual risk estimates.

Reproductive evidence demands equally exact boundaries. In a cohort of 1,325,563 live-birth pregnancies, first-trimester lithium exposure was associated with cardiac malformations in 2.41% versus 1.15% among unexposed pregnancies, adjusted risk ratio 1.65 with a 95% confidence interval of 1.02–2.68, and a dose-response pattern. Administrative exposure measures, residual confounding, and restriction to live births prevent this population association from becoming an individualized prediction.

Valproate presents a different and serious developmental signal. In a prospective observational epilepsy cohort—not a bipolar-specific cohort—prenatal valproate exposure was associated with an adjusted IQ of 92 at age three, compared with approximately 98–101 after lamotrigine, phenytoin, or carbamazepine exposure. Maternal disease, treatment selection, dose, genetics, socioeconomic conditions, missing outcomes, and indication constrain causal transfer. The evidence nevertheless makes fetal and child outcomes part of pharmacological value, never an external footnote. It also prevents psychiatric benefit from being discussed in a temporal vacuum, detached from pregnancy intention and the consequences of both exposure and destabilization. Both sides of that comparison require evidence and specialist interpretation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Renal clearance, endocrine feedback, metabolism, placental exposure, fetal development, sleep, and circadian state couple medication to a whole-body and intergenerational trajectory.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Lithium pregnancy and valproate neurodevelopment claims are full-text locked observational results. They do not supply individual causal estimates or a complete maternal-fetal benefit-harm comparison.

PART 09 · 9.8 · THE VALUE FUNCTION CHANGES ACROSS A LIFE

9.8 · Trajectory includes body and reproduction

Body variables do not sit beside psychiatric outcomes; they feed back into them. Thyroid change can affect energy and mood. Renal change can alter lithium exposure. Weight, glucose, hepatic state, and sedation can change sleep, mobility, self-experience, and willingness to continue treatment. Pregnancy and postpartum physiology can change clearance while sleep disruption and circadian instability alter the clinical state. The signs and magnitudes differ across drugs and people, so the lecture must resist a single burden score.

Reproductive planning also exposes a false separation between the person and future time. Fetal risk, maternal episode recurrence, medication effectiveness, prior history, alternative treatments, contraception, pregnancy intention, and postpartum support form one decision system. The cited cohorts illuminate specific associations; they do not decide that system. Individual decisions require current specialist guidance and shared assessment. General evidence should never be converted into abrupt medication change, especially when destabilization itself can carry serious risk.

Flow Hijacked represents value as a time-varying surface over symptoms, cognition, agency, sleep, sexuality, metabolic and organ health, relationships, recurrence risk, and reproductive commitments. This is a normative and testable measurement proposal, not a validated clinical calculator. Its ethical purpose is simple: no outcome that matters to the person should disappear merely because another outcome is easier to count. The trajectory closes Part 9 by returning the molecule to a living body embedded in future plans. Those plans can change, so the relevant utility surface must be revisited rather than assumed permanent.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Observational reproductive studies retain confounding and selection boundaries; long-term toxicity estimates vary across cohorts, durations, and monitoring eras.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A clinically meaningful plan must make room for bodily comfort, fertility and pregnancy intentions, cognition, family roles, and fear of recurrence—not only a mood score.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The medication trajectory is nested across brain, body, relationships, and future generations; benefit in one layer cannot erase cost in another.

TRANSITION

Phase specificity sets the standard for novelty: Part 10 asks what a mechanism beyond D2 must prove, and what failure actually falsifies.

PART 09 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

'Mood stabilizer' is not a universal mechanism or rank; phase, polarity, recurrence, switching, and body state define the intervention.

Bipolar pharmacology becomes coherent only when every claim names the phase, polarity, outcome, time horizon, exposure system, and bodily context. Acute control, depressive relief, switching, maintenance, function, and reproductive or organ consequences form a coupled trajectory rather than one mood-stabilizer rank.

Once treatment is read as a phase-specific trajectory, a novel mechanism must do more than engage a new target: it must produce replicated, durable, tolerable value in a defined state.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

9.1 · Build the phase matrix first — Acute mania, bipolar depression, mixed features, rapid cycling, maintenance, and polarity prevention are different treatment questions.

9.2 · Acute mania has its own evidence — Lithium, valproate, and multiple antipsychotics can reduce mania; efficacy and acceptability do not collapse into one ranking.

9.3 · Bipolar depression is not inverse mania — Quetiapine, lurasidone, cariprazine, lumateperone, lamotrigine, and other strategies have phase-specific—not universal—evidence.

9.4 · Switching risk is conditional — Monotherapy registry signals and STEP-BD adjunctive findings differ by population, co-treatment, monitoring, phase, and outcome.

9.5 · Three antiseizure drugs, three PK systems — Valproate has nonlinear free fraction; carbamazepine autoinduces; lamotrigine half-life shifts sharply with valproate or inducers.

9.6 · Polarity-specific maintenance matters — Lamotrigine is not an acute antimanic; antipsychotic and lithium roles differ for preventing manic versus depressive recurrence.

9.7 · BALANCE and STEP-BD test strategies — Combination, lithium, valproate, and adjunctive antidepressants must be read through design, phase, attrition, and durable recovery.

9.8 · Trajectory includes body and reproduction — Renal, thyroid, metabolic, hepatic, fetal/child, postpartum, cognitive, sleep, and circadian variables alter value over time.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Why do mania, depression, mixed states, and maintenance demand different evidence?

PART 10

Beyond D2: success, failure, and theory updating

What does a successful drug prove—and what does a failed drug falsify?

Perturbations identify leverage probabilistically; they do not automatically validate or erase an entire disease theory.

Part route

- 1. Why the field moved beyond D2**
- 2. Partial agonism complicates dopamine**
- 3. Xanomeline-trospium is multiscale by design**
- 4. Short-term efficacy has a boundary**
- 5. Ulotaront is a nonconfirmation case**
- 6. Bitopertin constrains glutamate theory**
- 7. BeneMin separates biomarker from treatment**
- 8. Use a falsification ladder**

PART 10 · 10.1 · A SUCCESSFUL LEVER CAN STILL BE AN INCOMPLETE MAP

10.1 · Why the field moved beyond D2

CORE SENTENCE

D2 blockade established a powerful therapeutic lever, but incomplete response and heterogeneous harms showed that one lever is not a complete model of psychosis.

Dopamine D2 antagonism transformed the treatment of psychosis and remains a major therapeutic route. Across acute schizophrenia trials, antipsychotics reduce overall symptoms on average, while comparative synthesis finds mostly graded rather than categorical efficacy differences and more marked differences in adverse effects. First-episode occupancy evidence also places therapeutic response and motor or endocrine effects in partly overlapping D2-occupancy ranges. A useful target can therefore carry a narrow or person-dependent benefit-harm window.

The pressure to move beyond D2 came from what this success did not solve. Some people show limited response, and clozapine's distinct role in treatment resistance already indicates that ordinary class expectations are incomplete. Negative symptoms, cognitive difficulty, functioning, and subjective vitality often remain even when positive symptoms improve. Motor effects, akathisia, prolactin changes, metabolic burden, sedation, and other costs vary by molecule and exposure. None of these facts denies antipsychotic efficacy; together they deny that efficacy exhausts the disease or the person.

A pharmacological perturbation is an intervention into a causal system, not a transparent window onto its origin. If D2 blockade reduces symptoms, dopamine-linked signaling is a leverage point for that outcome under those conditions. It does not follow that every psychotic experience is caused by a unitary dopamine excess, that upstream glutamatergic, cholinergic, stress, developmental, or network processes are irrelevant, or that D2 engagement predicts restoration of life function. Success localizes leverage more readily than etiology.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

D2 blockade perturbs a downstream signaling lever that can reduce positive-symptom expression, while upstream causes and parallel symptom-generating pathways may remain active.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Acute comparative efficacy is well supported, but the occupancy anchor remains abstract-level here, and symptom response does not establish a complete etiological or functional model.

PART 10 · 10.1 · UNMET NEED IS MULTIDIMENSIONAL

10.1 · Why the field moved beyond D2

The term nonresponse also needs decomposition. It may mean persistent positive symptoms despite adequate treatment, intolerable exposure before an adequate trial is possible, poor adherence caused by burden, a symptom domain that the drug was never strong at changing, or a functional life that remains compressed after scale improvement. These states do not point to one alternative target. They create different research programs and different standards for declaring novelty useful.

The history of generations can obscure this need. First-, second-, and so-called third-generation labels are historically convenient but pharmacologically coarse. Within each group, affinities, intrinsic efficacy, metabolites, formulation, persistence, and adverse-effect geometry vary. Moving beyond D2 may mean changing how D2 is engaged, adding a distinct target, or avoiding direct D2 binding altogether. Those are not the same mechanistic revolution and should not share one promotional label.

For a person taking medication, the relevant unmet need may be hearing voices that remain frightening, emotional flattening, cognitive fog, restlessness, weight change, sexual burden, or difficulty returning to relationships and work. Research gains integrity when it names the outcome people are still missing. A novel receptor story matters only if it changes a valued dimension without silently exchanging one burden for another. That standard motivates the cases that follow. It also requires trials to retain people who are usually excluded, because novelty tested only in a narrow sample may leave the largest unmet needs untouched.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

D2-based medicines remain effective for many acute outcomes; persistent limitations do not imply that dopamine is irrelevant or that every non-D2 program will succeed.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The unmet outcome should be named in the person's terms—fear, clarity, energy, movement, connection, function—not hidden inside the prestige of a novel target.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

A successful perturbation identifies one controllable direction in a high-dimensional system; it does not identify the whole state space.

TRANSITION

The first move beyond simple antagonism stayed at D2 but changed the mode of engagement: partial agonism.

PART 10 · 10.2 · A RECEPTOR CAN BE OCCUPIED WITHOUT BEING SILENCED

10.2 · Partial agonism complicates dopamine

CORE SENTENCE

Partial agonism is not a fixed middle position between blockade and stimulation; its net action depends on receptor system, competing ligand, intrinsic efficacy, and history.

Aripiprazole, brexpiprazole, and cariprazine are grouped as dopamine partial agonists, yet the grouping should not conceal molecular differences. Their D2 or D3 preferences, intrinsic efficacy, serotonin actions, metabolites, and persistence are agent-specific. A partial agonist binds a receptor and activates it less strongly than a reference full agonist in a given assay. That definition is relational: observed signaling depends on receptor density, coupling, pathway, competing dopamine, and the experimental system.

In a high-dopamine context, a high-affinity partial agonist can displace dopamine and reduce net signaling relative to the prior state. In a low-dopamine context, the same bound ligand can provide some receptor activation rather than pure antagonism. This is the intuition behind the phrase dopamine stabilization. But the phrase is an authors' and field interpretation, not a measured homeostat that guarantees restoration to a healthy set point across brain regions and people.

Functional selectivity complicates the picture further. A ligand need not drive every downstream pathway in the same proportion, and assay findings do not automatically map onto living human circuits. High D2 occupancy can coexist with a different prolactin or motor profile from pure antagonism, while akathisia, insomnia, activation, nausea, or impulse-control problems can still be prominent. Partial agonism is therefore a genuine pharmacological distinction, not an intrinsic claim of gentleness or universal balance. Its meaning must be re-established for each molecule, dose, formulation, pathway, clinical state, and outcome rather than inherited from the class name.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Net receptor signaling reflects competition between endogenous dopamine and a ligand with lower intrinsic efficacy, filtered through receptor density and pathway-specific coupling.

AUTHORS' INTERPRETATION · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Partial-agonist pharmacology is measured, while dopamine stabilization is a context-dependent interpretation. Assay-level biased signaling does not establish a human therapeutic mechanism.

PART 10 · 10.2 · HISTORY CHANGES WHAT PARTIAL AGONISM DOES

10.2 · Partial agonism complicates dopamine

A switch from a strong D2 antagonist to a partial agonist is not a static receptor substitution. Prior blockade may have altered receptor expression, signaling, sleep, and subjective state; the outgoing drug may persist while the incoming drug rises. During overlap, competition occurs among dopamine, two medicines, and sometimes active metabolites. The same written schedule can therefore create different transient signaling in people with different prior exposures and metabolic states.

Persistence magnifies this path dependence. Aripiprazole has long-acting injectable formulations, and cariprazine has very long-lived active metabolites. Benefits, activation, and adverse effects may consequently emerge or resolve on clocks that outlast a recent dose change. This does not prove that every difficult switch is receptor-mediated, because expectation, illness dynamics, adherence, and environment also change. It does show why the present dose is an incomplete causal description.

For the person, words such as stabilizer can sound like a promise that the drug detects and corrects the right direction automatically. A more accurate explanation preserves hope without personifying the molecule. Partial agonists offer distinct profiles and effective treatment in molecule-specific indications, but some people experience restlessness or activation and others do not respond. Individual monitoring and clinical judgment remain essential; the mechanism label cannot substitute for the person's observed trajectory. Careful temporal description—what changed first, what followed, and what persisted—can be more informative than debating whether the molecule is activating or balancing in the abstract.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Different partial agonists are not interchangeable, and reduced prolactin or motor burden on average does not eliminate akathisia, activation, metabolic effects, or nonresponse.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person's experience of restlessness, clarity, sleep, or agency is not overruled by the appealing word stabilization.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Partial agonism is a state-dependent controller whose effective sign and magnitude can change with endogenous tone, prior blockade, and exposure overlap.

TRANSITION

The next strategy avoids direct D2 blockade and deliberately splits central efficacy from peripheral tolerability.

PART 10 · 10.3 · ONE CAPSULE CONTAINS TWO ANATOMICAL INTENTIONS

10.3 · Xanomeline-trospium is multiscale by design

CORE SENTENCE

The fixed combination engineers two spatially different actions: a proposed central therapeutic perturbation and peripheral counter-perturbation, each with its own exposure clock.

Xanomeline-trospium differs from a conventional single-target story. Xanomeline is described in the current label as an agonist at central muscarinic M1 and M4 receptors, while trospium is a predominantly peripheral muscarinic antagonist with limited central penetration. The design seeks central muscarinic engagement while reducing peripheral cholinergic adverse effects. It is therefore a paired intervention across compartments, not merely one active molecule plus an inert protective ingredient.

The components also have distinct pharmacokinetics. Label evidence indicates that steady state is reached in roughly three to five days and that component half-lives are on the order of five to six hours, while metabolism and elimination differ. Trospium has substantial renal elimination; xanomeline uses several metabolic pathways. Food markedly changes trospium exposure, and renal or hepatic state can matter. Administration context is consequently part of the realized central-peripheral balance.

This design is multiscale before any network theory is invoked. Molecular binding is separated by anatomy; bodily tolerability is used to permit central exposure; gastrointestinal, urinary, cardiovascular, renal, hepatic, and food-related variables become part of the treatment system. The label nevertheless states that the schizophrenia mechanism is unclear and only thought to involve M1 and M4 agonism. Known receptor actions and PK do not identify the complete circuit route to symptom change. Nor do they reveal whether benefit arises through one dominant pathway or several interacting changes in cortical, striatal, autonomic, and experiential dynamics.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Central muscarinic agonism is paired with a largely peripheral antimuscarinic intended to subtract bodily cholinergic burden while preserving central perturbation.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Component pharmacology and PK are locked to the current US label. The proposed M1/M4 therapeutic mediation remains an interpretation, not a fully demonstrated human circuit mechanism.

PART 10 · 10.3 · COUNTER-PERTURBATION DOES NOT ERASE BODILY TRADE-OFFS

10.3 · Xanomeline-tropium is multiscale by design

Tropium's role should not be narrated as complete cancellation. The combination still produces both cholinergic and anticholinergic adverse effects, and the label identifies gastrointestinal, urinary, autonomic, cardiovascular, biliary, renal, and hepatic considerations. Reducing one peripheral burden can reveal another because agonism and antagonism act across different tissues, concentrations, and times. A central-peripheral design is sophisticated, but it is not a frictionless separation.

Food effects make this especially concrete. If food changes one component's exposure more than the other, the capsule's nominal fixed ratio does not guarantee a fixed biological ratio. Renal impairment can alter tropium persistence, while hepatic state can affect the combination through other routes. The causal object is therefore not simply milligrams of xanomeline plus milligrams of tropium. It is a time-varying pair of exposures conditioned by administration and body state.

For a person, the new mechanism may offer a different burden geometry rather than freedom from burden. Less direct D2 blockade can matter, but nausea, constipation, dry mouth, dyspepsia, vomiting, urinary difficulty, blood-pressure or pulse changes may matter too. The correct comparison is not old versus modern in the abstract. It is the full vector of symptom, bodily, cognitive, functional, and experiential outcomes over time, assessed in individual care. Rare or delayed effects also require surveillance after approval, because short trials cannot populate the far edges of that vector. Patient-reported experience is therefore an evidential domain, not a decorative testimonial added after efficacy has been decided.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Peripheral restriction is incomplete as a clinical burden solution: the combination retains cholinergic and anticholinergic risks, and long-term adaptation remains immature.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A different mechanism may feel meaningfully different, but novelty should be described through the burdens and benefits a person actually lives with.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

The combination is a two-compartment controller whose effectiveness depends on the ratio and timing of central perturbation and peripheral counter-perturbation.

TRANSITION

The architecture is plausible; the next question is what the short-term efficacy trial actually established.

PART 10 · 10.4 · A REPLICATED DIRECTION BEGINS WITH ONE LOCKED ESTIMATE

10.4 · Short-term efficacy has a boundary

CORE SENTENCE

EMERGENT-1 establishes a five-week symptom contrast for xanomeline-trospium; it does not establish comparative lifetime value or a complete muscarinic disease theory.

EMERGENT-1 was a randomized, double-blind, five-week phase-2 trial in adults with schizophrenia. Of 182 randomized participants, 170 entered the modified intention-to-treat efficacy analysis. PANSS total scores changed by -17.4 points with xanomeline-trospium and -5.9 with placebo. The least-squares mean between-group difference was -11.6 points, with a 95% confidence interval from -16.1 to -7.1 . That is the fully appraised numerical anchor in this acquisition.

The trial supports short-term antipsychotic efficacy without direct D2-receptor blockade. It also reported cholinergic and anticholinergic adverse events, with constipation, nausea, dry mouth, dyspepsia, and vomiting among the common events. Five weeks can detect a symptom contrast and common early tolerability signals. It cannot characterize rare harms, long-latency bodily adaptation, relapse prevention, treatment resistance, sustained cognition, employment, relationships, or comparative effectiveness against established antipsychotics.

The distinction between direct result and interpretation is essential. The empirical result is the measured five-week PANSS difference in the study population. The authors and regulatory framework connect efficacy to the paired muscarinic design, while the label states that the exact schizophrenia mechanism remains unclear. The broader inference is that direct D2 blockade is not necessary for short-term symptom reduction by every effective antipsychotic strategy. None of these statements proves that schizophrenia is fundamentally a muscarinic-deficiency disorder. Multiple upstream and downstream pathways could converge on the same PANSS change, and the trial did not adjudicate among them. Mediation would require additional measurements and designs beyond treatment assignment and endpoint separation.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The trial demonstrates clinical efficacy under a non-D2 direct-binding strategy; it does not identify which M1/M4-linked circuits mediate the symptom change.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High confidence for the appraised phase-2 short-term contrast; low confidence for long-term trajectory. The phase-3 article remained full-text pending at this checkpoint.

PART 10 · 10.4 · APPROVAL AND ACUTE EFFICACY OPEN QUESTIONS RATHER THAN CLOSE THEM

10.4 · Short-term efficacy has a boundary

The wider development program and US approval make xanomeline-trospium historically important, but this lecture keeps the locked and pending layers distinct. The phase-2 article is fully appraised; the phase-3 article cited in the package remained full-text pending at the checkpoint, while the official approval page verifies regulatory status. Regulatory authorization is consequential evidence, but it is not a substitute for reading each trial's estimand, missingness, harms, sponsor role, and follow-up.

The trial was funded by Karuna Therapeutics and the Wellcome Trust. Sponsor involvement does not invalidate the data, nor should novelty confer immunity from scrutiny. Modified intention-to-treat analysis excluded randomized participants without post-baseline efficacy data, and brief exposure limits harm detection. Larger and longer studies, active comparisons, treatment-resistance populations, functional endpoints, switching studies, and real-world persistence address questions that a placebo-controlled acute trial was not designed to answer.

For people living with psychosis, a non-D2 option may expand meaningful choice, especially when prior benefit was incomplete or burdens were difficult. Yet a new mechanism should not be presented as a guaranteed clean experience. The person still encounters a whole exposure system, including gastrointestinal and autonomic effects, dosing context, uncertainty, and the possibility of nonresponse. Hope is strongest when its evidential boundary is visible rather than hidden. The next decisive evidence will concern persistence, function, comparative burden, and who benefits outside the selected acute-trial population. Until then, acute efficacy and long-term value must remain distinct sentences.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Five-week placebo-controlled efficacy does not establish active-comparator superiority, long-term function, rare-harm safety, treatment-resistance benefit, or a complete muscarinic etiology.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Novelty can expand options, but a person needs the likely experience, uncertainty, and burden vector—not only the receptor headline.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

EMERGENT-1 identifies a new controllable direction in symptom space; long-term controllability and life-level value remain unmeasured dimensions.

TRANSITION

A positive phase-2 signal becomes trustworthy only through forward confirmation; ulotaront shows what happens when that chain weakens.

PART 10 · 10.5 · A LANDMARK SIGNAL MEETS THE REST OF THE PROGRAM

10.5 · Ulotaront is a nonconfirmation case

CORE SENTENCE

The standing of a drug follows the total development chain, not its most memorable positive paper; nonconfirmation updates the target probabilistically rather than erasing it.

Ulotaront, formerly SEP-363856, was developed as a TAAR1 agonist with 5-HT_{1A} activity and without direct D₂ binding. A four-week phase-2 trial in adults with acute schizophrenia reported a PANSS advantage over placebo and created genuine interest in a non-D₂ route. In this acquisition, that foundational paper remains abstract-level. Its positive result is historically relevant, but later evidence must govern the compound's present standing.

Two full-text-appraised syntheses now converge on uncertainty rather than robust confirmation. A living review of four studies with 1,291 participants found no clear overall acute-symptom advantage: standardized mean difference 0.15, with a 95% confidence interval from -0.05 to 0.34 under its sign convention. A dose-response analysis of three randomized trials with 1,144 participants estimated a small PANSS-total effect near 100 mg, SMD -0.23 with interval -0.43 to -0.02, but only one 100-mg group informed that point.

The apparently different pooled estimates can reflect inclusion, model, dose representation, and sign convention rather than a simple contradiction. Both are compatible with small or inconsistent efficacy and large placebo responses. They do not support a robust new class effect at this checkpoint. Nor do they prove that TAAR1 can never be useful. Target, dose, exposure, subgroup, illness stage, endpoint, site quality, and trial execution remain separable explanations requiring further discriminating evidence. Any renewed program must prospectively distinguish those explanations rather than retrofitting whichever one preserves optimism after the fact. That requirement converts post-hoc possibility into a falsifiable next test.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

A plausible TAAR1/5-HT_{1A} perturbation generated an early clinical signal, but later trials weakened the estimated link from target strategy to symptom outcome.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Moderate confidence that current efficacy is small or inconsistent; low confidence about an optimal dose or future target success. The original phase-2 paper remains abstract-level.

PART 10 · 10.5 · TARGET ENGAGEMENT CAN SURVIVE CLINICAL NONCONFIRMATION

10.5 · Ulotaront is a nonconfirmation case

A small 14-day open-label adjunctive study offers a useful warning about mechanistic layers. Among 22 patients, ulotaront was associated with reduced striatal dopamine-synthesis capacity measured with fluorodopa imaging, and the change correlated with positive-symptom improvement at $r=0.5$. The study was uncontrolled, brief, adjunctive, and correlational; it remains abstract-level. It may signal biological engagement, but it cannot establish mediation or clinical efficacy.

This separation matters because a drug can reach a target or alter a biomarker without producing a reliable therapeutic effect. Conversely, failure to show efficacy can arise before the target is adequately tested, through insufficient exposure, wrong population, weak endpoint, or trial noise. The total program nevertheless lowers confidence in the tested ulotaront strategy. Scientific caution does not mean refusing to update; it means updating the narrow claim at the level the data actually challenge.

For people waiting for better treatment, phase-2 excitement followed by nonconfirmation is not an abstract methodological lesson. It can create cycles of hope and disappointment. Responsible communication should say that an early signal was real as a reported trial result, that the current pooled efficacy is uncertain or small, and that investigation may continue without implying availability or benefit. A pipeline entry is not a treatment recommendation, and trial registration is not efficacy evidence. Transparent updates preserve trust better than quietly continuing to cite the founding positive paper after the evidential center of gravity has moved.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

A preliminary imaging change and an early positive trial do not outweigh later clinical nonconfirmation; conversely, one compound's program does not falsify every TAAR1 strategy.

LIVED RELEVANCE

People deserve a current account of the whole evidence chain, not recycled phase-2 hope or premature declarations that a target is dead.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Each link—exposure, target engagement, biomarker, symptoms, function—has its own transfer probability; failure at one link updates, but does not automatically erase, the entire chain.

TRANSITION

Bitopertin provides a second nonconfirmation case, this time constraining a specific GlyT1 route into glutamatergic theory.

PART 10 · 10.6 · A TARGET-LEVEL PREDICTION REACHES PHASE 3

10.6 · Bitopertin constrains glutamate theory

CORE SENTENCE

Failure of a well-specified GlyT1 intervention weakens that intervention-population-endpoint chain, not the entire heterogeneous family of glutamate hypotheses.

Bitopertin was developed as a glycine-transporter-1 inhibitor intended to modify glycine availability and NMDA-linked signaling. The clinical prediction was narrower than glutamate matters in schizophrenia: adjunctive inhibition of GlyT1, at tested doses, should improve persistent predominant negative symptoms in stable people already receiving antipsychotics. This specificity is scientifically valuable because it makes failure more informative than a vague test of a broad neurotransmitter theory.

Three phase-3 studies formed the program. SunLyte met prespecified futility criteria. In the acquired abstract, DayLyte and FlashLyte randomized 605 and 594 participants respectively after a stabilization period, comparing several bitopertin doses with placebo over 24 weeks. All arms improved, but none of the tested bitopertin doses separated significantly from placebo on the PANSS negative-symptom factor or the other reported endpoints. The abstract concludes that the studies provided no evidence of superior adjunctive efficacy.

That result constrains a real prediction. It lowers confidence that the tested doses and implementation of GlyT1 inhibition improve this negative-symptom construct in this stable population over this interval. It does not demonstrate that glutamate is normal, that NMDA-linked biology is irrelevant, or that every glycine-related intervention must fail. Glutamatergic hypotheses differ by cell type, circuit, developmental timing, disease stage, direction of perturbation, and clinical outcome. The null therefore narrows the viable theory space most usefully when those dimensions are kept explicit rather than bundled under one transmitter name. It is a boundary marker, not an eraser.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

GlyT1 inhibition was intended to alter glycine/NMDA-linked signaling; the phase-3 null breaks the predicted transfer from this target implementation to negative-symptom improvement.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High confidence for the reported phase-3 nulls at the abstract level. Full-text appraisal remains pending, so detailed attrition, multiplicity, harms, and subgroup claims are not locked.

PART 10 · 10.6 · A FAILED MOLECULE UPDATES A THEORY BY RESOLUTION

10.6 · Bitopertin constrains glutamate theory

The strongest conclusion matches the resolution of the experiment. Bitopertin did not show superior efficacy as an adjunct for the specified negative-symptom population at the tested doses and endpoint. A weaker conclusion would ignore a costly phase-3 failure; a stronger conclusion would falsely claim that all glutamate or NMDA theories are refuted. Good falsification sits between those errors and states precisely which arrow in the causal chain lost probability.

Alternative explanations should not become automatic rescue devices. Perhaps target engagement was insufficient, the relevant illness stage earlier, the negative-symptom construct heterogeneous, the circuit effect compensatory, or the endpoint insensitive. Each possibility must generate an independent measurement or prospective prediction. Without such a test, adding exceptions after failure only protects the theory from learning. The null result earns its place in the model even while broader mechanisms remain open.

For people living with persistent negative symptoms, this distinction matters because mechanistic plausibility can be marketed as imminent relief long before replicated benefit exists. The failed program does not make the symptoms less real or the need less urgent. It redirects attention toward better phenotyping, functional outcomes, earlier or different interventions, and evidence that a proposed target is actually engaged. Scientific disappointment should increase precision, not reduce the person to a failed endpoint. It should also protect scarce time and participation by requiring the next trial to answer a sharper question than the last.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Target engagement was not established here, negative symptoms are heterogeneous, and one GlyT1 implementation cannot erase all glutamatergic or NMDA-linked mechanisms.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A phase-3 null closes one promised route more than it closes the person's future; the research obligation is to learn exactly what failed.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Failure reduces the estimated gain of one input-state-output pathway; it should reshape the control map at that resolution, not flatten the whole system.

TRANSITION

BeneMin tests another tempting shortcut: moving from inflammatory relevance to an anti-inflammatory treatment claim.

PART 10 · 10.7 · A PLAUSIBLE ANTI-INFLAMMATORY ADJUNCT MEETS A PRAGMATIC TEST

10.7 · BeneMin separates biomarker from treatment

CORE SENTENCE

Etiological relevance, biomarker association, target engagement, and treatment efficacy are four different claims; BeneMin directly tested only part of that chain.

Minocycline attracted interest because it is an antibiotic with proposed anti-inflammatory and neuroprotective properties, and smaller studies had suggested benefit. BeneMin sought to replicate improvement in negative symptoms and investigate proposed mechanisms in recent-onset schizophrenia-spectrum psychosis. The trial randomized 207 people to minocycline or placebo added to ongoing care and followed them for 12 months. This was a clinically meaningful attempt to move from biological rationale to durable outcome.

The full-text-appraised result was null. For the primary negative-symptom outcome, the adjusted treatment-effect difference was -0.19 , with a 95% confidence interval from -1.23 to 0.85 . Primary biomarker outcomes—medial prefrontal grey-matter volume, dorsolateral prefrontal activation during working memory, and plasma interleukin-6—did not show the predicted treatment changes. About 61% of participants had the primary 12-month outcome, although dropout was balanced and sensitivity analyses did not reveal benefit.

The empirical conclusion is strong for the tested intervention and endpoint: adjunctive minocycline did not improve negative symptoms in this trial. The authors interpreted the findings as offering no evidence of the expected persistent progressive inflammatory or neuropathic process underpinning those symptoms. The broader inference must be narrower. Minocycline is one compound with particular actions; peripheral inflammation is not identical to central microglial state; and an unenriched population can dilute a responder subgroup that has not yet been validated. Crucially, the proposed subgroup cannot be assumed into existence merely because the overall trial was negative.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The proposed chain—anti-inflammatory drug to biomarker change to negative-symptom benefit—failed at both measured biomarker and clinical links in the tested population.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

High confidence for the tested minocycline strategy and primary endpoint. Attrition, intervention specificity, and lack of a validated enriched subgroup prevent target-wide or etiology-wide falsification.

PART 10 · 10.7 · INFLAMMATION CAN MATTER WITHOUT VALIDATING MINOCYCLINE

10.7 · BeneMin separates biomarker from treatment

Four propositions are often collapsed: inflammatory processes participate in some schizophrenia trajectories; a peripheral biomarker identifies that participation; minocycline engages the relevant central process; and minocycline improves a valued clinical outcome. Evidence for one does not logically supply the others. BeneMin directly weakens the last proposition in its studied population and provides no support for the measured biomarker mediation. That is already a substantial scientific update.

The trial's limitations should calibrate, not neutralize, the null. Missing primary outcomes reduce precision, but balanced dropout and sensitivity analyses did not reveal a hidden benefit. The intervention may be nonspecific, the timing wrong, or the relevant subgroup rare, but each rescue hypothesis now requires prospective enrichment and verified target engagement. A linked correction notice was inspected and did not reverse the primary null. Correction checking is part of the evidence, not an administrative afterthought.

For people, biomarkers can create a seductive sense that a blood result or inflammatory story has found the answer. The distinction protects them from overpromising. A biologically plausible explanation may validate that suffering has bodily dimensions, yet it does not automatically make a particular drug effective. The appropriate response to BeneMin is neither to dismiss inflammation nor to recommend minocycline broadly; it is to demand a better-connected chain from subgroup to target to lived outcome. That chain must be specified before treatment success is inferred from biological recognition alone. Recognition and therapeutic validation are related aspirations, not synonyms.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The trial tested minocycline in an unenriched recent-onset population, not every anti-inflammatory intervention or every biologically defined inflammatory subgroup.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A biomarker story can make suffering feel biologically recognized, but recognition should not be confused with proof that a proposed treatment will help.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

A multiscale explanation is only as strong as its weakest empirically tested transfer: body marker, central target, network change, symptoms, and life function must each be linked.

TRANSITION

The final section turns these cases into a reusable falsification ladder for every future mechanism claim.

PART 10 · 10.8 · SEVEN RUNGS PREVENT ONE RESULT FROM BECOMING A WHOLE THEORY

10.8 · Use a falsification ladder

CORE SENTENCE

Every mechanism claim should climb distinct evidential rungs; success or failure updates the rung tested, while transfer to the next rung must be demonstrated.

A falsification ladder separates seven questions. First: did the formulation create the intended exposure? Second: did it engage the proposed target in the relevant tissue? Third: did proximal cellular, circuit, or biomarker variables change as predicted? Fourth: did symptoms improve against an adequate comparator? Fifth: did cognition, function, agency, or quality of life improve? Sixth: was benefit durable and acceptably safe? Seventh: did independent replication and active comparison establish useful value? Each rung requires its own design.

The cases in Part 10 occupy different positions. Xanomeline-trospium has locked label pharmacology and a locked five-week phase-2 symptom contrast, while its long-term comparative and functional standing remains less mature. Ulotaront had an early symptom signal and preliminary imaging engagement, but pooled later efficacy is small or inconsistent. Bitopertin reached phase 3 and failed at the specified negative-symptom rung. BeneMin was null clinically and on its measured biomarker pathway. None can be summarized by the single word mechanism.

The ladder also governs pipeline language. A registered or recruiting trial proves that a protocol exists, not that a treatment works. Completion proves that data collection ended, not that results are positive. A press release is not a peer-reviewed analysis, target engagement is not clinical efficacy, statistical symptom change is not functional recovery, and approval is not active-comparator superiority. These distinctions keep anticipation connected to evidence rather than publicity. They also specify the next missing rung instead of treating every unknown as one undifferentiated gap.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Evidence must transfer sequentially from exposure to target to proximal biology to symptoms to life outcomes; no rung supplies the next by implication.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The ladder is a research-design inference synthesized from the verified cases. It is not a validated scoring instrument and does not assign a universal numerical threshold to any rung.

PART 10 · 10.8 · UPDATE PROBABILITY AT THE RESOLUTION OF THE TEST

10.8 · Use a falsification ladder

Theory updating can be written schematically as $P(H|D)$ proportional to $P(D|H)P(H)$: a result changes confidence in a hypothesis according to how expected that result was if the hypothesis were true. A failed, adequately powered trial should strongly reduce confidence in its precise intervention-population-endpoint claim. It may reduce a broad target theory less, because the broad theory permits many implementations. That flexibility is scientifically legitimate only when alternatives were specified before or can now be tested independently.

Success has the same asymmetry. A positive trial increases confidence that the tested strategy can affect the measured outcome. It increases confidence in a complete disease theory only modestly when several causal routes predict the same improvement. Symptom efficacy without direct D2 binding shows that D2 blockade is not necessary for every effective acute intervention; it does not identify a sole muscarinic cause. The best explanation survives comparison with alternatives, replication, mediation tests, and out-of-sample prediction.

Flow Hijacked adds a multiscale requirement: discordance is information. Adequate plasma exposure with no target engagement points to distribution or assay problems. Engagement without symptoms points to a weak causal link, compensation, or wrong state. Symptoms without function expose an outcome gap. Early benefit without durability identifies a time-scale failure. Benefit with intolerable harm identifies a utility failure. The ladder turns apparent disappointment into a map of where the chain broke and what must be measured next. Its purpose is disciplined learning, not awarding a mechanistic sophistication score.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The ladder can oversimplify feedback, parallel pathways, and measurement error; causal chains are often branched rather than strictly serial, and broad theories can be too elastic to falsify.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person needs to know which rung has evidence: reaching a receptor, lowering a score, and restoring a livable future are not interchangeable achievements.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Mechanistic progress is a mapped pattern of concordance and discordance across scales, not a binary verdict attached to a molecule.

TRANSITION

The ladder leads directly to Part 11: if the links can diverge across time and scale, the living brain must be modeled as a history-dependent control problem.

PART 10 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Perturbations identify leverage probabilistically; they do not automatically validate or erase an entire disease theory.

Moving beyond D2 replaces a single-mechanism narrative with disciplined perturbation science. Partial agonism changes the mode of dopamine engagement; xanomeline-trospium establishes short-term efficacy through a non-D2 direct-binding strategy; ulotaront, bitopertin, and minocycline show how later evidence constrains early promise. Each success and failure updates only the causal links it actually tests.

The resulting discordance among exposure, engagement, symptoms, function, durability, and harm demands the multiscale, history-dependent control model developed in Part 11.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

10.1 · Why the field moved beyond D2 — Persistent nonresponse, negative and cognitive symptoms, motor/endocrine costs, and heterogeneous trajectories created pressure for new leverage points.

10.2 · Partial agonism complicates dopamine — D2/D3 partial agonists are genuine pharmacological distinctions; ‘dopamine stabilization’ remains a context-dependent interpretation.

10.3 · Xanomeline-trospium is multiscale by design — Central M1/M4 agonism is paired with peripheral muscarinic antagonism; food, renal state, and distinct component PK shape exposure.

10.4 · Short-term efficacy has a boundary — Phase-2 PANSS difference –11.6 points supports efficacy without direct D2 blockade; phase-3 full text and long-term comparisons remain incomplete here.

10.5 · Ulotaront is a nonconfirmation case — Phase-2 promise did not mature into robust phase-3 efficacy; pooled estimates are small/inconsistent and do not falsify TAAR1 universally.

10.6 · Bitopertin constrains glutamate theory — Failed phase-3 negative-symptom trials update GlyT1/NMDA predictions without erasing every glutamatergic mechanism.

10.7 · BeneMin separates biomarker from treatment — Adjunctive minocycline was null; inflammation may remain relevant without making minocycline broadly effective.

10.8 · Use a falsification ladder — Ask separately about target engagement, symptoms, function, durability, safety, replication, and comparative value; registration is not efficacy evidence.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

What does a successful drug prove—and what does a failed drug falsify?

PART 11

The living brain as a history-dependent control problem

Which variables did each era hold fixed that living systems refuse to hold fixed?

Mathematics clarifies exposure, delay, adaptation, switching, gain, and trade-offs, while remaining a scaffold until each mapping is identified and tested in people.

Part route

- 1. Reassemble the 17-link chain**
- 2. Dose is not exposure**
- 3. Plasma is not effect site**
- 4. Fast state meets slow adaptation**
- 5. State space has geometry**
- 6. Stable systems can transiently amplify**
- 7. Control is constrained and model-dependent**
- 8. Close the feedback loop**

PART 11 · 11.1 · FROM MOLECULE TO TRAJECTORY

11.1 · Reassemble the 17-link chain

CORE SENTENCE

A psychiatric drug acts through a causal chain whose links change one another; no single link can stand for the whole treatment.

The earlier parts followed discoveries one molecule and one era at a time. We can now reassemble them into a single causal chain: molecule and formulation; route and absorption; metabolism and clearance; plasma, free, and tissue exposure; target engagement; intracellular response; local circuit; distributed network; body state; felt experience; behavior; relationships and environment; feedback into the next exposure; and the longer trajectory. Counting boundaries differently produces seventeen useful links, but the exact number is less important than refusing to erase the middle.

Evidence is not equally direct at every link. Labels and pharmacokinetic studies can measure formulation, concentration, clearance, and some bodily consequences. Positron-emission tomography can estimate target occupancy in selected settings. Randomized trials can estimate average differences in specified outcomes. By contrast, the path from receptor perturbation to a particular network state, from that state to meaning, and from meaning to future adherence is often only partly observed. The multiscale maps therefore mark measured relations, mechanistic interpretations, and Flow Hijacked synthesis separately.

This architecture also prevents reverse inference. If a medicine reduces a symptom, that does not prove that the disorder was caused by the molecular process the drug perturbed. If a receptor is occupied, that does not establish the route by which a life changed. The chain is a discipline for asking what was actually measured, which mediator was inferred, what alternative path could produce the same observation, and which link would need a direct perturbation before causal language becomes justified. It also prevents a later outcome from being projected backward as proof that an earlier link was already known.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

The chain joins pharmacokinetics, target engagement, multiscale biological response, lived experience, environmental interaction, and recursive feedback without claiming that every intermediate arrow has been empirically identified.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The acquired mechanism maps support measured examples at several links, but the complete 17-link ordering is a Flow Hijacked organizing synthesis, not a validated universal causal graph.

PART 11 · 11.1 · THE MISSING MIDDLE IS THE SCIENTIFIC WORK

11.1 · Reassemble the 17-link chain

Different medicines illuminate different segments. Clozapine makes clearance visibly dependent on smoking, inflammation, age, and co-medication before its broad receptor pharmacology is considered. Haloperidol occupancy data show that response and motor or endocrine burden can rise across partly overlapping target-engagement ranges. Antidepressant experience evidence adds a different limit: a reported state can be common while its attribution to treatment versus residual illness remains unresolved. These observations support a multiscale question; they do not supply one universal mechanism connecting every link.

The chain changes research design. A target study without timed exposure cannot distinguish pharmacology from variable delivery. A network correlation without a receptor or concentration measure cannot show mediation. A symptom scale without body, function, and experience measures cannot reveal the trade-off it summarizes. A follow-up that ignores sleep, stress, substance use, relationships, access, and actual medication taking cannot close the feedback loop. Missing variables are not background noise when they alter the intervention itself.

For a person receiving treatment, the same diagram has a humane consequence. A dose is not simply imposed on a brain; it is taken, absorbed, interpreted, tolerated, sometimes resisted, and situated within a day. Relief may enable sleep and reconnection, while restlessness or flattening may weaken trust and alter future exposure. Those statements describe possible pathways, not a prediction about any individual. That distinction keeps the model explanatory rather than totalizing. The next section begins at the first quantitative break in the chain: the amount prescribed is not the exposure that reaches the body or brain.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

No acquired study observes all links simultaneously, and causal ordering can differ by drug, person, state, and outcome; a neat chain can falsely imply linearity where feedback and parallel routes dominate.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The framework makes room for simultaneous relief, burden, uncertainty, and agency, while refusing to treat one person's experience as proof of a population mechanism.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked uses the 17-link chain as a claim-auditing instrument: every arrow must be measured, bounded, or explicitly marked as inference.

TRANSITION

The chain's first quantitative lesson is that administered dose must be translated into time-varying exposure before downstream effects can be interpreted.

PART 11 · 11.2 · TRANSLATE INPUT INTO CONCENTRATION

11.2 · Dose is not exposure

CORE SENTENCE

A prescribed amount becomes a time-varying exposure only through formulation, physiology, behavior, and clearance.

A basic pharmacokinetic compartment treats plasma concentration as a balance: input raises concentration, while clearance removes drug relative to a distribution volume. A physiological model adds tissues with their own blood flows, volumes, partitioning, and sinks. Neither equation is a picture of the body. Each is a deliberately simplified accounting system that asks where mass can move, how quickly, and which observations are sufficient to estimate the unknown parameters.

The distinction matters because equal nominal doses can produce unequal concentration curves. Route and formulation alter absorption and peaks. Smoking or inflammation can change clozapine clearance. Renal function and sodium or water state change lithium exposure. The same contextual change can therefore alter delivered exposure without changing the prescription, so a dose comparison must not be mistaken for an exposure comparison. These are documented examples of state-dependent pharmacokinetics, not evidence that concentration alone determines benefit or harm.

A useful model must therefore specify the clock, material, and compartment. Is the input an oral tablet, injection, depot release, or missed administration? Is the measured quantity total plasma drug, unbound drug, active metabolite, or a tissue proxy? Are clearance and adherence stable across the observation window? Parameters fitted in one population may not transport to another. The established model family supplies a language for these questions; a drug-specific, person-specific application requires measured data and prospective validation. It becomes clinically informative only when observations identify its flows rather than merely decorate assumed compartments.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Compartment and physiologically based pharmacokinetic equations conserve drug mass while representing absorption, distribution, metabolism, and elimination as parameterized flows.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

MATH-01 is an established modeling family. Its psychiatric illustrations are supported by drug-specific PK evidence, but no generic parameter set or individual dosing rule is inferred here.

PART 11 · 11.2 · EXPOSURE IS A TRAJECTORY, NOT A LABEL

11.2 · Dose is not exposure

Exposure is not one number. Peak, trough, average, free fraction, active-metabolite burden, accumulated depot release, and rate of change can each matter for a different outcome. A concentration measured at an unknown interval after a dose may be difficult to interpret. A stable average can hide peaks associated with transient burden or troughs associated with loss of target engagement. Sparse samples can still be useful in population models, but only when timing, formulation, covariates, and the observation process are represented honestly.

The model also reveals circularity. Illness can change eating, smoking, hydration, sleep, and medication taking; infection can change clearance; adverse effects can change willingness to continue. These changes alter future concentration even when the prescription is unchanged. What appears to be changing receptor sensitivity may begin as changing delivery. Conversely, a concentration within a population reference range does not prove adequate target-site exposure or explain a person's response, because unmeasured tissue distribution, pharmacodynamics, and context remain.

For lived care, this is a reason for precision and humility, not a dosing calculator. Timed measurements can sometimes clarify nonresponse, interaction, or toxicity, especially for selected medicines, while still leaving clinical judgment and the person's experience indispensable. The present lecture does not convert population equations into individualized instructions. It establishes a measurement order: reconstruct actual input and exposure before attributing an effect to receptors or diagnosis. Uncertainty in that reconstruction should travel forward into every downstream claim. Once that is done, the next uncertainty appears—the concentration in plasma still need not be the concentration or effect at the relevant site.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Compartment structure can be misspecified, free brain exposure is rarely measured, adherence and clearance can vary over time, and a better concentration estimate may still fail to predict clinical value.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Two people receiving the same prescribed dose may experience different timing, intensity, benefit, and burden without either experience being dismissed as inconsistency.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats exposure reconstruction as the first identification problem in any medication trajectory, before a mechanistic or moral explanation is entertained.

TRANSITION

After dose has been translated into exposure, an effect-site model is needed to represent lag, saturation, and regulated response.

PART 11 · 11.3 · DELAY, SATURATION, AND TURNOVER

11.3 · Plasma is not effect site

CORE SENTENCE

Concentration becomes effect through delay, nonlinear target engagement, and biological turnover—not through an instantaneous one-to-one conversion.

An effect compartment inserts a simple delay between plasma concentration and a hypothetical biophase: the effect-site concentration approaches plasma at an estimated equilibration rate. Hill or Emax functions then represent a saturating relation between concentration and effect or occupancy. Near the steep part of such a curve, a modest exposure change can produce a larger target change; near saturation, a larger dose change may add little engagement. The parameters belong to a defined drug, outcome, population, and model—not to a universal psychiatric constant.

Indirect-response models add another clock. A drug may stimulate production or inhibit loss of a regulated quantity—hormone, metabolic signal, gene product, or synaptic variable—whose response lags behind concentration. When exposure falls, that quantity need not return along the same route or at the same speed. This creates onset-offset asymmetry and offers one formal way to represent rebound. It does not, by itself, identify which slow variable matters clinically or prove that post-discontinuation worsening is withdrawal rather than recurrence.

Haloperidol occupancy illustrates both the usefulness and danger of the curve. In one small first-episode study, modeled probabilities of response, prolactin elevation, and extrapyramidal effects increased over partly overlapping D2-occupancy ranges. The result supports probabilistic windows, not a sharp universal threshold. A static occupancy value leaves out how quickly it was reached, how long it persisted, which other targets were engaged, how the system adapted, and which outcome the person values. Different outcomes may also require distinct effect sites and parameter sets.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

MATH-02-04 separate equilibration delay, saturating concentration-effect relations, and regulated production or loss, allowing distinct onset and offset trajectories.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The equations are established PK/PD forms and D2 occupancy has empirical support in a small specific study; extension to subjective or recurrence dynamics is outcome-specific and incompletely identified.

PART 11 · 11.3 · THE DIRECTION OF TRAVEL MATTERS

11.3 · Plasma is not effect site

A concentration–effect plot can form a loop rather than a single line. On the rising limb, distribution delay may make effect smaller than expected from plasma; on the falling limb, effect-site concentration or a regulated response may persist. Longer histories add receptor regulation, plasticity, endocrine change, learning, and expectation. The same measured concentration can therefore coexist with different effects depending on whether exposure is rising or falling and what preceded it. This is hysteresis as a modeling observation, not yet a complete clinical explanation.

The distinction protects discontinuation research from two opposite errors. It is unsafe scientifically to assume that every early worsening simply reveals an unchanged underlying disorder. It is equally unwarranted to classify every event after reduction as withdrawal. Timing, physical and affective features, taper pattern, prior duration, drug half-life, recurrence history, and stabilization after a dose hold may contribute information, but clean causal separation is often unavailable. An indirect-response equation can organize candidate mechanisms; adjudication still requires appropriately designed longitudinal evidence.

For the person, onset and offset asymmetry can feel like unpredictability or disbelief from others: the medicine may have left plasma while sleep, movement, emotion, or cognition has not returned to baseline. The model validates the possibility of multiple clocks without claiming what any symptom means for one individual. Clinical decisions remain individualized and supervised. The conceptual gain is narrower and important: a present concentration does not erase exposure history. To represent that history explicitly, the next section separates fast state from slow adaptation.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Apparent hysteresis can arise from model misspecification, unmeasured active metabolites, changing adherence, measurement delay, or disease dynamics rather than a distinct effect compartment or adaptation process.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The possibility of several clocks helps explain why a person's reported experience may not track a plasma half-life, while preserving uncertainty about its cause.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats direction, rate, and prior duration of exposure as candidate state variables rather than reducing response to the current level alone.

TRANSITION

Effect-site delay explains minutes or hours; path dependence over weeks or years requires a coupled fast-slow system.

PART 11 · 11.4 · TWO CLOCKS, ONE EVOLVING SYSTEM

11.4 · Fast state meets slow adaptation

CORE SENTENCE

What changes quickly evolves inside conditions that change slowly—and those slow conditions remember prior treatment.

A fast-slow formulation distinguishes a rapidly varying state, x , from slower parameters, p . The fast state may summarize neural activity, autonomic arousal, attention, mood, perception, and immediate experience under drug and environmental inputs. The slow variables may represent receptor regulation, plasticity, endocrine or metabolic state, learned expectations, habits, relationship patterns, and stable features of the care environment. Random fluctuations enter because repeated trajectories are never perfectly identical, even under apparently similar inputs.

The separation is conceptual, not anatomical. A hormone can change quickly in one setting and slowly in another; sleep loss can alter experience within hours yet accumulate across weeks; a relationship can shift suddenly while its consequences persist. The small parameter customarily used to mark slow evolution is justified only when data support a time-scale separation. There is no single universal epsilon for psychiatry, and no requirement that every variable fit cleanly into one of two boxes.

The model's value is to make adaptation visible. A drug can perturb a target quickly while slower bodily and learned conditions determine whether that perturbation becomes relief, tolerance, burden, or a changed response to later exposures. When the drug clears, those conditions may remain. This offers a disciplined language for delayed benefit, chronic adverse effects, sensitization, and incomplete reversal, but it does not prove a specific biological adaptation. Each proposed slow variable needs measurement, manipulation where ethical, and out-of-sample predictive value. More than two time scales may be required when the evidence supports them.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

MATH-05/06 couple stochastic fast state dynamics to slowly evolving parameters, allowing present response to depend on prior exposure, body state, learning, and environment.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Fast-slow and stochastic dynamics are established mathematics. The selected psychiatric state variables and couplings are an empirically motivated Flow Hijacked organizing model, not biological proof.

PART 11 · 11.4 · HISTORY ENTERS THE PARAMETERS

11.4 · Fast state meets slow adaptation

Path dependence means that the same present input can have different consequences after different histories. Prior duration, previous dose changes, sleep debt, stress, inflammation, learning, and relational safety may have altered the slow parameters through which today's exposure acts. Hysteresis is one visible signature: the system can follow a different path as input falls than it followed as input rose. Yet history dependence is broader than any loop on a graph; it includes changes in both biology and the conditions of living.

A fast-slow account can also fail. An apparently slow adaptation may be an unmeasured fast driver. A smooth parameter drift may conceal abrupt switching. Noise may stand in for omitted causes, and flexible latent variables can fit nearly any trajectory after the fact. Dense longitudinal data are therefore necessary but not sufficient. The decisive tests use known perturbation times, repeat observations within people, compare simpler models, and ask whether the fitted system predicts a held-out change rather than merely redescribing the past.

The lived implication is neither determinism nor blame. If response depends on accumulated state, variability across days or people is not evidence that someone is unreliable. At the same time, a model cannot know which experience matters unless the person reports it and the measurement system listens. The framework invites an expanded history—medication, sleep, body, expectations, relationships, and access—without converting biography into pathology. Once history changes parameters, abrupt clinical transitions become possible; the next section asks how the geometry of state space can represent them.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Many clinically relevant variables do not separate neatly into fast and slow scales, fitted latent dynamics can be nonidentifiable, and descriptive path dependence does not establish its molecular substrate.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A history-dependent account can take changing experience seriously without declaring it imagined, fixed, or mechanistically solved.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked places plastic, bodily, learned, and relational conditions inside the evolving model rather than holding them fixed outside pharmacology.

TRANSITION

When slow parameters reshape the vector field, the next question is geometric: which states become stable, reachable, or difficult to leave?

PART 11 · 11.5 · STATES, BASINS, AND THRESHOLDS

11.5 · State space has geometry

CORE SENTENCE

A medicine may reshape where a system tends to dwell and how it moves, but a clinical landscape must be inferred and tested rather than merely drawn.

State space represents the possible configurations of selected variables. A point is not a location in the brain; it is a simultaneous value of the model's coordinates. In Wilson-Cowan equations, interacting excitatory and inhibitory population activities can produce fixed points, oscillations, thresholds, and hysteresis as coupling, input, or gain changes. The model is foundational for neural populations, yet mapping a psychiatric drug from receptor action into those particular parameters remains a hypothesis-generating step.

An attractor is a pattern toward which nearby trajectories tend to evolve. Its basin contains the starting states that approach it. With noise, a system may dwell for a time in a region and then switch, making metastability more useful than permanent equilibrium. Medication, sleep, stress, and learning could in principle alter basin depth, barriers, dwell time, or transition probability. These phrases organize abrupt episodes and partial responses without requiring a fixed lesion, but they are not clinical facts simply because the geometry is compelling.

A potential landscape is especially seductive: valleys look like illness states and hills like recovery barriers. Yet living-brain dynamics are generally non-equilibrium and need not be generated by a single potential function. Dimensionality reduction, preprocessing, or an assumed number of latent states can manufacture apparent valleys. A defensible landscape requires clearly defined observables, repeated trajectories, perturbations, uncertainty estimates, and a demonstration that the inferred geometry predicts transitions outside the data used to draw it. The mapping must also survive changes in task, measurement modality, and clinical phase; otherwise the landscape may belong to the assay.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Neural-mass equations and stochastic transition models can represent thresholds, dwell times, switching, and hysteresis by changing the vector field or transition structure.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Wilson-Cowan dynamics, attractors, and metastability are established mathematical constructs; their specific mapping to psychiatric medication trajectories is incomplete and must remain labeled as model or synthesis.

PART 11 · 11.5 · A LANDSCAPE MUST EARN ITS CLINICAL MEANING

11.5 · State space has geometry

Network data can be summarized as latent states, transition matrices, synchronization measures, or dwell-time distributions. Repeated electroencephalography, magnetoencephalography, or carefully modeled functional imaging may reveal changes in repertoire or switching under exposure. But the number and identity of states depend on sampling rate, preprocessing, motion, model selection, and the behavior performed during measurement. A state that is statistically reproducible is not automatically a syndrome, a conscious experience, or a treatment target.

Clinical identification therefore requires bridges across levels. Timed dose and concentration should precede target engagement; target engagement should precede a preregistered network prediction; the network change should be tested as a mediator of an outcome that matters. Active comparators help distinguish a target-specific change from sedation, expectancy, or common clinical contact. Within-person replication helps separate stable individual dynamics from population averages. Even then, the model may predict without revealing a uniquely correct mechanism. External validity must precede any clinical interpretation of a latent state.

For lived experience, geometry offers a cautious metaphor: a person may feel stuck, abruptly shifted, unusually fragile, or temporarily more flexible. Those descriptions can guide questions but cannot diagnose an attractor. The ethical gain comes from recognizing that effort alone does not determine movement through a constrained state space, while still preserving agency and multiple possible paths. The next section adds a less intuitive result: a system can be stable in the long run and nevertheless amplify a small perturbation dramatically for a while.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Inferred states can be artifacts of preprocessing or model choice, potential landscapes may be invalid for non-equilibrium dynamics, and no acquired evidence identifies a universal medication-shaped clinical attractor.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Feeling stuck or suddenly shifted can be described without blaming the person, but the metaphor must not be used as a hidden diagnosis or proof of a brain state.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked uses state-space geometry to formulate testable transition questions while withholding biological status until exposure-linked, longitudinal identification succeeds.

TRANSITION

Geometry explains where trajectories may dwell; transient-gain theory asks why a small input can have a disproportionately large temporary effect.

PART 11 · 11.6 · THREE ROUTES TO DISPROPORTIONATE CHANGE

11.6 · Stable systems can transiently amplify

CORE SENTENCE

Long-run stability does not rule out large temporary responses, but importing that mathematics into psychiatry creates hypotheses—not discoveries.

Critical slowing describes a restricted situation near certain bifurcations: recovery from a small disturbance becomes slower as a dominant restoring rate approaches zero. Under additional assumptions, variance and lagged autocorrelation may rise. A locally catalogued depression study reports associations between such indicators and selected mood transitions, but its full text has not been appraised for this release. It does not show that every transition is a bifurcation, and the indicators are neither necessary nor sufficient. Trends, colored noise, changing measurement, and medication changes can imitate warning signals.

Non-normal dynamics provide a different route. Even if every eigenvalue indicates asymptotic stability, non-orthogonal modes can align so that a perturbation grows temporarily before decaying. The gain depends on direction: the same-sized input along another mode may do little. Resolvent analysis extends the question into frequency, asking whether a system selectively amplifies rhythmic inputs such as sleep-wake, arousal, sensory, or stress fluctuations. These are established mathematical results about operators, not established properties of a medicated human brain.

Flow Hijacked therefore makes a bounded proposal. Some abrupt activation, akathisia, dissociation, or destabilization might reflect exposure changes aligned with a temporarily sensitive mode; some approaching episodes might show slower recovery from ordinary perturbations. The proposal predicts measurable input-output patterns, not a hidden explanation for every difficult experience. It requires timed exposure, dense within-person outcomes, system identification, simpler benchmarks, and prospective replication before any mechanistic or clinical claim is earned. A predicted sensitive direction must be observable and distinct from ordinary dose-response nonlinearity.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

MATH-10-12 distinguish reduced recovery rate near some transitions, direction-selective transient amplification in non-normal systems, and frequency-selective resolvent gain.

NEW HYPOTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The mathematical foundations are established. The psychiatric early-warning anchor is bibliographic/abstract-level and not full-text appraised; medication-specific transient-gain and resolvent mechanisms remain explicit new hypotheses.

PART 11 · 11.6 · A FALSIFIABLE SENSITIVITY MAP

11.6 · Stable systems can transiently amplify

The hypothesis becomes scientific only when the sensitive direction and time scale are specified in advance. A study might estimate a local input-output operator from repeated, ethically acceptable perturbations, then predict which rate or timing of exposure change produces transient movement, sleep disruption, or cognitive alteration. A held-out perturbation must be predicted better than a simple dose, concentration, or trend model. Otherwise non-normality is an elegant redescription rather than an explanatory gain.

Early-warning claims need equally severe tests. Autocorrelation or variance should be computed from stable measurement procedures, with artifacts from missingness, circadian rhythm, changing adherence, and medication adjustments modeled explicitly. Performance must be evaluated prospectively across people and transitions, including false alarms and missed events. A signal that appears only after selecting the transition window or smoothing method cannot guide care. Even a replicated predictor would not show that critical slowing caused the episode.

For someone who experiences a response far larger than a small dose change seemed to warrant, transient-gain theory can preserve the question without invalidating the report. It cannot retrospectively certify the mechanism, and it should never be used to make an individualized dosing decision from this lecture. The humane use of the model is to ask better temporal questions: what changed, how fast, in which state, and how long did recovery take? Negative findings would meaningfully weaken the proposal. The next section turns from sensitivity to control and asks whether mathematical reachability corresponds to anything clinically achievable.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Stable eigenvalues, rising autocorrelation, or high resolvent gain can reflect modeling choices, noise, or omitted variables; none currently establishes a psychiatric-drug mechanism or a safe intervention rule.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The model allows disproportionate temporary experience to be investigated seriously without treating it as proof, prediction, or personal failure.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

Flow Hijacked proposes exposure-linked sensitivity and recovery-time maps as falsifiable research targets, not as clinical instruments ready for use.

TRANSITION

Sensitivity asks how much a system responds; control theory asks whether a desired transition can be produced under realistic inputs and constraints.

PART 11 · 11.7 · REACHABILITY IS NOT TREATMENT

11.7 · Control is constrained and model-dependent

CORE SENTENCE

A state may be reachable in an equation yet unreachable, unsafe, unwanted, or unidentifiable in a person's life.

Linear control theory asks whether inputs can move a modeled state from one point to another and what input energy a specified model assigns to that transition. The answer depends on the dynamics matrix, the input map, the time horizon, the chosen norm, and the target state. In network neuroscience, substituting structural connectivity for dynamics can make the calculation possible, but anatomical adjacency is not the same as causal influence, drug delivery, or full-state observation.

Minimum energy is therefore a property of a model, not a quantity of motivation or therapeutic difficulty. Normalization can alter rankings; the controllability Gramian may be ill-conditioned; linearization is local; and a medicine does not inject arbitrary independent signals into selected brain nodes. Real interventions have uncertain, distributed targets and bodily constraints. The contradiction dossier accordingly treats structural controllability as a hypothesis generator, not evidence that a clinician can steer a living brain along the computed route.

Other formalisms contribute different information. Reinforcement-learning models estimate how prediction errors, learning rates, effort, and value updating may change under dopamine-modulating drugs, but task parameters can mimic one another and laboratory reward is not lived meaning. Bayesian state-space models infer hidden states from noisy observations, yet priors, observation models, missing data, and dataset shift shape the result. Each tool answers a bounded question. Combining them does not remove their assumptions; it multiplies the need for identification. The clinically relevant test is whether formal states and inputs correspond to observables and actions that can actually be identified. That correspondence must be tested prospectively.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

MATH-13-15 formalize modeled reachability and energy, value updating, and hidden-state estimation, while their clinical meaning depends on dynamics, inputs, observations, targets, and validation.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The mathematics and computational frameworks are established. Their mapping to psychiatric medication response is partial or contested, and structural network metrics do not establish clinical controllability.

PART 11 · 11.7 · CONTROL REQUIRES A TARGET WORTH REACHING

11.7 · Control is constrained and model-dependent

A control problem is undefined until the target and constraints are named. Reducing hallucination intensity, restoring sleep, avoiding hospitalization, preserving cognition, protecting metabolic health, and enabling chosen relationships may point toward different trajectories. Some objectives conflict over time. The target can also change as the person's state and priorities change. A mathematically convenient scalar objective can conceal those conflicts and the power of whoever selected the weights.

Estimation creates a second constraint. Symptoms, behavior, biomarkers, and neural signals are noisy partial observations of latent processes. If the state is wrongly defined or only sparsely observed, an apparently optimal input can optimize a modeling artifact. Prospective decision value—not fit to the discovery dataset—is the relevant test. The model must improve an actual choice beyond simpler information, remain calibrated after transport, expose uncertainty, and fail safely when observations are missing or the person's goals change.

For lived care, shared control is more accurate than mechanical steering. A person is not the plant in an engineering diagram, and agency is not an unmeasured disturbance. Clinicians can contribute safety knowledge and causal evidence; caregivers may notice change and support routines; services determine access; the person defines what recovery and unacceptable burden mean. Mathematics can reveal trade-offs and assumptions, but it cannot legitimately choose values. This boundary must remain explicit whenever a model informs deliberation. The final section of this part closes the loop, showing how experience and behavior feed back into future exposure and into the very target being pursued.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Control metrics can reverse with normalization or model choice, latent states can be nonidentifiable, and predictive fit does not establish a safe, desirable, or causally effective clinical action.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The person's goals and limits are part of the control problem, not soft context added after the model has selected an optimum.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats controllability as conditional on a validated model, ethical input set, observable state, person-valued target, and explicit safety and access constraints.

TRANSITION

Once control is constrained by values and observation, the open loop must become a nested feedback system that includes behavior and environment.

PART 11 · 11.8 · OUTPUTS RETURN AS INPUTS

11.8 · Close the feedback loop

CORE SENTENCE

Treatment output becomes the next treatment input, so medication, person, relationships, and environment form one evolving feedback system.

An open-loop story ends when the molecule changes a target. A living trajectory continues. Reduced threat may make sleep, conversation, meals, and follow-up more possible. Sedation may reduce activity; akathisia may intensify distress; sexual effects or emotional flattening may alter intimacy and trust. These experiences change behavior, and behavior changes the next exposure through timing, missed doses, smoking, substance use, hydration, food, service contact, and willingness to continue. The output has returned as an input.

The environment also responds. Caregivers may increase support or conflict; clinicians may change formulation or monitoring; housing instability may disrupt routine; psychotherapy may help use a window of reduced symptom intensity; stigma or coercion history may change how every intervention is interpreted. Some of these pathways are supported separately by pharmacokinetic, comparative-effectiveness, and patient-experience evidence. Their full causal signs and magnitudes are rarely measured together, so the nested loop remains a Flow Hijacked synthesis rather than an estimated universal system.

State-space inference can, in principle, update beliefs about a hidden state as new observations arrive. Multi-objective control can, in principle, represent symptom, harm, function, and effort simultaneously. In practice, the observation model must include what the person notices, and the objective must not be assigned without them. Closing the feedback loop therefore changes more than an equation. It shifts the unit of analysis from a molecule acting on a passive brain to a history-dependent person-body-environment trajectory with shared but unequal sources of control. The loop must retain uncertainty at every return path.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

MATH-15/16 provide an updating and multi-objective scaffold; FHS-006 adds recursive paths from experience and behavior through environment and medication taking into future exposure and state.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Individual links are empirically motivated, but their combined feedback architecture, signs, delays, and weights have not been jointly identified as a validated clinical model.

PART 11 · 11.8 · FROM CONTROL OF STATE TO STEWARDSHIP OF TRAJECTORY

11.8 · Close the feedback loop

Once feedback is closed, success cannot be read from one time point. An acute reduction in symptom intensity may open opportunities that later consolidate, or it may coexist with burdens that erode participation. A transient adverse effect may resolve, while a metabolic or endocrine pathway accumulates quietly. Discontinuation may alter exposure faster than adaptation reverses. The relevant object is therefore a trajectory across interacting clocks, not a single response label attached at week four.

This formulation also redistributes responsibility. The person can report values, experience, and feasible routines; clinicians can support safety, diagnosis, monitoring, and evidence-based options; caregivers can offer observation and practical help with consent; services can reduce or create access barriers. None can guarantee the trajectory. Calling the system shared does not erase power differences, coercion history, resource limits, or the right to refuse. Those constraints must be visible in any model that claims to be humane.

Part 11 has established what the mathematics can do: distinguish dose from exposure, plasma from effect site, fast state from slow adaptation, long-run stability from transient gain, and modeled reachability from clinical control. It has also established where the mathematics stops. Parameters are not people, fit is not mechanism, and optimization is not legitimacy. That boundary is part of the result, not a disclaimer. Part 12 therefore asks the final question: which outcomes should be controlled together, whose values define benefit, and what can a molecule never accomplish without body, relationship, environment, and time?

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

The complete nested system has not been estimated, feedback can stabilize or destabilize, and expanding the model can increase nonidentifiability rather than improve prediction or decisions.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Treatment unfolds through daily life; recognizing that fact can dignify experience and context without making either a substitute for clinical evidence.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked defines psychiatric medication as one input in a nested, history-dependent control process whose success must be evaluated across person-valued trajectories.

TRANSITION

The final part replaces a single response score with the multidimensional life trajectory that treatment is meant to serve.

PART 11 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Mathematics clarifies exposure, delay, adaptation, switching, gain, and trade-offs, while remaining a scaffold until each mapping is identified and tested in people.

Part 11 reframes psychiatric pharmacology as a history-dependent control problem without allowing mathematics to overclaim. Established model families distinguish administered dose from exposure, plasma from effect site, immediate perturbation from slow adaptation, and asymptotic stability from transient sensitivity. State-space, inference, learning, and control formalisms can sharpen questions about switching, hidden state, and constrained reachability. Their psychiatric mappings remain incomplete until timed exposure, longitudinal observation, ethical perturbation, mediation, and out-of-sample validation connect the levels. The resulting system includes body, experience, behavior, relationships, environment, and the person's own objectives because these are causal inputs and outcomes, not decorative context.

Once treatment is understood as multiscale control, the final question is not whether a molecule changes a score. It is which life variables changed, for whom, over which horizon, at what cost, and under whose definition of value.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

11.1 · Reassemble the 17-link chain — Molecule, route, absorption, metabolism, exposure, target, cell, circuit, network, body, experience, behaviour, environment, feedback, and trajectory.

11.2 · Dose is not exposure — Compartment and PBPK models connect administered input to plasma and tissue concentration; drug-specific parameters require fitting and validation.

11.3 · Plasma is not effect site — Effect compartments, Hill/Emax, occupancy, and indirect response explain delay, saturation, onset/offset asymmetry, and regulated rebound.

11.4 · Fast state meets slow adaptation — A stochastic fast-slow system separates neural and experiential state from plastic, endocrine, metabolic, learned, and relational parameters.

11.5 · State space has geometry — Wilson-Cowan dynamics, attractors, basins, metastability, and hysteresis model thresholds and switching; clinical landscapes require identification.

11.6 · Stable systems can transiently amplify — Critical slowing, non-normal gain, and resolvent sensitivity motivate early-warning and disproportionate-response hypotheses—not established drug mechanisms.

11.7 · Control is constrained and model-dependent — Minimum energy, reinforcement learning, aberrant salience, and state-space estimation offer tools; structural adjacency is not clinical controllability.

11.8 · Close the feedback loop — Medication changes experience and behaviour, which change sleep, stress, substances, relationships, adherence, future exposure, and person-valued utility.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

Which variables did each era hold fixed that living systems refuse to hold fixed?

PART 12

What the molecule cannot do alone

What would count as controlling a life rather than a rating scale?

Treatment is constrained, shared, multi-objective stewardship of a trajectory—not a scalar optimization imposed by a molecule or model.

Part route

- 1. Benefit is a multidimensional trajectory**
- 2. The body is not a side-effect appendix**
- 3. Experience is an outcome**
- 4. Adherence is a system variable**
- 5. Environment enters the controller**
- 6. Precision must improve decisions**
- 7. Shared control has constraints**
- 8. End with falsifiable questions**

PART 12 · 12.1 · REPLACE THE SCALAR WITH AN OUTCOME VECTOR

12.1 · Benefit is a multidimensional trajectory

CORE SENTENCE

A treatment can improve one dimension while leaving another unchanged or worse, so benefit must be read as a trajectory rather than a verdict.

Psychiatric trials often require a primary outcome, and symptom scales can answer an important bounded question. The mistake begins when that answer is allowed to stand for the entire life. Symptom intensity, cognition, sleep, felt agency, sexuality, metabolic health, everyday function, relationships, hospitalization, mortality, and quality of life are distinct dimensions. They can move together, diverge, or change on different clocks. No arithmetic rule supplied by the evidence makes one dimension a sufficient substitute for the others.

The acquired corpus makes divergence visible. Acute network meta-analyses estimate average symptom and acceptability differences, while comparative-effectiveness trials emphasize discontinuation, quality of life, or real-world persistence. Observational cohorts address mortality with different causal limits, and patient-experience research asks about emotional blunting. These designs do not combine into one universal rank because populations, comparators, horizons, and outcomes differ. Their disagreement can be informative rather than a defect.

A multidimensional trajectory preserves time. Early activation may precede benefit or intolerable burden; symptom relief may enable later social participation; metabolic change may accumulate while acute efficacy remains; recurrence protection may matter over years. Measurement should therefore specify baseline, direction, magnitude, duration, uncertainty, and who reports the outcome. The broader inference is strong that the dimensions are not interchangeable. A core outcome set should expose these divergences rather than average them away. The vector must remain inspectable, not merely aggregated. How they should be valued together remains a shared, person-specific judgment rather than an empirical constant.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

An outcome vector represents parallel symptom, bodily, experiential, functional, relational, and survival trajectories, each with its own measurement process and time horizon.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Cross-design evidence strongly supports outcome non-equivalence, but the corpus rarely measures all dimensions together and cannot supply universal weights or an individual optimum.

PART 12 · 12.1 · TRADE-OFFS ARE DATA, VALUES, AND TIME

12.1 · Benefit is a multidimensional trajectory

A complete assessment separates three questions. First, what changed and with what uncertainty? Second, how plausibly did the intervention cause the change? Third, how valuable is that pattern to this person now? Randomization can strengthen the second question for an average contrast, but it does not answer the third. A caregiver, clinician, researcher, and person receiving treatment may observe different parts of the vector; none should silently replace the person's judgment about their own life.

Weights also evolve. During acute danger, immediate safety or sleep may temporarily dominate. Later, concentration, sexuality, work, parenting, creativity, or bodily health may carry greater weight. Adaptation can change preferences, and constrained choices can make an expressed preference difficult to interpret. A model should record that uncertainty rather than freeze one questionnaire response into a permanent utility. Shared decision-making does not require agreement on every value; it requires that evidence, limits, options, power, and the right to revise a goal remain visible.

For lived relevance, the vector explains why two statements can both be true: a medicine helped substantially, and some of its effects were costly; a symptom score improved, and life did not yet feel restored. Neither statement cancels the other. Recording both can improve the next decision without forcing a final verdict. This is educational framing, not an instruction to start, stop, or alter medication. It prepares the next section, where the body leaves the side-effect column and becomes a set of primary trajectories with its own organs, risks, protections, and clocks.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Multidimensional sets increase measurement burden, outcomes can be correlated or missing, and person-defined weights may be unstable; these difficulties do not justify collapsing all value into one symptom score.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person can name both relief and loss without being forced into the categories of treatment success or treatment failure.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked treats benefit as a time-indexed outcome vector whose interpretation combines causal evidence with revisable, person-defined values.

TRANSITION

The first neglected dimension is often the body, where harms, protections, and state changes unfold on clocks that outlast the symptom trial.

PART 12 · 12.2 · MANY ORGANS, MANY CLOCKS

12.2 · The body is not a side-effect appendix

CORE SENTENCE

Bodily effects are part of treatment's primary causal and value structure, not secondary notes beneath a symptom outcome.

Psychiatric medicines act in bodies whose receptors, enzymes, ions, and regulatory systems are not confined to a symptom circuit. Motor effects, prolactin and sexual function, appetite and metabolism, cardiovascular regulation, kidney and thyroid function, reproduction, gastrointestinal motility, blood cells, temperature, and seizure threshold can each become clinically important. The relevant profile is molecule-specific: a generation label or broad class name is too coarse to predict the pattern for one agent or person.

Time separates these pathways. Restlessness, orthostasis, nausea, sedation, or activation may appear early. Weight and metabolic measures may change over months. Thyroid or renal trajectories under lithium, reproductive decisions, and cumulative cardiovascular risk extend much longer. Pregnancy changes both physiology and the consequence of exposure, while untreated illness also carries risk. A short efficacy trial cannot observe every slow outcome, and a long observational study cannot automatically identify a drug's causal contribution.

The acquired evidence gives concrete boundaries. Comparative antipsychotic synthesis finds larger heterogeneity across several adverse-effect dimensions than across acute efficacy. Lithium research supports thyroid and urinary-concentrating burdens, while severe renal outcomes are much rarer and uncertain in magnitude. Large pregnancy cohorts document associations for first-trimester lithium and for prenatal valproate in different populations and designs. These findings justify systematic bodily measurement across onset, maintenance, and long follow-up. Multiple clocks require planned observation rather than one baseline comparison; the findings do not generate a universal hierarchy or an individualized risk estimate.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Distributed targets and regulatory feedback create organ-specific effects whose onset, accumulation, reversibility, and interaction with exposure differ across medicines and states.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

The cited trials, syntheses, cohorts, and labels support specific average bodily outcomes in defined contexts; cross-drug ranking, individual causation, and lifetime net effect remain more uncertain.

PART 12 · 12.2 · MONITORING IS PART OF THE INTERVENTION

12.2 · The body is not a side-effect appendix

Monitoring changes the treatment delivered. Timed concentration, blood count, blood pressure, weight, glucose and lipid measures, kidney and thyroid tests, movement examination, bowel function, sleep, sexual function, and pregnancy-related assessment may be relevant for different medicines and people. The exact schedule and decision threshold belong to current clinical guidance and individualized care, not to this general lecture. The systems point is that an unmonitored prescription and a well-supported monitored treatment are not identical interventions.

Bodily burden must also be considered beside protection. Antipsychotic exposure can carry metabolic and cardiovascular liabilities, yet large observational cohorts have sometimes associated treatment—particularly certain agents or sustained exposure—with lower mortality. Such studies remain vulnerable to treatment selection, adherence, and healthy-user effects, so they do not erase documented harms or prove a causal survival advantage. They show why one slow pathway cannot stand for net outcome and why mortality, hospitalization, and organ health need separate measurement.

For the person, a laboratory value and a felt bodily change provide different information. Tremor, thirst, constipation, restlessness, sexual change, fatigue, or cognitive slowing can shape daily life before they become visible in a primary psychiatric scale. Reports should be investigated without assuming mechanism, frequency, or causality from one account. The humane scientific stance keeps benefit, burden, monitoring, and uncertainty in one frame. Neither data stream is complete without the other, and that distinction should remain visible at every review. That leads to the next neglected domain: experience itself is an outcome, even when it cannot be reduced to a laboratory measure.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Monitoring can prevent or detect harm but also create burden and access barriers; observational mortality associations and short trials cannot resolve every competing lifetime pathway.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Bodily experience may determine whether symptom benefit is usable, sustainable, or acceptable, and deserves attention alongside measured laboratory risk.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked places organ trajectories and monitoring inside the treatment model because they change both future exposure and the value of symptom change.

TRANSITION

The body shows that outcomes exceed the rating scale; subjective experience shows that even a complete laboratory panel would still be insufficient.

PART 12 · 12.3 · MEASURE THE FELT STATE WITHOUT OVERREADING IT

12.3 · Experience is an outcome

CORE SENTENCE

What treatment feels like can determine its value and continuation, even when experience does not reveal the mechanism that produced it.

Psychiatric treatment directly concerns experience, yet trials often measure it through symptom items chosen by observers or standardized scales. Akathisia, emotional blunting, activation, sedation, dissociation, altered sexuality, cognitive slowing, identity, meaning, and felt agency may not fit those items. Some are conventionally labeled adverse effects; others may be part of illness, desired regulation, or a mixed state. Their status can change with timing, baseline, dose, context, and the person's own interpretation.

The acquired evidence illustrates the identification problem. Emotional blunting is commonly reported during antidepressant treatment, but cross-sectional survey data cannot cleanly separate a drug effect from residual depression. D2-occupancy work links target engagement probabilistically to motor and endocrine effects in a small defined sample, not to every subjective experience. The cited esketamine trial documents acute altered states and symptom change, but unblinding, expectancy, transient effects, and selected populations complicate any claim that the experience mediates later benefit.

Good measurement therefore begins before treatment and repeats across exposure changes. It asks about intensity, timing, bodily location, function, valence, and personal meaning rather than forcing a single label. Ecological assessments can capture within-day variation; qualitative work can reveal missing constructs; behavioral tasks can test specific processes. None has privileged access to mechanism. The empirical result is the reported pattern within its design. The person's account establishes what they experienced, not how often others experience it or which biological pathway caused it.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Subjective states may arise from target, circuit, bodily, contextual, and expectancy pathways whose relative causal contributions require temporal and interventional discrimination.

EMPIRICAL RESULT · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Specific subjective phenomena are reported in defined studies and labels, but prevalence, attribution, mediation, and personal value vary; lived reports do not by themselves establish population mechanism.

PART 12 · 12.3 · RELIEF AND ESTRANGEMENT CAN COEXIST

12.3 · Experience is an outcome

Experience resists a universal sign. Reduced emotional intensity may feel like welcome protection from overwhelming pain for one person and like loss of love, creativity, or self for another. Sedation may enable an urgently needed night of sleep and later obstruct work or conversation. An altered state during a rapid-acting intervention may be meaningful, frightening, neutral, or simply burdensome. The same descriptor can change value across phases of one person's trajectory.

This is why experience cannot be placed beneath efficacy as a secondary satisfaction score. It can affect function, consent, trust, medication taking, relationships, and willingness to return for care. Yet respecting experience does not require endorsing every causal explanation attached to it. Clinicians and researchers can separate the fact of the report from competing mechanisms, investigate urgent harms, and preserve uncertainty. Lived knowledge contributes constructs, temporal detail, and values; population evidence contributes frequency and comparative causal estimates.

A humane measurement system allows mixed testimony: helped and harmed, safer and less alive, quieter and less able to think, relieved and uncertain. It also protects people whose experience differs from the average without claiming that every difference predicts a biological subgroup. This lecture cannot adjudicate an individual symptom or recommend a medication change. Its claim is methodological and ethical: if a treatment changes experience, that change belongs in the outcome vector. Such testimony should remain attributable to the person and time observed. The next section shows how experience then becomes a system variable by shaping whether and how treatment is actually taken.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Subjective reports can be shaped by illness, expectation, recall, context, and measurement wording; that limits causal attribution but does not make the experience clinically irrelevant.

LIVED RELEVANCE

The person is the primary witness to felt agency, estrangement, relief, and meaning, while scientific claims about cause and prevalence require additional evidence.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked keeps reported experience as a primary outcome and a feedback input, while separating its validity as experience from unproven mechanistic attribution.

TRANSITION

Because experience changes willingness, routine, and trust, adherence must be modeled as an outcome of the system rather than a personality trait.

PART 12 · 12.4 · DISCONTINUATION IS AN OUTCOME TO EXPLAIN

12.4 · Adherence is a system variable

CORE SENTENCE

Whether medicine reaches the person over time is produced by treatment design and life conditions, not by a moral category called compliance.

A prescription specifies intended input; adherence describes only part of the input actually delivered. Between them lie access, cost, formulation, cognitive load, routine, housing, transportation, pharmacy supply, swallowing, food requirements, adverse effects, symptom state, trust, previous coercion, family relationships, and the expected value of continuing. Treating this gap as a fixed patient trait removes causal variables that services and treatment design can change.

CATIE offers a powerful aggregate signal: most participants discontinued their assigned antipsychotic before eighteen months, for reasons that included insufficient effect, tolerability, and other causes. The trial does not reduce those decisions to one mechanism or transport directly to every setting. It shows that treatment persistence is itself an effectiveness outcome. A drug that works on a symptom scale but is not continued has a different realized exposure trajectory from one that is acceptable, available, and integrated into daily life.

Measurement should distinguish never obtained, started late, intermittently taken, intentionally reduced, stopped because of burden, stopped after recovery, and interrupted by system failure. Electronic records, pharmacy fills, self-report, concentration, and digital tools each observe only part of the process and can alter trust or surveillance. The purpose is not to police a person. It is to reconstruct exposure, understand reasons, and identify which obstacles are modifiable with consent. Those distinctions matter because each implies a different remedy and a different interpretation of effectiveness. They also protect voluntary choice from being redescribed as pathology merely because it changes exposure.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Experience, access, routines, formulation, cognition, and relationships determine delivered input; delivered input changes outcome, which recursively changes willingness and future input.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Comparative trials document high discontinuation and drug-specific reasons, while PK evidence shows exposure consequences; the full causal weights of social and relational determinants are not jointly estimated here.

PART 12 · 12.4 · TRUST AND EXPOSURE FORM A FEEDBACK LOOP

12.4 · Adherence is a system variable

The feedback can stabilize. Relief that the person values may make routines and follow-up easier; a formulation matched to preference may reduce daily burden; clear information and responsive management of adverse effects may strengthen trust. It can also destabilize. Unwanted experience, inaccessible monitoring, cost, disrupted supply, coercive encounters, or a plan that ignores priorities may reduce future exposure. In medicines with long half-lives or depot formulations, the pharmacological tail can outlast the decision to stop.

Actual exposure then changes the evidence clinicians see. Irregular input can resemble loss of efficacy, rapid metabolism, or fluctuating illness. A concentration can sometimes clarify the picture, but only with timing, formulation, interactions, and consent. Escalating a prescription without reconstructing delivery may increase peaks when doses are taken while leaving gaps unresolved. This is not a rule for individual management; it is an identification problem showing why prescribed dose, dispensed dose, reported dose, and measured exposure are different variables.

Person-first language changes the science. Asking what made the plan difficult elicits mechanisms; labeling someone noncompliant ends inquiry. It also recognizes that refusing a burdensome or coercively framed intervention can be an exercise of agency, not a symptom. Clinicians still have obligations to communicate risks and support urgent safety, while the person retains rights and values. The next section widens the same logic: sleep, stress, housing, social safety, substances, psychotherapy, continuity, and monitoring are not scenery around pharmacology. They enter the controller.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Adherence measures are incomplete and can be intrusive; discontinuation may reflect rational choice, recovery, burden, access failure, or changing illness, so no single indicator reveals motive or value.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A plan becomes more intelligible when the question shifts from “Why did you fail to comply?” to “What happened between the prescription and your day?”

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked models medication taking as a mutable output of experience, access, trust, formulation, cognition, routine, and relationship—not as a moral trait.

TRANSITION

Once delivered exposure depends on daily conditions, environment is no longer outside treatment; it is part of the causal input and feedback architecture.

PART 12 · 12.5 · CONTEXT CHANGES MORE THAN EXPECTANCY

12.5 · Environment enters the controller

CORE SENTENCE

Environment can alter exposure, state, interpretation, behavior, and consolidation, so it is part of treatment's causal system rather than background context.

Environment enters before the receptor. Food and route alter absorption; smoking and inflammation can alter clearance; hydration and sodium balance matter for lithium; substances and co-medications can change exposure or state. Sleep and circadian phase are candidate inputs to arousal, cognition, and episode vulnerability, but this section does not establish their causal weight. Housing, safety, transportation, cost, and continuity determine whether monitoring and medication are available. These pathways differ in evidential strength, but they show that context is not merely a psychological narrative placed around a fixed pharmacological input.

Environment also enters after target engagement. Reduced symptom intensity may become durable function only if there is an opportunity to sleep, practice skills, reconnect, work, or receive therapy. Conversely, persistent threat, isolation, conflict, or disrupted care may oppose the new state. The cited psilocybin comparison delivered drug exposure with psychological support. Preparation, therapist and site, expectancy, unblinding, and integration remain candidate components whose causal weights are not resolved by the local records. The bundle makes the contextual problem visible without proving synergy.

The same principle should not be used to romanticize context or deny molecular efficacy. A supportive environment is not a substitute for an effective medicine when medication benefit is established for a defined condition, and a drug is not a substitute for safety, housing, relationship, or meaningful activity. Interaction is the claim: one input can alter the response to another, and their sequence may matter. Its direction may differ across people and phases. Testing that claim requires factorial or adaptive designs, site and therapist effects, timed exposure, and outcomes beyond symptom scores. Baseline context must be measured before interaction is inferred.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Environmental inputs can modify pharmacokinetics, latent state, expectancy, learning, available action, and consolidation, thereby changing both immediate response and future exposure.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Specific PK modifiers and psychological support bundled with the cited psilocybin comparison are documented; individual contextual effects, synergy, and the integrated amplification or consolidation claim remain an incompletely measured Flow Hijacked synthesis.

PART 12 · 12.5 · A CAUSAL ECOLOGY, NOT A BACKDROP

12.5 · Environment enters the controller

Calling environment causal does not mean that every environmental variable is manipulable or that its effect is known. Social safety, housing, income, discrimination, family capacity, and service continuity are constrained by institutions and history. They can be correlated with illness severity, treatment selection, and measurement. Strong causal claims require designs that distinguish selection from intervention and that represent unequal access rather than treating it as random missingness.

The controller is distributed. A clinician may alter prescription or monitoring; a therapist may help translate a window of flexibility into new behavior; a caregiver may support sleep and notice change; a service may coordinate supply; the person chooses among available actions and assigns meaning. Roles should be negotiated with consent. Family involvement can support or constrain, and clinical authority can protect or coerce. A systems account is humane only when it represents those power differences rather than dissolving them into neutral feedback arrows.

For the person, environment may determine whether pharmacological change becomes a livable trajectory. That statement does not promise that better surroundings will overcome every severe state, nor does it assign responsibility for structural conditions to the individual. It widens the evidence question: not simply whether the molecule produced an average response under trial conditions, but which surrounding inputs enabled, blocked, or transformed that response. Those inputs should be reported with the same seriousness as the nominal dose. Precision psychiatry often promises to answer who will benefit. The next section asks a stricter question: does the precision tool actually improve a prospective decision?

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Contextual variables are often confounded, incompletely measured, and difficult to randomize; visible bundling does not identify each component's causal contribution or prove synergy.

LIVED RELEVANCE

A person should not be blamed for unsafe housing, interrupted supply, unsupported caregiving, or a treatment context that makes a theoretically effective input unusable.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked places environmental and relational inputs inside the controller, with causal strength, modifiability, consent, and power specified rather than assumed.

TRANSITION

A richer causal ecology makes prediction harder, so precision must be judged by whether it improves decisions beyond simpler, available information.

PART 12 · 12.6 · FOUR LAYERS OF PRECISION

12.6 · Precision must improve decisions

CORE SENTENCE

A marker becomes clinically precise only when using it produces better decisions, not merely better fit or biological plausibility.

Precision begins with distinguishable tasks. Therapeutic drug monitoring asks whether measured exposure clarifies delivery, clearance, interaction, or toxicity. Pharmacogenomic guidance may inform metabolism or specific safety risks for selected gene-drug pairs. Biomarkers may stratify prognosis or candidate mechanism. Predictive models may combine clinical, biological, and contextual data. Success at one layer does not guarantee the next: an association can be real without changing treatment choice, and a changed choice can occur without improving net outcome.

The local evidence supports bounded utility. Clozapine concentration varies materially with smoking, inflammation, age, body size, and interacting drugs, so timed monitoring can illuminate some exposure questions while remaining an incomplete response predictor. Pharmacogenomic guidelines support selected pharmacokinetic gene information and reject or limit some pharmacodynamic claims. In a large guided-care depression trial, the primary mean symptom improvement did not significantly differ, although some secondary response and remission outcomes favored guidance. The full decision value remains context- and implementation-dependent.

A prospective test must predefine the decision, comparator, threshold, and harm. Does the tool select a different treatment or dose? Does that difference improve patient-valued benefit after costs, false classifications, delay, burden, and inequity are counted? Is calibration retained across sites, ancestries, ages, comorbidity, and changing practice? Performance should be compared with simple clinical information, not with ignorance. A model that predicts outcome similarly for every treatment is prognostic; it does not identify which treatment will work better.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Precision tools move from exposure clarification or biological association to treatment-effect heterogeneity only if they alter a specified decision and improve prospective net benefit.

BROADER SCIENTIFIC INFERENCE · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Selected TDM and pharmacogenomic applications have evidential support, while broad biomarker-guided treatment utility remains uneven; no cited tool establishes universal prospective benefit.

PART 12 · 12.6 · PREDICTION IS NOT DECISION BENEFIT

12.6 · Precision must improve decisions

Retrospective accuracy can be inflated by leakage, overfitting, selective outcomes, flexible preprocessing, and repeated tuning to one dataset. A high area under a curve may coexist with poor calibration at the threshold that matters. Even a calibrated risk predictor may not identify treatment-effect heterogeneity. To justify use, the model should be locked before testing, evaluated at independent sites, compared with simpler rules, and assessed with a decision curve or another explicit net-benefit framework.

Implementation can reverse apparent benefit. A test that takes weeks may delay urgent treatment. Cost and specialist access may widen inequity. A genotype can remain constant while renal function, inflammation, smoking, pregnancy, interactions, and adherence change. Commercial panels may combine evidence-supported and unsupported elements behind an opaque category. Precision therefore includes knowing when ordinary history, examination, timed concentration, or close follow-up is more informative than a complex score.

For the person, uncertainty should remain visible. A probability is not a destiny, a genomic category is not an identity, and a biomarker does not define what outcome is valuable. A useful tool should support a conversation, reveal its error range, and permit revision when the trajectory changes. This lecture does not endorse a specific test. It sets the acceptance criterion: prospective decisions and person-valued outcomes must improve beyond a fair comparator. Performance must also remain credible when the population, care setting, and available treatments change. A decision audit should record who benefited, who did not, and why. The next section asks who chooses those outcomes and which safety, reversibility, access, and power constraints bind the decision.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Some tests can validly inform selected dosing or safety decisions even without a universal outcome advantage; conversely, retrospective prediction and biological plausibility alone do not establish clinical utility.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Precision should reduce uncertainty that matters to the person, not replace their priorities with the model's easiest endpoint.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked defines precision by incremental, prospective, equitable decision benefit across person-valued outcomes—not by assay novelty or model complexity.

TRANSITION

Once prediction is subordinate to decision value, shared control must specify who supplies evidence, who bears risk, and who defines the objective.

PART 12 · 12.7 · NO UNIVERSAL OPTIMUM

12.7 · Shared control has constraints

CORE SENTENCE

Shared control coordinates evidence, safety, access, and person-defined value under real constraints; it does not authorize a model or professional to choose the life objective.

A multi-objective formulation can display the conflict among symptom burden, bodily harm, functional loss, recurrence risk, effort, and treatment burden. It may also include hard safety constraints and resource limits. The mathematical act of writing weights is useful because it exposes assumptions that a single scale hides. It is not legitimate to infer that every value can be converted into a stable number or that the person's present preference is free from crisis, coercion, unavailable alternatives, or adaptation.

Constraints change what is feasible. Monitoring, transportation, cost, housing, clinician continuity, formulation availability, pregnancy, comorbidity, cognition, and polypharmacy can remove options or make their effects hard to attribute. Reversibility differs: an oral dose, a long-acting injection, a slowly clearing metabolite, and a cumulative organ effect have different tails. Equity matters because a theoretically optimal plan that only some people can access is not a universal solution; it is a policy-dependent pathway.

Shared control assigns roles without pretending they are equal. Researchers estimate population contrasts and uncertainty. Clinicians contribute diagnostic, pharmacological, and safety knowledge and retain duties during urgent risk. Caregivers may contribute observation and support when the person consents. Services determine practical access and continuity. The person contributes goals, tolerability, experience, and the authority to define what a worthwhile life means. Disagreement should become explicit reasoning, not a silent transfer of value-setting power. The process needs an auditable record of disagreement and a scheduled review; otherwise "shared" can describe participation while leaving decisive authority and accountability unchanged. Review must also ask whether the constraints themselves can be changed.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

Multi-objective control makes trade-offs and constraints explicit, but value weights, feasible inputs, observation quality, reversibility, and access remain person- and system-dependent.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

Divergent outcomes and burdens are empirically grounded; the shared-control formulation is a normative Flow Hijacked proposal and is not a validated clinical optimization algorithm.

PART 12 · 12.7 · CONSTRAINTS PROTECT VALUE FROM OPTIMIZATION

12.7 · Shared control has constraints

Safety constraints are not just penalties added to an objective. Some risks require exclusion, urgent action, or monitoring regardless of average utility. Consent, legal rights, and the ability to revisit a decision are also constraints on legitimate control. A system that maximizes symptom reduction through unacceptable coercion has not found a better optimum; it has optimized the wrong problem. The same applies when an endpoint ignores sexuality, cognition, identity, or relational consequences that matter to the person.

Polypharmacy exposes another limit. When several medicines change exposure, targets, and adaptation at once, attribution becomes opaque and withdrawal or sequencing effects are sparsely identified. A more complicated regimen may be necessary in some contexts, but complexity itself creates monitoring and learning costs. Shared control should therefore value interpretability, reversibility, and the smallest credible next decision, while recognizing that urgent states sometimes constrain gradual experimentation. This is a principle for structuring deliberation, not a universal prescribing rule.

For lived relevance, shared control means that expertise is plural but not interchangeable. A person may know that an effect makes life unlivable; a clinician may know that a sudden change carries risk; a caregiver may see a pattern the others miss; evidence may show average trade-offs. The task is to hold these forms of knowledge together without treating experience as mechanism or population data as a personal command. The resulting reasons should remain visible to everyone involved. The final section keeps that humility by ending not with a master equation, but with hypotheses designed to fail if the world does not support them.

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Preferences can conflict, capacity and urgency can change, family or clinical roles may be unsafe, and some constraints leave no good option; shared control is not a guarantee of consensus or outcome.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Recovery goals belong to the person, while support can contribute evidence, safety, access, and companionship without substituting for that value judgment.

FLOW HIJACKED SYNTHESIS

Flow Hijacked proposes shared, constrained trajectory stewardship in which person-defined value governs objectives and scientific or clinical knowledge constrains claims and options.

TRANSITION

A legitimate framework ends by exposing what would disconfirm it, which measurements are missing, and how the next study could improve an actual decision.

PART 12 · 12.8 · SIX HYPOTHESES, SIX OPPORTUNITIES TO BE WRONG

12.8 · End with falsifiable questions

CORE SENTENCE

The lecture's synthesis becomes scientific only where it generates predictions that can be tested prospectively and abandoned when they fail.

The first hypothesis asks whether the rate and curvature of changing D2 occupancy predict akathisia, rebound, or subjective destabilization better than occupancy level alone in some people. The second asks whether inflammation-related reduction in clozapine clearance can move exposure across a network-sensitivity threshold, producing change out of proportion to the prescribed dose. Pharmacokinetic coupling is empirically motivated; the proposed network-gain mechanism is not established and may add nothing beyond concentration and inflammation themselves.

The third asks whether rising autocorrelation, variance, or recovery time prospectively identifies a subset of impending mood or psychosis transitions after medication and measurement artifacts are removed. The fourth asks whether circadian phase and recent sleep debt alter transition probability under the same pharmacological perturbation. Both require dense time series, preregistered windows, held-out prediction, simple benchmarks, and false-alarm accounting. Neither signal should be assumed universal, causal, or ready for clinical warning.

The fifth asks whether time-varying, person-valued utility surfaces improve decisions beyond symptom-only endpoints. The sixth asks whether repeated, small, ethically acceptable perturbations of timing, sleep regularity, or environmental support identify within-person response models better than cross-sectional biomarkers. These are measurement and research-program proposals, not interventions recommended by this lecture. Each requires consent, safety constraints, transport testing, and a predefined result that would count against the hypothesis. Keeping them separate prevents a successful test of one proposition from being used to validate the others or the framework as a whole.

MECHANISTIC BRIDGE

HYP-001-006 connect exposure dynamics, state sensitivity, circadian forcing, utility measurement, and within-person identification into separate testable predictions rather than one master mechanism.

NEW HYPOTHESIS · EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

All six proposals are explicitly unproven. The cited local anchors motivate separate components, but several are bibliographic or abstract-level and not full-text appraised; none validates a clinical mechanism, biomarker, or decision rule.

PART 12 · 12.8 · THE STUDY THAT WOULD CHANGE THE CONCLUSION

12.8 · End with falsifiable questions

A credible next program would begin with input-output identification, not a grand retrospective model. It would record formulation, actual timing, concentration where appropriate, sleep and circadian measures, body state, patient-reported experience, function, environment, and clinically relevant events. Repeated observations within people would be nested inside a diverse pragmatic cohort. Perturbations would be small, ethically justified, and governed clinically. Predictions, preprocessing, thresholds, and stopping rules would be registered before outcomes are known.

The models would compete. Exposure level would be compared with exposure derivatives; ordinary trend models with critical-slowness indicators; simple clinical rules with biomarkers; static between-person predictors with within-person dynamics; symptom-only outcomes with multidimensional utility surfaces. Evaluation would include calibration, decision benefit, heterogeneity, missingness, transport, adverse events, false alarms, and burden. Longer follow-up must test whether short-term predictive gains translate into durable function, safety, agency, and equity. Failures should remain visible in the public record. A beautiful equation that fails out of sample would be revised or rejected rather than protected by a more elaborate story.

The lecture therefore closes where responsible synthesis should: with sharper uncertainty. Psychiatric medicines can alter severe states, recurrence probabilities, bodies, experiences, and possibilities. They do not alone define recovery, control context, choose values, or prove the disease story implied by their targets. The final question returns to the opening: not only “Does it work?” but for whom, in what state, along which path, toward which outcomes, over what time, at what cost, and according to whose definition of a life worth moving toward?

COUNTEREVIDENCE AND LIMITS

Dense multimodal studies can still be burdensome, confounded, and nonidentifiable; null results may reflect a false hypothesis or an inadequate perturbation, measure, horizon, or sample.

LIVED RELEVANCE

Research should reduce uncertainty without turning a person’s treatment into an uncontrolled experiment or making participation a condition of dignified care.

NEW HYPOTHESIS

Flow Hijacked ends with a falsifiable, person-centered research program: identify trajectories within people, compare models fairly, and let failed predictions change the framework.

TRANSITION

Return to the opening question with a deeper answer: effectiveness is a constrained, multiscale, person-valued trajectory—not a molecular verdict.

PART 12 · SYNTHESIS

What this part changes

CORE SENTENCE

Treatment is constrained, shared, multi-objective stewardship of a trajectory—not a scalar optimization imposed by a molecule or model.

Part 12 replaces the single response score with a multidimensional, person-valued trajectory. Symptoms, body, experience, function, relationships, hospitalization, mortality, and quality of life can diverge and unfold on different clocks. Medication taking and environment are causal system variables, not moral or decorative context. Precision tools earn their name only when they improve prospective decisions beyond simpler information. Shared control makes evidence, safety, access, reversibility, power, and person-defined goals explicit without pretending that values can be outsourced to an optimization algorithm. The lecture ends with six unproven hypotheses and the study designs that could support, revise, or reject them.

The molecule matters. It can change exposure, targets, symptoms, recurrence, bodies, experience, and possibility. It cannot alone choose the destination, create the conditions of recovery, or decide which trade-offs make a trajectory worth living. That responsibility remains shared, constrained, evidence-led, and centered on the person.

EIGHT SECTION ANCHORS

12.1 · Benefit is a multidimensional trajectory — Symptoms, cognition, sleep, agency, sexuality, metabolic health, function, relationships, hospitalization, mortality, and quality of life need joint measurement.

12.2 · The body is not a side-effect appendix — Motor, endocrine, metabolic, cardiovascular, renal, thyroid, reproductive, sexual, gastrointestinal, and mortality pathways have distinct clocks.

12.3 · Experience is an outcome — Akathisia, blunting, activation, sedation, dissociation, identity, meaning, and felt agency can determine whether average benefit is personally valuable.

12.4 · Adherence is a system variable — Experience, access, trust, coercion history, relationships, formulation, cognition, routine, and cost shape exposure; adherence is not a personality trait.

12.5 · Environment enters the controller — Sleep, stress, housing, social safety, substances, relationships, psychotherapy, care continuity, and monitoring can amplify or consolidate drug effects.

12.6 · Precision must improve decisions — Therapeutic drug monitoring, pharmacogenomics, biomarkers, and prediction matter only when they add prospective net benefit beyond simpler information.

12.7 · Shared control has constraints — Person-defined weights, safety limits, access, reversibility, polypharmacy opacity, equity, and family or clinical roles prevent one universal optimum.

12.8 · End with falsifiable questions — Test exposure derivatives, inflammation-clozapine gain, early warning, circadian windows, utility surfaces, and within-person identification out of sample.

QUESTION CARRIED FORWARD

What would count as controlling a life rather than a rating scale?

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Historical and generational map

ERA-00 · Before modern psychopharmacology

Context and wave: Psychosis, mania, and severe depression were managed in institutions through containment, sedation, hydrotherapy, insulin coma, convulsive treatments, lobotomy, and uneven social/moral frameworks; ECT became an effective somatic treatment but was embedded in coercive systems. No single molecular wave; this is the clinical and ethical baseline against which later drugs appeared. The later drugs promised portable, repeatable symptom control and deinstitutionalization potential. Sedation or somatic shock preceded receptor-level explanations.

Demonstrated change: Some somatic treatments, especially ECT, could be effective; modern drugs changed the feasibility of ongoing community treatment.

Harms and blind spots: Coercion, mortality, cognitive harm, social abandonment, and institutional crowding; later drug histories often exaggerate a simple asylum-to-cure transition.

Why next / what remains: Need for scalable symptom control without surgery or repeated induced seizures. Historical humility, ECT for selected severe states, and attention to environment and care systems. Medication history cannot be separated from service design, rights, housing, family burden, and what counted as recovery.

Sources: FH-PHARM-4624F5B901 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095514

ERA-01 · 1949-1954: lithium enters psychiatry

Context and wave: Mania was recurrent, dangerous, and treated mainly with containment, sedation, or somatic interventions. Cade's animal observations and uncontrolled clinical series were followed by Schou and colleagues' controlled work. Acute manic excitement and, later, recurrence prevention. A simple ion with uncertain mechanism; early narratives sometimes overread Cade's urate experiments.

Demonstrated change: Antimanic efficacy and later prophylaxis, with possible suicide-prevention benefit.

Harms and blind spots: Narrow therapeutic window, renal/thyroid effects, toxicity, pregnancy risk, and the need for monitoring.

Why next / what remains: Nonresponse, tolerability, monitoring burden, and need for phase-specific alternatives. A core treatment with uniquely long historical continuity and a distinct evidence profile. An archetype of fast ionic exposure coupled to slow intracellular, endocrine, renal, behavioral, and adherence dynamics.

Sources: FH-PHARM-2E59E3AE88 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.5694/j.1326-5377.1949.tb36912.x | FH-PHARM-882F35CEEC [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1136/jnnp.17.4.250 | FH-PHARM-5B6301C900 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1111/j.1399-5618.2009.00706.x

ERA-02 · 1952-1960: chlorpromazine, reserpine, iproniazid, imipramine

Context and wave: Severe disorders lacked reliable daily pharmacological control; diagnostic and etiologic models were heterogeneous. Chlorpromazine emerged from antihistamine/anesthetic experimentation; reserpine from antihypertensive use; iproniazid from tuberculosis treatment; imipramine from a failed antipsychotic search. Psychotic agitation/positive symptoms and depressive syndromes could be altered by orally administered molecules. Clinical effects preceded modern transmitter theories; terms such as 'neuroleptic' emphasized motor/behavioral quieting.

Demonstrated change: Clear short-term antipsychotic and antidepressant effects in subsets of patients.

Harms and blind spots: Motor/endocrine/autonomic toxicity, overdose lethality, interactions, and conflation of quieting with recovery.

Why next / what remains: Mechanistic clues and major harms drove receptor theories and more selective compounds. Some older agents remain effective, inexpensive, and clinically useful when their risks fit the person and setting. Serendipity is best understood as prepared observation within drug-development and clinical systems, not magic discovery.

Sources: FH-PHARM-049BB6F555 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/a.jp.115.5.459 | FH-PHARM-3311BCE482 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1111/j.1600-0773.1963.tb01730.x | FH-PHARM-F1399DAE5C [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1177/02698811221115762

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Historical and generational map

ERA-03 · 1960s-1970s: monoamine and dopamine hypotheses

Context and wave: The new drugs worked, but causal mechanisms and disease biology were uncertain. Drug-induced transmitter depletion/blockade and later receptor-binding potency correlations organized the field. Created testable molecular accounts and rational screening strategies. Dopamine blockade for psychosis; catecholamine/serotonin deficiency for depression.

Demonstrated change: D2 engagement strongly relates to antipsychotic action; monoamine transporters/enzymes are real drug targets.

Harms and blind spots: Target mechanism was promoted into a disease-cause story; negative/cognitive symptoms, delayed response, heterogeneity, and environment were underexplained.

Why next / what remains: Tardive/EPS/endocrine harm and incomplete response demanded different receptor profiles and richer mechanisms. Receptor pharmacology, occupancy, transporter kinetics, and experimentally tractable hypotheses. Dopamine and monoamines remain important variables, not one-chemical diagnoses.

Sources: FH-PHARM-35F5B3359A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/ajp.122.5.509 | FH-PHARM-2CA7EB7B76 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1192/bjp.113.504.1237 | FH-PHARM-0CD52B7C92 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/261717a0 | FH-PHARM-B1E0A108FF [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1126/science.3854

ERA-04 · 1970s-1980s: first-generation consolidation and delayed harms

Context and wave: Antipsychotic potency and dose were often equated with stronger treatment. High-potency D2 antagonists expanded; clinical observation and long exposure revealed EPS, akathisia, hyperprolactinemia, and tardive dyskinesia. Reliable positive-symptom suppression across formulations, including depots. More complete dopamine blockade was presumed to be better.

Demonstrated change: Strong acute antipsychotic efficacy and relapse prevention.

Harms and blind spots: Narrow occupancy window; motor and subjective adverse effects; cognition/function often secondary.

Why next / what remains: Search for antipsychotic efficacy with fewer motor/endocrine costs. Some agents remain effective and metabolically less burdensome than some later drugs. Dose and occupancy are probabilistic control parameters with competing outputs.

Sources: FH-PHARM-2027F0FA70 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.157.4.514 | FH-PHARM-D1F8E2150B [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1002/14651858.cd000284.pub3

ERA-05 · 1988-1990s: clozapine and the invention of 'atypicality'

Context and wave: Treatment resistance was often treated as global pharmacological failure. Clozapine returned under blood-monitoring systems after agranulocytosis had curtailed use. A meaningful response option for rigorously defined treatment resistance and recurrent suicidality. Low EPS and broad receptor profile became templates for 'atypical' drugs.

Demonstrated change: Distinct efficacy in treatment-resistant schizophrenia.

Harms and blind spots: Severe neutropenia, myocarditis, seizures, constipation/ileus, metabolic effects; clozapine's uniqueness was generalized to heterogeneous successors.

Why next / what remains: Desire to reproduce benefits without blood and systemic toxicity. Clozapine remains a key treatment; access infrastructure is part of effectiveness. The 2025 US REMS removal changes administrative control, not biological risk.

Sources: FH-PHARM-550C92F8BC [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800330013001 | FDA_CLOZAPINE_REMS [official communication inspected] — URL <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-communications/fda-removes-risk-evaluation-and-mitigation-strategy-rems-program-antipsychotic-drug-clozapine>

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Historical and generational map

ERA-06 · late 1980s–2000s: SSRIs and overlapping antidepressant waves

Context and wave: MAOIs and TCAs were effective but burdened by interactions, anticholinergic/cardiac effects, and overdose toxicity. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibition, followed by SNRIs, NDRIs, NaSSAs, and multimodal agents. Safer, more tolerable, scalable treatment across depression and anxiety. Selective correction of a serotonin deficit became a public simplification.

Demonstrated change: Average acute benefit over placebo and broader safety in overdose than TCAs for many agents.

Harms and blind spots: Sexual dysfunction, emotional blunting, activation, age-dependent suicidality signals, and withdrawal; modest mean effects and publication bias.

Why next / what remains: Nonresponse, latency, residual symptoms, adverse effects, and treatment resistance. Well-studied first-line options for many presentations, when benefit-harm preferences fit.

Therapeutic efficacy does not validate a simple deficiency etiology.

Sources: FH-PHARM-7BC4DAA748 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/0024-3205(74)90345-2 | FH-PHARM-1FD6FBC08B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmsa065779 | FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7 | FH-PHARM-78D71F1060 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/s41380-022-01661-0

ERA-07 · 1990s–2000s: second-generation antipsychotic expansion

Context and wave: Clozapine suggested that antipsychosis might be separated from EPS. Multiple 5-HT_{2A}/D₂ and broad-receptor agents were marketed as an atypical class. Expected better negative/cognitive outcomes and lower motor harm. Serotonin-dopamine antagonism and ‘atypicality.’

Demonstrated change: Some molecule-specific efficacy/tolerability advantages and lower EPS at some exposures.

Harms and blind spots: Marked metabolic, prolactin, sedation, QT, and cardiovascular heterogeneity; class superiority weakened in CATIE/CU_TLASS.

Why next / what remains: Need for better tolerability, adherence, negative/cognitive outcomes, and non-D₂ mechanisms. A diverse set of useful agents whose profiles must be compared individually. Adverse-effect geometry is often more differentiated than efficacy geometry.

Sources: FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688 | FH-PHARM-344344D15C [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1192/bjp.bp.106.028654 | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

ERA-08 · 1990s–2010s: bipolar function-specific polypharmacy

Context and wave: Lithium was treated as the prototype universal mood stabilizer. Valproate/carbamazepine entered from anticonvulsant practice; lamotrigine and antipsychotics developed phase-specific roles.

Alternatives for acute mania, bipolar depression, mixed states, and maintenance. ‘Mood stabilization’ often obscured divergent sodium-channel, GABA, second-messenger, and receptor pharmacology.

Demonstrated change: Strong acute antimanic options; polarity-specific maintenance patterns; combination advantages in selected settings.

Harms and blind spots: Teratogenicity, metabolic/renal/endocrine effects, interactions, and antidepressant-associated switching.

Why next / what remains: Bipolar depression, mixed features, cognition/function, and individualized maintenance remain difficult. Function- and phase-specific selection rather than a fictitious generation taxonomy. The goal is trajectory stabilization, not merely episode suppression.

Sources: FH-PHARM-832A5E006D [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/jama.1994.03510360044034 | FH-PHARM-0688939B27 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.4088/jcp.v60n0203 | FH-PHARM-9722471149 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa064135 | FH-PHARM-5005AAED29 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61828-6

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Historical and generational map

ERA-09 · 2000s: comparative-effectiveness reckoning

Context and wave: Regulatory efficacy trials and marketing implied broad class hierarchies. CATIE, CUtLASS, STAR*D, STEP-BD, BALANCE, registries, and network meta-analysis shifted attention to discontinuation, sequence, cost, relapse, and long-term outcomes. Tested how strategies perform outside narrow efficacy narratives. Less a new receptor story than an evidence-system correction.

Demonstrated change: Revealed genuine benefits alongside high attrition, phase specificity, and side-effect tradeoffs.

Harms and blind spots: Pragmatic trials still select participants; functioning, quality of life, and patient priorities remain undermeasured.

Why next / what remains: Need for precision, novel mechanisms, and better endpoints. Trial architecture itself became part of what must be taught. Effectiveness is a trajectory through choices and discontinuations, not a single endpoint.

Sources: FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688 | FH-PHARM-983862533A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/ajp.2006.163.11.1905 | FH-PHARM-9722471149 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa064135 | FH-PHARM-5005AAED29 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61828-6

ERA-10 · 2000-present: ketamine and rapid-acting antidepressants

Context and wave: Antidepressant benefit was expected to require weeks despite immediate transporter effects. Subanesthetic ketamine produced rapid clinical changes; esketamine created a regulated intranasal pathway. Speed and treatment-resistant depression. NMDA blockade→AMPA throughput→BDNF/mTOR synaptogenesis.

Demonstrated change: Rapid average symptom reduction and maintenance benefit in selected responders.

Harms and blind spots: Dissociation, blood-pressure effects, misuse, monitoring burden, functional unblinding, durability, and mechanism controversy.

Why next / what remains: Search for durable rapid action without dissociation or intensive infrastructure. A decisive challenge to simple delayed monoamine models. Fast response does not abolish slow adaptation or context dependence.

Sources: FH-PHARM-7C511E5074 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0006-3223(99)00230-9 | FH-PHARM-D3624284FF [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/nature10130 | FH-PHARM-DBEC9D275A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19020172 | FDA_SPRAVATO_2025_LABEL [official label inspected] — URL https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2025/211243s0161b1.pdf

ERA-11 · 2010s-present: dopamine partial agonism and functional selectivity

Context and wave: Antagonism was treated as the canonical way to control D2 signaling. Aripiprazole, brexpiprazole, and cariprazine combined partial agonism with receptor- and pathway-specific profiles. Preserve useful dopamine signaling while limiting prolactin/EPS or addressing mood/negative domains. 'Dopamine stabilization' and sometimes 'third generation.'

Demonstrated change: Useful molecule-specific profiles and indications.

Harms and blind spots: Akathisia/activation, impulse-control concerns, long active-metabolite clocks, and no unitary third-generation property.

Why next / what remains: Persistent nonresponse and D2-related limitations. Partial agonism and biased signaling as genuine pharmacological distinctions. The category is contested and should never substitute for dose-exposure-state analysis.

Sources: FH-PHARM-7B9E3A8F83 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.10.011 | FH-PHARM-611D0212AD [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.09.027

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Historical and generational map

ERA-12 · 2010s-present: psychedelics and context-coupled pharmacology

Context and wave: Treatment effects were commonly attributed chiefly to molecule and dose. Renewed controlled studies of psilocybin paired drug exposure with preparation, support, and integration. Potential rapid and durable change in difficult depression with few administrations. 5-HT_{2A} agonism, increased entropy/flexibility, and psychologically mediated updating.

Demonstrated change: Promising signals in selected supported samples; comparative primary evidence remains limited.

Harms and blind spots: Expectancy, functional unblinding, therapist/site effects, exclusion of bipolar/psychosis risk, and uncertain generalizability.

Why next / what remains: Need for scalable, safer, testably component-specific interventions. Makes molecule–experience–environment coupling impossible to ignore. Emerging and contested, not a universal treatment conclusion.

Sources: FH-PHARM-3C1B555CD9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2032994 | FH-PHARM-BA54F69B7B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3285 | FH-PHARM-2E203AD776 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1038/s41398-021-01706-y

ERA-13 · 2020s: non-D2 antipsychotic strategies

Context and wave: Effective antipsychosis was often assumed to require D2 blockade. Muscarinic agonism with peripheral antagonism reached approval; TAAR1, glutamate, GABA, and immune strategies continue with mixed results. Potential efficacy without the standard D2 occupancy trade space. Circuit modulation upstream or parallel to D2.

Demonstrated change: Xanomeline-trospium has replicated short-term efficacy; some other programs have failed or remain investigational.

Harms and blind spots: Long-term comparative effectiveness, functioning, rare harms, adherence, and treatment resistance are unresolved.

Why next / what remains: Need for cognitive/negative-symptom benefit and true disease-course modification. Proof that clinical antipsychosis need not be built exclusively on direct D2 binding. An emerging wave, not yet a settled generation.

Sources: FH-PHARM-5EED522183 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2017015 | FH-PHARM-3A57A79CFA [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(23)02190-6 | FH-PHARM-5A834B14E9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa1911772 | FH-PHARM-95AE40EDE0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.11.014 | FH-PHARM-D3D942411B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s2215-0366(18)30345-6

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AP-001 · Chlorpromazine; low-potency phenothiazines

Class / use: First-generation antipsychotic; 1950s neuroleptic wave Schizophrenia/psychosis and selected acute agitation/mania contexts; current use varies by jurisdiction.

Targets / certainty: D2 antagonism with substantial H1, M1, and $\alpha 1$ antagonism; target mix explains sedation, anticholinergic effects, and hypotension as well as antipsychosis. Receptor actions measured; exact therapeutic chain remains incomplete.

Formulation / PK: Oral and parenteral formulations; oral exposure is variable and formulation-specific. Lipophilic, highly distributed, hepatically metabolized with active/complex metabolites; consult product-specific label for exact PK.

Exposure / state: Antipsychotic response tracks D2 engagement probabilistically; high doses add motor, endocrine, autonomic, and subjective costs. Older age, dehydration, cardiovascular disease, anticholinergic burden, sedatives, and hepatic state materially change risk.

Time / outcomes: Sedation/autonomic effects can be immediate; antipsychotic improvement develops over days to weeks and may remain partial. D2 adaptation, tardive syndromes, metabolic/behavioral adaptation, and rebound/withdrawal phenomena can outlast plasma drug. Effective for positive symptoms and relapse prevention; weak evidence for restoring cognition/function by itself.

Burden / gaps: EPS, akathisia, tardive dyskinesia, prolactin effects, hypotension, sedation, anticholinergic effects, QT/cardiac and rare hematologic/hepatic events. High for antipsychotic efficacy; benefit-harm balance is strongly dose/person/context dependent. Optimal low-dose roles, patient-valued outcomes, and long-term comparisons under modern care.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-CHLORPROMAZINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22chlorpromazine%22 | FH-PHARM-D1F8E2150B [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1002/14651858.cd000284.pub3

DRUG-AP-002 · Haloperidol; high-potency butyrophenones

Class / use: First-generation antipsychotic; receptor-potency era Acute psychosis/mania/agitation and maintenance; oral, short-acting injectable, and depot formulations.

Targets / certainty: Strong D2 antagonism with comparatively less H1/M1/ $\alpha 1$ action than chlorpromazine. D2 occupancy-response/EPS relation directly supported for haloperidol; circuit consequences partly inferred.

Formulation / PK: Oral, intramuscular, and long-acting decanoate; formulation changes peak-trough geometry and persistence. Hepatic metabolism including CYP pathways; long depot absorption produces a much longer effective tail than oral dosing.

Exposure / state: Response, prolactin, and EPS probability rise over overlapping occupancy ranges; occupancy thresholds are not universal constants. First episode, age, prior EPS, dopamine-blocker history, co-sedatives, QT risk, and agitation source matter.

Time / outcomes: Motor/subjective effects may appear rapidly; antipsychotic benefit continues over days/weeks. Depot exposure decays slowly; tardive risk and withdrawal/rebound may be temporally dissociated from plasma decline. High acute antimanic/antipsychotic efficacy; tolerability can limit retention and quality of life.

Burden / gaps: EPS, akathisia, tardive dyskinesia, hyperprolactinemia, QT prolongation, NMS; monitor according to route/risk. High for acute efficacy; high heterogeneity in subjective and motor tolerability. Lowest effective long-term exposure and transition protocols across formulations.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-HALOPIERIDOL [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22haloperidol%22 | FH-PHARM-2027F0FA70 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.157.4.514 | FH-PHARM-46DEE62387 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(11)60873-8

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AP-003 · Clozapine

Class / use: Dibenzodiazepine antipsychotic; clozapine/atypicality pivot Treatment-resistant schizophrenia; recurrent suicidal behavior in schizophrenia/schizoaffective disorder in the US label.

Targets / certainty: Broad D2/D4, 5-HT2A/2C, M1–M5, H1, and α -adrenergic actions; low striatal D2 occupancy relative to many antipsychotics. Exact efficacy mechanism remains unknown. Binding is measured; treatment-resistance mechanism is unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral tablets/ODT/suspension depending market; gastrointestinal function and adherence are clinically important. Primarily hepatic CYP1A2 with contributions from CYP3A4/2D6; norclozapine metabolite; exposure varies widely.

Exposure / state: Therapeutic drug monitoring can clarify nonresponse/toxicity but concentration is not a complete response predictor. Smoking induction, smoking cessation, caffeine, inflammation/infection, sex, age, ancestry proxies, interacting drugs, constipation and seizure risk alter exposure or harm.

Time / outcomes: Sedation, salivation, hypotension and autonomic effects can precede antipsychotic response; adequate treatment-resistance trials take time. Metabolic/autonomic burden, constipation, myocarditis risk early, cardiomyopathy, seizure risk, and severe rebound/withdrawal possibilities require trajectory thinking. Distinct efficacy in rigorously defined treatment resistance; observational evidence suggests favorable mortality associations, with causal uncertainty.

Burden / gaps: Severe neutropenia, myocarditis/cardiomyopathy, seizures, profound constipation/ileus, metabolic effects, orthostasis, sedation and sialorrhea. US REMS removed in 2025 but ANC monitoring remains recommended. High for short-term treatment-resistant efficacy; long-term effectiveness depends heavily on access, monitoring, exposure, and tolerability. Mechanism of unique efficacy; precision initiation; myocarditis/neutropenia prediction; optimal inflammatory-state dosing research.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-CLOZAPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22clozapine%22 | FH-PHARM-550C92F8BC [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800330013001 | FH-PHARM-AAAEF1BA9E [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1111/bcp.15691 | FDA_CLOZAPINE_REMS [official communication inspected] — URL <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-communications/fda-removes-risk-evaluation-and-mitigation-strategy-rems-program-antipsychotic-drug-clozapine>

DRUG-AP-004 · Risperidone; paliperidone

Class / use: D2/5-HT2A antipsychotics; second-generation and LAI expansion Schizophrenia, mania/mixed episodes and other label-specific uses; multiple oral and long-acting formulations.

Targets / certainty: D2 and 5-HT2A antagonism with α -adrenergic effects; risperidone is converted by CYP2D6 to active paliperidone, which is substantially renally cleared. Measured binding/exposure; symptom-domain mediation remains incomplete.

Formulation / PK: Oral solution/tablets/ODT and several LAIs with noninterchangeable loading, interval, and persistence profiles. Risperidone CYP2D6/3A4; paliperidone largely renal. Genetic/interaction effects redistribute parent versus metabolite exposure.

Exposure / state: Prolactin/EPS risks rise with D2 exposure; LAIs reduce covert nonadherence but do not guarantee acceptance or response. Renal function, CYP2D6 phenotype/inhibitors, age, prior prolactin/EPS sensitivity, and formulation history matter.

Time / outcomes: Peak-related adverse effects may precede benefit; LAI steady-state and washout span weeks/months depending product. Persistent depot exposure changes switching/withdrawal timelines; hyperprolactinemia and sexual/bone effects can accumulate. Effective positive-symptom and antimanic agents; LAI strategy may reduce relapse in suitable contexts but RCT/observational estimates differ.

Burden / gaps: Prolactin elevation, EPS/akathisia, weight/metabolic effects, sexual dysfunction, orthostasis and rare serious antipsychotic risks. High efficacy evidence; formulation and outcome heterogeneity is large.

Which people gain net functional benefit from which LAI and initiation strategy.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-RISPERIDONE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22risperidone%22 | FH-PHARM-921C5C6D9B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1002/wps.20972 | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AP-005 · Olanzapine

Class / use: Broad-receptor second-generation antipsychotic Schizophrenia; acute/maintenance bipolar phases; olanzapine-fluoxetine for label-specific depressive indications.

Targets / certainty: D2/5-HT2A antagonism with H1, M1, 5-HT2C and $\alpha 1$ actions. Binding and exposure well established; metabolic and therapeutic mediators are multimechanistic.

Formulation / PK: Oral/ODT, short-acting IM, and long-acting pamoate in some markets; depot requires post-injection safety systems. Hepatic CYP1A2 and glucuronidation; smoking can lower exposure; relatively long and variable oral half-life.

Exposure / state: Strong efficacy/retention signal in CATIE came with substantial weight and metabolic cost. Smoking, age, sex, metabolic baseline, sedation vulnerability, and co-medications affect benefit-harm.

Time / outcomes: Sedation/appetite effects can be rapid; symptom and episode control evolves over days/weeks. Weight, insulin/lipid regulation and behavioral routines can create slow feedback; depot persistence changes transition dynamics. High acute antipsychotic/antimanic efficacy; some bipolar maintenance/depression roles; functioning may be offset by metabolic/sedative effects.

Burden / gaps: High weight, glucose and lipid burden; sedation, anticholinergic effects, orthostasis; formulation-specific injection warning. High for efficacy and metabolic liability; individual tradeoff varies widely. Long-term cardiometabolic mitigation without losing efficacy.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-OLANZAPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22olanzapine%22 | FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688 | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

DRUG-AP-006 · Quetiapine

Class / use: D2/5-HT2A antipsychotic with active norquetiapine; second-generation Schizophrenia, acute mania, bipolar depression and maintenance adjunct; major-depression augmentation in label-specific settings.

Targets / certainty: Transient D2/5-HT2A antagonism; H1/ $\alpha 1$ effects; norquetiapine has norepinephrine-transporter and 5-HT1A-related pharmacology. Measured pharmacology; relative contribution to bipolar depression is inferred.

Formulation / PK: Immediate- and extended-release oral formulations produce different peak profiles. CYP3A4 metabolism; short parent half-life with active metabolite; strong 3A4 inhibitors/inducers matter.

Exposure / state: Low doses can be predominantly antihistaminergic; indication cannot be inferred from the drug name without dose/exposure context. Sleep need, orthostasis, metabolic risk, hepatic function, CYP3A4 drugs, and substance/sedative use change effects.

Time / outcomes: Sedation is rapid; mood/psychosis outcomes are delayed and phase-specific. Metabolic burden and sleep dependence may develop; abrupt changes can disturb sleep and autonomic state. Evidence spans psychosis, mania, and bipolar depression, but effect and optimal comparator differ by phase.

Burden / gaps: Sedation, orthostasis, weight/metabolic effects, anticholinergic burden, QT and class risks. Moderate to high by approved phase; substantial dose and person dependence. How much benefit is mediated by sleep normalization versus direct mood circuitry.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-QUETIAPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22quetiapine%22 | FH-PHARM-46DEE62387 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(11)60873-8

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AP-007 · Ziprasidone; lurasidone

Class / use: D2/5-HT2A antipsychotics with lower average weight liability; heterogeneous second-generation agents Schizophrenia; ziprasidone in mania/mixed states; lurasidone in schizophrenia and bipolar depression where approved.

Targets / certainty: D2/5-HT2A antagonism with agent-specific serotonin actions; not pharmacologically interchangeable. Receptor profiles known; network/subjective mediation uncertain.

Formulation / PK: Oral food requirements materially affect exposure; ziprasidone also has IM formulation. Agent-specific hepatic pathways; label-specific food and interaction rules are central to realized exposure.

Exposure / state: Apparent nonresponse can reflect inadequate food-dependent absorption as well as pharmacodynamics. QT/cardiac risk, meal pattern, hepatic state, CYP interactions, and bipolar phase.

Time / outcomes: Exposure can change immediately with food; clinical benefit remains delayed/phase-specific. Less average weight gain does not mean no metabolic or withdrawal burden. Effective in label-specific indications with differing strength across phases.

Burden / gaps: Akathisia/EPS, sedation or nausea; ziprasidone QT concern; lurasidone activation/akathisia; class risks. High for approved acute indications; head-to-head functional data limited. Real-world exposure adequacy and patient-valued tolerability.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-ZIPRASIDONE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22ziprasidone%22 | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

DRUG-AP-008 · Aripiprazole; brexpiprazole; cariprazine

Class / use: Dopamine partial agonists / functionally selective antipsychotics; contested 'third generation' Schizophrenia; mania/mixed states for some; depression augmentation for some; cariprazine bipolar depression/mania in approved settings.

Targets / certainty: Agent-specific D2/D3 partial agonism and serotonin activity; intrinsic efficacy and biased signaling differ. Binding/function measured in assays; 'dopamine stabilization' is a context-dependent shorthand.

Formulation / PK: Oral agents; aripiprazole has multiple LAIs; formulation alters persistence substantially. CYP2D6/3A4 important for aripiprazole/brexipiprazole; cariprazine has very long-lived active metabolites.

Exposure / state: High D2 occupancy can coexist with fewer prolactin/EPS effects than pure antagonists, yet akathisia/activation can be prominent. CYP phenotype/inhibitors, prior dopamine blockade, mania/activation risk, impulse-control vulnerability, and depot history.

Time / outcomes: Activation/akathisia may precede benefit; long metabolites delay both steady state and resolution after changes. Partial agonism during switches can produce state-dependent destabilization; long tails complicate causal attribution. Effective across molecule-specific indications; no universal class superiority.

Burden / gaps: Akathisia, insomnia/activation, nausea, impulse-control problems for aripiprazole-class warnings, plus metabolic/EPS class risks. High for approved outcomes; 'third generation' has low taxonomic precision. Functional selectivity in humans and who benefits from long persistence.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-ARIPIPAZOLE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22aripiprazole%22 | FDA-LABEL-BREXPIPAZOLE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22brexpiprazole%22 | FDA-LABEL-CARIPRAZINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22cariprazine%22 | FH-PHARM-7B9E3A8F83 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.10.011

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AP-009 · Lumateperone

Class / use: Multimodal antipsychotic; late second-generation / post-atypical wave Schizophrenia and bipolar depression in approved settings.

Targets / certainty: Serotonin, dopamine and glutamate-linked pharmacology is proposed; D2/5-HT2A and transporter actions are agent-specific. Binding established; integrated mechanism and long-term comparative advantage remain uncertain.

Formulation / PK: Oral; exposure and hepatic interactions are label-specific. Hepatic metabolism through multiple pathways; consult current label for interacting inhibitors/inducers.

Exposure / state: Clinical efficacy occurs at a distinct occupancy/profile from many traditional antagonists, but a simple occupancy rank is insufficient. Hepatic function, sedation, orthostasis, metabolic baseline, and co-medications.

Time / outcomes: Somatic/subjective effects may be early; mood and psychosis benefit unfolds over trial timescales. Long-term metabolic, functional, and withdrawal evidence is less mature than for older agents. Short-term efficacy in approved phases; comparative effectiveness remains limited.

Burden / gaps: Somnolence/sedation, dizziness, dry mouth, metabolic and class antipsychotic warnings. Moderate; newer-drug evidence is sponsor-heavy and short-term. Long-term function, cognition, mortality, and head-to-head positioning.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-LUMATEPERONE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22lumateperone%22 | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

DRUG-AP-010 · Xanomeline-trospium (Cobenfy)

Class / use: Central muscarinic agonist plus peripheral muscarinic antagonist; first approved post-D2 mechanism wave US-approved oral treatment of schizophrenia in adults; current jurisdictional status must be checked.

Targets / certainty: Xanomeline agonism at central M1/M4 is presumed to mediate efficacy; trospium antagonizes peripheral muscarinic receptors to reduce cholinergic adverse effects. Receptor actions known; label says exact schizophrenia mechanism is unclear.

Formulation / PK: Fixed oral combination; food markedly lowers trospium exposure, making administration state part of the intervention. Xanomeline uses multiple CYP/FMO pathways; trospium has limited CNS penetration and substantial renal elimination; steady state about 3–5 days and component half-lives roughly 5–6 hours in label data.

Exposure / state: No D2-occupancy model; component exposures and central/peripheral balance replace the classical occupancy window. Renal/hepatic function, gastric retention, anticholinergic burden, food timing, autonomic/cardiovascular and biliary states.

Time / outcomes: Autonomic/gastrointestinal effects can be early; short-term PANSS benefit demonstrated over weeks. Long-term muscarinic adaptation, adherence, cognition/function, discontinuation and relapse data remain limited. Replicated acute symptom reduction in phase 2/3; long-term comparative and treatment-resistance evidence immature.

Burden / gaps: Nausea, dyspepsia, constipation, vomiting, hypertension/tachycardia and anticholinergic/urinary/gastric risks per label. High for short-term placebo-controlled efficacy; low to moderate for long-term trajectory. Cognitive/negative symptoms, rare harms, real-world persistence, switching from D2 agents, and mechanistic responders.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-XANOMELINE-AND-TROSPIUM-CHLORIDE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22xanomeline%20and%20trospium%20chloride%22 | FH-PHARM-5EED522183 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2017015 | FH-PHARM-3A57A79CFA [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(23)02190-6 | FDA_COBENFY_APPROVAL [official page inspected] — URL <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-drug-new-mechanism-action-treatment-schizophrenia>

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AP-011 · Ulotaront (SEP-363856; investigational)

Class / use: TAAR1 agonist with 5-HT1A activity; investigational non-D2 strategy Not an established approved universal treatment; development status must be checked at lecture time.

Targets / certainty: TAAR1/5-HT1A agonist activity without direct D2 binding. Target engagement rationale; exact human antipsychotic mediation unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral investigational compound; program-specific PK. Use trial/IB-specific data; do not infer current dosing from early publications.

Exposure / state: No classical D2 occupancy threshold; early dose-response and biomarker validation incomplete. Trial population, region/site, placebo response, illness phase, prior antipsychotics and washout.

Time / outcomes: Phase-2 acute signal; later nonconfirmation demonstrates development path dependence. Insufficient mature long-term evidence. Positive phase 2 does not establish current efficacy after phase-3 failures/nonconfirmation.

Burden / gaps: Investigational safety database; early program included serious events requiring program-level interpretation. Low for current clinical efficacy; historically important failed/contested prediction. Whether target, dose, subgroup, or trial execution can yield a replicable benefit.

Sources: FH-PHARM-5A834B14E9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa1911772

DRUG-AP-012 · Long-acting injectable antipsychotics (class strategy)

Class / use: Formulation strategy across first- and second-generation molecules Maintenance in schizophrenia/psychosis and selected bipolar indications depending molecule.

Targets / certainty: Same molecule-specific targets as oral parent; altered absorption, peak-trough variability, observability of nonadherence, and persistence. Formulation PK known; psychosocial meaning and adherence effects vary.

Formulation / PK: Intramuscular/subcutaneous depots with intervals from weeks to months; initiation/loading/oral overlap are product-specific. Flip-flop absorption and long terminal tails can dominate apparent half-life.

Exposure / state: Smoother exposure may prevent troughs, but prolonged adverse exposure cannot be quickly reversed. Preference, coercion history, access, clinic continuity, prior oral tolerability, metabolism, body composition, and injection technique.

Time / outcomes: Slow attainment and resolution; injection itself changes adherence information and relationships. Long tails blur discontinuation date and delay switching; relapse protection may reflect assured exposure. RCT and real-world comparisons differ because adherence-enriched trial populations and service contexts differ.

Burden / gaps: Parent-drug harms plus injection reactions and product-specific post-injection syndromes. High that formulation changes exposure; comparative effectiveness is context-sensitive. Shared-decision effects, functional outcomes, and best matching of formulation to adherence mechanism.

Sources: FH-PHARM-921C5C6D9B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1002/wps.20972 | FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AD-001 · Iproniazid legacy; tranylcypromine and irreversible MAOIs

Class / use: Monoamine oxidase inhibitors; first antidepressant wave Selected treatment-resistant, atypical, or specialist-managed depression; agent/jurisdiction specific.

Targets / certainty: Irreversible MAO-A/B inhibition increases monoamine availability; tranylcypromine has additional amphetamine-like pharmacology. Enzyme inhibition measured; therapeutic mediation broader and delayed.

Formulation / PK: Oral; enzyme recovery is far slower than plasma disappearance. Hepatic metabolism; drug and food interactions dominate practical kinetics.

Exposure / state: Duration follows irreversible enzyme resynthesis, demonstrating why plasma half-life is not effect duration. Tyramine intake, sympathomimetics, serotonergic drugs, blood pressure, hepatic state and adherence to interaction rules.

Time / outcomes: Enzyme inhibition begins early; mood benefit often delayed; interaction risk can be immediate. Enzyme recovery/washout, sleep changes and withdrawal can extend beyond plasma clearance. Effective in selected depression, limited by interaction and safety burden rather than absence of pharmacology.

Burden / gaps: Hypertensive reactions, serotonin toxicity with contraindicated combinations, orthostasis, insomnia and withdrawal. Historical efficacy established; modern comparative and patient-experience data thinner. Who gains enough benefit to justify specialist burden in contemporary care.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-TRANLYCYPROMINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22tranylcypromine%22 | FH-PHARM-4624F5B901 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095514

DRUG-AD-002 · Imipramine; tricyclic antidepressants

Class / use: Tricyclics; 1950s antidepressant wave Depression and agent-specific pain/sleep/other indications; often later-line due to safety/tolerability.

Targets / certainty: Norepinephrine/serotonin transporter inhibition plus variable M1, H1, α 1 and cardiac sodium-channel effects; active metabolites matter. Transporter/receptor actions measured; disease-cause inference invalid.

Formulation / PK: Oral with first-pass metabolism; therapeutic-drug monitoring useful for selected TCAs. Hepatic CYP2D6/2C19 and agent-specific active metabolites; genetic and drug interactions can alter exposure.

Exposure / state: Therapeutic and cardiac/anticholinergic effects overlap; total exposure and metabolite profile matter. Age, cardiac conduction, overdose risk, CYP genotype/inhibitors, anticholinergic burden, bipolarity.

Time / outcomes: Autonomic/sedative effects precede antidepressant benefit. Anticholinergic adaptation and withdrawal/rebound; toxicity risk does not map to efficacy latency. Effective antidepressants, sometimes strong in melancholic/severe depression, with selection and tolerability constraints.

Burden / gaps: Cardiac conduction/arrhythmia and overdose lethality, anticholinergic effects, orthostasis, sedation, sexual effects, mania switch. High efficacy; high safety heterogeneity. Modern precision use and comparison with augmentation/rapid-acting strategies.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-IMIPRAMINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22imipramine%22 | FH-PHARM-049BB6F555 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/ajp.115.5.459

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AD-003 · SSRIs: fluoxetine, sertraline, paroxetine, escitalopram and others

Class / use: Selective serotonin-reuptake inhibitors; late-1980s onward Major depression, anxiety/OCD/PTSD and agent-specific conditions; bipolar depression only with phase-specific caution/co-treatment.

Targets / certainty: SERT inhibition with molecule-specific secondary actions; acute serotonin change precedes therapeutic adaptation. Transporter occupancy established; downstream therapeutic mechanism plural and unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Primarily oral; some liquid and special formulations. Half-lives range from roughly a day to several days; fluoxetine/norfluoxetine persist far longer. Hepatic CYP pathways differ; paroxetine/fluoxetine inhibit CYP2D6; active metabolites vary.

Exposure / state: SERT occupancy is nonlinear and saturates at common doses; more dose can add harms without proportional benefit. Age, bipolarity, anxiety/activation, sexual priorities, pregnancy, hepatic state, pharmacogenomics, substances and expectations.

Time / outcomes: Nausea, activation/sedation and sexual effects can be early; mood benefit commonly develops over weeks though early cognitive-affective shifts are hypothesized. Receptor/network adaptation and withdrawal differ markedly by half-life; paroxetine often has greater discontinuation burden than fluoxetine. Average acute benefit over placebo; many nonresponders/partial responders; long-term function and recurrence are less completely characterized.

Burden / gaps: Sexual dysfunction, emotional blunting, GI effects, sleep change, hyponatremia, bleeding interactions, activation, age-dependent suicidality warning, serotonin toxicity. High for acute average efficacy; high person/drug/outcome heterogeneity. Mechanism of delayed benefit, persistent sexual symptoms, optimal discontinuation, and predictors of blunting versus recovery.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-FLUOXETINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22fluoxetine%22 | FDA-LABEL-SERTRALINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22sertraline%22 | FDA-LABEL-PAROXETINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22paroxetine%22 | FDA-LABEL-ESCITALOPRAM [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22escitalopram%22 | FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7 | FH-PHARM-D70A627EDD [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.08.027

DRUG-AD-004 · SNRIs: venlafaxine, duloxetine and others

Class / use: Serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors Depression, anxiety and agent-specific pain indications.

Targets / certainty: SERT and NET inhibition with dose- and molecule-dependent balance. Transporter actions measured; therapeutic mediation not reducible to transmitter amount.

Formulation / PK: Oral IR/ER depending agent; short parent half-life for venlafaxine with active desvenlafaxine; duloxetine hepatic metabolism. CYP2D6 important for venlafaxine parent/metabolite balance; duloxetine CYP1A2/2D6; renal/hepatic state matters by product.

Exposure / state: Noradrenergic contribution rises with exposure for some agents; blood-pressure and withdrawal burdens can rise too. CYP phenotype, blood pressure, pain, hepatic/renal function, bipolarity, interacting serotonergic agents.

Time / outcomes: Autonomic/GI/activation effects early; mood/pain benefits have differing latencies. Short effective half-life can produce prominent missed-dose and discontinuation symptoms. Effective acute antidepressants; average comparative differences are modest.

Burden / gaps: Withdrawal, nausea, sweating, sexual dysfunction, blood-pressure/heart-rate effects, hyponatremia, bleeding and suicidality warning. High for acute efficacy; state- and dose-dependent harms.

Who benefits from dual-transporter action and optimal taper geometry.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-VENLAFAXINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22venlafaxine%22 | FDA-LABEL-DULOXETINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22duloxetine%22 | FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AD-005 · Bupropion

Class / use: Norepinephrine/dopamine reuptake inhibitor-like antidepressant; aminoketone Depression and smoking cessation in formulation-specific labels; augmentation in practice.

Targets / certainty: NET/DAT-related and nicotinic-receptor actions are proposed; active metabolites contribute substantially. Human therapeutic mechanism not fully resolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral IR/SR/XL formulations yield very different peaks and dosing intervals. CYP2B6 metabolism to active hydroxybupropion; CYP2D6 inhibition; renal/hepatic state affects metabolites.

Exposure / state: Peak and total exposure influence seizure risk; formulation is not a cosmetic detail. Seizure/eating-disorder risk, agitation/anxiety, sleep, CYP2B6 variation, substance use and bipolarity.

Time / outcomes: Activation/insomnia may be early; antidepressant benefit delayed. Long-lived metabolites and sleep/behavior feedback shape offset; classic serotonergic withdrawal may be less prominent but not impossible. Effective antidepressant with lower average sexual side-effect burden than many serotonergic agents.

Burden / gaps: Dose-related seizure risk, insomnia, anxiety/agitation, blood pressure, suicidality warning, mania activation. High for approved efficacy/safety constraints. Mechanism and responder profiles across anhedonia, fatigue and anxiety.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-BUPROPION [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22bupropion%22 | FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7

DRUG-AD-006 · Mirtazapine

Class / use: NaSSA / tetracyclic antidepressant Major depression; commonly selected when sleep/appetite dimensions are relevant.

Targets / certainty: α_2 -adrenergic antagonism; 5-HT₂/5-HT₃ and H₁ antagonism; no simple reuptake blockade story. Binding known; clinical mediation across sleep/appetite/mood unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral tablets/ODT; hepatic metabolism with multi-day attainment of steady exposure. Multiple CYP pathways; renal/hepatic impairment can change clearance.

Exposure / state: H₁ effects can dominate at clinical exposures; common claim that higher dose is always less sedating is not a universal law. Weight/appetite goals, insomnia, metabolic state, age, sedative co-use, bipolarity.

Time / outcomes: Sedation/appetite change often precede antidepressant benefit. Weight/metabolic and sleep feedback can accumulate; discontinuation may disturb sleep/GI state. Effective acute antidepressant with distinct tolerability profile.

Burden / gaps: Somnolence, appetite/weight gain, dry mouth, rare neutropenia warning, suicidality warning. High for acute efficacy; preference-sensitive tradeoffs. Which benefits are sleep-mediated versus independent mood effects.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-MIRTAZAPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22mirtazapine%22 | FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AD-007 · Vortioxetine

Class / use: Multimodal serotonergic antidepressant Major depressive disorder.

Targets / certainty: SERT inhibition plus 5-HT receptor agonist/antagonist profile; downstream network claims exceed direct evidence. Targets measured; contribution of each to clinical effect uncertain.

Formulation / PK: Oral with relatively long half-life. CYP2D6 prominent; inhibitors/poor metabolism raise exposure.

Exposure / state: Exposure varies with 2D6 phenotype; cognitive claims require outcome-specific appraisal. CYP2D6, sexual/GI tolerability, age, hepatic state, serotonergic combinations and bipolarity.

Time / outcomes: Nausea can be early; antidepressant/cognitive outcomes over weeks. Long half-life shapes offset; long-term comparative functioning data limited. Effective acute antidepressant; no universal superiority.

Burden / gaps: Nausea, sexual effects, bleeding/hyponatremia/serotonin toxicity class concerns, suicidality warning. High for acute efficacy; lower for special cognitive advantage. Independent pro-cognitive effect and long-term patient-valued outcomes.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-VORTIOXETINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22vortioxetine%22 | FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7

DRUG-RA-001 · Ketamine (racemic; IV and other specialist routes)

Class / use: Dissociative anesthetic / rapid-acting antidepressant repurposing Anesthesia label; off-label specialist depression use in some systems; evidence also studied in bipolar depression.

Targets / certainty: Noncompetitive NMDA antagonism with multiple downstream glutamate, opioid, HCN and plasticity-related candidates. Acute NMDA pharmacology established; antidepressant mediator not uniquely identified.

Formulation / PK: IV research convention yields precise exposure; oral, intranasal, subcutaneous and IM routes have different bioavailability/metabolites and evidence. Rapid distribution; CYP metabolism to norketamine/hydroxynorketamine; subjective effects resolve before some mood effects.

Exposure / state: Subanesthetic exposure can change symptoms within hours; psychoactive intensity is neither proven necessary nor irrelevant. Cardiovascular status, substance-use risk, concomitant sedatives, expectancy, setting, unipolar/bipolar state and psychosis vulnerability.

Time / outcomes: Dissociation and blood-pressure effects in minutes; mood response hours/days; durability often requires repeat/maintenance strategies. Repeated-exposure cognitive, urinary, misuse and tolerance questions are distinct from single-dose trials. Rapid short-term benefit in some TRD; durability and comparative long-term function less secure.

Burden / gaps: Dissociation, sedation, blood pressure, nausea, misuse/dependence and urinary/cognitive risks with repeated/high exposure. High for rapid short-term signal; lower for optimal long-term trajectory and mechanism. Durable responders, necessary psychological effects, maintenance, bipolar switch, and mechanism.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-KETAMINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22ketamine%22 | FH-PHARM-7C511E5074 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0006-3223(99)00230-9 | FH-PHARM-D3624284FF [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/nature10130

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-RA-002 · Esketamine intranasal (Spravato)

Class / use: Regulated rapid-acting NMDA antagonist Adult TRD as monotherapy or with oral antidepressant in the January 2025 US label; acute depressive symptoms with suicidal ideation/behavior only with oral antidepressant, without demonstrated suicide prevention.

Targets / certainty: S-enantiomer noncompetitive NMDA antagonism; antidepressant mechanism unknown. Target known; clinical mediator unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Supervised intranasal device; bioavailability about 48%, peak roughly 20–40 minutes in label data. CYP2B6/3A4 metabolism; terminal half-life roughly 7–12 hours, while benefit/relapse dynamics last longer.

Exposure / state: Fixed device doses, variable nasal absorption; acute subjective and cardiovascular monitoring tied to peak exposure. Blood pressure/cerebrovascular risk, respiratory status, abuse risk, nasal drugs, food/liquid timing, setting and expectancy.

Time / outcomes: Dissociation/sedation/BP in hours; symptom response assessed over four-week induction; maintenance spacing is responder-dependent. Enriched withdrawal trial supports continuation in responders but cannot fully separate recurrence from discontinuation effects. Modest mean acute advantage in pivotal adjunctive trial; relapse delay in selected responders; monotherapy indication added in 2025.

Burden / gaps: Boxed sedation, dissociation, respiratory depression, abuse/misuse and suicidality; REMS and ≥2-hour monitoring. Moderate to high for approved outcomes; infrastructure and selection are part of effectiveness. Long-term cognitive/urinary/misuse risk, spacing, withdrawal, real-world function and suicide-related outcomes.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-ESKETAMINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22esketamine%22 | FH-PHARM-DBEC9D275A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19020172 | FH-PHARM-A6A3317EAB [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.1189 | FDA_SPRAVATO_2025_LABEL [official label inspected] — URL https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2025/211243s0161b1.pdf

DRUG-RA-003 · Psilocybin-assisted treatment (investigational/limited-jurisdiction frameworks)

Class / use: 5-HT_{2A} psychedelic pharmacology embedded in structured psychological support Investigational for depression in most medical jurisdictions; not an established universal pharmacotherapy.

Targets / certainty: Psilocin 5-HT_{2A} agonism with broad cortical/network and experiential effects; other serotonin receptors contribute. Acute target effects supported; durable therapeutic mediation and component weights unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral psilocybin converted to psilocin; session design and support are co-interventions. Acute exposure is hours, while reported psychological/clinical changes may persist weeks/months—an extreme time-scale separation.

Exposure / state: Dose predicts acute intensity imperfectly; expectancy, set/setting, and therapeutic alliance alter experience and possibly outcome. Personal/family psychosis or bipolar risk, current mood state, trauma, expectations, culture, therapist/site, and concomitant serotonergic drugs.

Time / outcomes: Profound acute experience; later meaning-making/integration and plasticity hypotheses. Few-dose model limits classic daily withdrawal; long-term adverse psychological trajectories and durability remain undermeasured. Promising selected-sample results; small comparative trial did not win its primary endpoint versus escitalopram.

Burden / gaps: Acute anxiety, panic, blood-pressure effects, challenging experiences; risk of mania/psychosis in vulnerable states; rare persistent perceptual/psychological harms uncertain. Moderate for selected trial signals; low for broad generalization and component causality. Blinding, support dose, durability, bipolar/psychosis safety, equity and scalable delivery.

Sources: FH-PHARM-3C1B555CD9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2032994 | FH-PHARM-BA54F69B7B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3285 | FH-PHARM-2E203AD776 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1038/s41398-021-01706-y

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-BD-001 · Lithium carbonate/citrate

Class / use: Elemental ion; foundational bipolar treatment Acute mania and maintenance; augmentation in unipolar depression; phase/label/jurisdiction specific.

Targets / certainty: Multiple intracellular candidates including GSK-3, inositol signaling, ion transport, circadian and plasticity pathways; no single accepted therapeutic target. Direct biochemical actions measured; clinical mediation unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral immediate/extended-release salts; complete absorption with formulation-dependent peaks. Total-body-water distribution, negligible protein binding, no metabolism, renal elimination; approximate label half-life 18–36 hours but longer with age/renal impairment.

Exposure / state: Narrow plasma therapeutic index; plasma level is a safety/exposure guide, not a direct brain-occupancy measure. Renal function, sodium/water balance, fever/illness, age, pregnancy/postpartum shifts, NSAIDs, diuretics and renin-angiotensin drugs.

Time / outcomes: GI/tremor effects can be early; antimanic and prophylactic effects have distinct latencies. Thyroid/renal concentrating effects are slow; abrupt withdrawal has been associated with rapid recurrence in susceptible patients. Strong antimanic and maintenance evidence; possible suicide reduction; response is not universal and may be stronger in classic episodic phenotypes.

Burden / gaps: Boxed toxicity; renal/thyroid/calcium, tremor, GI, weight, cardiac and pregnancy concerns; narrow-window monitoring. High for core bipolar roles; magnitude varies by polarity/phenotype/adherence. Mechanism, renal-risk prediction, neuroprotection claims, optimal long-term trajectories and suicide-effect magnitude.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-LITHIUM-CARBONATE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22lithium%20carbonate%22 | FH-PHARM-2E59E3AE88 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.5694/j.1326-5377.1949.tb36912.x | FH-PHARM-5005AAED29 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61828-6 | FH-PHARM-BADB405F68 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1136/bmj.f3646

DRUG-BD-002 · Valproate/divalproex

Class / use: Antiseizure-derived antimanic treatment Acute mania/mixed episodes and selected maintenance; major reproductive restrictions/warnings.

Targets / certainty: Multiple proposed GABA, sodium-channel, signaling, gene-expression and mitochondrial effects; bipolar mechanism unestablished. Biochemical effects known; clinical mediator unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral and IV forms; enteric/extended-release formulations change peaks and bioavailability. Concentration-dependent protein binding; hepatic UGT, beta-oxidation and other metabolism; free exposure rises nonlinearly.

Exposure / state: Total level can underestimate free fraction in low albumin/high concentration; response is phase-specific. Pregnancy potential, hepatic/mitochondrial disease, age, albumin, metabolic state, UGT interactions, lamotrigine co-use.

Time / outcomes: Antimanic effects over days; sedation/GI/tremor earlier; teratogenic risk begins with exposure, not symptom response. Weight/metabolic, endocrine, hepatic and hematologic burden; stopping can destabilize mood/seizure state. Effective acute antimanic drug; BALANCE found lithium-containing strategies superior to valproate alone for its maintenance population.

Burden / gaps: Boxed hepatotoxicity, pancreatitis and fetal risk; thrombocytopenia, hyperammonemia, weight, tremor, hair/endocrine effects. High for acute mania; reproductive harm evidence strong; maintenance role conditional. Responder phenotypes and safer alternatives across mixed/rapid-cycling states.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-VALPROATE-SODIUM [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22valproate%20sodium%22 | FH-PHARM-B32A5E006D [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/jama.1994.03510360044034 | FH-PHARM-5005AAED29 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61828-6 | FH-PHARM-B3B5C7B765 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa0803531

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-BD-003 · Carbamazepine

Class / use: Sodium-channel antiseizure drug used in bipolar mania/maintenance Acute mania and selected maintenance, often when alternatives are unsuitable; jurisdiction/label specific.

Targets / certainty: Use-dependent voltage-gated sodium-channel blockade and multiple downstream effects. Electrophysiology known; bipolar therapeutic mediator unresolved.

Formulation / PK: Oral IR/ER; absorption can be variable. CYP3A4 metabolism to active epoxide; autoinduction shortens half-life over initial weeks; potent inducer of many drugs.

Exposure / state: Time-varying clearance means the same dose does not imply the same exposure early versus later. Genetic severe-cutaneous-risk alleles in relevant ancestries, hepatic state, sodium, blood counts, pregnancy, extensive co-medications.

Time / outcomes: Neurologic adverse effects can be early; autoinduction is a slow PK adaptation; mood benefit over days/weeks. Autoinduction and de-induction create path dependence during initiation/stopping. Antimanic efficacy; comparative maintenance evidence less robust than lithium for many populations.

Burden / gaps: Serious cutaneous reactions, aplastic anemia/agranulocytosis warnings, hyponatremia, hepatic effects, dizziness/ataxia, teratogenicity and major interactions. Moderate to high for acute mania; high interaction complexity. Modern niche and precision benefit under polypharmacy.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-CARBAMAZEPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22carbamazepine%22 | FH-PHARM-EAFC8F0B82 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1159/000054844

DRUG-BD-004 · Lamotrigine

Class / use: Sodium-channel/glutamate-modulating antiseizure drug; bipolar-depression/maintenance wave Maintenance of bipolar I disorder with stronger prevention of depressive than manic recurrence; acute depression evidence mixed; not an acute antimanic.

Targets / certainty: Voltage-sensitive sodium-channel inhibition and reduced glutamate release are proposed; bipolar mechanism unestablished. Channel effects known; clinical mechanism uncertain.

Formulation / PK: Oral IR/ER/ODT depending product; slow titration is a safety constraint, not merely PK convenience. UGT glucuronidation; half-life roughly 25 h alone, ~70 h with valproate, ~12 h with inducers in label summaries.

Exposure / state: No routine occupancy biomarker; interaction-dependent exposure and titration history determine rash risk. Valproate/inducers, pregnancy (clearance changes), prior interruption/restart, age and rash history.

Time / outcomes: Safety-mandated titration delays full exposure; acute-trial window can underrepresent a slow preventive role. Interruption may require retitration; maintenance benefit and withdrawal timing differ from plasma decline. One early positive acute trial; broader acute evidence mixed; maintenance role more secure for depressive recurrence.

Burden / gaps: Boxed serious rash/SJS/TEN, especially with rapid titration or valproate; dizziness, diplopia, ataxia and rare hypersensitivity. High for label PK/safety; phase-specific efficacy must be stated precisely.

Which acute depressive subgroups benefit and how pregnancy kinetics should inform research trajectories.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-LAMOTRIGINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22lamotrigine%22 | FH-PHARM-0688939B27 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.4088/jcp.v60n0203

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Canonical drug and class atlas

DRUG-AUG-001 · Lithium, atypical-antipsychotic, thyroid-hormone and other depression augmentation strategies

Class / use: Mechanistically heterogeneous augmentation—not one class Treatment-resistant unipolar depression after inadequate response; agent and guideline specific.

Targets / certainty: Adds distinct intracellular, receptor, endocrine or arousal perturbations to an existing antidepressant state. Strategy-level efficacy may be known while synergy mechanism remains uncertain.

Formulation / PK: Combination PK and adherence burden; each component retains its own clock. Interaction-specific; lithium renal, antipsychotics hepatic/depot, thyroid endocrine feedback.

Exposure / state: Augmentation changes a multivariate exposure state, not simply 'more antidepressant.' Residual symptom domain, bipolar misdiagnosis, thyroid/renal/metabolic status, prior response, co-medication and preference.

Time / outcomes: Side effects can precede added benefit; endocrine/plastic adaptations have distinct delays. Polypharmacy multiplies long-term burden and makes causal attribution/withdrawal sequencing harder. Some strategies improve response/remission averages; comparative long-term functional evidence is less complete.

Burden / gaps: Component-specific metabolic, renal/thyroid, motor/endocrine, cardiac and pregnancy risks. Moderate; treatment-resistance definitions and sequencing differ. Mechanism-informed selection, deprescribing sequence, and functional outcome superiority.

Sources: FH-PHARM-983862533A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/ajp.2006.163.11.1905 | FDA-LABEL-LITHIUM-CARBONATE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22lithium%20carbonate%22 | FDA-LABEL-ARIPRAZOLE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22ariprazole%22 | NICE_DEPRESSION_NG222 [official landing page inspected; full guideline not exhaustively extracted] — URL <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng222>

DRUG-ADJ-001 · Benzodiazepines and sedative adjuncts

Class / use: GABA-A positive allosteric modulators and heterogeneous sedatives; adjunctive, not core disease-modifying class Short-term agitation/anxiety/insomnia; lorazepam challenge/treatment in catatonia; supportive roles under close context-specific assessment.

Targets / certainty: GABA-A receptor positive allosteric modulation by benzodiazepines; rapid reduction of arousal and motor/catatonic symptoms in responsive states. Receptor action known; syndrome-specific therapeutic mechanisms vary.

Formulation / PK: Oral, sublingual, IM/IV and agent-specific routes; onset and active metabolites vary widely. Some agents rely on CYP oxidation/active metabolites; lorazepam/oxazepam/temazepam use glucuronidation; age/hepatic state matter.

Exposure / state: Rapid peak can calm or disinhibit; sedation is not equivalent to antipsychotic or mood recovery. Respiratory disease, opioids/alcohol, age, trauma/dissociation, delirium, substance-use history and catatonia subtype.

Time / outcomes: Minutes/hours for anxiolysis, sedation or catatonia response; tolerance can emerge over days/weeks. Tolerance, dependence, cognitive/psychomotor effects and withdrawal—including seizures—can dominate long-term trajectory. Important acute adjunct and catatonia treatment; generally not a substitute for core longitudinal treatment.

Burden / gaps: Sedation, falls, memory effects, respiratory depression with other depressants, paradoxical disinhibition, dependence/withdrawal. High for rapid GABAergic effects; syndrome and long-term benefit highly conditional. Minimal exposure that preserves acute benefit without reinforcing chronic dependence/avoidance cycles.

Sources: FH-PHARM-DAB1FF3493 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1093/schbul/21.4.607

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Multiscale mechanism maps

MAP-01 · D2 antagonist antipsychotics

Molecule to cell: Agent-specific oral/IM/depot exposure; peak-trough and persistence vary. D2 antagonism plus molecule-specific 5-HT/H1/M1/α1 targets. Reduced D2 signaling; altered cAMP/β-arrestin pathways and excitability; chronic receptor/signaling adaptation.

Circuit to body: Striatal salience/action-selection modulation; nigrostriatal motor and tuberoinfundibular endocrine collateral effects; prefrontal effects indirect. Hypothesized reduction of aberrant salience and psychosis-related network instability; possible reduced motivational/cognitive gain at excess exposure. Prolactin, motor control, autonomic and agent-specific metabolic regulation.

Experience / feedback: Reduced psychotic intensity for responders; possible akathisia, dysphoria, sedation, flattening or cognitive slowing. Improved organization or reduced threat may restore engagement; adverse effects can reduce agency/adherence and strain relationships. Adherence, sleep, stress, stigma, service contact and depot persistence feed back into relapse and function.

Status / biological boundary: Targets and clinical effects measured; circuit/network links partly inferred; FH control framing is synthesis.

Sources: FH-PHARM-2027F0FA70 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.157.4.514 | FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688

MAP-02 · Clozapine / broad-receptor treatment-resistance pharmacology

Molecule to cell: Oral clozapine with highly variable CYP1A2-sensitive exposure. Broad dopamine/serotonin/muscarinic/histamine/adrenergic binding; relatively distinctive D2 kinetics/profile. Multiple GPCR and plasticity effects; no proven single treatment-resistance pathway.

Circuit to body: Striatal and cortical modulation with lower classic EPS liability; seizure/autonomic/gut networks also affected. Unique clinical efficacy may reflect multireceptor/network action, but mechanism remains an inference. Neutrophils, myocardium, metabolism, gut motility, salivation, thermoregulation and seizure threshold.

Experience / feedback: Potential relief after prior nonresponse; sedation, salivation, constipation, cognitive/affective effects can dominate experience. Monitoring/access can structure daily life; smoking and infection change exposure; benefit may enable social recovery. Inflammation→clearance↓→exposure↑; side effects/adherence and service access create feedback loops.

Status / biological boundary: Treatment-resistant efficacy and PK modifiers measured; unique network mechanism unresolved.

Sources: FH-PHARM-550C92F8BC [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800330013001 | FH-PHARM-AAAEF1BA9E [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1111/bcp.15691 | FDA-LABEL-CLOZAPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22clozapine%22

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Multiscale mechanism maps

MAP-03 · D2/D3 partial agonists

Molecule to cell: Oral or selected LAI exposures; some active metabolites persist for weeks. State-dependent partial agonism and agent-specific serotonin actions. Ligand- and pathway-dependent signaling/ β -arrestin hypotheses; intrinsic activity differs by assay and cellular context.

Circuit to body: Can oppose high dopamine tone while supplying agonism under low tone—a useful but simplified description. May preserve some motivational/executive signaling or provoke activation; direct network proof limited. Often lower prolactin burden; akathisia, insomnia, nausea and metabolic effects remain.

Experience / feedback: Some experience less sedation/flattening; others experience restlessness, activation or impulse changes. Energy/drive changes can improve function or destabilize sleep/mania risk. Long metabolite tails and switches from antagonists create path dependence.

Status / biological boundary: Partial agonism measured; ‘dopamine stabilization’ and network effects are interpretations.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-ARIPRAZOLE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22ariprazole%22 | FDA-LABEL-CARIPRAZINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22cariprazine%22 | FH-PHARM-7B9E3A8F83 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.10.011

MAP-04 · Xanomeline-trospium

Molecule to cell: Fixed oral central agonist/peripheral antagonist with food-sensitive component exposure. Presumed central M1/M4 agonism; peripheral muscarinic antagonism by trospium. Gq/Gi-linked muscarinic signaling modifies excitability and transmitter release.

Circuit to body: Cortical/striatal cholinergic modulation may influence dopamine/glutamate signaling without D2 blockade. Hypothesized salience/cognitive network reconfiguration; human mediation not established. Competing cholinergic and anticholinergic effects across GI, urinary, cardiovascular and secretory systems.

Experience / feedback: Psychosis improvement in responders; nausea/GI/autonomic burden in some. Fasting/meal timing, tolerability and adherence alter realized treatment. Bodily side-effect control is built into the molecule pair; long-term adaptation unknown.

Status / biological boundary: Short-term clinical efficacy and component PK measured; circuit/network claims inferred.

Sources: FH-PHARM-5EED522183 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2017015 | FH-PHARM-3A57A79CFA [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(23)02190-6 | FDA_COBENFY_LABEL [official label + openFDA sections inspected] — URL https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2024/216158s0001b1.pdf

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Multiscale mechanism maps

MAP-05 · Monoaminergic antidepressants

Molecule to cell: Daily oral transporter/enzyme/receptor interventions with widely different half-lives/metabolites. SERT/NET/DAT, MAO, α_2 , serotonin and histamine receptors depending class. Immediate transmitter changes followed by receptor, gene-expression, BDNF/plasticity and homeostatic adaptations.

Circuit to body: Raphe/locus-coeruleus projections influence limbic, cortical, striatal, habenular and brainstem circuits. Hypothesized changes in negative affective bias, reward learning, DMN-salience-control balance and flexibility. Sleep, GI, sexual, autonomic, platelet, endocrine and pain regulation.

Experience / feedback: Reduced depressive/anxious symptoms for some; activation, emotional blunting, sexual dysfunction or no benefit for others. Early side effects and expectations affect adherence; improved energy can precede mood; activity/relationships feed back. Chronic adaptation and discontinuation interact with stress and recurrence; no single serotonin clock.

Status / biological boundary: Targets and average efficacy measured; detailed circuit/network mediation remains inferential.

Sources: FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7 | FH-PHARM-78D71F1060 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/s41380-022-01661-0 | FH-PHARM-D70A627EDD [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.08.027

MAP-06 · Ketamine / esketamine

Molecule to cell: IV racemate or supervised intranasal S-enantiomer; acute exposure in minutes-hours. NMDA antagonism with competing downstream/parallel candidates. AMPA throughput, BDNF/eEF2, mTOR, synaptic plasticity hypotheses; preclinical evidence stronger than direct human mediation.

Circuit to body: Corticolimbic excitation/inhibition and habenular/reward circuitry are candidate sites. Rapid changes in connectivity/dynamics may enable transition from rigid depressive states; not proven as exclusive mechanism. Blood pressure, respiration, nausea, vestibular and urinary systems.

Experience / feedback: Dissociation/altered perception acutely; rapid symptom relief for some, transient/no response for others. Clinical setting, monitoring, expectancy and repeated-session access shape trajectory. Short exposure can have longer benefit, but relapse and maintenance frequency show slow variables remain.

Status / biological boundary: Rapid clinical effect measured; synaptogenesis/network story is partly animal/inferred.

Sources: FH-PHARM-7C511E5074 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0006-3223(99)00230-9 | FH-PHARM-D3624284FF [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/nature10130 | FH-PHARM-DBEC9D275A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19020172

MAP-07 · Psilocybin-assisted pharmacology

Molecule to cell: One/few oral sessions embedded in preparation, support and integration. Psilocin agonism especially at 5-HT_{2A}. Gq-linked signaling and plasticity hypotheses.

Circuit to body: Layer-V cortical and thalamocortical effects; sensory/association integration altered. Increased dynamical repertoire/flexibility and altered modular control-energy landscapes are modeled observations. Autonomic arousal, nausea, blood pressure and sleep aftermath.

Experience / feedback: Intense perceptual, emotional, autobiographical and meaning-laden states. Set, setting, trust, therapist behavior and cultural meaning are causal candidates, not nuisance variables. Integration and changed behavior/relationships may consolidate or undermine acute plasticity.

Status / biological boundary: Acute target/network changes and selected trial outcomes measured; durable causal chain contested.

Sources: FH-PHARM-3C1B555CD9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2032994 | FH-PHARM-2E203AD776 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1038/s41398-021-01706-y | FH-MATH-985014225F [bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending] — DOI 10.1038/ncomms9414

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Multiscale mechanism maps

MAP-08 · Lithium

Molecule to cell: Oral ion; renal and water/sodium-state-dependent exposure. No receptor occupancy; intracellular ions/enzymes/signaling including GSK-3 and inositol pathways. Gene expression, circadian, mitochondrial, neurotrophic and excitability effects across slow timescales.

Circuit to body: Broad modulation rather than a single circuit; antimanic action and depressive-recursion prevention may differ. Hypothesized stabilization of switching/oscillatory and reward-control dynamics; direct evidence incomplete. Kidney, thyroid, calcium/parathyroid, heart, GI and fluid balance.

Experience / feedback: Mood stabilization for responders; tremor, cognitive dulling, thirst/polyuria or emotional changes for some. Hydration, illness, monitoring, pregnancy, adherence and routines become part of treatment. Slow renal/endocrine change and abrupt-discontinuation recurrence risk embody path dependence.

Status / biological boundary: Clinical efficacy/PK/body risks measured; network-stabilizer language is FH synthesis.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-LITHIUM-CARBONATE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22lithium%20carbonate%22 | FH-PHARM-5005AAED29 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61828-6 | FH-PHARM-A967D7F9BB [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1073/pnas.93.16.8455

MAP-09 · Valproate/carbamazepine/lamotrigine

Molecule to cell: Oral antiseizure-derived agents with distinct absorption, binding, autoinduction and UGT interactions. Sodium channels, GABA/glutamate and diverse intracellular effects; no shared 'mood stabilizer receptor.' Excitability and transmitter release altered; gene-expression/metabolic effects differ.

Circuit to body: May constrain hyperexcitable/recurrent activity, but bipolar phase effects are not reducible to seizure control. Agent- and phase-specific stabilization is inferred; lamotrigine's depressive-polarity pattern differs from valproate's antimanic role. Hepatic, hematologic, dermatologic, metabolic, reproductive and endocrine systems differ sharply by agent.

Experience / feedback: Sedation/cognitive slowing/tremor versus improved stability; lamotrigine often has a different subjective profile. Pregnancy potential, monitoring, interactions and slow titration shape choices and adherence. Autoinduction, nonlinear protein binding, and interaction-dependent half-life generate pharmacokinetic path dependence.

Status / biological boundary: PK/safety and phase-specific efficacy measured; unified network mechanism unsupported.

Sources: FDA-LABEL-VALPROATE-SODIUM [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22valproate%20sodium%22 | FDA-LABEL-CARBAMAZEPINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22carbamazepine%22 | FDA-LABEL-LAMOTRIGINE [formulation-specific label sections acquired] — URL https://api.fda.gov/drug/label.json?search=openfda.generic_name:%22lamotrigine%22 | FH-PHARM-832A5E006D [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1001/jama.1994.03510360044034

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-01 · Central/physiological pharmacokinetic compartments

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dC_p}{dt} &= \frac{\text{Input}(t)}{V} - \frac{CL}{V}C_p, \\ \frac{dC_i}{dt} &= \frac{Q_i}{V_i} \left(C_{art} - \frac{C_i}{K_{p,i}} \right) \\ &\quad - \text{Sink}_i(C_i)\end{aligned}$$

Intuition: Different exposure after the same nominal dose; active-metabolite and organ-state effects; formulation-dependent peaks and tails.

Symbols, units, assumptions: C_p , C_i and C_{art} are concentrations [mass/volume]; V and V_i are volumes; CL and Q_i are volume/time; $K_{p,i}$ is dimensionless; Input is mass/time; Sink_i is concentration/time. Compartments are assumed well mixed and units compatible.

Data / fit: Timed dose/formulation, plasma and ideally target-site/metabolite concentrations, covariates, organ function.

Mapping: Route, absorption, distribution, hepatic/renal function, pregnancy, smoking and interactions determine the input reaching brain targets.

Boundary: Established modeling family; drug-specific model must be fitted and validated. Misspecified compartments, time-varying adherence/clearance, unmeasured free drug, and assuming plasma equals brain exposure.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-1451BA0568: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-1CD061DA46: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-1451BA0568 → DOI 10.1038/psp.2013.41 ; FH-MATH-1CD061DA46 → DOI 10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.47.120505.105154

textcolorTealMATH-02 · Effect compartment / biophase delay

$$\frac{dC_e}{dt} = k_{e0} (C_p - C_e)$$

Intuition: Concentration–effect hysteresis caused by distribution delay.

Symbols, units, assumptions: C_e and C_p are effect-site and plasma concentrations in the same units; k_{e0} is an equilibration rate [1/time]. The equation assumes first-order exchange on one declared clock.

Data / fit: Dense PK and time-matched effect/occupancy data.

Mapping: A simple first delay between plasma and receptor/circuit effect; useful for peak-lag and route comparisons.

Boundary: Established PK/PD model; psychiatric application is outcome-specific. Cannot by itself represent plasticity, tolerance, illness change, expectancy, or multiple effect sites; apparent hysteresis can be model error.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-F347480924: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-C1652E9653: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-F347480924 → URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/761446/> ; FH-MATH-C1652E9653 → DOI 10.2165/00003088-198106060-00002

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-03 · Hill/Emax and receptor occupancy

$$E(C_e) = E_0 + \frac{E_{\max} C_e^h}{EC_{50}^h + C_e^h}, \quad \text{Occ}(C) = \frac{C^h}{K_d^h + C^h}$$

Intuition: Saturation, narrow occupancy windows, and why reductions near low doses need not be linear in occupancy.

Symbols, units, assumptions: E , E_0 and $E_{\max}$ use one declared outcome scale; C_e , C , EC_{50} and K_d are concentrations; h is dimensionless; Occ is a fraction from 0 to 1. The curve assumes a stationary monotone saturating relation.

Data / fit: Exposure, PET/target engagement, benefits and adverse effects across doses and states.

Mapping: Nonlinear dose-occupancy and occupancy-response/adverse-effect curves; the same dose increment can have different impact along the curve.

Boundary: Established pharmacological form; parameters and relevance must be estimated per outcome. Static curve ignores time, adaptation, multiple targets and heterogeneity; EC_{50} is not a universal patient constant.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-C1652E9653: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-PHARM-2027F0FA70: abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise

FH-MATH-C1652E9653 → DOI 10.2165/00003088-198106060-00002 ; FH-PHARM-2027F0FA70 → DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.157.4.514

textcolorTealMATH-04 · Indirect response and turnover

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = k_{in}[1 + S(C_e)] - k_{out}[1 + I(C_e)] R$$

Intuition: Delayed onset/offset even when exposure changes quickly; rebound when regulated production/removal adapts.

Symbols, units, assumptions: R is a response on a declared scale; k_{in} is response/time; k_{out} is 1/time; S and I are dimensionless functions of effect-site exposure C_e . The form assumes first-order turnover and explicitly named stimulation/inhibition directions.

Data / fit: Repeated exposure and response measures through onset, steady state and withdrawal.

Mapping: Endocrine, metabolic, gene-expression or synaptic variables change through production/removal rather than instantaneously.

Boundary: Established PK/PD class; candidate bridge to slow psychiatric variables. One turnover variable cannot represent interacting systems; feedback may change k_{in}/k_{out} over time.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-1CD061DA46: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-1CD061DA46 → DOI 10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.47.120505.105154

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-05 · Fast neural/experiential stochastic dynamics

$$dx_t = f(x_t, p_t, u_t, t) dt + \Sigma(x_t, p_t) dW_t$$

Intuition: Variable trajectories under the same nominal input, noise-driven switching and state-dependent response.

Symbols, units, assumptions: x , p and u are scaled state, parameter and input vectors; f is state/time; Σ maps Wiener increments dW [√time] into state units; t is time. Use requires a stated stochastic calculus, Markov approximation and measurement scale.

Data / fit: Dense multimodal longitudinal data and known perturbation times; preferably within-person replications.

Mapping: Symptoms and experiences fluctuate within a changing landscape under medication, sleep, stress and social inputs.

Boundary: Flow Hijacked organizing model, not biological proof. Latent-state choice can be arbitrary; noise may hide unmeasured drivers; fitted dynamics need out-of-sample perturbation validation.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-A252D5540C: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-662CDB5CE8: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-B114005174: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-A252D5540C → DOI 10.1201/9780429492563 + URL <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.1201/9780429492563/nonlinear-dynamics-chaos-steve>

n-strogatz ; FH-MATH-662CDB5CE8 → DOI 10.1038/nn.4497 ; FH-MATH-B114005174 → DOI 10.1038/nn.4238

textcolorTealMATH-06 · Slow adaptation / plasticity / bodily parameters

$$\frac{dp}{dt} = \varepsilon g(x, p, u, t), \quad 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$$

Intuition: Delayed therapeutic effects, chronic adverse effects, sensitization, path dependence and incomplete reversal after clearance.

Symbols, units, assumptions: p is the slower parameter vector; x is the current or faster state; u is input; g is parameter/time; ε is a dimensionless time-scale ratio; t is time. Slowness is an assumption relative to the selected clock, not an observed fact.

Data / fit: Longitudinal biomarkers/behavior across initiation, maintenance and discontinuation with multiple sampling scales.

Mapping: Fast target action can reshape slower conditions that later determine response, tolerance, withdrawal and recurrence.

Boundary: Flow Hijacked synthesis grounded in fast-slow modeling logic. No single ε ; some 'slow' variables change rapidly; separation may fail near transitions.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-A252D5540C: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-1CD061DA46: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-A252D5540C → DOI 10.1201/9780429492563 + URL <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.1201/9780429492563/nonlinear-dynamics-chaos-steve>

n-strogatz ; FH-MATH-1CD061DA46 → DOI 10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.47.120505.105154

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-07 · Wilson-Cowan excitation-inhibition dynamics

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_E \dot{E} &= -E + S_E(w_{EE}E - w_{EI}I + P), \\ \tau_I \dot{I} &= -I + S_I(w_{IE}E - w_{II}I + Q)\end{aligned}$$

Intuition: Multiple fixed points, oscillations, thresholds and hysteresis in local population activity.

Symbols, units, assumptions: E and I are normalized excitatory and inhibitory population activities; τ_E and τ_I are times; w terms are couplings under the stated normalization; P and Q are drives; S functions map input to activity. The model lumps each population as homogeneous.

Data / fit: Circuit-resolved electrophysiology and perturbations with pharmacological manipulation.

Mapping: Drugs may shift gain, time constants or coupling rather than simply raise/lower a transmitter.

Boundary: Foundational neural-mass model; psychiatric mapping is hypothesis-generating. Coarse populations, non-identifiable parameters and weak mapping from receptor to w/ τ /S.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-1FFA29AE38: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-1FFA29AE38 → DOI 10.1016/s0006-3495(72)86068-5

textcolorTealMATH-08 · Attractors, basins and stochastic transitions

$$dx_t = -\nabla V(x, p, u) dt + \sigma dW_t, \quad k \propto \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta V}{\sigma^2}\right)$$

Intuition: Abrupt episode transitions, partial response as basin reshaping, relapse risk without a fixed lesion.

Symbols, units, assumptions: x is state; V is an effective potential scaled so $-\nabla V dt$ has state units; p and u are parameters and inputs; σ is state/ $\sqrt{\text{time}}$; W is Wiener noise; $\Delta V/\sigma^2$ is dimensionless; k is 1/time. The escape form assumes an effective gradient/noise approximation.

Data / fit: Dense state trajectories, controlled perturbations and robust state definitions.

Mapping: Medication, sleep or stress may change basin depth/barriers, dwell time and transition probability.

Boundary: Established mathematics; clinical landscape is analogy/model unless fitted and tested. Living-brain dynamics are generally non-gradient and non-equilibrium; inferred landscapes can be visualization artifacts.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-105132E447: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending;

FH-MATH-26FBAC8520: not reviewed

FH-MATH-105132E447 → DOI 10.1073/pnas.79.8.2554 ; FH-MATH-26FBAC8520 → DOI 10.1038/s41598-017-03073-5

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-09 · Metastability and switching

$$\hat{P}_{ij} = \Pr(z_{t+1} = j \mid z_t = i), \quad \mathcal{M} = \text{Var}_t[R(t)]$$

Intuition: Network switching, rigidity, fragmentation and state-dependent response.

Symbols, units, assumptions: z is a categorical latent state; $\hat{P}_{ij}$ is a transition probability on a fixed sampling interval; $R(t)$ is a declared synchrony/order measure; $\mathcal{M}$ is its temporal variance. Estimated transitions assume the observation window and state definition are stable enough.

Data / fit: High-temporal-resolution EEG/MEG or carefully modeled fMRI, repeated across exposure and symptom states.

Mapping: Different drugs may alter repertoire, dwell times, transition asymmetry or flexibility rather than static connectivity alone.

Boundary: Empirical modeling family; medication-to-clinical mapping remains incomplete. State number, preprocessing and motion can dominate; latent states need external validity.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-F8BAB3E3B2: not reviewed; FH-MATH-26FBAC8520: not reviewed; FH-MATH-24A90B3A21: not reviewed

FH-MATH-F8BAB3E3B2 → DOI 10.1098/rstb.2011.0351 ; FH-MATH-26FBAC8520 → DOI 10.1038/s41598-017-03073-5 ; FH-MATH-24A90B3A21 → DOI 10.1162/netn

_a_00116

textcolorTealMATH-10 · Bifurcation and critical slowing

$$\alpha(J) = \max_i \text{Re } \lambda_i(J) \rightarrow 0^- \implies \tau_{rec} \approx -\alpha(J)^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$$

Intuition: Early-warning signals before some depressive or relapse transitions.

Symbols, units, assumptions: J is the local Jacobian [1/time]; x^* is an equilibrium; $\alpha(J)$ is the largest real eigenvalue part [1/time]; τ_{rec} is recovery time. The approximation requires local stability and one dominant mode; complex or multiple modes need fuller treatment.

Data / fit: Dense, pre-transition within-person time series with known medication/environment changes and external validation.

Mapping: A system approaching episode transition may recover more slowly from ordinary perturbations.

Boundary: Foundational cross-domain theory with preliminary psychiatric evidence. Not all transitions are bifurcations; colored noise, trends and observation changes create false signals.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-8AB6009EAA: not reviewed; FH-MATH-9E4573D2A7: not reviewed; FH-MATH-C2793A966D: not reviewed; FH-MATH-FBFC38BF04: not reviewed

FH-MATH-8AB6009EAA → DOI 10.1038/nature08227 ; FH-MATH-9E4573D2A7 → DOI 10.1126/science.1225244 ; FH-MATH-C2793A966D → DOI 10.1073/pnas.13121

14110 ; FH-MATH-FBFC38BF04 → DOI 10.1159/000441458

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-11 · Local linearization and non-normal transient gain

$$\delta \dot{x} = J\delta x + B\delta u, \quad JJ^* \neq J^*J, \quad G(t) = \|e^{Jt}\|_2$$

Intuition: Disproportionate temporary activation, akathisia, dissociation or destabilization without asymptotic instability.

Symbols, units, assumptions: δx is a state perturbation; J is 1/time; B maps input perturbation δu to state/time; $*$ denotes the adjoint; $\|\cdot\|_2$ uses a declared state metric; G is dimensionless gain. The relation is local and depends on scaling.

Data / fit: Input-output perturbations sufficient to identify local operators and compare gain predictions.

Mapping: A small drug/exposure/stress change might create a large transient if it aligns with sensitive non-orthogonal modes.

Boundary: Established mathematics plus explicit new biological hypothesis. Linearization is local; unobserved dimensions and nonlinear saturation; no current proof for psychiatric medication response.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-F68AEC4FFF: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-56C5FC7490: not reviewed; FH-MATH-B17B4B1CA3: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-F68AEC4FFF → DOI 10.1126/science.261.5121.578 ; FH-MATH-56C5FC7490 → DOI 10.1103/physreve.86.011909 ; FH-MATH-B17B4B1CA3 → DOI 10.2307/

j.ctvzxx9kj + URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvzxx9kj>

textcolorTealMATH-12 · Resolvent and frequency-selective amplification

$$R(z) = (zI - J)^{-1}, \quad \Gamma(z) = \|R(z)\|_2, \\ \Lambda_\epsilon(J) = \{z : \|R(z)\|_2 > \epsilon^{-1}\}$$

Intuition: High response at selected temporal frequencies and fragility to small parameter perturbations.

Symbols, units, assumptions: z is complex frequency/growth rate [1/time]; I is identity; J is 1/time; R is the resolvent; Γ is induced gain in the declared norm; ϵ is an operator perturbation scale [1/time]; Λ_ϵ is the pseudospectrum. State scaling and norm are fixed explicitly.

Data / fit: Frequency-resolved perturbations, EEG/MEG/system identification and exposure measures.

Mapping: Medication may change sensitivity to rhythmic sleep, arousal, sensory or stress inputs even if resting eigenvalues change little.

Boundary: Mathematical foundation; Flow Hijacked psychiatric mapping is novel hypothesis. Choice of norm/state variables; nonlinear/nonequilibrium brain; operator not identifiable from passive correlation.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-B17B4B1CA3: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-F68AEC4FFF: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending

FH-MATH-B17B4B1CA3 → DOI 10.2307/j.ctvzxx9kj + URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvzxx9kj> ; FH-MATH-F68AEC4FFF → DOI 10.1126/science.261.5121.5

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-13 · Network controllability and minimum energy

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad W_T = \int_0^T e^{A\tau} B B^\top e^{A^\top \tau} d\tau,$$

$$\Delta x = x_T - e^{AT} x_0, \quad E_{\min} = \Delta x^\top W_T^{-1} \Delta x$$

Intuition: Why some states are easier to enter than escape and why combined interventions may reduce transition cost.

Symbols, units, assumptions: x is state; A is 1/time; B maps control u to state/time; T is the horizon; x_0 and x_T are initial and target states; Δx is their free-evolution residual; W_T is the controllability Gramian; $E_{\min}$ is normalized input energy. W_T^{-1} requires reachability and nonsingularity.

Data / fit: Validated dynamics, physically meaningful inputs, target states and interventional outcomes.

Mapping: Drugs and environment could alter A , B or target state, changing the modeled cost of transitions.

Boundary: Established control theory; brain implementation debated; clinical medication claims unproven. Structural adjacency is not A ; normalization dominates; linear full-state control is biologically unrealistic; Gramian can be ill-conditioned.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-985014225F: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-5226281125: not reviewed; FH-MATH-F8E6827148: not reviewed

FH-MATH-985014225F → DOI 10.1038/ncomms9414 ; FH-MATH-5226281125 → DOI 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.04.010 ; FH-MATH-F8E6827148 → DOI 10.1162/netn

_a_00158

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-14 · Reinforcement learning and aberrant salience

$$\delta_t = r_t + \gamma V(s_{t+1}) - V(s_t), \quad V(s_t) \leftarrow V(s_t) + \alpha \delta_t$$

Intuition: State- and task-dependent changes in belief/value updating and anhedonia.

Symbols, units, assumptions: s is state; r , V and δ share declared reward/value units; γ is a dimensionless discount; α is a dimensionless learning rate; t indexes trials. The update assumes a stated Markov representation and sufficiently stable reward convention.

Data / fit: Behavioral tasks, computational identifiability, pharmacological manipulation and neural validation.

Mapping: Dopamine-modulating drugs can alter learning, effort and salience as well as psychotic symptoms or motivation.

Boundary: Strong computational-neuroscience foundation; syndrome/treatment mapping remains partial. Parameter mimicry, task validity, many dopamine functions, and translation from laboratory reward to lived meaning.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-A5FBF19813: not reviewed; FH-MATH-81E9CD5E1F: not reviewed; FH-MATH-838FB50A82: not reviewed; FH-MATH-34D9EE7C02: not reviewed

FH-MATH-A5FBF19813 → DOI 10.1523/jneurosci.16-05-01936.1996 ; FH-MATH-81E9CD5E1F → DOI 10.1038/nature05051 ; FH-MATH-838FB50A82 → DOI 10.3758/

cabn.8.4.429 ; FH-MATH-34D9EE7C02 → DOI 10.1186/2045-5380-3-12

textcolorTealMATH-15 · Bayesian/state-space computational psychiatry

$$p(z_t \mid y_{1:t}, u_{1:t}) \propto p(y_t \mid z_t) \times \int p(z_t \mid z_{t-1}, u_t) p(z_{t-1} \mid y_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t-1}) dz_{t-1}$$

Intuition: Diagnostic heterogeneity, changing parameters, uncertainty and individualized forecasts.

Symbols, units, assumptions: z is latent state; y is observation; u is input; $p(\cdot \mid \cdot)$ denotes conditional density or mass; dz integrates the prior state; t indexes observations. The omitted proportionality constant normalizes the posterior; transition and observation models must be specified.

Data / fit: Longitudinal measurements, explicit observation models, interventions and held-out validation.

Mapping: Infer hidden illness/adaptation states from noisy multimodal observations and known treatment inputs.

Boundary: Established statistical framework; clinical utility must be prospectively demonstrated.

Nonidentifiability, prior sensitivity, dataset shift, label leakage, and mistaking model latent variables for biological entities.

Appraisal depth: FH-MATH-B114005174: bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending; FH-MATH-797F206404: not reviewed; FH-MATH-696F2EAE28: not reviewed

FH-MATH-B114005174 → DOI 10.1038/nn.4238 ; FH-MATH-797F206404 → DOI 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005542 ; FH-MATH-696F2EAE28 → DOI 10.1371/journal.pcbi

.1007263

APPENDIX · MATHEMATICS AND BIOLOGICAL STATUS

Sixteen mathematical model objects

textcolorTealMATH-16 · Multi-objective treatment control

$$\min_{u(\cdot)} \int_0^T [w_s S(x) + w_h H(x, p) + w_f F(x) + \rho \|u\|_2^2] dt,$$

$$g_j(x, p, u, t) \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m$$

Intuition: No universal optimum and why the same symptom change can be recovery for one person and unacceptable flattening for another.

Symbols, units, assumptions: x and p are state and parameter vectors; u is control; S , H and F are declared symptom, harm and function-loss scales; weights convert them to one objective; ρ weights effort; T is time; g_j is constraint j , and m counts constraints. Causal dynamics, constraint scales and values must be stated.

Data / fit: Patient-valued longitudinal outcomes, causal treatment models, constraints and shared decisions.

Mapping: Treatment seeks symptom relief, safety, function, agency and relapse prevention simultaneously.

Boundary: Normative Flow Hijacked proposal, not an established clinical algorithm. Values cannot be reduced to a stable scalar; optimization may conceal power, coercion and unmodeled harms.

Appraisal depth: FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0: abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise; FH-PHARM-11781E110E: abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise; FH-MATH-5226281125: not reviewed

FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 → DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688 ; FH-PHARM-11781E110E → DOI 10.1016/j.jad.2017.05.048 ; FH-MATH-5226281125 → DOI 10.1016/j.neur

oimage.2018.04.010

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Contradictions and failed predictions

CFD-001 · Atypical class superiority

Expectation / supporting signal: Second-generation antipsychotics are uniformly more effective and better tolerated than first-generation drugs. Some individual SGAs reduce EPS at some doses; clozapine is distinctly effective in treatment resistance.

Counterevidence / fault lines: CATIE and CUtLASS weakened class-wide superiority; modern network meta-analysis finds graded efficacy and sharply heterogeneous harms. Dose equivalence, comparator choice, sponsorship, discontinuation, population exclusions, and class aggregation.

Resolution / lecture function: Compare molecules and outcomes, not generations; retain clozapine as a special case. Historical promise→comparative reckoning.

Sources: FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688 | FH-PHARM-344344D15C [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1192/bjp.bp.106.028654 | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

CFD-002 · Maintenance benefit versus withdrawal confounding

Expectation / supporting signal: Relapse after stopping proves continuous suppression of an unchanged disease process. Maintenance RCTs show large average relapse reduction.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Abrupt/rapid discontinuation and enriched designs can add withdrawal-related destabilization and selection effects. Taper speed, prior exposure, washout, relapse definition, early-event concentration, and long-term functional endpoints.

Resolution / lecture function: Maintenance benefit is real on average; the causal composition of post-discontinuation events is incompletely identified. Two truths must coexist.

Sources: FH-PHARM-005CCE46A4 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(12)60239-6 | FH-PHARM-69B34DD4C7 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1093/schbul/sbab017 | FH-PHARM-D70A627EDD [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.08.027 | FH-FWD-34587384 [journal abstract appraised; companion full report reviewed] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2106356 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34587384/> | FH-FWD-34842135 [full report manually appraised] — DOI 10.3310/hta25690 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34842135/>

CFD-003 · Symptom control versus life recovery

Expectation / supporting signal: Lower symptom scores imply restored functioning and quality of life. Acute trials reliably detect average symptom change.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Functioning, cognition, employment, agency, sexuality, and relationships are often sparse or diverge from symptom outcomes. Short follow-up, clinician-rated endpoints, informative dropout, and underpowered functional outcomes.

Resolution / lecture function: Treat outcomes as a vector, not a scalar. The gap between quieting a symptom and rebuilding a life.

Sources: FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa051688 | FH-PHARM-344344D15C [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1192/bjp.bp.106.028654 | FH-PHARM-11781E110E [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.jad.2017.05.048

CFD-004 · Antipsychotics and mortality

Expectation / supporting signal: Metabolic/cardiovascular adverse effects imply net increased mortality. Several agents worsen weight, lipids, glucose, QT, and other risk pathways.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Long observational cohorts often associate antipsychotic exposure—especially clozapine/LAIs in some analyses—with lower all-cause mortality. Confounding by indication/adherence, immortal time, health-service contact, suicide prevention, and cause-specific risk.

Resolution / lecture function: Drug-specific body harms and net mortality associations can coexist; causal magnitude remains uncertain. Competing slow pathways to survival.

Sources: FH-PHARM-4946BB109E [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)60742-x | FH-PHARM-335E305305 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Contradictions and failed predictions

CFD-005 · Serotonin deficiency versus antidepressant efficacy

Expectation / supporting signal: SSRIs work because depression is caused by low serotonin. SSRIs engage serotonin transporters and antidepressants outperform placebo on average.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Etiologic evidence does not support a simple generalized serotonin deficit; immediate transporter action does not explain delayed response. Conflating drug mechanism, mediator, biomarker, and disease cause.

Resolution / lecture function: Reject the deficiency slogan without denying efficacy or serotonergic complexity. Mechanism-of-action is not reverse proof of pathogenesis.

Sources: FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7 | FH-PHARM-78D71F1060 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/s41380-022-01661-0

CFD-006 · Published antidepressant efficacy

Expectation / supporting signal: The journal literature is an unbiased record of all trials. Many published trials were positive.

Counterevidence / fault lines: FDA-registry comparison found unpublished and outcome-framed negative studies, inflating apparent positivity and effect size. Nonpublication, selective outcomes, spin, sponsorship, inaccessible data.

Resolution / lecture function: Prefer registered/unpublished-inclusive syntheses and inspect risk of bias. The evidence system can hijack the apparent pharmacology.

Sources: FH-PHARM-1FD6FBC08B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmsa065779

CFD-007 · Antidepressant withdrawal prevalence

Expectation / supporting signal: Withdrawal is uniformly mild and brief—or, conversely, affects a fixed majority severely. Many observational and trial reports establish a real syndrome, sometimes prolonged.

Counterevidence / fault lines: The widely cited 56% estimate pools highly heterogeneous and selected data; incidence varies with drug, duration, taper, and ascertainment. Sampling, definition, spontaneous reporting, nocebo, relapse overlap, and taper design.

Resolution / lecture function: Withdrawal is real; a universal percentage is not secure. Preserve harm without manufacturing precision.

Sources: FH-PHARM-D70A627EDD [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.08.027 | FH-PHARM-CADC64D258 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s2215-0366(19)30032-x | FH-FWD-34842135 [full report manually appraised] — DOI 10.3310/hta25690 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34842135/> | FH-FWD-42594039 [abstract appraised; full text pending] — DOI 10.1159/pps/aemag002 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42594039/>

CFD-008 · Ketamine's mechanism

Expectation / supporting signal: A single NMDA→mTOR→synaptogenesis chain fully explains rapid human benefit. Strong rodent/cellular experiments and rapid clinical timing support glutamatergic/plasticity involvement.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Human mediation, durability, dissociation/expectancy, opioid-system findings, and alternative cellular pathways remain contested. Species translation, assay specificity, dose, behavioral-model validity, and functional unblinding.

Resolution / lecture function: Treat as a mechanistic family with unresolved causal weights. A beautiful mechanism is not automatically the human mechanism.

Sources: FH-PHARM-D3624284FF [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1038/nature10130 | FH-PHARM-7AE65B22DB [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1126/science.1190287 | FH-PHARM-DBEC9D275A [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19020172

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Contradictions and failed predictions

CFD-009 · Psychedelic molecule versus therapeutic context

Expectation / supporting signal: Outcome is a direct function of 5-HT_{2A} agonist exposure. Neuroimaging and clinical studies show acute target-linked changes and promising outcomes.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Preparation, expectancy, support, therapist/site, meaning, and unblinding are inseparable in current trials; primary comparative evidence is not uniformly positive. Blinding, expectancy controls, component dismantling, adverse selection, and generalizability.

Resolution / lecture function: Model as drug×person×setting, with all components requiring causal tests. Environment enters the pharmacological causal chain visibly.

Sources: FH-PHARM-3C1B555CD9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa2032994 | FH-PHARM-2E203AD776 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1038/s41398-021-01706-y

CFD-010 · Lithium and suicide

Expectation / supporting signal: Lithium has a precisely known, uniquely large anti-suicide effect. Randomized and observational syntheses often point toward fewer suicides/attempts.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Rare events yield unstable estimates; updated analyses and design choices can change statistical conclusions. Zero-event trials, continuity corrections, adherence, disorder pooling, and comparator selection.

Resolution / lecture function: Clinically important possible benefit; magnitude and exclusivity remain uncertain. Rare but consequential outcomes demand calibrated uncertainty.

Sources: FH-PHARM-BADB405F68 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1136/bmj.f3646 | FH-PHARM-A997E9337C [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1111/j.1399-5618.2006.00344.x | FH-FWD-40441661 [full text manually appraised] — DOI 10.1016/j.jad.2025.119487 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40441661/> | FH-FWD-42551960 [full text manually appraised] — DOI 10.1136/bmjment-2026-302694 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42551960/> | FH-FWD-41768277 [full text + correction manually appraised] — DOI 10.1016/j.eclinm.2026.103800 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41768277/> | FH-FWD-42011221 [correction notice manually appraised] — DOI 10.1016/j.eclinm.2026.103901 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42011221/>

CFD-011 · Lamotrigine in acute bipolar depression

Expectation / supporting signal: One positive early trial proves robust acute antidepressant efficacy. Study 602 reported advantages on several depression and global measures.

Counterevidence / fault lines: The broader acute program was mixed; maintenance/polarity-prevention roles are not identical to acute treatment. Multiplicity, slow titration, short trial duration, sponsor program publication, and endpoint choice.

Resolution / lecture function: Present phase-specific evidence, not a universal class label. Trial sequence changes the standing of a landmark.

Sources: FH-PHARM-0688939B27 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.4088/jcp.v60n0203

CFD-012 · Antidepressant-associated mania

Expectation / supporting signal: Antidepressants either invariably cause switches or never meaningfully do so. Registry data show elevated risk with monotherapy; clinical concern is stronger in mixed/rapid-cycling states.

Counterevidence / fault lines: STEP-BD found no increased switching in its adjunctive, monitored population, but also no efficacy advantage. Monotherapy versus combination, subtype, phase, switch definition, drug, and confounding by severity.

Resolution / lecture function: Risk is conditional, not binary. Same pharmacological input, different surrounding controller.

Sources: FH-PHARM-1149704A3E [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13111501 | FH-PHARM-9722471149 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa064135

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Contradictions and failed predictions

CFD-013 · Inflammation as a treatment target in schizophrenia

Expectation / supporting signal: Inflammatory biomarkers imply broad benefit from anti-inflammatory adjuncts. Small studies and meta-analyses generated promising signals.

Counterevidence / fault lines: BeneMin was convincingly null for minocycline and did not establish the expected mechanistic subgroup. Biomarker enrichment, timing, target specificity, peripheral versus central inflammation, and regression to the mean.

Resolution / lecture function: Inflammation may be relevant without making minocycline broadly effective. Etiology, biomarker, and treatment target are different claims.

Sources: FH-PHARM-D3D942411B [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/s2215-0366(18)30345-6 | FH-PHARM-FCDE3C401B [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1177/0004867419835028

CFD-014 · Glutamate strategy failure

Expectation / supporting signal: Correcting glycine/NMDA signaling should improve negative symptoms. Convergent pathophysiology and early development data supported GlyT1 inhibition.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Bitopertin phase-3 trials failed. Target engagement, illness stage, outcome construct, circuit specificity, and compensatory adaptation.

Resolution / lecture function: The failed intervention constrains, but does not erase, glutamatergic hypotheses. A failed molecule updates a theory probabilistically.

Sources: FH-PHARM-95AE40EDE0 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.11.014 | FH-PHARM-4C14641702 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1002/wps.20693

CFD-015 · Non-D2 phase-2 success

Expectation / supporting signal: Novel target plus positive phase 2 predicts a new approved class. Ulotaront produced a statistically significant phase-2 PANSS benefit.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Later program nonconfirmation shows regression, population/region effects, design drift, or inadequate mechanism can overturn an early signal. Multiplicity, site quality, placebo response, assay sensitivity, dose, and publication timing.

Resolution / lecture function: Current status must follow the total program, not the landmark positive paper alone. Forward citation and development-chain discipline.

Sources: FH-PHARM-5A834B14E9 [abstract/indexing only; full text pending unless the Evidence Ledger records otherwise] — DOI 10.1056/nejmoa1911772 | FH-FWD-39710623 [full text manually appraised] — DOI 10.1192/bjp.2024.237 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39710623/> | FH-FWD-40795331 [full text manually appraised] — DOI 10.1093/ijnp/pyaf059 + URL <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40795331/>

CFD-016 · Network controllability claims

Expectation / supporting signal: Linear controllability metrics identify where or how to control a living brain clinically. Structural network models generate reproducible mathematical control metrics and testable regional hypotheses.

Counterevidence / fault lines: Metrics depend on normalization, model choice, linearization, time horizon, and uncertain control inputs; structural controllability is not clinical controllability. Identifiability, units, energy scaling, nonlinear state dependence, and validation by perturbation.

Resolution / lecture function: Use as a constrained model and hypothesis generator. Mathematical seriousness includes knowing where the mathematics stops.

Sources: FH-MATH-985014225F [bibliographic/relevance check; full-text appraisal pending] — DOI 10.1038/ncomms9414 | FH-MATH-5226281125 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.04.010 | FH-MATH-F8E6827148 [not reviewed] — DOI 10.1162/netn_a_00158

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Research agenda and evidence gaps

GAP-01 · Cross-cutting outcomes

Priority: Critical

Gap: Trials rarely measure symptom, cognition, agency, sexuality, sleep, functioning, quality of life, relationships, hospitalization and mortality together.

Why it matters: Tradeoffs are otherwise hidden by a single primary scale.

Best next design: Core multidomain outcome set with patient-defined weighting and long follow-up embedded in pragmatic trials.

Sources:

GAP-02 · Schizophrenia

Priority: Critical

Gap: Long-term comparative effectiveness of xanomeline-trospium versus established antipsychotics, including treatment resistance, cognition, negative symptoms and functioning.

Why it matters: Short-term placebo efficacy cannot establish a new treatment era.

Best next design: Independent active-comparator pragmatic trials and registries with exposure/side-effect/functional phenotyping.

Sources:

GAP-03 · Schizophrenia

Priority: Critical

Gap: Mechanism of clozapine's unique treatment-resistant efficacy.

Why it matters: Could enable safer treatments and earlier identification of likely benefit.

Best next design: Prospective multimodal first-clozapine cohorts with PK, PET/EEG, immunometabolic and symptom-domain mediation.

Sources:

GAP-04 · Schizophrenia

Priority: Critical

Gap: Optimal antipsychotic maintenance dose/taper after first episode without withdrawal confounding.

Why it matters: Relapse protection, adverse effects and long-term function may pull in different directions.

Best next design: Multi-year randomized gradual-reduction strategies with dense early-event timing and functioning endpoints.

Sources:

GAP-05 · Schizophrenia

Priority: Critical

Gap: Reliable treatments for primary negative and cognitive symptoms.

Why it matters: Positive-symptom control often fails to restore life.

Best next design: Mechanism/biomarker-enriched trials with active controls, validated cognition/function and null-result publication.

Sources:

GAP-06 · Schizophrenia

Priority: High

Gap: Why some non-D2 strategies succeed short term while TAAR1/GlyT1/inflammation programs fail or do not replicate.

Why it matters: Target engagement is not clinical efficacy.

Best next design: Program-level dose/exposure/target-engagement meta-research with shared placebo/site-quality data.

Sources:

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Research agenda and evidence gaps

GAP-07 · Depression

Priority: Critical

Gap: Causal mechanism of delayed benefit from monoaminergic antidepressants in humans.

Why it matters: Immediate transporter action does not identify the therapeutic chain.

Best next design: Repeated early affective-bias, PET/EEG, sleep, BDNF/plasticity and symptom mediation with perturbation/replication.

Sources:

GAP-08 · Depression

Priority: Critical

Gap: Incidence, duration and predictors of antidepressant withdrawal under well-characterized gradual versus rapid discontinuation.

Why it matters: Current estimates are polarized and methodologically heterogeneous.

Best next design: Prospective randomized taper-shape trials with blinded symptom adjudication and relapse discrimination.

Sources:

GAP-09 · Depression

Priority: High

Gap: Emotional blunting versus residual depression versus desired emotional regulation.

Why it matters: The same measured flattening may be harm, symptom or relief depending on state and values.

Best next design: Pre-treatment and repeated patient-reported/behavioral affect measures with randomized switch or dose perturbation.

Sources:

GAP-10 · Rapid-acting treatments

Priority: Critical

Gap: Necessary and sufficient mediators of ketamine/esketamine benefit and durable response.

Why it matters: Animal synaptogenesis, dissociation, expectancy and clinical benefit are often conflated.

Best next design: Mechanistic comparator/dismantling trials with active masking, exposure, receptor/pathway biomarkers and long follow-up.

Sources:

GAP-11 · Psychedelics

Priority: Critical

Gap: Independent and interactive causal contributions of drug, expectancy, preparation, support and integration.

Why it matters: Current intervention packages are not molecule-only pharmacology.

Best next design: Ethical component/dose/expectancy designs, site/therapist random effects, adverse-event and bipolar/psychosis-risk surveillance.

Sources:

GAP-12 · Bipolar

Priority: Critical

Gap: Effective, tolerable treatments for bipolar depression, mixed features and rapid cycling without destabilization.

Why it matters: These states drive morbidity and are underrepresented by classic mania trials.

Best next design: Phase-stratified pragmatic adaptive trials with switch/cycle and functional endpoints.

Sources:

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Research agenda and evidence gaps

GAP-13 · Bipolar

Priority: High

Gap: Magnitude and modifiers of lithium's suicide/mortality benefit.

Why it matters: Rare-event estimates are clinically consequential but unstable.

Best next design: Harmonized target-trial emulations plus individual-participant trial data and cause-specific outcomes.

Sources:

GAP-14 · Bipolar

Priority: High

Gap: Long-horizon renal, thyroid, cognitive and quality-of-life trajectories under lithium versus alternatives.

Why it matters: Slow harms and recurrence benefits accumulate on the same timescale.

Best next design: Decade-scale registry-cohort triangulation with measured exposure, monitoring intensity and patient-valued outcomes.

Sources:

GAP-15 · Reproductive psychiatry

Priority: Critical

Gap: Comparative maternal relapse, fetal/child outcomes and postpartum dynamics across treatment strategies.

Why it matters: Medication risk and untreated-illness risk are both state- and time-dependent.

Best next design: Prospective pregnancy registries linked to maternal course and long-term child development, with dose/exposure and confounding control.

Sources:

GAP-16 · PK/PD

Priority: Critical

Gap: Free brain exposure and active-metabolite trajectories are rarely linked to dense clinical/subjective outcomes.

Why it matters: Nominal dose is a weak intervention measure.

Best next design: Population PK/PD with sparse sampling at scale plus intensive subcohorts, adherence sensors and causal validation.

Sources:

GAP-17 · State dependence

Priority: Critical

Gap: Sleep, circadian phase, inflammation, hormonal state, sex, aging and substance use are seldom modeled jointly as response moderators.

Why it matters: They alter exposure, network state and lived response at once.

Best next design: Pre-registered multimodal longitudinal cohorts nested within trials, with interaction shrinkage and external validation.

Sources:

GAP-18 · Precision psychiatry

Priority: Critical

Gap: Many biomarkers predict within the discovery dataset but do not improve prospective treatment decisions.

Why it matters: Association is not actionable heterogeneity of treatment effect.

Best next design: Biomarker-stratified randomized tests and decision-curve/net-benefit evaluation across sites.

Sources:

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE-BOUNDED OBJECTS

Research agenda and evidence gaps

GAP-19 · Network neuroscience

Priority: High

Gap: Medication-induced changes in static connectivity are rarely tied causally to target engagement and patient-valued outcomes.

Why it matters: Network correlation can become mechanistic decoration.

Best next design: Dose/exposure perturbation, preregistered mediation, multimodal replication and active comparator.

Sources:

GAP-20 · Dynamical systems

Priority: Critical

Gap: Attractors, bifurcations, non-normal gain and control energy are rarely identified from actual psychiatric medication perturbations.

Why it matters: The Flow Hijacked lens must become falsifiable or remain analogy.

Best next design: Input-output system identification using dense within-person data and ethically safe perturbations; out-of-sample forecasts.

Sources:

GAP-21 · Equity and external validity

Priority: Critical

Gap: Older adults, adolescents, pregnancy, gender-diverse people, racialized populations, multimorbidity, substance use and unstable housing are underrepresented.

Why it matters: The strongest state modifiers are systematically excluded.

Best next design: Inclusive pragmatic trials, transportability analyses and co-designed outcomes.

Sources:

GAP-22 · Polypharmacy

Priority: Critical

Gap: Real-world combinations have sparse causal evidence and poorly characterized withdrawal/sequencing effects.

Why it matters: Each added drug changes exposure, adaptation and attribution.

Best next design: Factorial/platform trials, causal longitudinal emulation and structured deprescribing research.

Sources:

GAP-23 · Patient experience

Priority: Critical

Gap: Akathisia, flattening, sexuality, agency, identity and relational outcomes are not measured with the same rigor as symptom scales.

Why it matters: They often determine adherence and whether improvement feels like recovery.

Best next design: Co-produced instruments, ecological momentary assessment and qualitative-quantitative integration.

Sources:

GAP-24 · Regulation/access

Priority: High

Gap: Monitoring systems can prevent harm yet create barriers; their net effect is rarely evaluated.

Why it matters: Clozapine REMS history shows regulation changes treatment exposure at population scale.

Best next design: Interrupted time-series and equity analyses around regulatory changes with safety and access outcomes.

Sources:

APPENDIX · RELEASE 1.1

Claim lock and appraisal depth

CORE SENTENCE

Comprehensive does not mean equally locked.

17 · Full-text or official-source locks

Meaning: Wording may be definitive only within the exact population, estimand, comparator, and time horizon appraised.

1 · Partial lock

Meaning: The secured component is separated from the access-limited component.

22 · Abstract or access-limited

Meaning: Useful for orientation and narrow support; insufficient for unqualified load-bearing wording.

66 · Claim-level records

Meaning: The extended claim ledger contains empirical results, authors' interpretations, broader inferences, Flow Hijacked syntheses, and hypotheses. A separate nine-record ledger tracks the forward causal chain.

The lecture preserves category × appraisal depth × estimand × time horizon rather than converting corpus size into certainty.

APPENDIX · EVIDENCE MAINTENANCE

Correction and retraction checks

Three notices were manually appraised in full text. None changed a load-bearing numerical conclusion.

Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 32 oral antipsychotics

Notice: Erratum · 10.1016/S0140-6736(19)31677-0

Change: Corrected the zotepine-versus-haloperidol Figure 3 estimate to 0.08 (95% CrI -0.19 to 0.36); updated acknowledgments, declarations and copyright.

Claim impact: Does not alter EMP-SCZ-005's broad conclusion about graded efficacy and larger adverse-effect differences.

Sources: FH-CORR-31526735

BeneMin randomized trial

Notice: Correction · 10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30431-0

Change: Removed a footnote from the author list.

Claim impact: No effect on the BeneMin primary null result used in EMP-SCZ-011.

Sources: FH-CORR-30392729

Effect of psychotropic medications on suicide-related outcomes

Notice: Corrigendum · 10.1016/j.eclinm.2026.103901

Change: Added that SF received an Angelini Pharma honorarium for conference speaking on epilepsy care and no research funding relevant to the review.

Claim impact: Disclosure update only; no analytic result was changed.

Sources: FH-FWD-42011221

APPENDIX · SCOPE BOUNDARY

All-inclusive within the acquired core

CORE SENTENCE

A scope limit is not a weakness. It is the condition for evidential honesty.

Acquired core

Coverage: Psychosis and schizophrenia; major depression; bipolar disorder; shared pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics; withdrawal and discontinuation; harms; adaptation and dynamical models; 28 canonical drug/class/formulation objects.

Requires new acquisition

Domains: ADHD stimulants and nonstimulants; dedicated anxiety pharmacotherapy; sleep medicines and orexin antagonists; substance-use-disorder medicines; dementia-related drugs and pimavanserin; perinatal neuroactive steroids; dextromethorphan-bupropion; other global agents.

IMPLICATION

Claims in the lecture should not be generalized to the missing domains without a new acquisition and claim-lock pass.

APPENDIX · 1/2

Bilingual conceptual glossary

Dose · מינון

Definition: Amount administered; not equivalent to concentration or target engagement.

Exposure · חשיפה

Definition: Concentration over time at a defined compartment or site.

Formulation · תכשיר

Definition: Physical delivery form that shapes absorption, peaks, persistence, and reversibility.

Pharmacokinetics · פרמקוקינטיקה

Definition: What the body does to the drug across absorption, distribution, metabolism, and elimination.

Pharmacodynamics · פרמקודינמיקה

Definition: What drug exposure does to targets, regulated systems, and outcomes.

Effect site · ההשפעה אתר

Definition: A measured or virtual modeled compartment linking exposure to effect; it need not be anatomically nearer to a target than plasma.

Occupancy · קולטנים תפוסת

Definition: Fraction of available targets engaged under a specified model and measurement.

Estimand · לאמידה המטרה פרמטר

Definition: The treatment-effect target defined by population, intervention and comparator, outcome, intercurrent-event strategy, and summary measure.

Acute effect · חריפה השפעה

Definition: Change occurring on the immediate exposure clock.

Delayed effect · מושהית השפעה

Definition: Outcome emerging after immediate molecular action, often through regulated or learned processes.

Adaptation · הסתגלות

Definition: Time-dependent change in biological, experiential, behavioral, or environmental parameters.

Withdrawal · הפסקה תופעות

Definition: Effects produced by reducing or ending exposure; not automatically identical to recurrence.

Recurrence · הישנות

Definition: Return of a condition or episode after improvement; requires a defined syndrome and time frame.

Rebound · ריבאונד תופעת

Definition: Return beyond a prior baseline after removing a perturbation.

Hysteresis · היסטריזיס

Definition: Dependence of the current state on the path by which it was reached.

APPENDIX · 2/2

Bilingual conceptual glossary

Attractor · מושך

Definition: A set toward which modeled trajectories evolve under specified dynamics.

Basin · משיכה אגן

Definition: Initial states converging to an attractor under a defined model.

Metastability · מטסטביליות

Definition: Temporary persistence in semi-stable configurations with possible switching.

Bifurcation · ביפורקציה

Definition: Qualitative change in system behavior as a parameter crosses a critical value.

Non-normality · נורמליותאי

Definition: The operator does not commute with its adjoint; non-orthogonal modes can permit transient amplification despite asymptotic stability.

Resolvent · רזולבנט

Definition: Operator describing frequency-selective response of a linearized system to forcing.

Critical slowing · קריטית האטה

Definition: Slower recovery from perturbation near some transitions under restrictive conditions.

Controllability · שליטה יכולת

Definition: Mathematical ability to steer a modeled system through admissible inputs; not synonymous with clinical control.

State estimation · מצב אמידת

Definition: Inference of latent dynamic state from incomplete, noisy observations.

Multi-objective control · יעדים מרובת בקרה

Definition: Optimization with several outcomes, person-defined weights, and safety constraints.

Lived relevance · לחיים רלוונטיות

Definition: How evidence bears on experience and value without turning testimony into scientific proof.

Claim lock · טענה נעילת

Definition: Recorded appraisal depth sufficient for a precisely bounded statement.

Flow Hijacked synthesis · של סינתזה Flow Hijacked

Definition: Framework-level integration explicitly separated from empirical findings.

New hypothesis · חדשה השערה

Definition: A testable proposal not established by the cited evidence.

Trajectory stewardship · מסלול על משותפת שמירה

Definition: Shared, constrained, revisable care oriented toward outcomes the person values.

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 1/8

Landmark research portfolio

The 130 landmark anchors form the historical and evidential backbone; the full acquisition registry contains 700 biomedical/clinical and 100 mathematical records.

- 1.** Maximilian Huhn et al. (2019). Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 32 oral antipsychotics for the acute treatment of adults with multi-episode schizophrenia: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet* (London, England). DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(19)31135-3. FH-PHARM-335E305305. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 2.** Giovanni Ostuzzi et al. (2022). Oral and long-acting antipsychotics for relapse prevention in schizophrenia-spectrum disorders: a network meta-analysis of 92 randomized trials including 22,645 participants. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*. DOI: 10.1002/wps.20972. FH-PHARM-921C5C6D9B. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 3.** J.F.W. Deakin et al. (2018). The benefit of minocycline on negative symptoms of schizophrenia in patients with recent-onset psychosis (BeneMin): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *The lancet. Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(18)30345-6. FH-PHARM-D3D942411B. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 4.** Stephen K. Brannan et al. (2021). Muscarinic Cholinergic Receptor Agonist and Peripheral Antagonist for Schizophrenia. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa2017015. FH-PHARM-5EED522183. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 5.** Carlos A. Zarate et al. (2006). A Randomized Trial of an N-methyl-D-aspartate Antagonist in Treatment-Resistant Major Depression. *Archives of general psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.63.8.856. FH-PHARM-5A9F37CD6C. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 6.** Inder Kaul et al. (2024). Efficacy and Safety of Xanomeline-Trospium Chloride in Schizophrenia. *JAMA psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2024.0785. FH-PHARM-4145E41F2F. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 7.** Andrea Cipriani et al. (2018). Comparative Efficacy and Acceptability of 21 Antidepressant Drugs for the Acute Treatment of Adults With Major Depressive Disorder: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Lancet* (London, England). DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32802-7. FH-PHARM-9BFC043AED. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 8.** Vanina Popova et al. (2019). Efficacy and Safety of Flexibly Dosed Esketamine Nasal Spray Combined With a Newly Initiated Oral Antidepressant in Treatment-Resistant Depression: A Randomized Double-Blind Active-Controlled Study. *The American journal of psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19020172. FH-PHARM-DBEC9D275A. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 9.** Catherine J. Harmer et al. (2009). Why do antidepressants take so long to work? A cognitive neuropsychological model of antidepressant drug action. *The British journal of psychiatry : the journal of mental science*. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.108.051193. FH-PHARM-827D15F587. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 10.** Alan K. Davis et al. (2020). Effects of Psilocybin-Assisted Therapy on Major Depressive Disorder. *JAMA psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3285. FH-PHARM-BA54F69B7B. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 11.** Jeffrey A. Lieberman et al. (2005). Effectiveness of Antipsychotic Drugs in Patients with Chronic Schizophrenia. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa051688. FH-PHARM-31E2765BA0. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 12.** Suzanne Reeves et al. (2023). A population pharmacokinetic model to guide clozapine dose selection, based on age, sex, ethnicity, body weight and smoking status. *British journal of clinical pharmacology*. DOI: 10.1111/bcp.15691. FH-PHARM-AAAEF1BA9E. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 13.** Nicole Moschny et al. (2021). Therapeutic Drug Monitoring of Second- and Third-Generation Antipsychotic Drugs—Influence of Smoking Behavior and Inflammation on Pharmacokinetics. *Pharmaceuticals (Basel, Switzerland)*. DOI: 10.3390/ph14060514. FH-PHARM-398BC7C7CB. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 14.** Jari Tiihonen et al. (2017). Real-World Effectiveness of Antipsychotic Treatments in a Nationwide Cohort of 29 823 Patients With Schizophrenia. *JAMA psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.1322. FH-PHARM-269A4CD492. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 2/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 15.** James Davies et al. (2018). A systematic review into the incidence, severity and duration of antidepressant withdrawal effects: Are guidelines evidence-based?. *Addictive behaviors*. DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.08.027. FH-PHARM-D70A627EDD. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 16.** Mark Horowitz et al. (2019). Tapering of SSRI treatment to mitigate withdrawal symptoms. *The lancet. Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(19)30032-x. FH-PHARM-CADC64D258. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 17.** Ella Daly et al. (2019). Efficacy of Esketamine Nasal Spray Plus Oral Antidepressant Treatment for Relapse Prevention in Patients With Treatment-Resistant Depression. *JAMA psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.1189. FH-PHARM-A6A3317EAB. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 18.** Chad Bousman et al. (2023). Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) Guideline for CYP2D6 , CYP2C19 , CYP2B6 , SLC6A4 , and HTR2A Genotypes and Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor Antidepressants. *Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics*. DOI: 10.1002/cpt.2903. FH-PHARM-EB91E98BE5. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 19.** Marc De Hert et al. (2011). Physical illness in patients with severe mental disorders. I. Prevalence, impact of medications and disparities in health care. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*. DOI: 10.1002/j.2051-5545.2011.tb00014.x. FH-PHARM-86DC81E765. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 20.** Ian Creese et al. (1976). Dopamine Receptor Binding Predicts Clinical and Pharmacological Potencies of Antischizophrenic Drugs. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*. DOI: 10.1126/science.3854. FH-PHARM-B1E0A108FF. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 21.** Philip Seeman et al. (1976). Antipsychotic drug doses and neuroleptic/dopamine receptors. *Nature*. DOI: 10.1038/261717a0. FH-PHARM-0CD52B7C92. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 22.** Anissa Abi-Dargham et al. (2000). Increased baseline occupancy of D 2 receptors by dopamine in schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.97.14.8104. FH-PHARM-321CA90069. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 23.** Arvid Carlsson et al. (1963). Effect of Chlorpromazine or Haloperidol on Formation of 3-Methoxytyramine and Normetanephrine in Mouse Brain. *Acta pharmacologica et toxicologica*. DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0773.1963.tb01730.x. FH-PHARM-3311BCE482. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 24.** Anna Nordström et al. (1995). No elevated D2 dopamine receptors in neuroleptic-naïve schizophrenic patients revealed by positron emission tomography and [11C]N-methylspiperone. *Psychiatry research*. DOI: 10.1016/0925-4927(95)02732-d. FH-PHARM-3D2E741BE3. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 25.** Shitij Kapur et al. (2000). Relationship Between Dopamine D 2 Occupancy, Clinical Response, and Side Effects: A Double-Blind PET Study of First-Episode Schizophrenia. *The American journal of psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.157.4.514. FH-PHARM-2027F0FA70. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 26.** Oliver Howes et al. (2009). The Dopamine Hypothesis of Schizophrenia: Version III-The Final Common Pathway. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. DOI: 10.1093/schbul/sbp006. FH-PHARM-5241E13FDE. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 27.** Stefan Leucht et al. (2013). Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 15 antipsychotic drugs in schizophrenia: a multiple-treatments meta-analysis. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)60733-3. FH-PHARM-C9ED358F4E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 28.** John M. Kane (1988). Clozapine for the Treatment-Resistant Schizophrenic. *Archives of general psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.1988.01800330013001. FH-PHARM-550C92F8BC. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 3/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 29.** Oliver Howes et al. (2009). Elevated Striatal Dopamine Function Linked to Prodromal Signs of Schizophrenia. Archives of general psychiatry. DOI: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2008.514. FH-PHARM-C5F62B6A4F. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 30.** Linda Davies et al. (2007). Cost-effectiveness of first-v.second-generation antipsychotic drugs: results from a randomised controlled trial in schizophrenia responding poorly to previous therapy. The British journal of psychiatry : the journal of mental science. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.106.028654. FH-PHARM-344344D15C. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 31.** Stefan Leucht et al. (2012). Antipsychotic drugs versus placebo for relapse prevention in schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet (London, England). DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60239-6. FH-PHARM-005CCE46A4. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 32.** Jacqueline Mayoral-van Son et al. (2015). Clinical Outcome After Antipsychotic Treatment Discontinuation in Functionally Recovered First-Episode Non-affective Psychosis Individuals. The Journal of clinical psychiatry. DOI: 10.4088/jcp.14m09540. FH-PHARM-52EC2D3449. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 33.** Lex Wunderink et al. (2013). Recovery in Remitted First-Episode Psychosis at 7 Years of Follow-up of an Early Dose Reduction/Discontinuation or Maintenance Treatment Strategy. JAMA psychiatry. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.19. FH-PHARM-2977220DCA. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 34.** Christoph U. Correll (2009). Cardiometabolic Risk of Second-Generation Antipsychotic Medications During First-Time Use in Children and Adolescents. JAMA. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2009.1549. FH-PHARM-832217E734. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 35.** Jari Tiihonen et al. (2009). 11-year follow-up of mortality in patients with schizophrenia: a population-based cohort study (FIN11 study). Lancet (London, England). DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60742-X. FH-PHARM-4946BB109E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 36.** Jari Tiihonen et al. (2018). 20-Year Nationwide Follow-Up Study on Discontinuation of Antipsychotic Treatment in First-Episode Schizophrenia. The American journal of psychiatry. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17091001. FH-PHARM-8475CE9D85. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 37.** Wayne A. Ray et al. (2009). Atypical Antipsychotic Drugs and the Risk of Sudden Cardiac Death. The New England journal of medicine. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa0806994. FH-PHARM-DFB51137D0. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 38.** Dragana Bugarski-Kirola et al. (2016). Bitopertin in Negative Symptoms of Schizophrenia—Results From the Phase III FlashLyte and DayLyte Studies. Biological psychiatry. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.11.014. FH-PHARM-95AE40EDE0. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 39.** Kenneth S. Koblin et al. (2020). A Non-D2-Receptor-Binding Drug for the Treatment of Schizophrenia. The New England journal of medicine. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa1911772. FH-PHARM-5A834B14E9. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 40.** Joseph J. Schildkraut (1965). THE CATECHOLAMINE HYPOTHESIS OF AFFECTIVE DISORDERS: A REVIEW OF SUPPORTING EVIDENCE. International journal of psychiatry. DOI: 10.1176/ajp.122.5.509. FH-PHARM-35F5B3359A. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 41.** Roland Kuhn (1958). THE TREATMENT OF DEPRESSIVE STATES WITH G 22355 (IMIPRAMINE HYDROCHLORIDE). The American journal of psychiatry. DOI: 10.1176/ajp.115.5.459. FH-PHARM-049BB6F555. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 42.** David T. Wong et al. (1974). A selective inhibitor of serotonin uptake: Lilly 110140, 3-(p-Trifluoromethylphenoxy)-n-methyl-3-phenylpropylamine. Life sciences. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3205(74)90345-2. FH-PHARM-7BC4DAA748. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 43.** Alec Coppen (1967). The Biochemistry of Affective Disorders. The British journal of psychiatry : the journal of mental science. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.113.504.1237. FH-PHARM-2CA7EB7B76. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 44.** Madhukar H. Trivedi et al. (2006). Evaluation of Outcomes With Citalopram for Depression Using Measurement-Based Care in STAR*D: Implications for Clinical Practice. The American journal of psychiatry. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.163.1.28. FH-PHARM-8192F6B71A. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 45.** Irving Kirsch et al. (2008). Initial Severity and Antidepressant Benefits: A Meta-Analysis of Data Submitted to the Food and Drug Administration. PLoS medicine. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050045. FH-PHARM-791165BDB7. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 46.** A. John Rush et al. (2006). Acute and Longer-Term Outcomes in Depressed Outpatients Requiring One or Several Treatment Steps: A STAR*D Report. The American journal of psychiatry. DOI: 10.1176/ajp.2006.163.11.1905. FH-PHARM-983862533A. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 47.** Marc B. Stone et al. (2009). Risk of suicidality in clinical trials of antidepressants in adults: analysis of proprietary data submitted to US Food and Drug Administration. BMJ (Clinical research ed.). DOI: 10.1136/bmj.b2880. FH-PHARM-D3096F5686. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 4/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 48.** Alberto Chiesa et al. (2009). Treatment Emergent Sexual Dysfunction Related to Antidepressants: A Meta-analysis. *European Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s0924-9338(09)70732-1. FH-PHARM-C4F7ED2A04. not reviewed
- 49.** Guy M. Goodwin et al. (2017). Emotional blunting with antidepressant treatments: A survey among depressed patients. *Journal of affective disorders*. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2017.05.048. FH-PHARM-11781E110E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 50.** Jerrold F. Rosenbaum et al. (1998). Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor discontinuation syndrome: a randomized clinical trial. *Biological psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s0006-3223(98)00126-7. FH-PHARM-8CE2A1E76D. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 51.** John Geddes et al. (2003). Relapse prevention with antidepressant drug treatment in depressive disorders: a systematic review. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(03)12599-8. FH-PHARM-86BB5AD0A7. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 52.** Robert Berman et al. (2000). Antidepressant effects of ketamine in depressed patients. *Biological psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s0006-3223(99)00230-9. FH-PHARM-7C511E5074. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 53.** Joanna Moncrieff et al. (2022). The Serotonin Theory of Depression: A Systematic Umbrella Review of the Evidence. *Molecular psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1038/s41380-022-01661-0. FH-PHARM-78D71F1060. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 54.** Plínio Casarotto et al. (2021). Antidepressant drugs act by directly binding to TRKB neurotrophin receptors. *Cell*. DOI: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.01.034. FH-PHARM-F9A020E48E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 55.** Nanxin Li et al. (2010). mTOR-Dependent Synapse Formation Underlies the Rapid Antidepressant Effects of NMDA Antagonists. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*. DOI: 10.1126/science.1190287. FH-PHARM-7AE65B22DB. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 56.** Ronald S. Duman et al. (2006). A Neurotrophic Model for Stress-Related Mood Disorders. *Biological psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.02.013. FH-PHARM-BA0B9D0AEA. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 57.** Robin Carhart-Harris et al. (2021). Trial of Psilocybin versus Escitalopram for Depression. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa2032994. FH-PHARM-3C1B55CD9. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 58.** J. F. Cade (1949). LITHIUM SALTS IN THE TREATMENT OF PSYCHOTIC EXCITEMENT. *The Medical Journal of Australia*. DOI: 10.5694/j.1326-5377.1949.tb36912.x. FH-PHARM-2E59E3AE88. not reviewed
- 59.** Gary S. Sachs et al. (2007). Effectiveness of Adjunctive Antidepressant Treatment for Bipolar Depression. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa064135. FH-PHARM-9722471149. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 60.** Mogens Schou et al. (1954). THE TREATMENT OF MANIC PSYCHOSES BY THE ADMINISTRATION OF LITHIUM SALTS. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1136/jnnp.17.4.250. FH-PHARM-882F35CEEC. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 61.** C.L. Bowden (1994). Efficacy of Divalproex vs Lithium and Placebo in the Treatment of Mania. *JAMA*. DOI: 10.1001/jama.1994.03510360044034. FH-PHARM-832A5E006D. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 62.** Joseph R. Calabrese et al. (1999). A Double-Blind Placebo-Controlled Study of Lamotrigine Monotherapy in Outpatients With Bipolar I Depression. *The Journal of clinical psychiatry*. DOI: 10.4088/jcp.v60n0203. FH-PHARM-0688939B27. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 63.** Susan L. McElroy et al. (2010). A Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study of Quetiapine and Paroxetine as Monotherapy in Adults With Bipolar Depression (EMBOLDEN II). *The Journal of clinical psychiatry*. DOI: 10.4088/jcp.08m04942gre. FH-PHARM-37A7D93235. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 64.** Charles L. Bowden (2003). A Placebo-Controlled 18-Month Trial of Lamotrigine and Lithium Maintenance Treatment in Recently Manic or Hypomanic Patients With Bipolar I Disorder. *Archives of general psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.60.4.392. FH-PHARM-EC63C93B9B. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 65.** Joseph R. Calabrese et al. (2003). A Placebo-Controlled 18-Month Trial of Lamotrigine and Lithium Maintenance Treatment in Recently Depressed Patients With Bipolar I Disorder. *The Journal of clinical psychiatry*. DOI: 10.4088/jcp.v64n0906. FH-PHARM-74A3B9DCDC. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 66.** Antony Loebel et al. (2013). Lurasidone Monotherapy in the Treatment of Bipolar I Depression: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Study. *The American journal of psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2013.13070984. FH-PHARM-4F9A2101E3. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 5/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 67.** Charles L. Bowden (2000). A Randomized, Placebo-Controlled 12-Month Trial of Divalproex and Lithium in Treatment of Outpatients With Bipolar I Disorder. *Archives of general psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.57.5.481. FH-PHARM-7C23A299A8. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 68.** Andrea Cipriani et al. (2013). Lithium in the prevention of suicide in mood disorders: updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.f3646. FH-PHARM-BADB405F68. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 69.** Alexander Viktorin et al. (2014). The Risk of Switch to Mania in Patients With Bipolar Disorder During Treatment With an Antidepressant Alone and in Combination With a Mood Stabilizer. *The American journal of psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13111501. FH-PHARM-1149704A3E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 70.** Elisabetta Paterno et al. (2017). Lithium Use in Pregnancy and the Risk of Cardiac Malformations. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa1612222. FH-PHARM-FAB299386F. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 71.** Tomofumi Miura et al. (2014). Comparative efficacy and tolerability of pharmacological treatments in the maintenance treatment of bipolar disorder: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The lancet. Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(14)70314-1. FH-PHARM-6B31511991. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 72.** Rebecca McKnight et al. (2012). Lithium toxicity profile: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(11)61516-x. FH-PHARM-47D576116F. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 73.** Stefan Clos et al. (2015). Long-term effect of lithium maintenance therapy on estimated glomerular filtration rate in patients with affective disorders: a population-based cohort study. *The lancet. Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(15)00316-8. FH-PHARM-110594AB23. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 74.** Raymond Baker et al. (1996). Mechanism and Inhibition of Inositol Monophosphatase. Phosphorus, sulfur, and silicon and the related elements. DOI: 10.1080/10426509608545159. FH-PHARM-BF8091969E. not reviewed
- 75.** Michael D. Greicius et al. (2007). Resting-State Functional Connectivity in Major Depression: Abnormally Increased Contributions from Subgenual Cingulate Cortex and Thalamus. *Biological psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.09.020. FH-PHARM-86D3970C95. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 76.** Klaas E. Stephan et al. (2009). Dysconnection in Schizophrenia: From Abnormal Synaptic Plasticity to Failures of Self-monitoring. *Schizophrenia bulletin*. DOI: 10.1093/schbul/sbn176. FH-PHARM-8B78527FE1. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 77.** Dieter Naber (2009). Subjective well-being Under Neuroleptic Treatment. Relevance for Compliance and Remission. *European Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s0924-9338(09)70484-5. FH-PHARM-50ADCD1B82. not reviewed
- 78.** BALANCE investigators and collaborators (2010). Lithium plus valproate combination therapy versus monotherapy for relapse prevention in bipolar I disorder (BALANCE): a randomised open-label trial. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(09)61828-6. FH-PHARM-5005AAED29. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 79.** Roselinde H. Kaiser et al. (2015). Large-Scale Network Dysfunction in Major Depressive Disorder. *JAMA psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.0071. FH-PHARM-5A1C1A9AD4. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 80.** Erick H. Turner et al. (2008). Selective Publication of Antidepressant Trials and Its Influence on Apparent Efficacy. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmsa065779. FH-PHARM-1FD6FBC08B. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 81.** Anita E. Autry et al. (2011). NMDA receptor blockade at rest triggers rapid behavioural antidepressant responses. *Nature*. DOI: 10.1038/nature10130. FH-PHARM-D3624284FF. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 82.** Andrea Cipriani et al. (2011). Comparative efficacy and acceptability of antimanic drugs in acute mania: a multiple-treatments meta-analysis. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(11)60873-8. FH-PHARM-46DEE62387. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 6/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 83.** Kimford J. Meador et al. (2009). Cognitive Function at 3 Years of Age after Fetal Exposure to Antiepileptic Drugs. *The New England journal of medicine*. DOI: 10.1056/nejmoa0803531. FH-PHARM-B3B5C7B765. full text manually appraised for release-1.1 claim lock
- 84.** Helen S. Mayberg et al. (2005). Deep Brain Stimulation for Treatment-Resistant Depression. *Neuron*. DOI: 10.1016/j.neuron.2005.02.014. FH-PHARM-AE1A501ECE. not reviewed
- 85.** Sandeep T. Patil et al. (2007). Activation of mGlu2/3 receptors as a new approach to treat schizophrenia: a randomized Phase 2 clinical trial. *Nature medicine*. DOI: 10.1038/nm1632. FH-PHARM-72B0BED720. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 86.** Peter S. Klein et al. (1996). A molecular mechanism for the effect of lithium on development.. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.93.16.8455. FH-PHARM-A967D7F9BB. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 87.** Van Rossum Jm (1966). The significance of dopamine-receptor blockade for the mechanism of action of neuroleptic drugs.. *Archives internationales de pharmacodynamie et de therapie*. URL: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/5954044>. FH-PHARM-B33D36F505. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 88.** Karl Friston et al. (1995). Schizophrenia: a disconnection syndrome?. *Clinical neuroscience (New York, N.Y.)*. URL: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7583624>. FH-PHARM-B1F8274257. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 89.** David A. Shapiro et al. (2003). Aripiprazole, A Novel Atypical Antipsychotic Drug with a Unique and Robust Pharmacology. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1038/sj.npp.1300203. FH-PHARM-3E46DE4F71. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 90.** Helle Margrete Meltzer (1999). The Role of Serotonin in Antipsychotic Drug Action. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1016/s0893-133x(99)00046-9. FH-PHARM-B7C9C8F401. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 91.** Frank P. Bymaster et al. (1996). Radioreceptor Binding Profile of the Atypical Antipsychotic Olanzapine. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1016/0893-133x(94)00129-n. FH-PHARM-BFB347DE1D. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 92.** Toby Pillinger et al. (2019). Comparative effects of 18 antipsychotics on metabolic function in patients with schizophrenia, predictors of metabolic dysregulation, and association with psychopathology: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The lancet. Psychiatry*. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(19)30416-x. FH-PHARM-B6F23C6DA1. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 93.** Lakshmi N. Yatham et al. (2018). Canadian Network for Mood and Anxiety Treatments (CANMAT) and International Society for Bipolar Disorders (ISBD) 2018 guidelines for the management of patients with bipolar disorder. *Bipolar disorders*. DOI: 10.1111/bdi.12609. FH-PHARM-1D9AB9C9DE. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 94.** Lakshmi N. Yatham et al. (2012). Canadian Network for Mood and Anxiety Treatments (CANMAT) and International Society for Bipolar Disorders (ISBD) collaborative update of CANMAT guidelines for the management of patients with bipolar disorder: update 2013. *Bipolar disorders*. DOI: 10.1111/bdi.12025. FH-PHARM-64A3930BF7. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 95.** Christoph U. Correll et al. (2015). Effects of antipsychotics, antidepressants and mood stabilizers on risk for physical diseases in people with schizophrenia, depression and bipolar disorder. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*. DOI: 10.1002/wps.20204. FH-PHARM-5CD3B61556. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 96.** Thomas R. E. Barnes et al. (2019). Evidence-based guidelines for the pharmacological treatment of schizophrenia: Updated recommendations from the British Association for Psychopharmacology. *Journal of psychopharmacology (Oxford, England)*. DOI: 10.1177/0269881119889296. FH-PHARM-7C49F9B480. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 97.** Michael J. Owen et al. (2016). Schizophrenia. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)01121-6. FH-PHARM-2388B5FBA1. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 98.** Bitu Moghaddam et al. (2011). From Revolution to Evolution: The Glutamate Hypothesis of Schizophrenia and its Implication for Treatment. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1038/npp.2011.181. FH-PHARM-4798E7E91E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 99.** Richard J Beninger (1983). The role of dopamine in locomotor activity and learning. *Brain research*. DOI: 10.1016/0165-0173(83)90038-3. FH-PHARM-52E0E29C97. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 7/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 100.** Robert A. McCutcheon et al. (2020). Dopamine and glutamate in schizophrenia: biology, symptoms and treatment. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*. DOI: 10.1002/wps.20693. FH-PHARM-4C14641702. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 101.** GM Goodwin et al. (2016). Evidence-based guidelines for treating bipolar disorder: Revised third edition recommendations from the British Association for Psychopharmacology. *Journal of psychopharmacology (Oxford, England)*. DOI: 10.1177/0269881116636545. FH-PHARM-E60DF898D4. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 102.** Roger S. McIntyre et al. (2023). Treatment-resistant depression: definition, prevalence, detection, management, and investigational interventions. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*. DOI: 10.1002/wps.21120. FH-PHARM-3479D8811E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 103.** T. Scott Stroup et al. (2018). Management of common adverse effects of antipsychotic medications. *World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA)*. DOI: 10.1002/wps.20567. FH-PHARM-7EC83E8D09. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 104.** Marco Solmi et al. (2017). Safety, tolerability, and risks associated with first- and second-generation antipsychotics: a state-of-the-art clinical review. *Therapeutics and clinical risk management*. DOI: 10.2147/tcrm.s117321. FH-PHARM-34F40ACA9F. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 105.** Christian Otte et al. (2016). Major depressive disorder. *Nature reviews. Disease primers*. DOI: 10.1038/nrdp.2016.65. FH-PHARM-ACB32CB52C. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 106.** Christoph U. Correll et al. (2020). Negative Symptoms in Schizophrenia: A Review and Clinical Guide for Recognition, Assessment, and Treatment. *Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment*. DOI: 10.2147/ndt.s225643. FH-PHARM-A07CD48662. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 107.** Brendon Stubbs et al. (2018). EPA guidance on physical activity as a treatment for severe mental illness: a meta-review of the evidence and Position Statement from the European Psychiatric Association (EPA), supported by the International Organization of Physical Therapists in Mental Health (IOPTMH). *European psychiatry : the journal of the Association of European Psychiatrists*. DOI: 10.1016/j.eurpsy.2018.07.004. FH-PHARM-40C755A592. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 108.** Helen Herrman et al. (2022). Time for united action on depression: a Lancet-World Psychiatric Association Commission. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(21)02141-3. FH-PHARM-746A6AB08B. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 109.** Raymond W. Lam et al. (2024). Canadian Network for Mood and Anxiety Treatments (CANMAT) 2023 Update on Clinical Guidelines for Management of Major Depressive Disorder in Adults: Réseau canadien pour les traitements de l'humeur et de l'anxiété (CANMAT) 2023 : Mise à jour des lignes directrices cliniques pour la prise en charge du trouble dépressif majeur chez les adultes. *Canadian journal of psychiatry. Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*. DOI: 10.1177/07067437241245384. FH-PHARM-CA735C8FC2. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 110.** Anita Thapar et al. (2022). Depression in young people. *Lancet (London, England)*. DOI: 10.1016/s0140-6736(22)01012-1. FH-PHARM-30ED5A3F20. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 111.** Lulu Cui et al. (2024). Major depressive disorder: hypothesis, mechanism, prevention and treatment. *Signal transduction and targeted therapy*. DOI: 10.1038/s41392-024-01738-y. FH-PHARM-989BE1B606. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 112.** Luca Colucci-D'Amato et al. (2020). Neurotrophic Factor BDNF, Physiological Functions and Therapeutic Potential in Depression, Neurodegeneration and Brain Cancer. *International journal of molecular sciences*. DOI: 10.3390/ijms21207777. FH-PHARM-103CE97B74. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger

APPENDIX · REFERENCES · 8/8

Landmark research portfolio

- 113.** Magdalena Miranda et al. (2019). Brain-Derived Neurotrophic Factor: A Key Molecule for Memory in the Healthy and the Pathological Brain. *Frontiers in cellular neuroscience*. DOI: 10.3389/fncel.2019.00363. FH-PHARM-55C85460D5. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 114.** Robin Carhart-Harris et al. (2019). REBUS and the Anarchic Brain: Toward a Unified Model of the Brain Action of Psychedelics. *Pharmacological reviews*. DOI: 10.1124/pr.118.017160. FH-PHARM-76AADCDC1D. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 115.** Yvette I. Sheline et al. (2010). Resting-state functional MRI in depression unmasks increased connectivity between networks via the dorsal nexus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1000446107. FH-PHARM-D750460701. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 116.** Robert J. Schloesser et al. (2007). Cellular Plasticity Cascades in the Pathophysiology and Treatment of Bipolar Disorder. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301575. FH-PHARM-9B71FF5333. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 117.** Michaël Maes et al. (2012). Depression and sickness behavior are Janus-faced responses to shared inflammatory pathways. *BMC medicine*. DOI: 10.1186/1741-7015-10-66. FH-PHARM-71F794779C. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 118.** Diego A. Pizzagalli et al. (2021). Prefrontal cortex and depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1038/s41386-021-01101-7. FH-PHARM-2785976B0C. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 119.** John F. Cryan et al. (2019). The Microbiota-Gut-Brain Axis. *Physiological reviews*. DOI: 10.1152/physrev.00018.2018. FH-PHARM-11FDBC5732. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 120.** Sophie Achard et al. (2007). Efficiency and Cost of Economical Brain Functional Networks. *PLoS computational biology*. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.0030017. FH-PHARM-9540D1EE9A. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 121.** Christopher Pittenger et al. (2007). Stress, Depression, and Neuroplasticity: A Convergence of Mechanisms. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1038/sj.npp.1301574. FH-PHARM-BBBE49AFBE. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 122.** Mark J. Millan et al. (2016). Altering the course of schizophrenia: progress and perspectives. *Nature reviews. Drug discovery*. DOI: 10.1038/nrd.2016.28. FH-PHARM-B1DAE79D5E. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 123.** Robin Carhart-Harris et al. (2017). Psilocybin with psychological support for treatment-resistant depression: six-month follow-up. *Psychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1007/s00213-017-4771-x. FH-PHARM-4D46373D8C. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 124.** Maggie Fedgchin et al. (2019). Efficacy and Safety of Fixed-Dose Esketamine Nasal Spray Combined With a New Oral Antidepressant in Treatment-Resistant Depression: Results of a Randomized, Double-Blind, Active-Controlled Study (TRANSFORM-1). *The international journal of neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1093/ijnp/pyz039. FH-PHARM-BFF908A8F2. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 125.** J. Kevin Hicks et al. (2013). Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium Guideline for CYP2D6 and CYP2C19 Genotypes and Dosing of Tricyclic Antidepressants. *Clinical pharmacology and therapeutics*. DOI: 10.1038/clpt.2013.2. FH-PHARM-5193F4F931. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 126.** Caroline Samer et al. (2013). Applications of CYP450 Testing in the Clinical Setting. *Molecular diagnosis & therapy*. DOI: 10.1007/s40291-013-0028-5. FH-PHARM-5F6152326D. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 127.** Florian Holsboer et al. (1996). Antidepressants and Hypothalamic-Pituitary-Adrenocortical Regulation. *Endocrine reviews*. DOI: 10.1210/edrv-17-2-187. FH-PHARM-2E3A4F3637. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 128.** Pauline Belujon et al. (2017). Dopamine System Dysregulation in Major Depressive Disorders. *The international journal of neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1093/ijnp/pyx056. FH-PHARM-1BB17A1A84. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 129.** Michele Romoli et al. (2018). Valproic Acid and Epilepsy: From Molecular Mechanisms to Clinical Evidences. *Current neuropharmacology*. DOI: 10.2174/1570159x17666181227165722. FH-PHARM-616E7444C8. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger
- 130.** Dieter Riemann et al. (2019). Sleep, insomnia, and depression. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology*. DOI: 10.1038/s41386-019-0411-y. FH-PHARM-2B8169305B. PubMed abstract/indexing retrieved; full text not reviewed unless separately recorded in Evidence Ledger