

The Liver That Looks Normal but Cannot Keep Up

Absurd Health Institute | Frontier Medical Concept Paper 20 | Volume 7

Series: Great Clearance Paradoxes

Article type: Causal hypothesis and mechanistic argument; not an original clinical study

Corrective edition: 17 October 2026

The proposition we defend

Normal liver enzymes do not prove normal hepatic throughput. We argue that a liver can meet ordinary demands while possessing limited reserve for bile secretion, xenobiotic processing or metabolic flux; routine blood tests may therefore remain reassuring until a dynamic challenge reveals the bottleneck. This is a functional-reserve thesis, not an allegation that everyone with fatigue has occult liver disease.

Routine aminotransferases are mainly markers of hepatocellular injury, not complete readouts of transporter activity, enzymatic flux, biliary excretion or metabolic reserve. This essay asks whether significant functional bottlenecks may exist despite unremarkable enzyme measurements—and when that possibility is clinically established versus conjectural.

Why the mechanism deserves to be taken seriously

Bile formation requires canalicular transporters, hepatocyte polarity, energy-dependent transport and coordinated uptake/excretion systems. Drug metabolism involves multiple enzymes whose capacity can change with genotype, inflammation, interactions and liver disease. Albumin, bilirubin, INR and disease-specific tests offer different information from AST and ALT. The proposed systems lens emphasizes flux and throughput, not vague “liver congestion.”

The causal argument

Aminotransferases primarily report hepatocyte injury. They do not directly quantify bile-acid transport, canalicular secretion, hepatic extraction, urea synthesis under challenge or handling of a particular drug. Some functional disorders alter one pathway more than another. The key idea is demand-dependent failure: baseline production and clearance suffice, but after a meal, illness or added medication the relevant transport or synthesis pathway cannot keep up. Circulating concentrations then reflect input, secretion, distribution and feedback, not simply cell damage.

Causal architecture under closer examination

Liver physiology has multiple dimensions that common laboratory panels do not measure equally. Aminotransferases leak into blood with hepatocyte injury, while bile formation depends on transporters, canalicular secretion, ductal flow and enterohepatic feedback. Protein synthesis, drug metabolism and ammonia processing follow still other pathways. A patient can have a disturbance in one dimension without the characteristic pattern of another, although the degree and clinical importance vary by disease. The functional-reserve thesis should therefore specify the missing measurement. Is the claim that bile-acid transport is impaired, that hepatic blood flow limits first-pass extraction, that a particular enzyme has insufficient capacity, or that synthetic reserve fails under illness? Each has distinct biochemical indicators and clinical consequences. Without that specification, the claim becomes an unfalsifiable narrative in which every normal test is merely evidence of a hidden problem. The persuasive form instead states that baseline testing reports one aspect of a multifunctional organ and that challenge-related dysfunction should be demonstrable with an appropriately established or research measurement.

A concrete physiological case

Imagine a patient with normal ALT and AST but a suspected cholestatic process, fat malabsorption symptoms or altered response to a highly extracted medication. A responsible investigation uses clinically indicated bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase, imaging or specialized studies as warranted. One cannot infer diminished bile flow from nonspecific fatigue, and an abnormal liver test does not itself establish the rate-limiting pathway.

Original conceptual illustration

Consider a patient taking a drug cleared by a hepatic transporter who has normal AST and ALT. Drug exposure can still vary because of interactions, transporter genetics or changes in organ function. That is a tractable pharmacological question. It is very different from asserting that the patient has unspecified “liver congestion” because of a headache or food intolerance. Good terrain reasoning must preserve that difference.

What established physiology already supports

Functional hepatic reserve is a recognized clinical issue, and drug handling depends on blood flow, enzymes and transporters. The controversial extension is that mild, selective throughput deficits may contribute to earlier functional symptoms than injury-oriented screening captures. The proposal becomes scientific only when it names the capacity to be measured and the challenge expected to reveal it.

The strongest counterargument—and the answer

The strongest objection is that usual symptoms attributed to occult liver failure are nonspecific and more plausibly explained by medication, gastrointestinal or nutritional factors. Normal routine tests are often genuinely reassuring. The paper should reject a vague “silent liver toxicity” category and instead define precise functionally constrained cohorts.

Normal enzymes with symptoms are common and rarely prove occult hepatic disease. Symptoms attributed to poor detoxification might instead reflect gastrointestinal, endocrine, neurological or psychological conditions. Claims about unidentified circulating toxins without analytical measurements cannot substantiate the mechanism.

The discriminating experiment

Compare baseline testing with specific dynamic measures of bile secretion, selected substrate clearance or synthetic response where clinically justified. Ask whether these improve prediction of malabsorption, medication sensitivity or recovery after illness beyond standard panels. A negative result—normal dynamic function despite symptoms—should stop the hepatic explanation rather than invite ever more speculative pathways.

Discriminating evidence would be objective abnormalities in relevant transport, bile formation or drug metabolism pathways plus clinical response to correction of the demonstrated problem. Where tests and physiology remain normal, the hypothesis should not be used as a catch-all diagnosis.

Decisive comparisons and limits of inference

An experimental protocol might compare hepatic extraction of a named probe substrate under stable conditions and during a defined physiological challenge, in groups carefully characterized for liver disease and medication interactions. A more clinically grounded example is investigation of cholestasis with appropriate bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase, imaging and specialist assessment when indicated, even if aminotransferases are not dramatic. The point is not to prescribe a universal bile flow test for fatigue. It is to investigate a suspected functional bottleneck using the pathway that would actually be impaired. If dynamic measurements show normal transport and synthesis, the thesis should not be preserved by shifting to another unmeasured liver story. Serious hepatobiliary disease can be dangerous, and supplement or aggressive fasting recommendations are particularly inappropriate when bile handling, nutrition or organ function is uncertain. The strongest controversial claim is conceptually simple: normality on an injury panel is not equivalent to unlimited processing capacity. But processing limits have to be demonstrated

before they can explain a patient's symptoms.

A second prediction from the original model

The claim becomes medically meaningful only when the suspected bottleneck is named: which enzyme, transporter, synthetic function or excretion route is impaired? Vague “congestion” without a measured pathway offers no testable explanation.

Why the hypothesis matters if correct

This thesis is valuable only if “normal liver tests” is not used as a magic permission to posit invisible hepatic disease. Liver enzymes primarily address injury, while bile transport, metabolic extraction and synthesis are different functional dimensions. A more forceful paper names a missing dimension and predicts a characteristic failure under increased demand. A patient suspected of cholestasis needs investigation of biliary physiology, not a general terrain label; a patient with unexpected response to a drug may need evaluation of metabolism, transport and clearance. A negative targeted assessment should weaken that specific hypothesis. The intellectual challenge to conventional shortcuts remains substantial: the absence of hepatocyte injury does not establish the absence of every functional bottleneck. The corresponding obligation is just as strong. One must demonstrate the bottleneck and its clinical magnitude rather than using the limitations of routine tests to explain any symptom imaginable. The payoff would be a more discriminating model of liver health, separating injury, capacity and reserve instead of treating the organ as a single laboratory number.

The clinical and conceptual consequence

The strongest conclusion is not that standard tests are useless but that they answer different questions. Injury, synthesis, transport and reserve are related but nonidentical. A medically useful terrain model should specify which dimension has failed and demonstrate it rather than assigning the liver responsibility for every unexplained complaint.

The value is refined test interpretation: understand what a measurement assesses and what it does not. It does not justify liver flushing, indiscriminate supplements or stopping effective medication.

The value is refined test interpretation: understand what a measurement assesses and what it does not. It does not justify liver flushing, indiscriminate supplements or stopping effective medication.

Source bibliography: verification pending

- Jansen A et al. Increased levels of persistent organic pollutants in serum one year after a great weight loss in humans. Sci Total Environ. 2018.

Editorial and clinical boundaries

This paper advances a causal thesis and identifies observations that would support or defeat it. It does not establish a new diagnosis or treatment, and it should not be used to discontinue medically indicated care. Bibliographic entries inherited from the original edition have not all been independently verified.