

Hysteresis: Why Removing the Cause May Not Reverse the Disease

Absurd Health Institute · Medical Concept Papers, Volume Three · Third editorial pass, 17 October 2026

Article type: Mechanistic research perspective · **Status:** Conceptual argument, not clinical guideline

Why disease may remember an insult after the insult is gone Hysteresis is a specific claim about history, not a synonym for slow healing. When a system takes different routes into and out of a state despite the same instantaneous input, its prior trajectory is influencing the present. Biological candidates include tissue remodeling, epigenetic regulation, durable immune-cell programs, altered neural gain, and feedback between behavior and physiology. The controversial idea is that removing the initiating cause might be insufficient precisely because the organism now contains changed machinery. This is not a claim that every symptom represents permanent damage. A hysteretic state may be reversible, but by a different path from the one that created it.

Consider inflammation after an infection. In one individual the pathogen is cleared and inflammatory activity resolves. In another, antigen persistence, autoimmune processes, tissue injury, or impaired resolution may maintain symptoms. These possibilities are not interchangeable. Demonstrating hysteresis would require evidence that state persistence remains after an initial input has genuinely normalized, and that the persistence reflects defined internal changes rather than an undetected ongoing insult. Persistent symptoms alone do not prove it.

The asymmetry test A practical model should plot an input, such as controlled inflammatory stimulation in a laboratory preparation, against an output such as cytokine response during both increasing and decreasing exposure. If the same input yields different outputs depending on the preceding direction, history matters. Similar ideas can be adapted cautiously to clinical trajectories using naturally occurring changes or standard treatments, without exposing people to harmful challenges. The study must measure mediators at sufficient temporal resolution to distinguish an actual loop from ordinary measurement lag.

This thesis gives medicine a useful reason to investigate treatment *sequence*. It may be necessary first to interrupt a maintaining loop, then rebuild function, rather than merely withdrawing the original hazard and waiting. Yet an apparent benefit of sequence can have simpler explanations, including dose differences, adherence, time, and selection of patients with better prognosis. A fair trial would compare prespecified sequences while holding other treatment factors as constant as feasible. Hysteresis would become a powerful explanatory principle only if it predicts these directional asymmetries prospectively.

Distinguish lasting injury from a changeable memory of injury A patient may remain impaired after an injury has ended because of irreversible tissue loss. That is not hysteresis in the useful dynamical sense; no internal feedback reversal will restore a missing organ. A second patient may have intact capacity constrained by acquired sensitization or maladaptive control. Distinguishing these states is the essential clinical test. Serial structural measures, function, and a reversible perturbation can help separate fixed damage from maintenance dynamics. The theory becomes dangerous if it treats every structural deficit as an invisible self-reinforcing state.

Biological memory may involve multiple storage media: synaptic patterns, persistent immune-cell changes, extracellular matrix organization, or stable changes in tissue composition. These mechanisms operate on different timescales, so describing them with one word should not imply one treatment. A longitudinal study could follow response curves after an exposure returns to baseline and estimate whether the old state persists beyond ordinary physiological lag. If so, the next question is which measurable internal feature maintains it. That progression—from persistent history effect to identified sustaining mechanism—is what would justify a strong paper on hysteresis.

Slow recovery and hysteresis must be separated mathematically A slowly responding system can lag behind a changing input without possessing two distinct stable states. This matters because delayed improvement after treatment is often labeled “memory” when a simple time constant could explain it. An attractor or hysteresis model should compare the trajectory during increasing and decreasing inputs after allowing sufficient time for equilibration. If the outputs converge at the same sustained exposure, ordinary delay may be the better explanation. If a persistent directional difference remains, some form of state dependence is more plausible.

In tissue biology, long-lived matrix changes, altered cell populations and learned neural responses can all create history effects, but each has different timescales and possible interventions. The paper should not infer the molecular storage mechanism from the shape of a clinical symptom curve alone. The proper progression is phenomenology, dynamic measurement, candidate mediator, and targeted perturbation. Only then does the claim that “the body remembers” become a falsifiable causal account rather than a poetic restatement of persistent illness.

A hypothetical outcome with consequences If a feedback-driven disease state is present, two patients with comparable present exposures but different preceding histories should sometimes react differently to the same safe intervention. This history-response interaction is the crucial observable. A purely current-state model would predict equivalent response when all relevant current variables are matched. The Institute should identify where this comparison can actually be made, such as longitudinal recovery after a known injury, and estimate whether history adds explanatory information beyond fixed tissue damage. This matters because treating a persistent state as merely the continuation of its initial cause may direct interventions at a process that is no longer responsible for current disability. Equally, falsely invoking hysteresis can hide a continuing disease that needs direct treatment.

Detailed considerations from the original investigation

In systems with hysteresis, the current state depends partly on the path by which it was reached. A disease can remain clinically active after a precipitating event ends because the event produced durable tissue injury, learned regulatory patterns, altered ecological relationships or self-sustaining feedback. These are different mechanisms and should not be conflated. Hysteresis is a rigorous way to ask why the pathway into a disorder may differ from the pathway out.

Examples include persistent airway remodeling after repeated inflammation, conditioned fear after a threat has passed, or glucose-control changes after prolonged metabolic stress. In each case, temporary exposures can leave enduring substrates. Network feedback may reinforce the substrate: behavioral avoidance prevents corrective learning; chronic inactivity sustains deconditioning; inflammation may remodel tissue and alter local responsiveness. The point is not that every symptom is a protective memory but that treatment may have to address the newly established maintenance conditions, not just remove the original trigger.

After a viral infection has resolved, fatigue can persist because of tissue injury, dysautonomia, inflammatory sequelae, sleep disturbance or ongoing disease. The disappearance of detectable virus cannot distinguish these possibilities. Calling the persistence hysteresis is only informative if the paper identifies what was left behind and shows how that mechanism sustains symptoms. This distinction matters because different persistence mechanisms require different responses.

Persistent disease is also explained by undetected ongoing pathology. A clinician must not treat worsening asthma, infection, malignancy or neurological decline as harmless “system memory.” Furthermore, many phenomena are better described by irreversible tissue damage than by bistability or genuine hysteresis. Calling both an attractor can obscure whether a proposed intervention could plausibly restore function.

A stringent test compares matched states reached from different histories and measures whether future trajectories diverge despite similar present inputs. Longitudinal response curves, controlled stepwise exposure changes, and mechanistic readouts are more informative than an evocative

before-and-after narrative. If current pathology and ongoing exposures account fully for outcomes, invoking hysteresis adds little.

This framework offers a patient-respecting explanation for incomplete recovery without suggesting they have failed. It encourages treatment plans to distinguish ongoing cause, residual injury and reversible maintenance loops, and it gives remission and relapse more precise meanings.

Hysteresis means the route into an abnormal state differs from the route out because the system retains a history-dependent change.

After severe inflammation, matrix stiffness and fibroblast activation may persist even after the original trigger abates; continued fibrosis must not be assumed without measurement.

Intervene at different stages of an otherwise similar injury and test whether identical current exposures produce different recovery trajectories.

Selected scientific reading

1. Barabási, Gulbahce & Loscalzo (2011), Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease, Nature Reviews Genetics.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2918>

2. McEwen (1998), Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators, New England Journal of Medicine.

<https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJM199801153380307>

Editorial source note: The inherited selected readings are retained from the source manuscript and have not all been independently verified. Newly checked evidence is identified separately. The mechanistic extensions are hypotheses except where explicitly described as established physiology.