

Coherence Capacity: A New Framework for Understanding Recovery

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

Coherence capacity must earn its status as a biological variable The Institute proposes that recovery depends on more than the absence of injury: sufficient usable energy, regulatory flexibility, and the ability to synchronize repair processes over time may jointly determine whether the organism recovers. This can be expressed as a research program without asserting that a simple formula is a law. The bold hypothesis is that a measurable capacity for coherent response can predict improvement independently of baseline diagnosis and symptom severity. Rather than inventing a mysterious vital force, the task is to identify concrete physiological proxies and determine whether they capture something real.

Consider an older patient recovering from surgery. Muscle mass, nutritional status, microcirculation, sleep quality, inflammatory response, and rehabilitation participation all influence outcome. Yet a label such as “frailty” already captures some aspects of reserve, and composite surgical risk scores may predict many complications. A coherence-capacity proposal must outperform, or at least usefully refine, these existing instruments. Its case becomes more persuasive if it identifies an actionable mismatch—adequate energy supply but poor timing of rehabilitation, for example—rather than simply labeling a slow recovery “low coherence.”

A measurable construct or just elegant language? An initial prospective study could combine several defined features: recovery of heart rate after a standardized activity, circadian regularity, strength adaptation over weeks, and functional restoration after an ordinary clinical intervention. Those measures operate on different timescales and should not be multiplied casually without checking mathematical assumptions. Investigators would assess whether they cluster consistently, whether measurement remains stable across settings, and whether their combined score predicts meaningful outcomes beyond frailty, comorbidity, and baseline function.

The theory fails if it cannot distinguish two patients of similar health beyond restating their observed recovery. Its strongest version makes a wager before treatment: given a particular pattern of capacity and constraints, this patient will respond slowly to one intervention yet more quickly when another limitation is addressed. The disputed ground is not whether physiology is interconnected. It is whether the dynamics of restoration constitute a distinct and clinically useful dimension of disease.

Coherence as an independent construct must survive disaggregation A composite capacity score will be persuasive only if its components are not merely synonyms for frailty or general illness severity. Investigators should report how much predictive information comes from energetic availability, regulatory flexibility and temporal coordination separately. If a combined score looks strong because one familiar marker of age or disease dominates it, renaming the composite coherence adds nothing. The value must appear through reproducible interactions or clinically useful forecasts unavailable from simpler variables.

There is also a distinction between recovery from a planned intervention and recovery from an unexpected crisis. The same individual may handle a brief exertional challenge well but recover poorly after infection or surgery. A coherence proposal should specify the relevant domain and not pretend that one number predicts every outcome. A plausible experimental program would first validate domain-specific recovery measures, then examine whether a common latent pattern remains. The theory becomes worth defending when its predictions survive changes in hospital, population and type of insult. Until then, coherence is a guide to framing questions, not a diagnosis to be assigned to patients.

Falsifying coherence capacity by comparison with existing risk models A high-risk surgery population offers a hard test because surgeons already use validated assessments of frailty, comorbidity and organ function. The Institute could preregister a small set of dynamic measures and ask whether they predict postoperative recovery time or loss of independence beyond those standard predictors. Candidate measures would need repeatability and practical feasibility. A composite that predicts well only because it contains age and frailty by another name would not validate coherence as a new construct.

The idea may still yield a useful narrower conclusion if a single dimension—say, impaired return to baseline after ordinary exertion—adds meaningful information while the overall composite does not. That would be progress, not embarrassment. A good theoretical paper states how its attractive central metaphor could fragment into more accurate independent mechanisms. The most controversial claim is that a latent property of the organism's coordinated response can sometimes be inferred and changed. Whether that property is one construct or several remains an empirical question.

Detailed considerations from the original investigation

Coherence Capacity proposes that recovery requires at least three interdependent abilities: sufficient energetic availability, regulatory flexibility and integration across time. The book abbreviates these as E, R and T and writes $C = E \times R \times T$. This formulation expresses an intuitively valuable proposition: extremely poor performance in one domain can limit whole-person adaptation even when the others are relatively strong. It should be published as an exploratory construct rather than a validated clinical equation.

Energetic capacity can involve sleep continuity, nourishment, oxygen delivery, activity tolerance and recovery from exertion; regulation involves responses to stressors and return to baseline; temporal integration concerns circadian regularity, maintenance of gains and incorporation of adaptation over days or months. None can be inferred from a single wearable score. HRV varies with context, fitness, age, medication and measurement method. The multiplicative formulation needs operational definitions and units: if E, R and T are scored differently, the product can change with arbitrary rescaling. A safer scientific representation is initially $C = f(E,R,T)$, with multiplication retained as a philosophical proposal.

Two individuals can report identical symptom scores while differing substantially in sleep disruption, activity tolerance and recovery time after ordinary demands. The proposed E-R-T model asks whether those differences change the burden of treatment each can tolerate. Importantly, assigning values to E, R and T without validated measurement may create false mathematical precision. The concept should remain a clinical hypothesis until its scale properties are justified.

Most conventional care already accounts for reserve, severity and timing in some settings. A new index must therefore demonstrate what it adds; it cannot claim originality merely because it integrates variables. The framework also risks moralizing illness if low capacity is mistaken for personal failure. Structural disease, social deprivation and medications may constrain all three dimensions. Numerical simplicity must not conceal these different causal mechanisms.

A conceptual falsifier is straightforward: if an additive model or single existing functional measure predicts better than the multiplicative index, the equation should be revised. A clinical vignette can illustrate this without inventing clinical evidence: two people may report equal depressive symptom severity while differing in sleep, activity tolerance, autonomic symptoms and recovery time, leading to different feasible treatment burdens.

The immediate value is a language for discussing treatment feasibility. The Institute should explicitly distinguish the observed domain, the proposed causal interpretation and the intervention chosen, while avoiding any claim that the index diagnoses a disease or replaces validated assessment.

The coherence-capacity framework posits separate contributions from resources, regulatory flexibility and temporal coordination, but its product formula is a heuristic.

A patient may have sufficient caloric supply yet profound sleep fragmentation and delayed recovery; increasing intake alone would not restore orderly function.

Predefine each subscale and compare additive, multiplicative and simpler established models in out-of-sample validation.

Selected scientific reading

1. Kitano (2002), Systems biology: a brief overview, Science.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1069492>
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.