

# Vectorial Therapy: Medicine Designed to Change Biological Direction

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

**A medicine can be defined by the direction of physiological change it creates. Conventional drug descriptions emphasize binding, enzyme inhibition, receptor activation, and dose. Those remain indispensable. The vectorial therapy proposal adds a second question: what trajectory does the intervention cause the whole relevant disease system to follow over time? Two drugs with different molecular targets might move a patient toward the same functional endpoint; one drug can move different patients in opposite directions if its downstream effects interact with very different initial states. The thesis is thus about the direction and stability of change, not a new class of mystical medicines.**

For metabolic illness, a treatment might reduce glucose promptly but affect body weight, appetite, hepatic fat, or cardiorenal risk differently over months. A short-term improvement in one marker can coexist with an undesirable longer-term trajectory elsewhere. A vectorial analysis would define the outcome space explicitly instead of declaring that the body moved “toward health.” The relevant axes might be function, serious complications, symptom burden, treatment toxicity, and sustainability.

**How a therapeutic vector could be measured** The key research challenge is choosing meaningful dimensions without creating an arbitrary composite that hides harms. Investigators could represent a treatment as a time-dependent set of expected changes in several prespecified outcomes, estimate uncertainty around each change, and test whether baseline biology predicts the direction. A genuine predictive theory would identify patients for whom the same agent achieves target control but diverges in functional benefit or adverse effects.

This is compatible with conventional pharmacology rather than a substitute for it. Drug interaction, dose, target engagement, and known contraindications remain essential. The novelty lies in requiring the whole trajectory to matter when selecting among otherwise reasonable therapies. The model is falsified if its proposed state variables do not improve forecasts beyond established clinical predictors. Until then, “vectorial” is a conceptual design proposal. Its value will depend on whether it makes a clinician choose differently and whether that choice produces better outcomes.

**A therapeutic direction needs axes that do not hide tradeoffs. Calling a treatment's effect a vector invites mathematical clarity, but only if its dimensions are stated openly. An improvement in one component can coexist with harm in another. Suppose glycemic control improves while troublesome adverse effects reduce adherence or function. A composite “health direction” could conceal that tradeoff unless the separate outcomes remain visible. This is why the paper should prefer transparent trajectories over an unexplained score.**

A useful study would predefine patient-relevant endpoints at several times and estimate the joint treatment-response distribution, including harms. Baseline features may predict who moves favorably on multiple axes. A genuine vector model would flag cases where a drug successfully changes its target but pushes overall functioning in an undesirable direction. It should be compared with established multidimensional decision methods. The novelty is the demand to judge *direction over time*, not the claim that medicine has never examined more than one outcome.

**The meaning of a favorable direction** An outcome vector should not be constructed so that a favored intervention always wins by weighting a convenient surrogate more heavily than serious harms. A transparent analysis would show the individual endpoints, clinical priorities, and uncertainty, with patients' preferences considered explicitly where choices involve tradeoffs. For a treatment to have truly improved the trajectory, a change should persist long enough to matter and should not conceal deteriorating function elsewhere. The Institute can defend the idea of vectorial therapy by showing that initial state predicts those tradeoffs prospectively. If it cannot, the language adds no value beyond existing outcome-oriented clinical practice.

**A trajectory model must confront adverse divergence** Suppose two patients experience a similar improvement in a disease-specific marker after the same therapy. One regains exercise capacity and experiences few adverse effects; the other loses functional independence because of treatment burden or comorbidity. The model should distinguish those outcomes prospectively by specifying a vector of functional and safety endpoints rather than retrospectively assigning a favorable direction. Patient priorities also matter: avoiding hospitalization, reducing pain and preserving mobility do not always rank identically for every person.

The challenge is to make the resulting representation interpretable. Too many dimensions may render the model impossible to use, while a single weighted score may hide serious harms. The Institute's best proposal is a transparent, time-indexed profile whose clinically important tradeoffs remain visible. It should then demonstrate that the profile changes decisions or predicts outcomes more accurately than ordinary multi-outcome care. Otherwise “vectorial therapy” is only a new name for attention to benefit and risk.

**The direction must remain interpretable** Researchers should publish individual outcomes as well as their combined trajectory. A treatment cannot be judged beneficial solely because a composite index masks an increased rate of serious complications behind improvement in a convenient surrogate.

### **Detailed considerations from the original investigation**

The source book uses “vectorial therapy” to describe interventions chosen for their tendency to move a biological system from one state toward another. This is an original conceptual term rather than an established treatment class. Its potential value lies in changing the question from “did a marker move?” to “did the patient begin a durable functional trajectory?” The direction must be defined in measurable clinical terms before the idea can be evaluated.

In metabolic illness, a treatment may lower glucose acutely; a more ambitious trajectory might include improved physical function, reduced progression, fewer adverse events and sustained glycemic control. In trauma, short-term symptom reduction is important, but return of sleep, occupational function and relational participation also matter. Vector language becomes useful when it identifies upstream feedback relationships and feasible interventions that alter future trajectories. It becomes vague when “movement toward health” is merely inferred from feeling better immediately after a treatment.

The proposed vector metaphor becomes precise when the outcome is defined prospectively. A person may lose weight yet worsen muscle strength; a drug may improve a biomarker yet increase symptomatic hypotension. Neither is unambiguously movement toward health. A useful therapeutic direction therefore includes benefit, harm, durability and the priorities of the patient, rather than a single favorable arrow on a diagram.

Many existing disease-modifying treatments already aim at long-term trajectory. Antihypertensives preventing stroke, statins reducing vascular risk and immunomodulators reducing relapse illustrate that conventional pharmacology is not limited to momentary biomarker control. Vectorial therapy must not declare these established successes obsolete or claim that multi-compound regimens are superior without comparative data.

The proposed test is whether a prespecified package shifts validated patient-important endpoints over time more effectively or safely than established comparators. A shift in numerous biomarkers without better function or fewer events does not meet the test. Different “directions” may conflict, as when weight loss occurs alongside muscle loss or treatment benefit with severe adverse effects.

The language of therapeutic direction may help readers distinguish immediate response, sustained remission and disease modification. It is an organizing concept, not a license for untested drug combinations.

Vectorial therapy means measuring not only a present target value but the direction and velocity of change in a defined clinical state.

Two patients with the same inflammatory marker may be on opposite trajectories, one improving after infection control and one deteriorating.

Compare trajectory-aware decisions with conventional severity-adjusted rules using predefined safety and functional endpoints.

## **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. Drucker (2018), Mechanisms of action and therapeutic application of GLP-1, *Cell Metabolism*.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2018.03.001>

*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.*