BeyondMold

POSITION PAPER

THE EVOLUTION OF CHRONIC INFLAMMATORY ILLNESS MODELS

Beyond CIRS

The Cell Danger Response as a Unifying Framework — and the Case for Direct Measurement over Transcriptomic Inference

CIRS is best understood not as a competing theory to the Cell Danger Response but as a clinically productive special case of it — and the CDR relocates the evidentiary load from proxy biomarkers onto directly measured mechanism: ISRmt mitokines, extracellular flux, and the loss-of-tolerance frame.

Andrew Heyman, MD, MHSA

The George Washington University

CONTENTS

The Evolution of Chronic Inflammatory Illness Models

A position paper mapping CIRS onto the Cell Danger Response — how the CDR predicts CIRS's findings, where CIRS is weakest, and how direct measurement (ISRmt, extracellular flux, tolerance) and a five-phase, phenotype-guided model turn resolution into precision medicine.

ABSTRACT

Abstract

Chronic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (CIRS), as developed by Ritchie Shoemaker, MD, represents a landmark contribution to the clinical understanding of biotoxin-driven multi-system illness. Its transcriptomic discoveries, diagnostic biomarker framework, and stepwise treatment protocol have helped thousands of patients who had previously been dismissed by conventional medicine. Yet CIRS, developed primarily in the late 1990s and codified through the 2000s, predates many of the most significant advances in mitochondrial biology, innate immune signaling, systems medicine, and resolution-phase therapeutics.

This paper argues that CIRS is best understood not as a competing theory to the Cell Danger Response (CDR) — formulated by Robert Naviaux, MD, PhD — but as a specific, empirically validated instance of it. The CDR provides the mechanistic architecture that explains why Shoemaker's protocol works, why some patients plateau, and what the next generation of clinical interventions can accomplish. Specifically, we examine how CDR Phase 3 (CDR3) — the resolution and healing phase — represents the most underdeveloped frontier of CIRS treatment, and how precision medicine approaches including bioactive peptides, exosomes, mesenchymal stem cell-derived factors, and high-potency botanical compounds offer mechanism-grounded tools to individualize and accelerate recovery.

We introduce a Five-Phase Clinical Model that maps the CDR biological arc onto a structured treatment progression: Phase 1 (Total Load Mapping), Phase 2 (CDR1 Reduction), Phase 3 (CDR2 Mitochondrial and Structural Repair), Phase 4 (CDR3 Terrain Preparation), and Phase 5 (Phenotype-Guided Resolution Signaling). Critically, the transition from Phase 4 to Phase 5 is gated by phenotype characterization — assigning each patient to one or more resolution phenotypes (Neuropeptide-Depleted, Mitochondrial-Arrested, Resolution-Deficient, Neuroimmune-Dysregulated, or Epigenetically-Encoded) before delivering CDR3 signals. This gate is the mechanism by which precision medicine becomes clinically operational, and it is the most direct answer to why uniform CIRS protocols fail a significant proportion of patients.

EDITORIAL · READ FIRST

The Coherence Fix

The paper's rhetorical engine is *retroactive convergence*: every major CIRS finding is what the CDR predicts. That engine currently runs on four inputs the manuscript must now grade as weak — HLA-DR susceptibility, MARCoNS, the GENIE transcriptome, and the Triple Positive. A paper cannot cite HLA-DR as CDR-confirmatory and then dismiss HLA evidence as unreplicated; a reviewer will lead with the contradiction.

Resolution: reassign these four from *evidence for the CDR* to *CIRS-era surrogates the CDR replaces with direct measurement*. The convergence argument survives, but it now runs on mechanism — purinergic signaling, ISRmt, resolution biology — rather than on Shoemaker's proxy biomarkers. Concretely: cut the HLA-as-CDR-confirmatory claim in §3.3; retain the transcriptomic/biomarker material as *historical* corroboration only; and frame GENIE and the Triple Positive through the direct-measurement section that follows.

The move in one line Stop leaning on CIRS's proxy biomarkers as support for the CDR; carry the weight on measured mechanism instead.

SECTION 1

Introduction: The Clinical Gap That CIRS Tried to Fill

In the 1990s, a cluster of patients presented to physicians along the shores of the Chesapeake Bay with a constellation of symptoms that defied standard diagnostic categories: profound fatigue, cognitive dysfunction (colloquially termed "brain fog"), musculoskeletal pain, dysautonomia, sleep disruption, and immune dysregulation. These patients had often seen multiple specialists, been told their labs were "normal," and been referred to psychiatry.

Ritchie Shoemaker, a family physician in Maryland, began systematically studying this population and identified what he would come to call Chronic Inflammatory Response Syndrome (CIRS). His foundational insight was that a genetically susceptible subgroup of the population — those lacking specific HLA-DR immune response gene variants — could not adequately clear biotoxins from their systems. These toxins, primarily produced by organisms in water-damaged buildings (including Stachybotrys, Aspergillus, actinomycetes bacteria, and their mycotoxins and endotoxins) or by tick-borne pathogens, triggered a sustained innate immune activation that produced the syndrome.

Shoemaker's clinical and research work over the following two decades produced a reproducible diagnostic framework, including validated biomarkers (C4a, TGF-beta-1, MSH, VIP, VEGF, MMP-9, and others), a genetic susceptibility map via HLA-DR typing, and a stepwise treatment protocol beginning with removal from exposure and proceeding through cholestyramine binding, antifungal treatment, correction of MARCoNS nasal colonization, hormonal and VCS testing, and ultimately vasoactive intestinal peptide (VIP) as a healing signal.

Perhaps most impressively, Shoemaker and colleagues published transcriptomic analyses demonstrating consistent, reproducible patterns of gene expression in CIRS patients — patterns that distinguished them from healthy controls and that shifted toward normalization with treatment. This work, predating the CDR framework, represented some of the most sophisticated molecular biology applied to chronic illness in outpatient medicine.

Yet CIRS has limitations. It was built around a single class of exposure (biotoxins) and a single protocol pathway. It lacks an explicit mechanistic account of why treatment works at the cellular level. It did not incorporate the emerging science of mitochondrial signaling, purinergic danger signaling, or the biology of resolution and repair. And its end-of-protocol signal — VIP — while effective for many patients, fails others for reasons the CIRS model cannot adequately explain.

The Cell Danger Response framework, developed by Robert Naviaux over the following decade, provides precisely the mechanistic foundation that CIRS lacks — while fully accounting for and predicting the empirical findings Shoemaker documented.

SECTION 2

The Cell Danger Response: A Primer

2.1 Origins and Core Concept

Robert K. Naviaux, MD, PhD, Professor of Medicine, Pediatrics, and Pathology at the University of California San Diego, developed the Cell Danger Response framework through two decades of research into mitochondrial disease, autism spectrum disorder, and chronic multisystem illness. His landmark 2014 paper, "Metabolic features of the cell danger response," published in Mitochondrion, articulated a unified theory of how cells respond to threat.

The central insight of the CDR is that mitochondria function not merely as energy-producing organelles, but as the central sensors and coordinators of cellular threat responses. When a cell encounters a significant threat — whether infectious, toxic, traumatic, metabolic, or psychological — mitochondria initiate a stereotyped metabolic and signaling cascade designed to defend the cell and organism. This cascade involves a shift away from oxidative phosphorylation toward glycolytic metabolism, the release of extracellular ATP and other purine metabolites as danger signals, activation of the NLRP3 inflammasome, cytokine release, immune cell recruitment, and a fundamental reorganization of cellular metabolism toward defense rather than function.

Crucially, Naviaux identified that this response has three phases:

- CDR1: The acute threat and defense phase — characterized by innate immune activation, metabolic shift, and purinergic danger signaling. Total toxic load drives CDR1 intensity.
- CDR2: The repair and regeneration phase — in which the immune system and cellular machinery attempt to repair damage while the threat is contained.
- CDR3: The resolution and return to homeostasis phase — in which the CDR is switched off and the cell returns to normal metabolic function, requiring specific "all-safe" signals.

The CDR is not merely a theory of disease — it is a theory of healing. Its most important clinical implication is that chronic illness arises not primarily from the continued presence of the original threat, but from a failure of the CDR to complete its cycle and return to Phase 3. In other words, patients with CIRS, ME/CFS, long COVID, and related conditions are, in CDR terms, stuck in CDR1/CDR2, unable to receive or respond to the signals that would allow them to return to health.

2.2 Purinergic Signaling: The Language of the CDR

Central to the CDR framework is purinergic signaling — the use of extracellular nucleotides (primarily ATP, ADP, and adenosine) as communication molecules between cells and between cells and the immune system.

When cells are under threat, they release ATP through pannexin and connexin hemichannels. This extracellular ATP acts as a universal danger signal, activating P2X and P2Y receptors on immune cells, neighboring cells, and the cell itself.

Naviaux's research demonstrated that many patients with chronic multisystem illness have dysregulated purinergic signaling, with inappropriately elevated extracellular ATP or altered receptor sensitivity, perpetuating the CDR1 state even in the absence of the original threat. This explains a central clinical paradox of CIRS: why patients who have demonstrably left the moldy environment, completed antimicrobial treatment, and passed VCS testing can still feel profoundly ill — the CDR has been triggered but not resolved.

2.3 The CDR and Total Toxic Load

One of the most clinically important innovations of the CDR framework over CIRS is the concept of total toxic load as the driver of CDR1 intensity. In the CIRS model, biotoxin exposure is the trigger and the treatment is organized around that specific trigger. The CDR framework recognizes that mitochondria do not distinguish between threat types — they integrate inputs from multiple simultaneous stressors.

A patient with mold exposure who also has chronic Lyme disease, heavy metal burden, traumatic childhood adversity encoded as epigenetic stress, electromagnetic field exposure, nutritional insufficiency, and chronic psychological stress is experiencing a CDR1 of far greater intensity and complexity than one whose only insult was a single water-damaged building. This insight — that the cell is keeping a running total of all threat signals — explains why identical CIRS protocols produce vastly different outcomes across patients with superficially similar presentations.

> **Key CDR Insight:** Total Load
>
> The mitochondria integrate all threat signals — biologic, chemical, physical, and psychosocial — into a single CDR response. CIRS treatment addresses one input channel. CDR-informed treatment maps the entire threat landscape before designing the resolution strategy.

SECTION 3

Convergence: How the CDR Predicts Shoemaker's Findings

> **A note on this section** The convergences catalogued below are historical corroboration, not this paper's primary evidence. The mechanistic weight now rests on directly measured mechanism — see the Direct Measurement section — rather than on Shoemaker's proxy biomarkers.

One of the most compelling arguments for the CDR as the superior explanatory framework is its retroactive predictive power: every major finding of the CIRS clinical research literature is precisely what the CDR would predict. This is not a coincidence. Shoemaker's findings were empirically derived from a large patient cohort; Naviaux's framework was derived from cellular biology and metabolomics. That they converge is evidence of both being correct — and of the CDR being the deeper theory.

3.1 Transcriptomic Findings

Shoemaker and colleagues published transcriptomic analyses showing that CIRS patients have characteristic patterns of differential gene expression affecting immune signaling, complement activation, TGF-beta pathways, VEGF regulation, and neurological function. These patterns were reproducible across patients and normalized with appropriate treatment.

From the CDR perspective, these findings are historically consistent with the framework — corroboration, not primary evidence. CDR1 activation produces a characteristic transcriptomic signature — upregulation of innate immune genes, complement pathway genes, and inflammatory mediators; downregulation of mitochondrial function genes, oxidative phosphorylation complexes, and synaptic signaling genes. The Shoemaker transcriptome is the CIRS/biotoxin-triggered instance of the CDR1 transcriptomic signature.

Naviaux's metabolomic work in ME/CFS, a clinically overlapping condition, demonstrated comparable patterns of mitochondrial dysfunction, purinergic dysregulation, and altered lipid metabolism — consistent with the view that these different clinical entities share the same underlying cellular program.

3.2 Biomarker Patterns

The CIRS biomarker panel — elevated C4a, TGF-beta-1, and MMP-9; suppressed MSH and VIP; dysregulated ACTH/cortisol axis; low VEGF — is consistent with what would be expected from sustained CDR1/CDR2 activation:

- Elevated C4a reflects complement pathway activation, a primary innate immune CDR1 effector.
- Elevated TGF-beta-1 reflects both the CDR1 inflammatory state and the CDR2 repair phase attempting matrix remodeling.
- Suppressed MSH and VIP reflect the failure of endogenous resolution signaling — these neuropeptides are physiologically involved in CDR3 initiation and are predictably depleted when CDR1 persists.
- Dysregulated HPA axis reflects the downstream metabolic and neuroendocrine reorganization that accompanies sustained CDR1 in the CDR framework.
- Low VEGF reflects impaired mitochondrial signaling for vascular repair and tissue regeneration that should accompany CDR2 and CDR3.

In each case, the CDR framework provides a mechanistic account for findings that in the CIRS model are empirical observations without a unifying cellular explanation.

3.3 HLA-DR Susceptibility

Shoemaker identified specific HLA-DR haplotypes as susceptibility factors for CIRS. Earlier framings of this argument read that association as confirmatory of the CDR; this paper no longer does. As §5.8 sets out, the HLA-DR susceptibility claim is itself an unreplicated association, and a fixed genetic-susceptibility model is the wrong shape for the acquired, dynamic loss of tolerance the CDR describes. We therefore treat HLA-DR critically rather than as convergent evidence, and relocate susceptibility from an inherited haplotype to an acquired, measurable tolerance state — the reframing developed in the Direct Measurement section and formalized in §5.8.

3.4 VIP as a Partial CDR3 Signal

Vasoactive intestinal peptide, Shoemaker's terminal treatment protocol step, is a pleiotropic neuropeptide with well-documented anti-inflammatory and pro-resolution properties. Within the CDR framework, VIP functions as a partial CDR3 "all safe" signal: it activates VPAC receptors, suppresses NF-kB signaling, promotes regulatory T cell function, and stimulates cAMP-mediated anti-inflammatory pathways.

The fact that VIP works for many CIRS patients — and fails others — is itself a CDR prediction. VIP addresses one channel of CDR3 signaling. In patients whose CDR1 has been successfully attenuated by the preceding CIRS protocol and whose primary CDR3 deficit is neuropeptide signaling, VIP is sufficient. In patients with more complex CDR1 terrain — additional threat inputs, mitochondrial dysfunction, purinergic dysregulation, or epigenetically encoded allostatic load — VIP alone does not provide the full complement of signals required for CDR3 completion.

SECTION 4

Parallel Timelines: Shoemaker and Naviaux

The following timeline illustrates the parallel and intersecting development of CIRS and CDR research, demonstrating how these bodies of work — developed largely independently — converged on overlapping clinical and molecular findings before the CDR framework emerged as the broader explanatory theory.

Year	Contributor	Key Contribution
1997	Shoemaker	First clinical descriptions of biotoxin-associated illness in patients exposed to Pfiesteria and ciguatera; identifies reproducible multi-system syndrome not explained by infection alone.
1998	Shoemaker	Identifies HLA-DR haplotype susceptibility in biotoxin illness; proposes that genetic immune response variation determines who develops chronic illness after biotoxin exposure.
2001	Shoemaker	Visual Contrast Sensitivity (VCS) testing validated as inexpensive screening tool for neurotoxin-associated visual processing deficits in CIRS patients.
2003	Shoemaker	Publishes landmark findings on complement activation (C4a elevation) as a central biomarker of chronic biotoxin illness; establishes the innate immune nature of CIRS.
2005	Shoemaker	Identifies MARCoNS (Multiple Antibiotic Resistant Coagulase Negative Staphylococci) nasal colonization as perpetuating factor in CIRS; publishes on MSH suppression.
2006	Shoemaker	Publishes small randomized control trial demonstrating effectiveness of cholestyramine to pass Visual Contrast Test
2007	Naviaux	Publishes foundational work on mitochondrial disease mechanisms and begins articulating the concept of the CDR based on metabolomics in mitochondrial disorders.
2010	Shoemaker	VIP (vasoactive intestinal peptide) established as the terminal treatment step in the CIRS protocol; clinical data demonstrates normalization of biomarkers and symptom resolution in responsive patients.
2011	Naviaux	Articulates early formal version of the Cell Danger Response model at scientific conferences; identifies mitochondria as central danger sensors and coordinators of the innate immune response.
2013	Naviaux	Publishes metabolomic findings in autism spectrum disorder demonstrating CDR signature; introduces purinergic signaling as the molecular language of the CDR.
2014	Naviaux	Landmark paper: "Metabolic features of the cell danger response" published in Mitochondrion. Formally defines CDR1, CDR2, CDR3 phases; establishes framework that encompasses all forms of chronic threat-response illness.
2016	Naviaux	Publishes metabolomics study of ME/CFS in PNAS; demonstrates CDR1 metabolomic signature in ME/CFS, directly paralleling Shoemaker's CIRS transcriptomic findings and establishing CDR as a transdiagnostic framework.
2017	Shoemaker	Expanded CIRS diagnostic criteria; ongoing transcriptomic work; publications on TGF-beta-1 in CIRS and post-Lyme illness converge with CDR purinergic inflammation literature.

Year	Contributor	Key Contribution
2018	Naviaux	Publishes work on suramin (a P2 purinergic receptor antagonist) as a potential CDR modulator; Phase I clinical trial in autism demonstrates proof-of-concept for purinergic-targeted CDR intervention.
2019–2021	Both	Long COVID emerges as a new mass CDR activation event; research demonstrates overlapping transcriptomic, metabolomic, and clinical features with both CIRS and the CDR signature — vindicating the CDR as a transdiagnostic framework and highlighting the critical need for CDR3 resolution protocols.
2022–2024	Field-wide	Explosion of research in peptide therapeutics (BPC-157, TB-500, KPV, Selank), exosome-based delivery, MSC-derived secretomes, and specialized pro-resolving mediators (SPMs) as CDR3-relevant interventional tools; precision mitochondrial medicine emerges as a clinical subspecialty.
2025	Synthesis	Convergence of CDR framework with precision medicine modalities; clinical protocols incorporating total toxic load assessment, individualized CDR1 reduction, and personalized CDR3 signaling represent the state of the art in chronic inflammatory illness treatment.

SECTION 5

Where CIRS Ends and the CDR Begins: The Critical Gaps and an Evidence-Tier Assessment

Understanding CIRS as a special case of the CDR requires identifying precisely where the CIRS model reaches its explanatory and clinical limits. These gaps are not failures of Shoemaker's clinical acumen — they are consequences of the state of science at the time the model was built and the necessarily narrow scope required to generate a clinically actionable protocol from the available evidence.

5.1 The Single-Exposure Assumption

CIRS was developed primarily from observations in patients with water-damaged building exposure (mold, mycotoxins, actinomycetes, endotoxins), Lyme disease and co-infections, and marine biotoxin exposures (Pfiesteria, ciguatera). While Shoemaker extended the model across these triggers, the underlying assumption remained that the primary driver of illness was a specific identifiable biotoxin exposure, and that identifying and removing that exposure was the essential first step.

The CDR framework reframes this: the biotoxin is not a unique category of stressor but simply one input among many that the mitochondria and innate immune system can use to activate CDR1. Heavy metals, persistent organic pollutants, chronic viral infections, traumatic stress, severe nutritional insufficiency, sleep fragmentation, and even chronic electromagnetic field exposure have each been shown to activate CDR1-equivalent pathways. The clinical implication is profound: a patient who has cleared the mold exposure but still has

significant heavy metal burden, active Epstein-Barr virus reactivation, and significant ACE2 (adverse childhood experience) history will not complete CDR3 through the CIRS VIP protocol — because the CDR1 drivers have not been fully addressed.

5.2 The Protocol Uniformity Problem

The CIRS protocol is sequential and largely uniform across patients. This was a necessary design choice to generate reproducible clinical evidence and to give clinicians a practicable intervention framework. Its uniformity is a strength in clinical research and a weakness in individualized care.

The CDR framework predicts that CDR3 signaling must be personalized because the specific "all safe" signals required depend on which CDR1 and CDR2 processes have been active. A patient whose primary CDR1 driver was mitochondrial ROS accumulation needs different resolution signals than one whose primary driver was complement activation from biotoxin fragments. A patient with epigenetically encoded developmental CDR activation — the "prepared" CDR1 that Naviaux describes in neurodevelopmental conditions — needs resolution signals that address the intergenerational or developmental encoding of threat, which is categorically different from an adult onset exposure.

5.3 The Missing Mitochondrial Science

When Shoemaker developed CIRS in the late 1990s, mitochondria were understood primarily as the organelles of ATP production — the "powerhouse of the cell." The subsequent two decades produced a revolution in mitochondrial biology. We now understand that mitochondria are:

- Primary danger sensors, with pattern recognition receptors and the capacity to respond directly to pathogen-associated and damage-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs and DAMPs).
- Central regulators of innate immune signaling, including the NLRP3 inflammasome, interferon signaling, and NF-kB activation.
- Coordinators of metabolic reprogramming during immune activation, directing the Warburg-like metabolic shift toward glycolysis during CDR1.
- Active participants in resolution signaling, producing and responding to specialized pro-resolving lipid mediators (SPMs) during CDR3.
- Epigenetic memory organelles, capable of encoding stress history through mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) methylation and heteroplasmy patterns.

None of this mitochondrial biology is incorporated into the CIRS model. The CDR framework is built on it. This is perhaps the deepest scientific gap between the two frameworks — and the one with the greatest clinical implications, because it opens the door to mitochondrial-targeted interventions that the CIRS model has no mechanism to even theorize.

5.4 The Resolution Biology Gap

The emerging field of resolution biology — the study of how inflammation is actively terminated rather than simply fading in the absence of stimulus — was nascent during the development of CIRS and has exploded since. Charles Serhan and colleagues at Harvard identified the specialized pro-resolving mediators (SPMs): lipoxins, resolvins, protectins, and maresins — enzymatically derived lipid mediators that actively promote macrophage phenotypic shift from M1 (inflammatory) to M2 (reparative), clear apoptotic debris, suppress neutrophil recruitment, and send direct "return to homeostasis" signals to affected tissues.

SPMs represent the endogenous biochemistry of CDR3. Their dysregulation — documented in conditions including ME/CFS, post-Lyme syndrome, post-COVID, and likely CIRS — explains why some patients cannot complete resolution even in the absence of active threat. The CIRS model does not incorporate SPM biology. A CDR-informed protocol can directly target SPM pathways through nutrition (omega-3 substrates), pharmacological precursors, and resolution-phase nutraceuticals.

5.5 The protocol has never been evaluated as a whole

The most consequential evidentiary gap in CIRS is rarely stated: the complete sequential protocol — removal, binders, antifungals, MARCoNS eradication, hormonal correction, VIP — has never been tested as an integrated intervention in a controlled trial with prospectively defined, patient-centered outcomes. The evidence base is a collection of individual steps of uneven quality: a small early cholestyramine/VCS study, open-label VIP case series, and biomarker-normalization reports drawn largely from a single investigative group. Biomarker movement is used as the primary endpoint throughout, which presupposes the very causal model under test. No independent group has reproduced the protocol's outcomes in a controlled design, and there is no blinded comparison against exposure-removal-plus-time, the natural-history condition against which any biotoxin intervention must be judged. This is not a claim that the protocol is ineffective; it is a claim that its efficacy is, at present, formally unestablished.

5.6 MARCoNS: a perpetuating factor without independent confirmation

> **A triple category error.** The palytoxin–mitoribosome claim assigns the wrong mechanism — palytoxin is a plasma-membrane sodium-pump toxin that converts the Na+/K+-ATPase into an open cation channel, not an agent of the mitochondrial ribosome; to the wrong organism — palytoxin is a ~2,680-dalton marine polyether of zoanthids and *Ostreopsis* dinoflagellates, with no credible biosynthetic pathway in a small-genome nasal staphylococcus; acting at the wrong scale — a biofilm confined to the posterior nasal recess is not a plausible source of a systemically distributed, picomolar-potent ion-channel toxin. It should be retired from the framework, not softened.

The designation of Multiple Antibiotic-Resistant Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci as a perpetuating cause of CIRS is best understood not as a validated etiologic claim but as a durable inference layered on top of a near-universal commensal. Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS) are a defining component of normal human skin and nasal flora; deep nasal culture returns them in essentially everyone sampled, and the “MARCoNS” label is generated by adding an antibiotic-resistance criterion to an organism that is already ubiquitous. A test

that is positive in most people to whom it is applied — patients and matched non-ill controls alike — cannot, by itself, identify a disease-specific pathogen. This is the classic problem of the innocent bystander: a normal resident is cultured, found, and blamed. Grading the claim on its own terms, it does not clear the first bar — specificity — that a putative pathogen must clear.

The supporting evidence is, on inspection, largely correlational and largely in-house. The foundational MARCoNS–α-MSH association derives principally from observational and conference-level work within the originating research program — an American Society for Microbiology conference report linking nasal carriage of resistant CoNS to α-melanocyte-stimulating hormone (α-MSH) deficiency — rather than from independent, controlled replication. The most recent and most quantitatively serious contribution, a 2026 retrospective cohort analysis in *Frontiers in Endocrinology*, reports that patients who were MARCoNS-negative at follow-up carried higher circulating α-MSH than those who remained positive; but the authors explicitly frame this as an association warranting prospective study, and notably found no corresponding relationship for VIP or MMP-9. An association between a culture status and a single neuropeptide, recovered from a retrospective design, is a hypothesis-generating finding. It is not evidence that the organism drives the illness, and the monograph reads it as exactly that — a signal awaiting confirmation, not a confirmation.

The specific mechanistic claim advanced to bridge the nose to systemic mitochondrial dysfunction — that these organisms elaborate a palytoxin-like polycyclic ether that acts on the mitochondrial ribosome — does not survive contact with palytoxin's established pharmacology. It fails on three independent counts, set out in the callout below. Each error is independent of the others, so no softened version rescues the claim: repairing the mechanism does not supply the organism the biosynthesis, and repairing both does not close the gap between a local biofilm and a systemic, picomolar-potent effect. The appropriate disposition, on the monograph's reading, is retirement rather than qualification.

Reframed through the Cell Danger Response and its mitochondrial Integrated Stress Response (CDR/ISRmt), the nasal microbiome is more defensibly read as a terrain modifier of mucosal set-point than as a discrete infectious driver. The nose is a sentinel mucosal surface whose health is a property of immune tolerance — barrier integrity, secretory IgA and antimicrobial-peptide reserve, tolerogenic cellular tone, and a protective commensal consortium — not of the presence or absence of any single taxon. Dysbiosis, in this frame, is the ecological signature of a mucosa that has lost that tolerant, self-regulating state, typically tipping toward an *S. aureus*-dominant community as the protective consortium collapses; the resistant CoNS recovered from such a nose is a passenger of the host state as often as a driver, and frequently neither — a normal resident mislabeled. The α-MSH correlation is then more parsimoniously explained by shared upstream host recovery than by organism-driven causation: as the systemic danger state resolves, neuroendocrine "all-safe" signaling recovers, α-MSH rises, and the mucosal terrain normalizes so that the colonizer recedes on re-culture. That VIP and MMP-9 did not track with clearance is consistent with clearance being a marker of recovery rather than its engine.

This repositioning carries a direct clinical consequence, developed further in the sequencing discussion (see §7). Restoring nasal flora belongs in the framework, but as an ecological, fortify-phase objective sequenced after the danger signal resolves — not as an early, culture-triggered "kill-the-bug" step. Broadly targeting "coagulase-negative staph in the deep nose" with topical antibiotics is not obviously restoring an ecology at all: it risks depleting protective coagulase-negative members of the consortium — *S. epidermidis* and the lugdunin-producing *S. lugdunensis* among them — whose presence predicts exclusion of the true pathobiont, while se-

lecting for resistant survivors. Targeted antimicrobial therapy is warranted, on this account, for defined *S. aureus*-dominant pathology corroborated by clinical findings — not for a resistant-CoNS culture label read in isolation.

5.7 Symptom clusters: an internally derived, non-specific instrument

> **Counting is not clustering.** Tallying how many symptoms co-occur in a symptomatic population establishes only that ill patients report many complaints; a cluster is an empirical claim about covariance structure — that the items separate from a null model and from the broad differential — and that claim was never tested. As the monograph puts it, a claimed structure never subjected to a structure-finding analysis is not a finding; it is a layout.

The multi-cluster symptom roster used to gate CIRS diagnosis — thirteen clusters applied at an eight-of-thirteen threshold — is presented as though it were empirically derived from patient data and statistically validated. Read against its own primary sources, it is neither. The two foundational Neurotoxicology and Teratology time-series papers (2005, 2006) contain no cluster analysis and no data-driven structure derivation of any kind: both assign symptoms to organ systems *a priori* by clinical judgment and then analyze only a group-mean symptom *count* by paired t-tests across treatment time points. The roster is not even a fixed object — it expands by editorial revision from twenty-six symptoms in eight organ systems (a four-of-eight rule) to thirty-seven symptoms in ten organ systems (a five-of-ten rule), and the eight-of-thirteen cluster instrument actually deployed appears in neither. This is the distinction the monograph draws sharply: counting how many symptoms co-occur is not the same as demonstrating a cluster. A grouping is an empirical claim about the covariance structure of the data, one that must be discovered by factor analysis, latent-class or latent-profile modeling, or formal cluster analysis, each reporting its own diagnostics — eigenvalues, loadings, class-separation statistics. A partition produced instead by clinical intuition is an organizing convenience that carries none of the evidentiary weight the word "cluster" is meant to convey. The number thirteen, if it is to mean anything, must come out of such an analysis rather than be imposed before it.

The one study advanced as quantitative validation (McMahon 2017) does not repair the gap; it illustrates its circularity. That study applies the pre-existing thirteen-cluster instrument retrospectively to 371 patients drawn from a single specialty clinic and measures its reported "accuracy" against the construct's own case definition — a definition that itself rests on the same symptom roster. Index test and reference standard are therefore not independent; they are two expressions of one construct applied to one population. This is incorporation bias in its textbook form, and the high concordance it produces is an artifact of the circularity, not evidence of accuracy: the study measures how well a relabeled version of the instrument agrees with itself. The reported "error rates" are p-values from elementary contingency-table tests computed on public web calculators — establishing only that two columns are associated, and saying nothing about how the instrument will perform as a diagnostic test in a new patient. There is no ROC analysis locating the eight-of-thirteen cut-point on a sensitivity–specificity curve, no calibration, no out-of-sample testing.

The deeper problem, and the one that matters most at the bedside, is discriminant validity — the property the monograph calls the entire game for a multi-system, fatigue-and-cognition syndrome. The roster is assembled

from fatigue, cognitive difficulty, pain, headache, mood change, and other non-specific somatic, cognitive, and autonomic complaints — the shared vocabulary of chronic fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, depression, anxiety, obstructive sleep apnea, and hypothyroidism, among many others. An instrument built from such items can only mean "this disease" rather than "some illness" if it has been shown to separate its target from those look-alikes, and that test has never been performed. The predictable and demonstrable behavior of a count-based, non-specific, self-validated screen is to separate the chronically unwell from the well with high sensitivity and near-zero specificity: it labels a large fraction of any symptomatic population as cases. The high apparent prevalence the construct reports — a pediatric figure of 7.01 percent, projected from an enriched referral population onto the public as a base-rate error — is therefore not a discovery about the world but a property of the instrument, the arithmetic consequence of applying a sensitive, non-specific gate in a population already enriched for the condition. Without discriminant validity a high cluster count is uninterpretable; it is fully consistent with the patient having any of a dozen other conditions, or several at once.

A symptom cluster earns diagnostic weight only when it predicts something the broad differential does not — a data-derived internal structure, an independent biomarker, a treatment response, or a trajectory validated against a reference standard genuinely independent of the roster itself. None of this implies that patients are not ill, or that water-damaged buildings cause no disease; it implies only, in the monograph's own terms, that this instrument cannot establish who has this disease, because it was never built to. This is precisely the boundary at which CIRS ends and the CDR framework should begin (§5). The remedy the monograph describes — discover the structure by exploratory and confirmatory factor or latent-class analysis, let the data set the number of dimensions, establish reliability, and test discriminant validity against prospectively enrolled comparison groups — is the same prospective, multi-site, biomarker-anchored design the Cell Danger Response program needs in any case to validate its phenotypes. Anchoring a properly derived symptom structure to measurable biology, such as mitokine markers like GDF15 and FGF21, would let stratification rest on function and mechanism rather than on a clinically curated tally of common symptoms validated against itself. That is the functional and mechanistic stratification the CDR framework should substitute for the roster.

5.8 HLA-DR: susceptibility as an unreplicated association

> **The reframe in one line.** Susceptibility is real, but it is "simply not, in the main, a difference of antigen presentation" — it is a difference of danger: how readily it is entered, how stubbornly it persists, and how completely it can be resolved.

The CIRS susceptibility pillar holds that particular HLA-DR/DQ haplotypes leave a large minority of the population unable to present and clear biotoxins, defaulting into chronic innate activation — and that these "dreaded" haplotypes are recoverable in the large majority of patients. Measured against the standard that genuine HLA-restricted diseases set, this claim is best graded as an unreplicated association rather than an established mechanism. Its primary citation is not a peer-reviewed paper but a poster presented at the American Society for Tropical Medicine and Hygiene in 2002 — a legitimate vehicle for a preliminary signal, but one carrying no published methods, no disclosed control population, no correction for population structure, and no independent replication. The haplotype taxonomy that propagated through two decades of practice traces, in its original form, to that single unrefereed source. Shoemaker's genuinely peer-reviewed work

characterizes the phenotype of biotoxin illness — the multi-system syndrome, the treatment effect, the early Pfiesteria neurocognitive report — not its genetics; it describes the illness the genetic claim is meant to explain, not the claim itself. Even the most rigorous genomic work in the lineage, the 2015 ciguatoxin transcriptomic study, reported differential expression of HLA-region genes including HLA-DQB1 and HLA-DQB2 — a downstream, state-dependent observation logically distinct from the germline claim that an inherited haplotype predisposes to acquiring the illness in the first place.

The linkage-disequilibrium structure of the region turns a high "susceptible" prevalence into the expected null, not a finding. HLA is inherited in haplotype blocks held together in strong linkage disequilibrium, which is why disease associations attach to a haplotype rather than a resolved causal allele. The haplotypes designated susceptible are common and vary by ancestry, so a high prevalence among patients is expected even absent any causal link — and without ancestry-matched controls the observation is close to uninformative. Multiply that base-rate problem across the number of haplotypes invoked and a "most patients carry one" result becomes nearly guaranteed by construction. This is not an outside objection: the concern has been raised from within the CIRS community itself, where HLA testing has correspondingly lost favor. The contrast with the borrowed precedents is instructive. Chronic beryllium disease names a glutamate at position 69 of HLA-DPB1, carried by roughly 97% of cases versus about 30% of unaffected individuals, refined to specific Glu69-bearing alleles, quantified at an odds ratio near nine with a gene-dose effect, and mechanistically closed — beryllium acting as a hapten in the Glu69 groove. Even antibiotic-refractory Lyme arthritis, the nearest biotoxin-relevant analogue, shows its HLA-DRB1 association only when patients are stratified by outcome; overall haplotype frequencies resemble controls, and the risk alleles act by binding antigen well and mounting a vigorous response, not by failing to present it. No equivalent case-control study — still less a genome-wide one — confirms the CIRS haplotypes, and the inverted mechanism they require, a failure to present and clear, has never been demonstrated for any biotoxin.

Grade these together and the verdict is not that susceptibility is illusory but that a fixed genetic-susceptibility model is the wrong shape for the clinical reality. A fixed-haplotype model predicts that susceptibility is stable across the lifespan, untreatable at its root, and concentrated in carriers of particular alleles. The phenomena clinicians actually observe fall consistently on the other side of the ledger: sensitization on re-exposure, in which each successive insult lands harder; recovery with treatment, which a fixed defect should not permit; and symptoms far exceeding objective findings. A birthright written at conception cannot develop, cannot compound with cumulative exposure, and cannot resolve within an individual across a treatment arc — yet those are precisely the dynamics the CDR describes. Many candidate mycotoxins compound the mismatch: the trichothecenes, for instance, are small non-peptide molecules not presented in the class II groove at all, so an antigen-presentation account has no purchase on the very agents in play.

We therefore retire HLA haplotyping as an organizing construct and relocate susceptibility from an inherited genotype to an acquired, measurable tolerance state — the haplotype-to-healing-cycle move. Within Naviaux's Cell Danger Response frame, the question is no longer "which peptide can this person present?" but "at what threshold does this person enter the danger response, and how readily do they exit it?" Both parameters are set by metabolic and signaling machinery — mitochondrial reserve, purinergic tone, the integrated stress response, and the epigenetic state of innate immune cells — and both are shaped by prior exposome rather than fixed at conception. Trained immunity inscribes a lowered danger-response threshold in chromatin and in reprogrammed marrow progenitors, giving durability without genetics; the ATF4-driven mitochondrial integ-

rated stress response perpetuates the loop and resists exit; and the same stress axis, inverted inside T-helper cells, produces the antibody-negative persistence the HLA model invokes a presentation defect to explain, with no such defect required. Decisively, this relocated susceptibility is quantifiable and dynamic. The mitokines GDF15 and FGF21 rise with mitochondrial burden and fall with recovery; a susceptibility marker that moves with treatment is the signature of an acquired, modifiable state, where a fixed haplotype by construction cannot track symptom burden or recovery at all. Where the haplotype taxonomy never met the standard of matched-control validation, the tolerance-state model is falsifiable on instruments already in the clinic — developed in the companion monograph "From Haplotype to Healing Cycle" and taken up in the mechanistic sections that follow.

The remainder of §5 folds in a formal, tier-by-tier assessment of the two evidence bases — adapted from the companion CIRS/CDR Evidence Review — using standard evidence-hierarchy criteria.

5.9 Introduction: Why Evidence Hierarchy Matters

Medicine has developed a hierarchical system for evaluating the strength of scientific evidence. This system — commonly represented as a pyramid from expert opinion at the base to systematic reviews and meta-analyses at the apex — reflects both the internal validity of individual study designs and the capacity for findings to generalize to broader populations. The hierarchy is not a ranking of intelligence or effort; it is a recognition that some study designs are more vulnerable to bias, confounding, and error than others.

In evaluating the scientific foundations of any clinical framework, it is also important to consider:

- Journal tier and impact factor, which reflect the rigor of peer review, the selectivity of the editorial process, and the citation-based influence of published work
- Independence of research groups, since findings confirmed only by the original authors carry substantially less weight than those replicated by independent teams
- Acceptance by mainstream academic institutions, regulatory bodies, and professional societies
- Citation patterns and uptake within the broader scientific community

This review applies these criteria to the CIRS research body and the CDR framework, not to diminish either, but to provide an accurate map of where each sits on the scientific landscape — and to explain why that map matters for treatment decisions.

5.10 Evidence Hierarchy Framework

The most widely used evidence hierarchy in clinical medicine is adapted from the Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (OCEBM) and the GRADE framework. For this review, we apply a simplified five-level hierarchy:

Level	Design	Description
I	Systematic review / meta-analysis	Pooled analysis of multiple high-quality RCTs or cohort studies. Highest generalizability. Lowest risk of bias.
II	Randomized controlled trial (RCT)	Prospective, randomized allocation to treatment and control. Double-blind where possible. Gold standard for treatment efficacy.
III	Prospective cohort / controlled trial	Longitudinal observation of defined patient groups with pre-specified outcomes. Can establish association but not causation.
IV	Case series / retrospective analysis	Uncontrolled observations of patients receiving a treatment. Generates hypotheses. Cannot establish efficacy.
V	Expert opinion / consensus / mechanistic	Clinical experience, biological plausibility, theoretical framework. Necessary but lowest evidential weight.

5.11 Assessment of the CIRS Evidence Base

Study Design Profile

The peer-reviewed CIRS literature consists primarily of Level IV and Level V evidence: uncontrolled case series, retrospective analyses, and mechanistic/theoretical publications. The Dooley et al. 2024 systematic review in Annals of Medicine & Surgery — the most comprehensive recent synthesis — identified 13 peer-reviewed articles comprising 14 studies on CIRS treatment. Of these:

- Two were randomized controlled trials (Level II), representing the strongest evidence in the CIRS literature
- The remainder were case series, observational cohorts, and retrospective analyses (Level IV)
- One double-blind, placebo-controlled trial showed treatment outperformed placebo with p=0.012 — a statistically significant finding and the most rigorous single piece of CIRS treatment evidence
- McMahon's 2017 cohort of 1,061 consecutive patients represents the largest published CIRS cohort and achieves Level III-IV status as a large uncontrolled prospective series

The broader CIRS evidence base also includes epidemiological support: Dooley and McMahon's 2020 review found that 112 of 114 epidemiological studies (98.2%) identified adverse health effects from indoor mold and dampness exposure, with statistically significant odds ratios (≥2.0) in 79 studies. This is robust Level III epidemiological evidence for the association between water-damaged buildings and multisystem illness. It is important to note, however, that epidemiological association is distinct from mechanistic causation and does not in itself validate the CIRS diagnostic framework or treatment protocol.

The transcriptomic research by Shoemaker, Ryan, and colleagues — including RNA-Seq analyses showing differential gene expression in CIRS patients and its normalization with treatment — represents genuinely sophisticated molecular biology. This work, published primarily in Medical Research Archives, achieves Level III status as observational molecular research with pre/post comparison designs.

Research Group Independence

One of the most substantive criticisms of the CIRS evidence base — acknowledged even by proponents — is its degree of self-referentiality. The majority of key CIRS publications are authored or co-authored by a small, interconnected group centered on Shoemaker, Ryan, McMahon, and a limited circle of certified practitioners. The Dooley 2024 systematic review notes this pattern, and immunologist Dr. Andrea Love, writing in the Skeptical Inquirer, identified this as a significant limitation, while acknowledging the validity of some underlying observations.

Independent replication — the publication of similar findings by research groups with no affiliation to the Shoemaker research network — is limited in the CIRS-specific literature. This is not unusual for emerging fields, but it does constrain the evidential weight that can be attributed to the overall body of work. By contrast, the epidemiological evidence supporting indoor mold as a health hazard is extensively replicated across independent global research groups.

Journal Tier Assessment

Journal prestige, while imperfect as a measure of individual article quality, reflects the rigor of peer review, the editorial standards applied, and the influence of a publication on subsequent research. The primary journals in which CIRS research has been published include:

Journal	Impact	Tier	Notes
Annals of Medicine & Surgery (Wolters Kluwer / LWW) Medical Research Archives (European Society of Medicine) Internal Medicine Review	Factor IF 1.6 No IF (DORA) Low/ not indexed	Mid-tier Emerging Specialty	Legitimate peer-reviewed LWW journal, PubMed indexed. IF 1.6 places it in the lower-middle tier of general medical journals. Primary venue for Dooley 2024 systematic review. Fully open-access, peer-reviewed, PubMed- indexed. Has explicitly opted out of Impact Factor measurement per DORA declaration. Primary venue for Shoemaker transcriptomic and protocol publications since 2016. Small specialty journal; lower independent peer review visibility; primary early venue for several foundational CIRS papers.
PLOS ONE / Scientific Reports (some related work)	IF 3.7 / 4.6	Mid-tier	Some mold-illness adjacent epidemiological work appears in these broad open-access venues; acceptable but not high-impact.

Journal	Impact	Tier	Notes
Health (SCIRP)	Factor Low	Lower-tier	Open-access publisher Scientific Research Publishing; lower peer review standards; venue for early VIP papers.

On the Medical Research Archives Medical Research Archives has explicitly opted out of the Impact Factor system per the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). The journal is legitimate and PubMed- indexed, and DORA's principles about IF's limitations are widely accepted. However, the practical consequence for a research field is that its primary publication venue lacks the independent citation- based credibility metric that mainstream medicine uses to assess scientific influence. CIRS clinicians and advocates should understand this distinction when representing the evidence base to skeptical colleagues or payers.

Mainstream Medical Acceptance

CIRS is not recognized as a diagnostic category by the CDC, NIH, WHO, or any major US professional medical society (American College of Physicians, American Academy of Allergy Asthma and Immunology, etc.). This is relevant context for the evidence discussion — not as a definitive judgment of validity, since many legitimate conditions take decades to achieve official recognition — but as an accurate description of where the field stands.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has published case documentation supporting the association between water-damaged buildings and multisystem illness, which represents meaningful non- clinical validation of the environmental exposure component. The relationship between indoor mold exposure and adverse health outcomes is accepted by mainstream environmental medicine. What remains unrecognized by mainstream bodies is the CIRS diagnostic framework specifically: the HLA-DR susceptibility model, the specific biomarker panel, and the step-wise Shoemaker Protocol.

It is worth noting that mainstream non-recognition does not imply scientific invalidity. CIRS has documented real phenomena that mainstream medicine had been ignoring. The question addressed in this review is not whether CIRS is real — it demonstrably is — but how its evidence base compares to the standards of evidence that academic and regulatory medicine apply.

5.12 Assessment of the CDR Evidence Base

Study Design Profile

The CDR framework is grounded in a different kind of evidence from CIRS: less clinically applied but more fundamentally mechanistic, published in higher-tier venues, and supported by a broader and more independent scientific community. The key publications include:

Study / Finding	Evidence	Journal Tier	Study Design	Significance
	Level			
Naviaux 2014: Metabolic features of the CDR Naviaux et al. 2016: Metabolic features of ME/CFS Naviaux 2018: Healing cycle model Naviaux 2019: Incomplete healing and aging Naviaux et al. 2017: Suramin in autism (SAT1) Shoemaker et al. 2024: PD fingerprint in CIRS	III/V II–III IV–V IV–V II III	Top-tier (IF 3.9) Elite (IF 9.1) Top-tier (IF 3.9) Top-tier (IF 3.9) High-tier Mid-tier (MRA)	Review/Mechanistic in Mitochondrion Prospective metabolomics study in PNAS Mechanistic model in Mitochondrion Perspective in Mitochondrion Phase I/II RCT in Annals of Clin Transl Neurology Case-control transcriptomic study	Foundational framework paper defining CDR1/2/3. Mechanistic synthesis of mitochondrial biology, evolutionary biology, and immune signaling. Highly cited; provides biological architecture for CDR. Targeted broad-spectrum metabolomics in ME/CFS patients vs. controls. Published in PNAS — second most cited journal globally. Independent team. Demonstrates CDR metabolic signature in chronic illness cohort. Introduces CDR2/CDR3 staging and the concept of chronic disease as CDR arrest. Provides clinical framework for the healing cycle. Connects CDR arrest to aging mechanisms; foundational for the epigenetic/CDR3 phenotype model. First FDA-approved clinical trial testing CDR-modulating antipurinergic therapy (suramin) in autism. Level II evidence demonstrating CDR-targeted intervention produces measurable clinical change. Identifies Triple Positive transcriptomic fingerprint for pre-prodromal Parkinson's in CIRS patients. CDR- predicted finding. Published

Study / Finding	Evidence	Journal Tier	Study Design	Significance
	Level			
Dooley et al. 2024: CIRS evidence review Dooley & McMahon 2020: Mold literature review	I (review) I (review)	Mid-tier (IF 1.6) Mid-tier	Systematic review in Ann Med Surg Systematic review	in Medical Research Archives. 13 articles, 14 studies. Identifies 2 RCTs. Documents strongest evidence for Shoemaker Protocol efficacy. Published in Annals of Medicine & Surgery. 112/114 studies (98.2%) show adverse health effects from mold exposure. Strong epidemiological evidence base for exposure-illness association.

Journal Tier and Institutional Prestige

The contrast in publication venue between the core CDR framework papers and the core CIRS protocol papers is one of the most significant differences in the evidence profile of the two bodies of work:

Journal	Impact	Tier	Notes
PNAS (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences) Mitochondrion (Elsevier) Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology	Factor IF 9.1 IF 3.9 IF 5.3	Elite (Q1 top 15) High-tier (Q1) High-tier (Q1)	Second most cited scientific journal globally. Top 10 in multidisciplinary sciences. Acceptance rate ~15%. Editorial Board members are National Academy of Sciences members. Venue for Naviaux 2016 ME/CFS metabolomics. The field's primary specialist journal, indexed in all major databases. Founding associate editor: Naviaux. Q1 SJR ranking. Primary venue for CDR framework papers (2014, 2018, 2019, 2020). Wiley / American Neurological Association affiliated. Primary venue for Naviaux suramin RCT (2017).
Nature Reviews Neurology (CDR-adjacent ISRmt work)	IF 53.7	Elite	ISRmt/GDF15/mitochondrial danger signaling increasingly cited in Nature Reviews family journals — evidence of mainstream neuroscience uptake.

Institutional Prestige and Community Acceptance

Robert Naviaux holds a triple appointment (Medicine, Pediatrics, Pathology) at the University of California San Diego School of Medicine, one of the top research universities in the United States. He is the co- founder and former president of the Mitochondrial Medicine Society, a founding associate editor of the journal Mitochondrion, and the recipient of a 2023 United Mitochondrial Disease Foundation research award. His CDR work has been cited in reviews published across major journals in neuroscience, immunology, aging biology, and metabolomics.

The ISRmt (Integrated Stress Response of the mitochondria) concept — central to the CDR2 phase and the Phenotype B and C clinical models — has been independently developed and validated by multiple research groups, including those working on GDF15 and FGF21 as mitokines. These findings are published across high-impact journals including Cell Metabolism, Nature Metabolism, and the Journal of Clinical Investigation, with no connection to the CIRS research community. The convergence of CDR- predicted findings across independent research groups in different disease areas constitutes a form of indirect replication that substantially strengthens the CDR's evidential standing.

The purinergic signaling mechanisms central to the CDR — the role of extracellular ATP as a danger signal, P2X7 receptor biology, and CD39/CD73-mediated adenosine resolution — are established mainstream biology with hundreds of independent publications across inflammation, neuroscience, and immunology. The CDR framework draws on and synthesizes this literature rather than producing it in isolation.

5.13 Comparative Evidence Assessment

The following table provides a direct comparison of the two evidence bodies across key evaluation dimensions:

Dimension	CIRS Research Body	CDR Framework
Highest evidence level achieved	Level II: Two RCTs (one double-blind, placebo-controlled, p=0.012) in biotoxin illness treatment	Level II: FDA-approved Phase I/II RCT of suramin (antipurinergic CDR modulator) in autism; Level III metabolomics cohort study in PNAS
Primary publication venues	Medical Research Archives (no IF, PubMed indexed); Annals of Medicine & Surgery (IF 1.6); Internal Medicine Review (low/specialty tier)	PNAS (IF 9.1, global top 15); Mitochondrion (IF 3.9, Q1); Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology (IF 5.3, Q1)
Research group independence	Primarily self-referential: most key publications authored by Shoemaker, Ryan, McMahon, and certified practitioners	Broadly distributed: CDR mechanism papers by independent groups across mitochondrial biology, immunology, aging, and neuroscience
Mainstream medical recognition	Not recognized by CDC, NIH, WHO, or major professional societies as a diagnostic category; environmental mold-illness association accepted	CDR-adjacent mechanisms (ISRmt/GDF15, purinergic signaling, SPM resolution biology) are mainstream biology with independent global research communities
Institutional affiliation	Primarily private practice and small clinical groups	UCSD School of Medicine; Mitochondrial and Metabolic Disease Center; National Academy of Sciences affiliations
Citation breadth	Primarily self-citation and citation within CIRS practitioner community	PNAS 2016 paper cited across ME/CFS, long COVID, autism, aging, and environmental health literature by independent researchers
Biological plausibility	High: epidemiological evidence robust (98.2% of 114 studies); transcriptomic findings internally consistent; HLA-DR susceptibility mechanistically coherent	Highest: CDR mechanisms are evolutionarily conserved biology present across all eukaryotic life; independently validated across multiple disease areas and research groups
Treatment evidence	Two RCTs plus extensive case series; protocol shows reproducible outcomes in practitioner community but lacks independent RCT replication	Suramin RCT (CDR modulator) shows proof of concept; broader CDR3 resolution biology (SPMs, exosomes) supported by large independent research bodies

Summary Assessment

CIRS research has achieved Level II evidence for the existence of biotoxin-driven multi-system illness and for the efficacy of the Shoemaker Protocol in a limited RCT context. Its journal venue profile is mid-to-low tier, its research group is substantially self-referential, and it lacks mainstream medical recognition as a diagnostic category. The CDR framework has achieved Level II RCT evidence for CDR-mechanism-targeted intervention and Level III evidence for the CDR metabolic signature in chronic illness, published in elite venues (PNAS, Mitochondrion, Q1 journals), with the underlying mechanisms independently validated by a global research community. These are not competing bodies of evidence — CIRS is a clinical application within the CDR framework — but their evidential standing is not equivalent.

5.14 What the Evidence Hierarchy Does and Does Not Mean

A critical and fair reading of this analysis requires acknowledging several important qualifications:

Lower Evidence Tier Does Not Mean Clinically Invalid

Many important medical interventions have been used effectively for decades without achieving Level I or II evidence — surgical procedures, many psychiatric medications, and nutritional interventions among them. The CIRS protocol has produced meaningful clinical improvement for thousands of patients who had previously been dismissed by mainstream medicine. That clinical reality deserves respect and credit.

The evidence hierarchy is a tool for understanding generalizability and bias risk — not a ranking of clinical value. A Level IV case series showing consistent outcomes in hundreds of patients is clinically meaningful, even if it falls below the gold standard of a blinded RCT. What it cannot do is definitively establish that the observed outcomes are attributable to the specific mechanism proposed rather than to other elements of a complex multi-step protocol.

Mainstream Non-Recognition Is Not Disproof

Many conditions now recognized by mainstream medicine — chronic Lyme disease, fibromyalgia, long COVID — spent years or decades in the liminal space between patient reality and institutional recognition. The CIRS community has good reason to be skeptical of institutional gatekeeping. The fact that the CDC does not recognize CIRS as a diagnostic category does not mean it isn't real. It means the evidence has not yet cleared the bar that mainstream medicine sets for official recognition — a bar that is sometimes too high and sometimes appropriately high, depending on context.

Journal Tier Is a Proxy, Not a Verdict

Publishing in Medical Research Archives rather than PNAS does not mean a paper is wrong. MRA is peer-reviewed, indexed in PubMed, and has published legitimate research. The journal tier difference reflects the rigor of the peer review process, the competitive selectivity of the editorial process, and the citation-based influence of the venue — all real differences, but none of them constitutes proof that the research is invalid. What journal tier does tell you is this: when a body of research is concentrated in lower-tier venues with a self-referential author group, it should be held to higher scrutiny rather than lower, because fewer independent experts have evaluated it. This is not a judgment — it is the appropriate epistemic response to the structure of the evidence.

The CDR's Strength Is Mechanistic, Not Just Clinical

The CDR framework's evidential advantage over CIRS is not primarily that it has more or better clinical trials. It is that the mechanisms it invokes are mainstream biology validated across independent research groups in multiple disease areas. When the same cellular mechanism — ISRmt/GDF15 elevation — is independently identified by research groups studying aging, cancer cachexia, ME/CFS, long COVID, and mitochondrial disease, the evidential weight of that mechanism becomes very high regardless of whether any single clinical trial has tested it in CIRS patients specifically.

This convergence of independent findings is a form of scientific validation that does not appear in evidence hierarchies explicitly, but is widely recognized as one of the strongest forms of evidence for biological mechanism. It is what makes the CDR more than a theory and what makes its application to CIRS and chronic mold illness scientifically credible at a level that the CIRS literature cannot yet achieve on its own.

5.15 Implications for Clinical Practice

This evidence review has direct implications for how clinicians, patients, and institutional stakeholders should approach CIRS and CDR-informed treatment:

1. CIRS is real and clinically important. The epidemiological evidence for water-damaged building-related illness is robust (98.2% of 114 independent studies). The transcriptomic findings are genuine and reproducible. The HLA-DR susceptibility model is mechanistically coherent. These are not artifacts of poor science.
2. The Shoemaker Protocol is the only published treatment with documented clinical efficacy for CIRS (Dooley et al. 2024). Its evidence base, while limited by tier and research group independence, is real. Two RCTs and a large-scale case series represent a credible evidence foundation for clinical application.
3. The CIRS protocol is not wrong — it is incomplete. Its mechanisms are real but partial. Its protocol addresses CDR1 reduction and attempts CDR3 initiation via VIP, but lacks explicit mechanisms for CDR2 mitochondrial restoration, ISRmt resolution, immune reconstitution, and personalized CDR3 signaling. These gaps are not theoretical — they explain the documented plateau-and-relapse patterns in complex CIRS patients.
4. The CDR framework provides the mechanistic architecture that explains why CIRS works when it works and fails when it fails. Its publication in PNAS, Mitochondrion, and top-tier journals by a UCSD professor with institutional credibility gives it a scientific standing that the CIRS literature has not yet achieved. Clinicians who integrate the CDR framework with the CIRS protocol are building on stronger mechanistic ground, not weaker.
5. Both bodies of evidence would benefit from more independent replication, larger controlled trials, and publication in higher-tier mainstream venues. This is the genuine limitation of both fields and the honest call to future research.

For Patients and Clinicians: The Bottom Line The evidence that mold illness is real is strong. The evidence that the Shoemaker Protocol helps is real but limited in rigor. The CDR framework provides the deeper mechanistic explanation for both. Neither field has achieved the level of evidence that would satisfy a systematic reviewer at NEJM or Lancet — but the CDR's publication venues, institutional affiliations, and independent corroboration place it on substantially stronger scientific ground than the CIRS protocol literature taken alone. A clinical approach that integrates both — using CIRS diagnostics within a CDR mechanistic framework — is the most evidence-coherent option currently available.

DIRECT MEASUREMENT

ISRmt, Extracellular Flux, and the Tolerance Frame

The CDR's claim to supersede CIRS is strongest where it can name the machinery and measure it directly, rather than infer it from downstream blood-expression shadows.

The mechanistic spine

Mitochondrial dysfunction is relayed to the cytosol through a defined axis: the stress-activated protease OMA1 cleaves DELE1, whose short form accumulates in the cytosol and activates the eIF2α kinase HRI (EIF2AK1), phosphorylating eIF2α and inducing the transcription factor ATF4 — the mitochondrial integrated stress response (ISRmt).[37,38] This is the experimentally established, CRISPR-mapped route by which a mitochondrion under load reprograms the cell toward defense — mechanistic content the CIRS model, built before this biology existed, structurally cannot contain. One honest qualification belongs in the text: ISRmt activation is context-dependent; in proliferating cells, complex-I inhibition can engage the response through asparagine depletion and GCN2, bypassing OMA1–DELE1–HRI.[39]

Mitokines as readouts — with conservative grading

ATF4 output drives the circulating mitokines GDF15 and FGF21, the practical serum readouts of ISRmt engagement. In primary mitochondrial disease both are validated (below). Two limits must be stated plainly: GDF15 is non-specific — it rises with renal impairment, cardiovascular disease, inflammation, pregnancy, aging, and metformin — while FGF21 is more specific but carries hepatic and fasting noise.[42,43] And the CDR/mold application is unproven: validation lives in inborn mitochondrial disease, so using these mitokines, and especially their trajectory, as ISRmt readouts in mold-related illness is a defensible extrapolation, not an evidence-backed claim. They should function as gated confirmatory markers, not the primary diagnostic gate. Where cost or access preclude them, lactate and the lactate:pyruvate ratio proxy the energetic *consequence* of ISRmt — a different link in the chain than the mitokine *signal*.

ON TRANSFERRING THE ACCURACY FIGURES

The published accuracy figures below are from PRIMARY mitochondrial disease cohorts. Transfer to the CDR/mold population is an extension carrying the same caveat as the framework itself: mechanistically sound, not independently validated.

Table — Mitokine diagnostic accuracy in primary mitochondrial disease.

Marker / test	Diagnostic signal (primary MD)	Key limitation
GDF15	Highest pooled accuracy; AUC ~0.89 in children	Non-specific: renal, cardiac, inflammation, pregnancy, metformin
FGF21	AUC 0.87; not raised in non-mito controls	Hepatic / fasting noise
Lactate : pyruvate	Energetic consequence proxy; AUC ~0.67	Lower accuracy; pre-analytic sensitivity
Seahorse SRC	Direct functional reserve; grounds A-vs-B fork	Research-grade; ME/CFS signature heterogeneous

Extracellular flux as the direct functional measure

The decisive methodological upgrade the CDR permits is measuring bioenergetic capacity directly. Extracellular flux analysis (Seahorse XF) resolves, in living cells, basal oxygen consumption, ATP-linked respiration, proton leak, maximal respiration under FCCP, and — most usefully — spare respiratory capacity (SRC), the margin between basal and maximal OCR that indexes how close a cell runs to its bioenergetic ceiling. This grounds the A-vs-B routing fork on a direct measurement rather than a mitokine level: preserved-but-throttled respiration with recoverable SRC is consistent with regulated ISRmt throttling (Phenotype A); collapsed OCR/ECAR with absent reserve is consistent with structural CDR2-mitochondrial depletion (Phenotype B). Honest grading belongs in the text: the ME/CFS flux literature is heterogeneous. Some cohorts show reduced maximal and reserve capacity in patient PBMCs — one reporting patients could raise respiration only ~47% above baseline under FCCP versus ~98% in controls;[47,49] others, in immortalized lymphocytes, report an isolated Complex V inefficiency with *elevated* SRC.[48] The defensible claim is therefore about modality, not result: extracellular flux is the superior instrument for the bioenergetic phenotype the CDR posits, while the disease-specific fingerprint in mold-related illness remains to be established — a first-order priority for the MYCO-ME line.

Loss of tolerance as the organizing physiology

Host defense has two axes: resistance (reducing load) and tolerance (limiting damage per unit load without necessarily clearing it).[46] CIRS is a resistance model throughout. The reality it cannot explain — the patient who has cleared the exposure yet remains ill — is, in tolerance terms, collapse of tolerance. Here the mitokine axis and the concept become one physiology: GDF15 is an inflammation-induced central mediator of tissue tolerance,[45] so the same molecule that reports ISRmt engagement is a principal effector of the tolerance program. Chronic ISRmt with sustained GDF15 output is a tolerance mechanism that has become the disease. This reframing replaces the inherited HLA construct with an acquired, measurable, reversible tolerance state, and recasts "CDR arrest" as failure to restore tolerance rather than failure to remove a trigger. *Terminology note:* "loss of tolerance" here denotes disease/tissue tolerance (Medzhitov–Soares), not immune self-tolerance.

Why transcriptomics cannot bear clinical weight

Whole-blood gene-expression panels, GENIE included, are not a sound basis for individual-level clinical decisions, for reasons intrinsic to the method. Whole blood and PBMC are cell mixtures: a shift in leukocyte proportions produces apparent differential expression with no change in per-cell transcription, and because illness itself changes the cell mix, the confounder is correlated with the outcome.[54] Globin-RNA contamination reduces sensitivity; batch effects are severe, and where batch is confounded with condition, computational correction cannot recover signal.[55] Fold-change calls depend on reference and normalization assumptions proprietary panels rarely disclose; and a panel derived and interpreted within one lineage, without independent external validation, cannot support individual diagnosis regardless of internal reproducibility. The contrast is the point: a transcriptome infers state from an expression shadow subject to all of the above; extracellular flux measures the state directly and serum mitokines report a defined signaling axis.

The central-dogma gap: why an expression panel is a confounded proxy

The appeal of genome-wide expression profiling is genuine and worth stating before the objection: a single assay returns a hypothesis-free census of which genes are being transcribed, from a small sample, at industrial scale, and a heat map of up- and down-regulated genes looks like a direct readout of what a cell — or a patient — is doing. In the biotoxin field, differential-expression panels are used in exactly this spirit, to name inflammatory, metabolic, and mitochondrial "programs," to sort patients, and to track response. The problem is not the reach; it is what happens when a transcriptome is asked to serve as a *functional* readout. A transcriptome is mechanically a list of mRNA copy numbers, and copy number is several regulated steps removed from function. Reading function off it quietly assumes three things: that the transcript predicts the protein, that the protein predicts the flux, and that the transcript moved because of the biology of interest rather than a confounder. Each assumption is weak alone; stacked, they are fragile. Across large paired human and model datasets, steady-state mRNA abundance explains only on the order of forty percent of the variance in protein abundance ($R^2 \approx 0.4$), and the link loosens further from protein to enzyme activity to pathway flux, which is governed by demand, substrate supply, and thermodynamics — membrane potential, the ADP/ATP ratio, oxygen — as much as by enzyme abundance.

Blood transcriptomics adds a second, structural layer of confounding that is not random noise to be averaged away. A whole-blood or PBMC transcriptome is a weighted average over a mixture of cell types whose proportions shift with health and state, so an apparent change in a gene may index a move in the neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio rather than any change within a cell; cell composition is repeatedly found to be the dominant source of variance in blood expression data. Layered onto that are globin-transcript contamination, batch effects confounded with case/control status, circadian time-of-draw (roughly forty-three percent of protein-coding genes are transcribed rhythmically somewhere in the body), ex-vivo induction of immediate-early genes during collection and handling, and the remodeling imposed by medications, diet, and age. Undisclosed normalization and reference-range assumptions compound the fragility, and multi-gene classifier panels tend to overfit their training cohort and replicate poorly. Any one of these can manufacture a convincing "signature" while every sampled cell's mitochondrial function is unchanged (see also the whole-blood transcriptomics caution in § the Direct Measurement section).

The decisive point for this framework is narrower and more specific: the ISR_{mt} is precisely the state where transcript and function *decouple by design*. The mitochondrial integrated stress response is fundamentally a translational reprogramming — phosphorylated eIF2α suppresses global cap-dependent translation while selectively permitting translation of stress transcription factors carrying upstream open reading frames (ATF4, ATF5, CHOP) and their circulating mitokine outputs. A transcriptome, which counts mRNA, cannot see a translational brake: transcripts may hold steady or rise while protein output, including of respiratory-chain subunits, falls. Worse, the ISR transcripts that do rise report alarm, not capacity — high ISR-target expression means the engine is under strain, not that it is doing more work. There is also a direction trap unique to energetics: an energy-starved cell often up-regulates OXPHOS and biogenesis transcripts precisely because function is failing. So in the exact state this paper targets, the transcript-to-function map is not merely loosely coupled but can invert — stress transcripts up, functional capacity down.

The Seahorse assay as a direct functional measure

Where the transcriptome infers a bioenergetic state from a shadow, extracellular-flux ("Seahorse") analysis measures it. The assay records, in real time and in living, intact cells, the oxygen-consumption rate (OCR) — a direct proxy for electron-transport-chain flux through oxidative phosphorylation — alongside the extracellular acidification / proton-efflux rate that largely reflects glycolysis. The Mito Stress Test then resolves respiration into interpretable components by sequential injection of chain modulators onto the same cells: oligomycin inhibits ATP synthase (Complex V), and the resulting fall in OCR equals ATP-linked respiration while the oligomycin-insensitive remainder is proton leak; FCCP, a protonophore, collapses the proton gradient and drives the chain to maximal respiration; and rotenone plus antimycin A shut down mitochondrial respiration to reveal residual non-mitochondrial oxygen consumption. From these maneuvers the assay yields basal respiration, ATP-linked respiration, proton leak, maximal respiration, spare (reserve) respiratory capacity, and non-mitochondrial respiration, with a companion XF ATP-rate protocol partitioning total ATP production into its mitochondrial and glycolytic contributions. Each parameter is a measured behavior of the chain, not an inference about it.

The reason this counts as direct is mechanistic. OCR is the integrated output of every upstream layer at once — transcription, translation, post-translational modification, complex assembly, substrate supply, membrane potential, and mtDNA integrity all express themselves in how much oxygen the chain actually consumes. If translation is throttled in the ISR_{mt}, if a Complex I subunit fails to assemble, if membrane potential is low, OCR registers it regardless of what the transcripts report. Spare respiratory capacity — maximal minus basal respiration — is the parameter that maps most directly onto this paper's governing construct: it is reserve made quantitative, and it exposes the basal-normal, reserve-depleted cell that looks unremarkable at rest yet has no headroom under load, a pattern invisible to resting biomarkers and transcript panels alike (grounding the A-versus-B phenotype fork developed earlier in § the Direct Measurement section). The honest framing is a division of labor rather than a winner: transcriptomics — especially single-cell and spatial variants that partly dissolve the composition confounder — maps the genome-wide terrain and generates hypotheses; extracellular flux measures whether mitochondrial function and reserve are actually impaired, and by how much. For staging bioenergetic state and quantifying reserve, the flux assay is the arbiter and the transcript panel is the map.

> **The relocation of evidentiary load.** This is the same move the paper makes throughout: the transcriptome lists the upstream pieces and infers state from a confounded average; the Seahorse assay measures the chain's actual behavior in living cells. For the question of mitochondrial capacity and reserve, the framework relocates the burden of proof from a proxy onto a directly measured mechanism — measure it, do not infer it.

The tolerance threshold: trigger load over tolerance reserve

The bioenergetic set-point does not sit in isolation; it is one term in the relation that governs whether the innate alarm stays lit. In the tolerance monograph, CDR1 activation is proposed to scale as trigger load divided by tolerance reserve. The numerator is the summed load of all triggers reaching the alarm at a given time —

and because the innate system has no private sensor for mold, or metal, or grief, but only pattern-recognition receptors reading pathogen- and damage-associated molecular patterns, heterogeneous insults are partially interchangeable as drivers. The denominator is the host's capacity to keep those signals out, to tolerate the ones that get in, and to resolve the response they provoke. Illness emerges when the numerator exceeds the denominator, which can happen because load is high, because reserve is low, or — most often — because both drift in the wrong direction together. This dissolves the need for a mysterious "susceptibility": susceptibility simply is a low tolerance reserve, decomposable into parts that can be named, measured, and rebuilt.

Tolerance decomposes into three measurable capacities. The first is the barrier — the layered epithelial surfaces of gut, airway, and skin (tight junctions, the mucus and antimicrobial-peptide and secretory-IgA layer, tolerogenic antigen-presenting cells) that keep the signal on the outside; when the seal loosens, luminal LPS and antigens translocate and a local nuisance becomes a systemic danger signal. The second is the regulatory and resolution apparatus that actively stands the alarm down — $Foxp3^{+}$ regulatory T cells, IL-10 and TGF-β, the specialized pro-resolving mediators (resolvins, protectins, maresins, lipoxins) derived from omega-3 and omega-6 fatty acids, and the vagal cholinergic anti-inflammatory pathway. The third is the innate set-point — the myeloid threshold for firing, established by trained-immunity reprogramming that is substantially metabolic and mitochondrial, since the glycolytic shift and TCA-intermediate accumulation underlying training are mitochondrial events. This third capacity is where the tolerance model meets CDR and the ISR_{mt} directly: a cell in a danger-metabolism is, by definition, a cell with a lowered alarm threshold, which is why GDF15, FGF21, and lactate appear as candidate readouts of the set-point.

One organizing correction reframes the therapeutic target. Living spaces and bodies are never sterile, so the pathologic variable is never the presence of organisms but overgrowth, loss of diversity, and loss of the keystone species that hold a community in balance. Eradication is therefore a category error as an endpoint; the load can be lowered but never zeroed, and the only stable target is the response threshold, not sterilization. Restoration follows from the ratio as two levers — lower the numerator enough to fall below the patient's current threshold, and raise the denominator by rebuilding the three capacities in sequence (seal the barrier first, then rebuild regulation and resolution, then, cautiously and last, address the slow-moving innate set-point). The set-point rebuilding — membrane and cardiolipin repair, mitochondrial support, and pointed avoidance of innate-training agents such as β-glucan in a hyper-reactive host — is where this frame rejoins the directly measured bioenergetics above: spare respiratory capacity is a functional readout of the same mitochondrial set-point the tolerance model treats as the innate alarm threshold. Consistent with the paper's discipline, the tolerance construct is offered as one trigger theory among several converging on CDR1, and the extrapolation from primary mitochondrial disease to mold-related illness remains mechanistically reasoned rather than independently validated; no single marker reports tolerance, and the evidentiary unit is convergence across markers moving together, and ahead of symptoms, under intervention.

Move clinical weight off inference and onto measurement.

SECTION 6

CDR Phase 3 as the Precision Medicine Frontier

If CDR1 represents the field of battle and CDR2 represents the repair of damage, CDR3 represents the restoration of peace. It is the phase in which the organism transitions from a defense-organized metabolic and immune state to a health-organized one — from threat physiology to thriving physiology. In the CIRS model, this transition is primarily managed by VIP. In the CDR framework, it is a multi-channel, context-dependent, individualized process.

The case for precision medicine in CDR3 is grounded in four converging realities:

- Different CDR1 drivers leave different molecular residues requiring different resolution signals.
- Individual variation in resolution biology (SPM synthesis, purinergic receptor sensitivity, mitochondrial reserve capacity, epigenetic load) means that the same intervention produces different outcomes across patients.
- The therapeutic tools available to augment CDR3 have expanded dramatically and include classes of molecules (peptides, exosomes, MSC secretomes, high-extract botanicals) that were unavailable when CIRS was developed.
- Measurement technology — including metabolomics, mitochondrial function testing, purinergic pathway biomarkers, and epigenomic profiling — now allows individualized CDR3 assessment that was impossible 20 years ago.

6.1 Bioactive Peptides as CDR3 Modulators

Peptide therapeutics represent one of the most promising and mechanistically coherent additions to the CDR3 toolkit. Several peptides have demonstrated capacity to directly modulate pathways relevant to CDR3 completion:

BPC-157 (Body Protection Compound 157)

BPC-157 is a synthetic pentadecapeptide derived from a protein found in gastric juice. Its effects on multiple organ systems have been extensively documented in animal models and are increasingly supported by clinical observations. From a CDR3 perspective, BPC-157 is notable for:

- Upregulation of the nitric oxide system — critical for vascular healing and mitochondrial biogenesis signaling during CDR3.
- Activation of FAK-paxillin pathway promoting tissue regeneration and resolution of fibrotic scarring accumulated during CDR2.
- Anti-inflammatory effects mediated through modulation of the eicosanoid pathway, specifically promoting resolution-phase lipid mediator balance.

- Documented gut mucosal repair — particularly relevant in CIRS patients with documented leaky gut perpetuating ongoing LPS-mediated CDR1 activation.
- Neurological protection and repair, including upregulation of growth hormone receptor expression — relevant to the HPA axis dysregulation documented in CIRS.

Thymosin Beta-4 (TB-500) and its Fragment

Thymosin beta-4 is an endogenous 43-amino acid peptide with critical roles in cytoskeletal organization, tissue repair, and immune modulation. Its synthetic variant TB-500 and the active fragment Ac-SDKP have demonstrated:

- Promotion of M2 macrophage polarization — the CDR3-associated phenotype that clears damage signals and supports tissue resolution.
- Inhibition of NF-kB signaling, reducing the maintained inflammatory transcription that perpetuates CDR1 in chronic illness.
- Cardiac and neurological tissue regeneration, with documented effects on angiogenesis and axonal regrowth.
- Mitochondrial protection through antioxidant pathway upregulation and reduction of mitochondrial membrane potential dysregulation.

KPV (Lys-Pro-Val) and Other Melanocortin Fragments

KPV is a tripeptide derived from the C-terminal sequence of alpha-MSH (melanocyte-stimulating hormone), which is notably suppressed in CIRS patients (as MSH). KPV and related melanocortin fragments have demonstrated potent anti-inflammatory effects through MC1R activation, NLRP3 inflammasome suppression, and promotion of regulatory T cell function. In CDR terms, these peptides directly address the neuropeptide signaling deficit that the CIRS model attempts to correct with exogenous VIP — but with potentially greater selectivity and with MC1R-specific resolution pathway activation that VIP does not engage.

Selank and Semax

These Russian-developed neuropeptides modulate brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF), nerve growth factor (NGF), and the GABA-benzodiazepine system. In CDR3, neurological resolution requires not just peripheral immune normalization but central nervous system signal restoration. The cognitive dysfunction, anxiety, and sleep dysregulation of CIRS represent CDR1 effects on CNS function — and require dedicated CNS-targeted resolution signals. Selank and Semax represent this class of CDR3 neurological resolution tools.

6.2 Exosomes and Extracellular Vesicles

Exosomes are 30–150 nm extracellular vesicles secreted by virtually all cell types that carry cargo including microRNAs, proteins, lipids, and mitochondrial components between cells. They have emerged as a fundamental communication medium for coordinating tissue-wide responses to injury, infection, and resolution — making them inherently relevant to the CDR framework.

Mesenchymal stem cell (MSC)-derived exosomes, in particular, have demonstrated remarkable capacity to:

- Transfer functional mitochondria or mitochondrial components to cells with damaged mitochondria — directly addressing the mitochondrial dysfunction at the core of CDR1 persistence.
- Deliver resolution-phase microRNAs (particularly the miR-146a and miR-21 families) that suppress NF-kB signaling and promote M2 macrophage polarization.
- Modulate the NLRP3 inflammasome through cargo-mediated suppression of ASC speck assembly.
- Restore SPM synthesis capacity by delivering lipid metabolism enzymes (particularly 15-lipoxygenase) to cells whose resolution biology has been compromised by chronic CDR1 activation.

Clinically, MSC-derived exosome preparations are being investigated and in some cases deployed for conditions with CDR-equivalent pathology including long COVID, ME/CFS, post-Lyme syndrome, and treatment-resistant PTSD. The precision medicine application is to characterize a patient's specific mitochondrial and resolution-biology deficits and match the exosome preparation (donor source, preparation method, cargo characterization) to those deficits.

6.3 Mesenchymal Stem Cell-Derived Secretomes

Beyond isolated exosomes, the full secretome of MSCs — including cytokines, growth factors, extracellular matrix proteins, and metabolic intermediates — represents a complex CDR3 resolution signal cocktail. MSCs are constitutively programmed to support tissue homeostasis and to actively suppress inappropriate immune activation. Their secretome includes:

- IDO (indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase): a key regulatory enzyme suppressing effector T cell activation and promoting tolerance.
- PGE2 (prostaglandin E2) and HGF (hepatocyte growth factor): promoting regulatory T cell induction and suppressing effector immune responses.
- VEGF and FGF: signaling tissue repair and vascularization relevant to CDR2/CDR3 transition.
- Stanniocalcin-1 and TSG-6: potent suppressors of the complement cascade and neutrophil activation that are chronically elevated in CIRS.

The therapeutic deployment of MSC secretomes — whether through direct MSC transplantation, conditioned media, or isolated secretome fractions — represents a CDR3-targeted intervention that addresses multiple resolution channels simultaneously while having a tolerability profile compatible with chronic illness patients.

6.4 High-Extract Botanicals as CDR3 Facilitators

A growing body of research supports the use of standardized high-extract botanical preparations to modulate specific CDR-relevant pathways. Unlike conventional pharmaceutical interventions that typically target single receptors or enzymes, botanical extracts contain complex mixtures of bioactive compounds that, when properly standardized, act as multi-target modulators of CDR-relevant networks — arguably more consistent with the multi-channel nature of CDR3 resolution than single-molecule drugs.

Palmitoylethanolamide (PEA) and Luteolin

PEA is an endogenous fatty acid amide that activates PPAR-alpha nuclear receptors, suppressing NF-kB signaling and mast cell activation. In combination with luteolin (a flavonoid with NLRP3 inhibitory activity), PEA-luteolin formulations have demonstrated efficacy in neuroinflammation, neuropathic pain, and immune dysregulation conditions overlapping with CDR1 phenotypes. These compounds represent CDR1 attenuation tools that prepare the terrain for CDR3 signaling.

Ashwagandha (KSM-66 and Sensoril extracts)

High-extract ashwagandha standardized for withanolide content has documented effects on the HPA axis, cortisol regulation, mitochondrial function (through coenzyme Q10 pathway activation and Complex I activity), and BDNF expression. In CDR terms, ashwagandha targets the neuroendocrine-mitochondrial interface that is disrupted by chronic CDR1 activation and that must be restored during CDR3.

Andrographis and NF-kB Pathway Botanicals

Andrographolide, the primary bioactive of Andrographis paniculata, is a potent NF-kB inhibitor and has demonstrated specific activity against the purinergic-mediated inflammatory pathways that Naviaux identified as central to CDR maintenance. High-extract standardized andrographis preparations represent a direct botanical intervention in the CDR1 perpetuation loop.

Reishi and Other Immunomodulatory Fungi

High-extract triterpene-standardized Ganoderma lucidum (Reishi) preparations have documented effects on dendritic cell function, regulatory T cell induction, TLR pathway modulation, and mitochondrial function. The immunomodulatory effects of properly standardized Reishi are mechanistically coherent with CDR3 resolution — they do not suppress immunity globally (a concern with many pharmaceutical anti-inflammatories) but specifically promote the shift from CDR1 threat-response to CDR3 homeostatic immune function.

SECTION 7

The Five-Phase Clinical Model: A Treatment Progression Framework

Translating the CDR framework into clinical practice requires more than a set of therapeutic tools — it requires a structured, sequenced model that tracks the patient through the full arc of CDR-informed recovery. A three-phase cellular biology does not map neatly onto a three-step clinical protocol. The biological phases of the CDR describe what the cell is doing; the clinical phases must describe what the clinician is doing, and in what order, and on the basis of what evidence.

We propose a Five-Phase Clinical Model that maps the biological CDR arc onto a clinical progression with defined entry criteria, specific therapeutic objectives, measurable exit criteria, and — critically — a phenotype-gated transition between Phase 4 and Phase 5 that ensures every patient receives the resolution signals specific to their biology, not a generic protocol applied uniformly.

This model supersedes the CIRS sequential protocol not by discarding it but by embedding it within a broader framework. The CIRS steps are primarily operative within Phase 2 and the early transition to Phase 3. What the CIRS model lacks — a structured Phase 1 mapping process, a mitochondrial and resolution-biology Phase 3 bridge, and the phenotype-gated precision of Phases 4 and 5 — is what this model provides.

The Five-Phase Model at a Glance

Phase 1: Total Load Mapping | Phase 2: CDR1 Reduction (Threat Elimination) | Phase 3: CDR2 Support (Mitochondrial & Structural Repair) | Phase 4: CDR3 Preparation (Resolution Terrain) | Phase 5: Phenotype-Guided "All Safe" Signaling (Individualized Recovery)

7.1 Phase 1 — Total Load Mapping

The first clinical phase is entirely diagnostic and represents the most significant expansion beyond the CIRS model. Its purpose is to characterize the full CDR1 driver landscape — not to begin treatment. Premature intervention without complete load mapping is one of the primary reasons CIRS patients plateau: binders are started before infectious co-drivers are identified, or VIP is introduced while mitochondrial dysfunction or heavy metal burden is maintaining CDR1 activation.

Phase 1 maps across seven domains:

- Environmental toxin burden: mycotoxin exposure, heavy metal testing (provoked urine, RBC metals), persistent organic pollutants, volatile organic compounds
- Infectious burden: Lyme disease and co-infections (Bartonella, Babesia, Ehrlichia), EBV/CMV/HHV-6 reactivation panels, occult dental/sinus infection imaging, comprehensive gut pathogen panel, SIBO breath testing
- Mitochondrial function: GDF15/FGF21, organic acids panel (Krebs cycle intermediates, Complex I/II/III/IV markers), CoQ10 and carnitine status, mtDNA copy number, lactate/pyruvate ratio
- Purinergic pathway status: extracellular ATP (emerging clinical assay), CD39/CD73 ectonucleotidase activity, adenosine receptor sensitivity markers
- Resolution biology capacity: omega-3 fatty acid index, SPM precursor availability (EPA/DHA status), 15-LOX-1 expression, LTB4/LXA4 ratio, T Helper/Suppressor/NK Cell ratios
- Epigenetic and allostatic load: ACE score, cortisol awakening response and diurnal rhythm, HRV assessment, autonomic nervous system tone, telomere length
- Structural barriers to resolution: MCAS screening (tryptase, histamine, prostaglandin D2), EDS/hypermobility assessment, craniocervical instability screening, POTS/dysautonomia workup, CCSVI screening where indicated

Phase 1 does not end until all seven domains have been adequately characterized. The output of Phase 1 is not a diagnosis — it is a threat map that becomes the blueprint for Phases 2 through 5. No two maps are identical, and therefore no two subsequent protocols will be identical.

Exit criterion for Phase 1: Complete characterization across all seven domains with a ranked threat burden profile and baseline biomarker panel (CIRS panel plus mitochondrial markers, purinergic markers, and resolution biology indices).

7.2 Phase 2 — CDR1 Reduction (Threat Elimination)

Phase 2 is the most clinically complex phase because it must address multiple CDR1 drivers simultaneously or in a biologically rational sequence without triggering overwhelming detoxification reactions or immune provocation. The CIRS protocol — binders, MARCoNS eradication, and HLA-DR-informed immune support — is deployed within Phase 2, but expanded to encompass the full threat map from Phase 1.

Sequencing is guided by two principles: biological priority (address the highest-burden and most biologically upstream threats first) and patient tolerability (avoid mobilizing secondary toxin burdens before primary clearance pathways are optimized).

- Step 2a — Biotoxin and mycotoxin burden: CIRS binder protocol, environmental remediation confirmation, continued avoidance
- Step 2b — MARCoNS and sinus microbiome: eradication protocol per Shoemaker; consideration of bacteriophage therapy and sinus microbiome restoration in refractory cases.
- Step 2c — Infectious co-drivers: pathogen-specific antimicrobial/antiviral protocols; Lyme and co-infection treatment where indicated; antiviral therapy for EBV/HHV-6 reactivation; dental/sinus focal infection remediation; candida
- Step 2d — Gut CDR1 drivers: leaky gut repair protocol (L-glutamine, zinc carnosine, colostrum, IgG secretory immunoglobulin); targeted dysbiosis treatment; SIBO eradication; microbiome restoration
- Step 2e — Heavy metal and toxicant elimination: DMSA/DMPS chelation (after Phase 2a completion to avoid remobilization into an inflamed gut); glutathione support; Phase I/II hepatic optimization (DIM, sulforaphane, milk thistle)
- Step 2f — Mitochondrial CDR1 support: CoQ10 (ubiquinol form, 400–600mg), NAD+ precursors (NMN or NR), PQQ, alpha-lipoic acid, mitochondria-targeted antioxidants (MitoQ or SkQ1); this step reduces the mitochondrial danger signaling that perpetuates CDR1 independent of external threats
- Step 2g — Purinergic modulation: low-dose naltrexone (LDN) initiated at 0.5–1.5mg, titrated to 4.5mg — the most accessible clinical tool for modulating the purinergic CDR1 perpetuation loop; consideration of low-dose P2X7 antagonists in refractory cases

Exit criterion for Phase 2: Demonstrable reduction in primary CDR1 biomarkers (C4a trending down, CRP normalization, improved VCS, MARCoNS clearance confirmed, HLA-DR-matched markers improving). Importantly, Phase 2 exit does not require biomarker normalization — it requires evidence of directional progress across the full threat map and absence of active ongoing major exposures.

7.3 Phase 3 — CDR2 Support (Mitochondrial and Structural Repair)

Naviaux's CDR2 is the repair and regeneration phase that follows CDR1 attenuation. Clinically, many CIRS patients enter what feels like a partial recovery — some symptoms improve after Phase 2 interventions, but they remain below baseline function, reporting persistent fatigue, reduced exercise tolerance, cognitive difficulty, and physical deconditioning. This is the CDR2 clinical landscape: the fires are mostly out, but the damage from the fire has not yet been repaired.

Phase 3 clinical work targets the mitochondrial and structural residues of CDR1 activation:

- Mitochondrial biogenesis: urolithin A (mitophagy activation and mitochondrial renewal), PQQ (peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma co-activator 1-alpha induction), high-intensity interval training adapted to tolerance (the most potent mitochondrial biogenesis stimulus available)
- Membrane restoration: plasmalogen precursors (scallop-derived plasmalogens, Prodrome Neuro), phosphatidylcholine (liposomal or IV), omega-3 repletion to therapeutic index
- Tissue architecture repair: peptide support initiated in Phase 3 for structural targets — BPC-157 for gut mucosa, vascular endothelium, and connective tissue; TB-500 for musculoskeletal repair and fibrosis resolution; GHK-Cu for collagen matrix remodeling
- Neuroendocrine repair: HPA axis rehabilitation through adaptogen support (KSM-66 ashwagandha), cortisol rhythm restoration, thyroid optimization, growth hormone axis assessment and support where indicated
- Autonomic nervous system rehabilitation: structured heart rate variability training, vagal tone exercises (diaphragmatic breathing, cold thermogenesis at tolerated thresholds), progressive physical reconditioning
- Cognitive architecture: BDNF pathway support (low-dose lithium 5–10mg, lion's mane standardized extract, aerobic exercise), neuroplasticity-supporting peptides (Semax for NGF/BDNF induction)

Exit criterion for Phase 3: Objective evidence of mitochondrial function improvement (organic acids normalization, improved exercise tolerance, lactate/pyruvate ratio normalization), structural repair markers (reduced MMP-9, improving VEGF, normalized TGF-beta-1 trajectory), and patient-reported functional improvement on validated instruments. The patient should demonstrate tolerance for moderate physical exertion without significant post-exertional malaise — a key marker that CDR2 repair has progressed sufficiently to support CDR3 initiation.

7.4 Phase 4 — CDR3 Preparation (Resolution Terrain)

Phase 4 is the bridge between repair and resolution. It is not yet the "all safe" signaling phase — that is Phase 5. Phase 4 prepares the biological terrain that must be in place before CDR3 resolution signals can be effectively received and transduced. A cell that is deficient in resolution mediator precursors, that has a depleted SPM synthesis capacity, or whose purinergic receptor landscape is still calibrated to a CDR1 threat state, cannot respond adequately to resolution signals even when those signals are provided.

Phase 4 is the phase most frequently skipped in CIRS treatment — and this is the most common explanation for VIP failure. VIP is a Phase 5 resolution signal. When it is introduced into Phase 3 or early Phase 4 terrain, the

biology cannot respond: the precursors are absent, the receptor sensitivity is wrong, and the downstream transduction machinery is not primed.

- SPM synthesis preparation: therapeutic omega-3 loading (EPA/DHA at 4–6g/day for 8–12 weeks), vitamin D3/K2 optimization (vitamin D is a direct SPM synthesis cofactor), zinc and magnesium repletion
- Purinergic receptor recalibration: continuation and optimization of LDN; assessment of adenosine receptor sensitivity; consideration of low-dose theophylline or caffeine cycling to modulate A2A receptor tone in patients with documented adenosine pathway dysfunction
- Immune phenotype preparation: promotion of regulatory T cell expansion (low-dose IL-2 protocols where available; curcumin phytosome; resveratrol at anti-inflammatory dosing); M2 macrophage preparation through PEA-luteolin and high-extract Reishi
- Neuropeptide axis priming: MSH precursor support (adequate protein intake, tyrosine, melanocortin pathway co-factors); assessment of VIP axis status; pituitary function evaluation
- Extracellular matrix preparation: resolution of residual fibrosis with serrapeptase or nattokinase; assessment of hyaluronan matrix quality; collagen cross-link optimization
- Circadian and allostatic recalibration: sleep architecture restoration (melatonin, chronotherapy); HPA axis rhythm normalization confirmed by 4-point salivary cortisol; autonomic balance confirmed by HRV metrics

Exit criterion for Phase 4: This is the critical gate, and it has two components. First, objective biological readiness: SPM precursor sufficiency (omega-3 index >8%), adequate regulatory T cell capacity (clinical assessment plus TGF-beta-1 normalization), purinergic pathway stability (LDN response, HRV improvement), and neuropeptide axis priming (MSH trajectory, VIP baseline). Second, phenotype characterization: before exiting Phase 4 and entering Phase 5, each patient must be assigned to their resolution phenotype. This characterization determines the specific "all safe" signal cocktail that Phase 5 will deploy. Phase 4 exit without phenotype assignment is not permitted — it is the defining gate of the precision medicine model.

7.5 The Phase 4→5 Gate: Four-Phenotype Resolution Profiling

The transition from Phase 4 to Phase 5 is the defining innovation of the CDR clinical model. CIRS administers a single terminal signal — VIP — to every patient who completes its protocol. The CDR framework, grounded in ISRmt biology and CDR phase mechanics, recognizes that patients arrive at Phase 4 in four biologically distinct states, each defined by a different rate-limiting bottleneck for CDR3 completion. Sending the same resolution signal into all four states is mechanistically incoherent and explains the plateau-and-relapse pattern seen at the upper boundary of CIRS outcomes.

The four phenotypes — CDR1-Dominant (A), CDR2-Mitochondrial (B), CDR2-Immune (C), and CDR3-Blocked (D) — are not severity grades. They are mechanistic descriptions of where in the CDR cycle the patient is arrested and what biological bottleneck is rate-limiting. Each requires fundamentally different intervention priorities, and phenotype assignment must be completed before Phase 5 begins.

Phenotype	CDR Phase / Bottleneck	Defining Biomarkers	Typical Duration	VIP Indicated?
A — CDR1-Dominant	CDR1 active. Persistent danger signaling via purinergic/TLR pathways. ISRmt not yet dominant.	MMP-9 elevated (>332 ng/mL); GDF15 normal; VIP low-normal; HRV acutely reduced; location-dependent symptoms	Weeks–18 months	Not indicated
A2 — Neuroimmune / Limbic	CDR1 encoded limbically. Mast cell hyperactivation, MCS, neuroinflammation persist after trigger removal.	TGF-β1 elevated; mast cell mediators elevated; MMP-9 may be normalizing; GDF15 normal	6–24 months	Not indicated
B — CDR2-Mitochondrial	CDR2 arrest. ISRmt dominant. ETC impairment, aerobic glycolysis shift. Immune and neuroendocrine intact.	GDF15 markedly elevated (>1,800 pg/mL); FGF21 elevated; MMP-9 normal; CD3/CD4/NK normal; VIP low-normal; HRV reduced (metabolic)	1–5 years	Not indicated
C — CDR2-Immune	CDR2 + immune exhaustion. ISRmt active AND T-cell/NK depletion from viral reactivation co-primary.	GDF15 markedly elevated; CD3/CD4/NK all depleted; EBV/HHV-6 reactivation; IDO pathway activation; VIP low; HRV compound reduction	2–7 years	Conditional only (when GDF15 trending down)
D — CDR3-Blocked	CDR3 entry blocked by neuroendocrine depletion. ISRmt resolved. VIP/α-MSH critically depleted. HRV collapsed.	GDF15 stable/normalizing; VIP critically low (<20 pg/mL); α-MSH <35 pg/mL; HRV RMSSD <20–30ms; emotional blunting prominent	4–10+ years	Indicated when triple gate met

The four phenotypes are not static disease categories — they are dynamic biological states that evolve across the treatment arc. Re-phenotyping at 12-week intervals is essential: a Phenotype B patient whose GDF15 normalizes but who fails to enter CDR3 should be re-assessed for Phenotype D emergence (VIP/α-MSH/HRV). A Phenotype C patient whose immune counts recover but who retains critically depleted VIP has transitioned to D. The clinical framework must accommodate this dynamism — applying the wrong phenotype protocol to a transitioning patient is one of the most common reasons for plateau.

The Phase 4→5 Gate: Three Conditions

Phenotype D — the state in which VIP is therapeutically indicated — requires all three gates simultaneously: (1) serum VIP below reference range, (2) α-MSH below 35 pg/mL, and (3) HRV RMSSD below 20–30ms. GDF15 must be stable or normalizing (confirming ISRmt resolution). Any patient receiving VIP without this triple gate having been assessed and met is receiving a Phase 5 intervention in Phase 3 or Phase 4 terrain — which explains the partial responses and poor tolerability commonly reported.

7.6 Phase 5 — Phenotype-Guided Resolution

Phase 5 deploys the resolution intervention matched to the patient's confirmed phenotype. Its objective is not symptom management but completion of the CDR cycle — restoring the organism to a biology that can mount a CDR response, repair through CDR2, and resolve through CDR3 autonomously when future threats arise. Each phenotype requires a fundamentally different therapeutic priority:

- Phenotype A: Remove the CDR1 driver completely. The nervous system and immune system cannot transition to CDR2 while the threat input is active. Phase 5 for Phenotype A is primarily environmental and exposure-based — CIRS protocol binders, antifungals, MARCoNS eradication, and ERMI/HERTSMI-2 remediation confirmation. In A2, mast cell stabilization and limbic system retraining are added. VIP is not indicated and may worsen CDR1 reactivity.
- Phenotype B: Resolve ISRmt. The bioenergetic arrest must be lifted before any resolution signal can be received or acted upon. Phase 5 for Phenotype B targets mitochondrial restoration — mitophagy activation, ETC substrate repletion, biogenesis induction, and VEGF-supported capillary restoration. VIP is not indicated until GDF15 normalizes.
- Phenotype C: Address ISRmt and immune reconstitution simultaneously. Neither can succeed without the other — viral reactivation perpetuates ISRmt while ISRmt suppresses antiviral immunity. Phase 5 for Phenotype C requires antiviral support for herpesvirus reactivation alongside mitochondrial restoration, PLP repletion (depleted by herpesviruses), and IDO pathway modulation to address the neuropsychiatric dimension. VIP may be conditionally introduced when GDF15 begins trending down and immune markers begin recovering.
- Phenotype D: Restore the neuroendocrine safety signal network. GDF15 stability means the metabolic capacity for CDR3 exists — what is missing is the biological permission signal. Phase 5 for Phenotype D targets VIP axis restoration, α-MSH/melanocortin pathway support, and autonomic delivery infrastructure (HRV restoration). VIP is indicated in Phenotype D when all three gate criteria are met and is the primary Phase 5 intervention for this phenotype — which is precisely the population for which Shoemaker's VIP protocol was most effective. The clinical failures of uniform VIP application are explained by its administration to Phenotype A, B, or C patients who do not meet the Phenotype D gate.

Phase 5 is monitoring-guided, not time-limited. Serial GDF15, VIP, α-MSH, HRV, MMP-9, and functional assessment track biological movement toward CDR3 completion. The goal state is autonomous CDR cycle function — not ongoing therapeutic dependency. Permanent maintenance therapy for CDR3 completion represents incomplete Phase 5, not successful outcome.

7.7 Monitoring Treatment Progression Across All Five Phases

Each phase transition is evidence-gated. The CDR/ISRmt biomarker panel provides the objective backbone for phase transitions and phenotype re-assessment:

- GDF15 (Growth Differentiation Factor 15): primary ISRmt severity marker; markedly elevated (>1,800 pg/mL) confirms CDR2-dominant phenotype (B or C); normalization is the primary exit criterion for Phases 2 and 3 in these phenotypes; must be stable before Phase 5 begins

- FGF21 (Fibroblast Growth Factor 21): independent ISRmt confirmation via fatty acid oxidation stress axis; tracked in parallel with GDF15 to confirm ISRmt resolution
- MMP-9: CDR1 activity marker; normalization (<332 ng/mL) confirms CDR1 resolution and Phenotype A exit; persistently elevated MMP-9 in any phenotype signals unresolved CDR1 driver
- TGF-β1: CDR3 blockade marker; elevated post-Phase 2 in Phenotype C and D; normalization tracked as a CDR3 terrain readiness signal
- CD3, CD4, NK cell counts: immune reconstitution markers; depletion defines Phenotype C; recovery trajectory guides Phase 5 pacing in C
- Serum VIP and α-MSH: neuroendocrine gate markers for Phenotype D; triple gate (VIP + α-MSH + HRV) must be assessed before Phase 5 VIP introduction
- HRV (RMSSD): autonomic CDR3 delivery capacity; collapsed HRV (<20–30ms) in Phenotype D distinguishes structural autonomic insufficiency from metabolic HRV suppression in B and C; tracked monthly from Phase 3
- VEGF: vascular perfusion marker; low VEGF in Phenotype B/C impairs mitochondrial substrate delivery; restoration tracked through Phase 3 and 4
- CIRS core panel (C4a, ACTH/cortisol, MSH): supplementary markers particularly relevant for Phenotype A monitoring and for neuroendocrine terrain assessment in Phase 4
- Cognitive and functional: objective neuropsychological testing (CNS Vital Signs or equivalent) at Phase 1 baseline, Phase 3 exit, Phase 5 entry, and Phase 5 completion; SF-36 and PROMIS Global Health at each phase transition

The monitoring framework serves two purposes: confirming readiness for phase transitions and providing diagnostic signal when a patient's trajectory diverges from expectation. A Phenotype B patient not showing GDF15 improvement at 8 weeks requires re-evaluation for an unaddressed CDR1 driver or a missed immune component. A Phenotype D patient whose HRV does not respond to treatment should prompt reassessment of whether GDF15 is rising — signaling CDR2 re-emergence that would change the phenotype designation.

7.8 THE FOUR PHENOTYPES: MECHANISTIC SCIENCE, DIAGNOSTICS, AND THERAPEUTIC RATIONALE

7.8 The Four Phenotypes: Mechanistic Science, Diagnostics, and Therapeutic Rationale

The four phenotypes are grounded in distinct cellular and molecular mechanisms that determine both their clinical presentation and the appropriate therapeutic response. What follows is the mechanistic science underpinning each phenotype, the laboratory diagnostic profile that confirms phenotype assignment, and the class-level therapeutic rationale for addressing the identified bottleneck. Specific agent selection within each class is individualized based on patient phenotype depth, comorbidities, and clinical availability.

Phenotype A — CDR1-Dominant

Core mechanism: Persistent purinergic danger signaling maintains CDR1 in the active state. Extracellular ATP — released through pannexin-1 hemichannels from cells under biotoxin or pathogen stress — acts on P2X7 and P2X4 receptors on macrophages, mast cells, and epithelial cells to maintain NLRP3 inflammasome activation, MMP-9 secretion, and the innate inflammatory cascade. The mitochondrial compartment is stressed but ISRmt is not yet established as the dominant biology. Location-dependent symptoms are the clinical signature: the CDR1 state requires ongoing antigen stimulation to persist, so removal from the exposure environment produces partial improvement.

The A2 Sub-Pattern

In Phenotype A2, the CDR1 alarm has become limbically encoded. The nervous system itself has become a CDR1 perpetuating input — mast cells are constitutively primed, multiple chemical sensitivities emerge, and the limbic system interprets an expanding range of stimuli as threats. This encoding occurs through TLR4-mediated microglial activation, amygdala sensitization, and mast cell-nerve fiber crosstalk that creates a positive feedback loop between perceived threat and biological CDR1 maintenance. TGF-β1 elevation in A2 reflects emerging T-reg dysregulation and a fibrotic trajectory that, if untreated, predicts transition toward longer-illness phenotypes.

Diagnostic Laboratory Profile

- MMP-9 (plasma): elevated >332 ng/mL — the most reliable CDR1 activity marker; reflects neutrophil, macrophage, and mast cell CDR1 effector activity; should be tracked serially as primary Phase 2 exit marker
- GDF15: normal or minimally elevated (<1,200 pg/mL) — critical distinguishing feature from Phenotype B/C; confirms ISRmt has not established
- VCS (Visual Contrast Sensitivity): impaired — reflects biotoxin neurotoxic effect on retinal processing; location-correlated changes are particularly diagnostic of ongoing exposure
- HLA-DR haplotyping: multi-susceptibility haplotypes (DR4, DR11, DR12, DR13, DR14, DR15) document inability to clear biotoxin antigens and predict CDR1 persistence risk
- TGF-β1: normal in A1; elevated in A2 — elevation flags the neuroimmune sub-pattern and predicts longer treatment course
- Mast cell panel (A2): serum tryptase, 24-hour urine prostaglandin D2, histamine/DAO ratio — confirms mast cell CDR1 perpetuation in A2
- ERMI/HERTSMI-2 environmental score: quantifies ongoing biotoxin exposure; essential for confirming that the CDR1 driver has been adequately removed before Phase 5

Therapeutic Stack Rationale

The therapeutic priority for Phenotype A is elimination of the CDR1 trigger input. No resolution signal can work while the danger pathway is being actively maintained by ongoing antigen stimulation.

- Environmental remediation and avoidance: the non-negotiable first intervention; confirmed by post-remediation ERMI/HERTSMI-2 testing; the most common reason Phenotype A does not transition is incomplete exposure removal
- CDR1 signal attenuation: binders (cholestyramine, activated charcoal, modified citrus pectin) reduce ongoing biotoxin recirculation; antifungals address persistent fungal CDR1 drivers; MARCoNS eradication eliminates the nasal biofilm that perpetuates MSH suppression and CDR1 immune activation
- Purinergic modulation: the therapeutic class that addresses the molecular mechanism sustaining CDR1 — low-dose naltrexone and emerging P2X7 pathway modulators reduce extracellular ATP-driven NLRP3 activation and represent the most mechanistically direct CDR1 off-switch available
- A2 mast cell stabilization: the therapeutic class that interrupts the limbic-mast cell-CDR1 perpetuation loop; must precede any systemic resolution intervention in A2 patients to avoid paradoxical CDR1 amplification from treatment-triggered mast cell responses

Phenotype B — CDR2-Mitochondrial

Core mechanism: The transition from CDR1 to CDR2 has occurred but CDR2 has not resolved. Activating transcription factor 4 (ATF4) drives sustained ISRmt, producing GDF15 and FGF21 as the primary circulating mitokines. The electron transport chain is functionally impaired at Complexes I and III, shifting cellular metabolism from oxidative phosphorylation to aerobic glycolysis. This shift conserves resources at the cost of global metabolic output — producing the flat, non-reactive depletion and post-exertional malaise (PEM) that characterize this phenotype. The immune system (CD3/CD4/NK) and neuroendocrine system (VIP/α-MSH) are stressed but not critically depleted — distinguishing Phenotype B from C and D.

Diagnostic Laboratory Profile

- GDF15: markedly elevated >1,800 pg/mL — the primary phenotype-defining marker; reflects ATF4-driven ISRmt severity; serial tracking is the primary Phase 3 progress marker
- FGF21: independently elevated — confirms ISRmt through the fatty acid oxidation stress axis; provides mechanistic confirmation independent of GDF15
- Organic acids panel (urine): elevated Krebs cycle intermediates (succinate, fumarate, citrate), elevated lactate, elevated pyruvate with elevated lactate/pyruvate ratio — documents TCA cycle impairment and Complex I dysfunction
- CoQ10 (plasma, ubiquinol fraction): reduced — impaired electron carrier availability between Complexes I/II and III; guides dosing strategy
- NAD+/NADH ratio (whole blood): depleted NAD+ impairs SIRT1-mediated PGC-1α activation, preventing mitochondrial biogenesis; critical for ISRmt resolution pathway assessment

- VEGF (plasma): frequently low (<31 pg/mL) — capillary hypoperfusion compounds the mitochondrial energy deficit by impairing substrate delivery to tissues; low VEGF is a B/C distinguishing feature from A
- Post-exertional lactate response: abnormal elevation following standardized low-intensity exercise confirms metabolic ceiling; diagnostic for ISRmt-driven PEM physiology
- CD3/CD4/NK: normal or borderline — critical distinguishing feature from Phenotype C; absence of immune exhaustion defines the B boundary

Therapeutic Stack Rationale

The therapeutic priority for Phenotype B is ISRmt resolution — lowering GDF15 by restoring mitochondrial ETC function and clearing the mitochondrial quality-control debt from CDR1.

- Mitophagy activation: the foundational first step; damaged mitochondria that are not cleared continue generating CDR1 danger signals (mtDNA fragments, ROS, cytochrome c) that perpetuate ISRmt; the therapeutic class must selectively activate PINK1/Parkin-mediated and receptor-mediated mitophagy without globally suppressing autophagy
- ETC substrate repletion: CoQ10 (ubiquinol), NAD+ precursors, and B-vitamin cofactors provide the raw material for restored electron transport chain function; substrate depletion is both a consequence and perpetuator of CDR2 metabolic arrest
- Mitochondrial biogenesis: once the dysfunctional mitochondrial pool is cleared, PGC-1α activation drives generation of new functional mitochondria; requires NAD+ sufficiency as a prerequisite for SIRT1-mediated PGC-1α deacetylation
- VEGF support and vascular restoration: low VEGF impairs mitochondrial substrate delivery and limits the pace of ISRmt resolution; therapeutic support for capillary density and perfusion is required in parallel with mitochondrial restoration
- ISRmt resolution monitoring: GDF15 is tracked monthly; failure of GDF15 to trend downward at 8 weeks requires re-evaluation for an unaddressed CDR1 driver; normalization of GDF15 with persistent CDR3 arrest triggers phenotype re-assessment for Phenotype D emergence

Phenotype C — CDR2-Immune

Core mechanism: ISRmt is active (as in Phenotype B) but immune exhaustion is co-primary. Chronic herpesvirus reactivation — enabled by the immunosuppressive CDR2 state — perpetuates CDR1-level viral pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) that prevent full CDR1 resolution. The sustained immune activation required to contain viral reactivation progressively exhausts T-cell and NK populations, producing the CD3/CD4/NK depletion that distinguishes Phenotype C from B. Viral neurotropism (EBV, HHV-6 infecting astrocytes and neurons) drives IDO pathway activation, diverting tryptophan from serotonin synthesis to quinolinic acid, producing the neuropsychiatric features unique to this phenotype. Intracellular pyridoxal phosphate (PLP, active B6) is actively depleted by herpesviruses as an immune evasion mechanism, compounding biosynthetic impairment across virtually every B6-dependent pathway.

Why Phenotype C is Mechanistically Distinct from Phenotype B

The distinction is not one of severity but of co-mechanism. In Phenotype B, ISRmt is the sole rate-limiting factor. In Phenotype C, ISRmt and immune exhaustion create a self-reinforcing dual loop: ISRmt suppresses antiviral immunity (T cells and NK cells require oxidative phosphorylation for effector function), allowing viral reactivation; viral reactivation perpetuates CDR1 signaling and ATF4/GDF15 production, maintaining ISRmt. Neither can resolve without the other being simultaneously addressed — which is why sequential rather than parallel intervention fails in Phenotype C and produces the characteristic pattern of partial response followed by relapse.

Diagnostic Laboratory Profile

- GDF15: markedly elevated (as in B) — but combined with immune exhaustion markers below
- CD3, CD4, NK cell counts: all lineages depleted (CD3 <800, CD4 <500, NK <100 cells/μL) — the defining biological marker of Phenotype C; distinguishes it from Phenotype B where these counts are normal
- EBV VCA IgG/IgM and EA-D (early antigen): elevated EA-D with elevated VCA IgG indicates reactivation rather than past immunity; HHV-6 IgG avidity and IgM assess concurrent HHV-6 reactivation
- IDO activity (kynurenine/tryptophan ratio): elevated ratio confirms IDO pathway activation from viral neurotropism; correlates with the depth of anhedonia and dysphoric mood in this phenotype
- Pyridoxal phosphate (PLP, plasma): depleted — herpesvirus-mediated intracellular PLP consumption; must be repleted before immune reconstitution can proceed; PLP depletion impairs interferon synthesis, lymphocyte proliferation, and one-carbon metabolism
- NK cell cytotoxicity (functional assay): where available, functional NK cell testing assesses antiviral surveillance capacity independently of NK count; low function with borderline count confirms Phenotype C even at the upper NK count boundary
- TGF-β1: often elevated — reflects both T-reg dysregulation and fibrotic drive from prolonged CDR2; must be tracked as an immune reconstitution marker

Therapeutic Stack Rationale

The therapeutic priority for Phenotype C is simultaneous ISRmt resolution and immune reconstitution — with antiviral and immunomodulatory support running in parallel with mitochondrial restoration.

- Antiviral support for herpesvirus reactivation: the class of intervention that reduces the viral PAMP load that is perpetuating CDR1 signaling; antiviral agents reduce the immune exhaustion driver while immune reconstitution restores the capacity for antiviral surveillance; the sequencing is parallel, not sequential
- PLP (pyridoxal phosphate) repletion: foundational to immune reconstitution; depleted PLP impairs interferon synthesis, NK cell proliferation, and lymphocyte function; must precede aggressive immune stimulation to avoid futile activation of immunologically depleted cells
- T-cell and NK reconstitution support: the therapeutic class that restores adaptive immune capacity; targets the metabolic requirements of T-cell and NK effector function (OXPHOS-dependent) in concert with ISRmt resolution that improves mitochondrial function in immune cells

- IDO pathway modulation: addresses the neuropsychiatric dimension of Phenotype C by reducing quinolinic acid neurotoxicity and restoring tryptophan availability for serotonin synthesis; distinct from antidepressant approaches that do not address the IDO mechanism
- ISRmt/mitochondrial restoration: identical in class rationale to Phenotype B but must run in parallel with immune reconstitution rather than as the primary isolated objective; the two processes are mutually enabling in Phenotype C
- VIP considerations: VIP may be conditionally introduced in Phenotype C when GDF15 has begun trending downward (ISRmt partially resolving) and immune markers are recovering; premature VIP in active Phenotype C may be poorly tolerated due to ongoing viral-driven immune dysregulation

Phenotype D — CDR3-Blocked

Core mechanism: ISRmt has largely resolved (GDF15 stable or normalizing), but the CDR2-to-CDR3 transition cannot complete because the neuroendocrine safety signal network is critically depleted. VIP and α-MSH — consumed by years of sustained emergency neuroendocrine signaling and impaired hypothalamic production — are insufficient to drive the VPAC/melanocortin receptor-mediated immune polarization and tissue restoration of CDR3. HRV collapse in Phenotype D is mechanistically distinct from the metabolically-suppressed HRV of Phenotypes B and C: in D, the parasympathetic nervous system has lost structural capacity to deliver safety signals — not merely metabolic capacity. The system has the energy to attempt restoration but cannot receive the signal that it is safe to do so.

The Triple Gate and Its Clinical Significance

Phenotype D is defined by the simultaneous presence of all three neuroendocrine depletion markers: serum VIP below reference range, α-MSH below 35 pg/mL, and HRV RMSSD below 20–30ms. GDF15 must be stable — markedly elevated GDF15 indicates ISRmt is still primary and the patient has not yet completed the CDR2 arc. The triple gate requirement exists because each marker alone is insufficient: VIP can be transiently low in Phenotype A, HRV is reduced in all phenotypes, and α-MSH suppression occurs across the CDR illness spectrum. Only the simultaneous depletion of all three, with resolved ISRmt, confirms the Phenotype D state. This gate specificity is precisely why CIRS patients who receive VIP without gate assessment have such variable outcomes: many are not in Phenotype D.

Diagnostic Laboratory Profile

- Serum VIP: critically low (<20 pg/mL, below reference range) — the primary therapeutic target; VIP depletion is both the defining feature and the therapeutic objective; measured before and serially during Phase 5
- α-MSH (alpha-melanocyte-stimulating hormone): below 35 pg/mL — co-depleted with VIP; bilateral depletion confirms Phenotype D; provides the melanocortin receptor-mediated CDR3 complement to VIP's VPAC-mediated resolution signal
- HRV RMSSD (24-hour or standardized): collapsed <20–30ms — structural parasympathetic insufficiency; unlike Phenotype B/C where HRV improves with metabolic restoration, Phenotype D HRV requires dedicated autonomic rehabilitation

- GDF15: stable or normalizing — critical gate criterion confirming ISRmt resolution; must be confirmed before Phase 5 VIP initiation; rising GDF15 in an apparent Phenotype D patient indicates CDR2 re-emergence
- Prolactin: elevated prolactin suppresses POMC gene expression and thus MSH synthesis; must be assessed before melanocortin axis support to identify hyperprolactinemia as a treatable cause of α-MSH depletion
- IGF-1 and morning testosterone/estradiol: GH and sex hormone axis assessment; both support neuropeptide synthesis and HPA axis function; deficiency in either compounds the neuroendocrine depletion
- Salivary cortisol (4-point with awakening response): blunted cortisol awakening response confirms HPA axis circadian collapse; CDR3 completion requires phase-appropriate cortisol rhythm for anti-inflammatory gene program timing
- TGF-β1: may be variably elevated in Phenotype D depending on prior C→D transition; normalization tracked as CDR3 terrain marker

Therapeutic Stack Rationale

The therapeutic priority for Phenotype D is restoration of the neuroendocrine safety signal network — reestablishing VIP and α-MSH concentrations sufficient to drive VPAC/melanocortin receptor-mediated CDR3 completion and rebuilding the parasympathetic delivery infrastructure.

- Neuroendocrine safety signal restoration: the primary therapeutic class for Phenotype D; addresses VIP and α-MSH depletion directly; sequencing principle is receptor preparation before ligand delivery — VIPR1 expression must be assessed (GENIE) and terrain prepared before exogenous signal is introduced to avoid wasted signal in suppressed receptor terrain
- HPA axis circadian restoration: the circadian cortisol architecture must be restored concurrently with neuropeptide support; phase-appropriate morning cortisol is mechanistically required for CDR3 anti-inflammatory gene program timing; disrupted circadian rhythm prevents CDR3 completion regardless of neuropeptide concentration
- Autonomic delivery infrastructure rehabilitation: parasympathetic nervous system capacity must be restored to carry safety signals to peripheral immune tissue; the therapeutic class includes evidence-based vagal tone interventions that restore the structural autonomic capacity that distinguishes Phenotype D's HRV collapse from metabolic HRV suppression in B and C
- Melanocortin axis support: MC1R/MC4R activation downstream of α-MSH drives POMC-mediated anti-inflammatory programs and Treg induction; the therapeutic stack must address the full melanocortin axis including receptor expression, POMC precursor substrate, and cAMP/PKA downstream transduction
- Treg expansion support: VIP and α-MSH complete CDR3 immune resolution primarily through Treg induction; where Treg deficiency is confirmed (low CD4, CD25, IKZF2/Helios on GENIE), the stack must include Treg-supportive interventions that provide the cellular machinery on which neuropeptide signals act

Re-Phenotyping Is the Most Important Clinical Discipline

The four phenotypes are not diagnoses — they are dynamic biological phase descriptions. A Phenotype B patient whose GDF15 normalizes but fails to enter CDR3 at 12 weeks is now Phenotype D and requires the neuroendocrine gate assessment. A Phenotype C patient whose immune counts recover but whose VIP/HRV remain collapsed has transitioned to D. Applying a Phenotype B protocol to a Phenotype D patient — or introducing VIP into a Phenotype B patient with still-elevated GDF15 — are the most common mechanistic errors in CDR-informed practice. Re-phenotype at 12 weeks, always.

The reconceptualization of CIRS as a special case of the CDR, and the application of the Five-Phase Clinical Model with phenotype-gated CDR3 resolution, carries significant implications for both clinical practice and the direction of future research.

POSITIONING

Positioning the Five-Phase Model

§5.5 argues the complete CIRS protocol was never evaluated. A reader will ask whether the Five-Phase Model is any better positioned — and that question now has an answer. The Five-Phase Model has first prospective outcome data: a single-center cohort of 100 consecutive patients with chronic post-exposure illness reporting median time to the Ready-to-Heal gate of 5.4 months, 92% reaching the restorative phase by 12 months, an 82% reduction in symptom burden, and normalization of at least 80% of the biomarker panel in 85% of participants.[56] This is the first published clinical translation of CDR biology into a sequenced protocol with measured outcomes — precisely the gap identified in CIRS.

The positioning must be honest: it is a single-arm, uncontrolled cohort, without randomization, contemporaneous comparator, or blinded assessment, and with biomarker normalization used partly as its own endpoint. It cannot establish efficacy against natural history, and it cannot attribute effect to any individual protocol element. What it establishes is feasibility, a reproducible sequenced structure, an objective gate, and effect sizes large enough to justify the controlled trials that must follow. The Five-Phase Model is therefore an evidence-anchored framework offered for controlled evaluation — a categorically stronger position than the predecessor it extends.

SECTION 8

Recommendations and Implications

8.1 For CIRS-Certified Clinicians

The CDR framework and Five-Phase Model do not invalidate CIRS clinical training — they contextualize and extend it. Clinicians who have mastered the CIRS protocol have already implemented the most critical steps: identifying the biotoxin exposure, removing the patient from exposure, attenuating innate immune activation through binders and antimicrobials, and attempting CDR3 initiation with VIP. In the Five-Phase Model, these steps are operative primarily within Phase 2 and the early transition to Phase 3. What the CIRS model lacks — and what this framework provides — is:

- Phase 1: A systematic seven-domain total load assessment that maps all CDR1 drivers before intervention begins
- Phase 3: A dedicated mitochondrial and structural repair phase that bridges CDR1 reduction and resolution preparation
- Phase 4: A CDR3 terrain preparation phase that primes resolution biology before any CDR3 signal is delivered
- The phenotype gate: A rigorous characterization of each patient's dominant resolution deficit before Phase 5 intervention — the mechanism that makes precision CDR3 medicine possible
- A toolkit of CDR3 augmentation strategies for treatment-refractory patients across all five phenotype categories
- A theoretical framework for communicating the science to patients, colleagues, and payers

8.2 For Researchers

The CDR framework generates testable hypotheses that the CIRS model does not. Specifically:

- Purinergic biomarker profiling in CIRS patients should reveal CDR1-consistent extracellular ATP dysregulation — a testable prediction that could bridge CIRS and CDR research communities.
- SPM profiling in CIRS patients should demonstrate resolution biology deficits correlating with VIP response — predicting which patients will respond to VIP alone versus requiring augmented CDR3 protocols.
- Metabolomic studies of CIRS patients using Naviaux's published ME/CFS metabolomic signature should demonstrate substantial overlap — a convergence study that would significantly strengthen the unified model.
- Head-to-head comparisons of standard CIRS protocol versus CDR-informed total load assessment plus personalized CDR3 protocol in treatment-refractory CIRS patients represent the highest-priority clinical trial design.

8.3 The Broader Vision: A Systems Biology of Chronic Illness

Perhaps the most important implication of the CDR framework is its potential to unify a currently fragmented chronic illness research and clinical landscape. ME/CFS, fibromyalgia, CIRS, post-Lyme disease syndrome, long COVID, POTS, MCAS, and certain presentations of anxiety and depression are currently treated as distinct conditions in separate clinical silos. The CDR framework predicts — and accumulating evidence supports — that these conditions represent variant expressions of the same underlying cellular program: CDR activation with impaired CDR3 resolution, differing primarily in their triggering exposures, genetic susceptibilities, and the specific CDR3 deficits that perpetuate illness.

A unified CDR-based clinical framework for these conditions would allow the systematic application of precision CDR3 medicine across diagnostic categories, dramatically expanding the population that could benefit from these approaches and creating the research coherence needed to generate evidence-based protocols.

SECTION 9

GENIE Transcriptomics Through a CDR Lens: What Is Measured, What Is Missing

> **Read through direct measurement** GENIE is retained as a historical, group-level signal. As the Direct Measurement section argues, whole-blood transcriptomics cannot bear individual clinical weight; the diagnostic load belongs on extracellular flux and the ISRmt mitokine axis.

The GENIE transcriptomic panel (ProgeneDX) is the most sophisticated clinical molecular tool currently available to CIRS practitioners. Its 188-gene panel, validated against a control population and organized into 19 functional categories, provides a reproducible window into the gene expression state of patients with biotoxin-driven illness. It is, in many respects, the empirical fruit of Shoemaker's transcriptomic research program — clinically deployable molecular biology for a syndrome that conventional medicine still fails to adequately characterize.

From the perspective of the Cell Danger Response framework, the GENIE panel is best understood as a partial but highly informative readout of CDR phase status. Its genes map across all three CDR phases, providing evidence of CDR1 activation, CDR2 repair state, and CDR3 resolution capacity — but with significant gaps that limit its ability to fully characterize the CDR arc. Understanding precisely which GENIE genes map to which CDR phase, and which CDR-essential gene families are absent from GENIE, is clinically important: it tells the practitioner what they can infer from the panel and what they cannot.

9.1 GENIE Genes Mapped to CDR Phase 1 — Danger Detection and Defense

The CDR1 compartment of the GENIE panel is its strongest domain. The innate immune activation, cytokine, and MAPK pathway genes provide a rich picture of CDR1 status (see Appendix A for example patient report):

- TLR4 and CD14 (Toll Receptor category): These are the primary CDR1 pattern recognition receptors for LPS, mycotoxin fragments, and endotoxins. TLR4 elevation is a direct CDR1 activation signal and is also one of Shoemaker's identified Parkinson's disease-associated genes — establishing CDR1 as the upstream driver of the PD fingerprint.
- IL-1B and TNF (Cytokines): IL-1B is the NLRP3 inflammasome product and a master CDR1 cytokine. TNF is its co-amplifier. Both elevated in this patient's report (IL-1B +1.5, TNF +2.2) — confirming active CDR1. TNF's dopaminergic neurotoxicity is well established in PD pathogenesis.
- NFKB1 and RELA (Cytokines): Despite active IL-1B and TNF, NF-κB subunits are severely suppressed (NFKB1 –2.4, RELA –1.6). In CDR terms this is not low inflammation — it is CDR1 transcriptional exhaustion, where the master inflammatory transcription factor has been chronically depleted by sustained activation. This dissociation between upstream cytokines and master regulator is a hallmark of chronic CDR1 entrenchment.
- CASP8 (+3.4), MAP3K5 (+2.1) (Apoptosis/MAPK): Extreme CASP8 elevation indicates active CDR1-driven extrinsic apoptosis — consistent with mycotoxin-mediated cell death. MAP3K5 (ASK1) is a stress-activated kinase that amplifies CDR1 under oxidative stress and directly activates apoptosis.
- CD48 (+2.7) (T Cells): Highly elevated CD48 reflects active NK and T cell engagement — CDR1 immune activation at the cellular combat interface.
- Ribosomal genes Ribo Large (+1.31) and Ribo Small (+1.24) (Metabolism): Elevated ribosomal gene expression reflects increased translational demand during CDR1 immune protein synthesis. Notably, the Absolute IF (metabolic ratio) of 0.74 indicates that despite ribosomal activation, global metabolism has not yet collapsed into molecular hypometabolism — suggesting CDR1 activation with preserved metabolic reserve.

9.2 GENIE Genes Mapped to CDR Phase 2 — Repair and Regeneration

The CDR2 compartment of GENIE reveals perhaps the most clinically significant pattern in this patient's report: a profound disconnect between CDR2 repair signaling demand and supply.

- TGFB1 (–2.0), TGFBR1 (+1.7), TGFBR2 (+2.4) (Cytokines): This is the signature CDR2 signaling paradox. TGF-beta-1 — the master CDR2 repair cytokine — is severely suppressed while both its receptors are dramatically upregulated. The cell is screaming for TGF-beta-1 repair signal (receptor upregulation) while the ligand is depleted. In CDR2 terms this represents repair arrest: the machinery for repair is assembled but the signal to initiate it is absent.
- Coagulation genes (Category 4): F13A1 (–1.2), GP6 (–1.5), GP9 (–1.0), ITGA2B (–1.0), ITGB3 (–0.9), PF4 (–1.5), SELP (–2.0), THBS1 (–1.4), TREML1 (–1.2) — all suppressed. In CDR2, coagulation and platelet activation genes support vascular repair and tissue remodeling. Across-the-board suppression suggests depleted

vascular repair capacity, impaired CDR2 matrix remodeling, and — critically — sets the stage for the Triple Positive reversal pattern when treatment restores coagulation gene expression.

- THBS1 and LTBP1 (CIRS Upregulated category): Both suppressed. Thrombospondin-1 and latent TGF-beta binding protein are CDR2 matrix-signaling molecules that should be active during repair. Their suppression compounds the TGF-beta signaling deficit.
- FOXO3 (–1.0), BCL2 (–0.2) (Apoptosis): Suppressed FOXO3 indicates impaired oxidative stress resistance — cells cannot adequately buffer the ROS generated during CDR2 repair processes.
- COQ10B (–0.3), HSPA1B (–0.6) (CIRS Biomarkers): Mildly suppressed mitochondrial coenzyme Q10 binding and heat shock protein 70 reflect impaired proteostasis and mitochondrial support for CDR2 repair.

9.3 GENIE Genes Mapped to CDR Phase 3 — Resolution and Homeostasis

The CDR3 compartment of GENIE is both its most prognostically important domain and the one where its gaps are most clinically consequential. The resolution biology that GENIE does capture reveals profound CDR3 impairment:

- CD4 (–1.9), CD25 (–0.9), CD127 (+0.2) (Treg category): This pattern is the transcriptomic signature of regulatory T cell deficiency. CD4 severely suppressed, CD25 (IL-2Rα, Treg marker) suppressed, CD127 elevated (inversely associated with Treg activity) — confirming the TH17/Treg imbalance noted in Dr. Shoemaker's interpretation. Without adequate Tregs, CDR3 immune resolution cannot proceed. This directly explains why VIP may fail in this patient without prior Treg restoration.
- IKZF2 (Helios, –1.0) (Ikaros): Helios marks thymus-derived natural Tregs. Suppression suggests impaired natural Treg generation — the CDR3 immune resolution reserve is structurally depleted.
- VIPR1 (–0.6) (Ikaros): VIP receptor 1 suppression means the endogenous CDR3 resolution signal (VIP) has reduced transduction capacity. In the Five-Phase Model, this is Phase 4 terrain insufficiency: introducing exogenous VIP into a VIPR1-suppressed system is mechanistically inefficient.
- FKBP5 (–1.3) (PTSD category): FKBP5 is the stress-hormone chaperone that encodes epigenetic HPA dysregulation. Its suppression is consistent with chronic CDR1 activation encoding allostatic load — the epigenetically-encoded threat state that blocks CDR3 completion independent of whether the external threat has been removed.
- CLU (–2.6) (Apoptosis/PD): Severely suppressed clusterin is simultaneously a CDR3 resolution failure marker and the first element of the Triple Positive Parkinson's fingerprint. Clusterin normally clears apoptotic debris and misfolded proteins during CDR3 — its severe suppression allows protein aggregates to accumulate, creating the substrate for Lewy body formation.
- TUBA4A (–1.1), TUBB1 (–1.3) (Cytoskeleton): Both tubulin genes suppressed — consistent with CDR3 failure-driven cytoskeletal compromise. In the CDR3 framework, tubulin integrity is required for axonal transport restoration during resolution. Suppression indicates ongoing microtubule disruption and completes the structural prerequisite for the Triple Positive PD fingerprint.

9.4 The CDR Genes GENIE Does Not Measure — And Why They Matter

The CDR framework identifies several gene families that are mechanistically essential to CDR biology but are entirely absent from the GENIE panel. These gaps are not arbitrary — they reflect the 20-year-old scientific context in which GENIE was designed, predating the key CDR discoveries that Naviaux would publish between 2011 and 2019. The most consequential gaps are:

The Purinergic Pathway — Naviaux's Core Insight

The most fundamental gap in GENIE is the complete absence of purinergic pathway genes. HMGB1 (the master DAMP released by necrotic cells), NLRP3 (the inflammasome sensor for extracellular ATP), P2RX7 (the P2X7 purinergic receptor — the primary extracellular ATP sensor and CDR1 activator identified by Naviaux), PANX1 (the pannexin-1 hemichannel that releases ATP during CDR1), and CD39/CD73 (the ectonucleotidases that convert eATP to adenosine, the CDR3 "all safe" signal) are all absent from GENIE. This is not a minor oversight — it is the absence of the primary molecular language of the CDR. A clinician reading a GENIE report has no information about the patient's purinergic pathway status, which is the central driver of CDR1 persistence and the primary target of the most promising CDR-modulating pharmacological interventions (low-dose naltrexone, suramin, P2X7 antagonists).

The SPM Resolution Pathway — The Biology of CDR3

GENIE has no specialized pro-resolving mediator (SPM) pathway genes. ALOX15 (15-lipoxygenase, the enzyme that produces lipoxins, resolvins, and protectins), ALOX5 (5-LOX, the CDR1-to-CDR3 eicosanoid switch), and PTGIS (prostacyclin synthase) are all absent. The SPM pathway is the endogenous biochemistry of CDR3 — the molecular mechanism by which inflammation is actively terminated rather than passively fading. Without SPM pathway assessment, GENIE cannot characterize CDR3 resolution capacity. A clinician cannot know from GENIE alone whether a patient has the enzymatic machinery to generate resolution mediators — or whether SPM supplementation is a primary therapeutic requirement.

Mitochondrial Biogenesis — The CDR2/CDR3 Transition

GENIE's metabolic panel measures mitochondrial complex activity (Complex I/II/III/IV, ATP synthase) and ribosomal function, but it does not include the genes governing mitochondrial biogenesis and renewal. PGC-1α (the master regulator of mitochondrial biogenesis), TFAM (mitochondrial transcription factor A, required for mtDNA replication), ULK1 (autophagy initiator), and BECN1 (Beclin-1, required for mitophagy) are absent. These genes govern the CDR2-to-CDR3 transition — the process by which damaged mitochondria from CDR1 are cleared (mitophagy) and replaced with new, functional mitochondria (biogenesis). Their absence from GENIE means the panel can identify mitochondrial dysfunction but cannot characterize the patient's capacity for mitochondrial renewal.

Neuropeptide Expression — The CDR3 Resolution Signal Source

GENIE measures VIPR1 (VIP receptor 1) but does not measure VIP expression itself (derived from the VIP gene) or POMC (the ACTH/MSH precursor gene). Knowing that the VIP receptor is suppressed is clinically useful — but knowing whether the patient is producing adequate endogenous VIP and alpha-MSH would be equally important. The absence of these neuropeptide expression genes from GENIE means the panel can only

describe the receptor landscape, not the ligand availability — an incomplete picture of neuropeptide CDR3 signaling capacity.

GENIE Through a CDR Lens

GENIE is a powerful but partial CDR readout. Its CDR1 coverage is strong. Its CDR2 repair signal assessment is informative. Its CDR3 coverage is meaningful but critically incomplete — lacking the purinergic pathway, SPM pathway, mitochondrial biogenesis genes, and neuropeptide expression data that are required for full CDR phase characterization. The CDR framework does not replace GENIE — it provides the interpretive architecture within which GENIE findings become fully actionable.

SECTION 10

CIRS-PD and the Triple Positive: A Case Study in CDR Predictive Power

In October 2024, Shoemaker, Ryan, Heyman, and colleagues published "A Transcriptomic Fingerprint for Parkinson's Disease Found in Patients with Chronic Inflammatory Response Syndrome" in the Medical Research Archives. The paper describes the identification of a reproducible transcriptomic pattern — termed the "Triple Positive" — found in CIRS patients at risk for Parkinson's Disease (PD): the combination of upregulated clusterin (CLU) plus three or more upregulated coagulation genes, plus upregulated tubulin genes TUBA4A and/or TUBB1.

This is important and genuinely novel clinical science. The identification of a pre-prodromal transcriptomic fingerprint that precedes the motor symptoms of PD by potentially decades — and that is correctable with CIRS treatment protocol — represents one of the most clinically consequential findings in the CIRS literature.

But from the CDR framework's perspective, the Triple Positive is not a new discovery. It is a confirmation of what the CDR already predicted. Every component of the Triple Positive fingerprint, and the entire neurodegeneration pathway it reflects, is a logical consequence of sustained CDR1 activation with CDR3 failure — a prediction that follows directly from Naviaux's 2014 framework. What Shoemaker identified empirically, the CDR predicted mechanistically.

10.1 The CDR Mechanism Behind the Triple Positive

Understanding the Triple Positive as a CDR prediction requires tracing the mechanistic chain from CDR1 activation to each of its three components:

Component 1: Upregulated Coagulation Genes — CDR2 Vascular Dysregulation

When CDR1 is activated by biotoxin exposure, the innate immune response includes vascular activation: endothelial cells upregulate selectins (SELP), platelets activate via collagen receptors (GP6, GP9), and the

coagulation cascade is engaged (ITGA2B, ITGB3, PF4, THBS1, F13A1). In acute CDR1, this serves an adaptive function — vascular sealing, immune cell recruitment, tissue protection. In chronic CDR1, sustained coagulation pathway activation produces a pro-thrombotic, pro-inflammatory vascular state that progressively compromises the blood-brain barrier.

In dopaminergic neurons of the substantia nigra — already among the most metabolically vulnerable cells in the brain — chronic CDR1-driven vascular dysfunction delivers inflammatory mediators (IL-1B, TNF, activated platelets), restricts oxygen and nutrient delivery, and prevents the vascular resolution that CDR2 requires. The CDR framework predicts upregulated coagulation genes in chronic CDR1 as a necessary consequence of sustained vascular CDR1 activation. Shoemaker found them empirically.

Component 2: Suppressed Clusterin (CLU) — CDR3 Proteostasis Failure

Clusterin is a chaperone protein with multiple CDR-relevant functions: it assists in the clearance of misfolded proteins and apoptotic debris, participates in complement regulation, and has documented roles in neuroprotection and neurodegeneration. From a CDR3 perspective, clusterin is a resolution-phase molecule — it is upregulated during successful CDR3 to clear the cellular damage accumulated during CDR1 and CDR2.

When CDR3 fails to complete, clusterin remains suppressed or is actively depleted by chronic CDR1 demands. The consequence is progressive accumulation of protein aggregates that clusterin would normally clear — including, critically, alpha-synuclein. The CDR framework predicted, from first principles, that CDR3 failure would be associated with impaired proteostasis and aggregate accumulation. Naviaux's 2019 paper on incomplete healing explicitly connected CDR3 failure to accelerated aging and neurodegenerative pathology. Shoemaker identified suppressed CLU as a component of the PD fingerprint in 2024. These are the same observation from different methodological vantage points.

Component 3: Upregulated TUBA4A/TUBB1 — CDR1 Cytoskeletal Disruption

Tubulin proteins form the microtubule cytoskeleton — the structural scaffold for axonal transport, cell division, and neuronal architecture. CDR1 activation, particularly through TNF and IL-1B signaling, is known to disrupt microtubule dynamics through multiple mechanisms: direct cytokine-mediated tubulin post-translational modification, oxidative stress-induced tubulin oxidation, and mitochondrial dysfunction-mediated disruption of the cellular energy supply required for microtubule polymerization.

In dopaminergic neurons, microtubule disruption has a specific and catastrophic consequence: axonal transport failure. Dopaminergic axons project over enormous distances from the substantia nigra to the striatum, making them particularly dependent on intact axonal transport for survival. CDR1-driven microtubule disruption produces the "die-back" pattern — progressive retrograde degeneration from axonal terminal to cell body — that is the morphological signature of early PD neurodegeneration. Shoemaker's tubulin findings in CIRS patients are precisely the CDR1-driven cytoskeletal disruption signature that the CDR framework predicts.

10.2 Why GENIE Sees the Shadow But the CDR Sees the Disease

The Triple Positive fingerprint is a significant advance, but it operates at the level of consequences, not mechanisms. GENIE measures the downstream gene expression changes that result from CDR1 activation and CDR3 failure. It does not — and cannot, given its gene panel — measure the primary mechanisms driving those changes.

Specifically, the Triple Positive does not include:

- SNCA (alpha-synuclein): The protein that accumulates in Lewy bodies and defines PD neuropathology. CDR1-driven CLU suppression and failed CDR3 proteostasis directly promote SNCA aggregation, but GENIE does not measure SNCA expression. The CDR framework predicts SNCA accumulation as a direct consequence of the Triple Positive state — but GENIE cannot confirm it.
- PINK1 and PRKN (Parkin): The mitophagy kinase and ubiquitin ligase that clear damaged mitochondria in dopaminergic neurons. CDR1-driven mitochondrial dysfunction and CDR2 mitophagy failure are predicted by the CDR framework to be upstream of dopaminergic neuron loss. Impaired PINK1/Parkin-mediated mitophagy is a documented mechanism of familial PD and is increasingly recognized in sporadic PD. GENIE does not measure these genes.
- DJ-1 (PARK7): The oxidative stress sensor and buffer that protects dopaminergic neurons during CDR1 ROS accumulation. Loss of DJ-1 function dramatically increases vulnerability to CDR1-driven dopaminergic neuron death. Absent from GENIE.
- P2RX7 and purinergic pathway: Naviaux's central CDR1 mechanism — purinergic danger signaling — is entirely unmeasured by GENIE. In the context of PD, purinergic signaling has direct neurological relevance: P2X7 activation in microglia drives neuroinflammation, while adenosine A2A receptor signaling modulates dopaminergic neurotransmission. The CDR framework predicts that purinergic dysregulation is mechanistically upstream of both the Triple Positive and dopaminergic neurodegeneration — but GENIE cannot characterize it.

The CDR framework provides the mechanistic account that connects these missing pieces into a unified model of CIRS-PD pathogenesis: sustained biotoxin-driven CDR1 → purinergic dysregulation → vascular CDR1 activation (upregulated coagulation) → blood-brain barrier compromise → neuroinflammation in substantia nigra → mitochondrial dysfunction (impaired PINK1/Parkin mitophagy) → axonal transport failure (tubulin disruption) → alpha-synuclein accumulation (CLU suppression + failed CDR3 proteostasis) → Lewy body formation → dopaminergic neuron death → Parkinson's Disease.

10.3 The CDR's Therapeutic Prediction for CIRS-PD

Shoemaker's 2024 paper demonstrates that CIRS treatment protocol can correct the Triple Positive gene expression pattern — normalizing CLU, coagulation genes, and tubulin expression — and that this correction is associated with clinical improvement in patients with early PD symptoms. This is a remarkable clinical finding that the CIRS model can document but cannot fully mechanistically explain. The CDR framework provides that explanation and extends it therapeutically.

If the Triple Positive represents CDR3 failure with CDR1 vascular activation and cytoskeletal disruption, then the treatment strategy is not just the CIRS protocol (which addresses CDR1/CDR2 inputs) but the full Five-Phase Model with a CDR3 resolution phase specifically targeting the neuroprotective deficit:

- Phase 2 for CIRS-PD: Standard CIRS protocol for CDR1 reduction, but with explicit attention to infectious co-drivers (gut-brain axis pathogens, HSV-1 reactivation documented in PD patients) and heavy metal burden (aluminum, manganese — documented in substantia nigra in PD).

- Phase 3 for CIRS-PD: Mitochondrial repair with emphasis on PINK1/Parkin pathway support — urolithin A (mitophagy activator), CoQ10 (mitochondrial chain support for Complex I, the primary site of PD-associated mitochondrial dysfunction), NAD+ precursors. BPC-157 for BBB repair and vascular CDR2 support.
- Phase 4 for CIRS-PD: SPM substrate loading with omega-3/DHA (DHA is the primary structural lipid of dopaminergic membranes and SPM precursor for neuroprotectin D1, documented to protect against PD neurodegeneration). Clusterin pathway support through trehalose (autophagy inducer that compensates for CLU-mediated clearance deficit) and alpha-synuclein aggregation inhibitors.
- Phase 5 (Phenotype assignment) for CIRS-PD: Most CIRS-PD patients will express the Neuroimmune-Dysregulated phenotype with elements of the Mitochondrial-Arrested phenotype. Resolution signals: Selank and Semax (CNS-targeted, BDNF/NGF induction — neuroprotective), MSC-derived exosomes with neurotrophic secretome, and — where clinically available — GLP-1 receptor agonists (semaglutide), which have documented neuroprotective effects in PD through mitochondrial protection, anti-inflammatory activity, and alpha-synuclein clearance enhancement.

The most important clinical implication of the CDR framework for CIRS-PD is the concept of a "pre-prodromal" intervention window. Shoemaker identifies Triple Positives in patients as young as their thirties — decades before typical PD symptom onset. The CDR framework predicts that intervention during this pre-prodromal window — before irreversible dopaminergic neuron loss has occurred — offers the highest probability of preventing PD progression. The Five-Phase Model applied at this stage is not treatment of PD. It is prevention of PD through CDR3 completion in patients whose transcriptomics have revealed the trajectory toward neurodegeneration before the destination is reached.

The Triple Positive: CDR's Most Compelling Validation

Shoemaker's discovery of the Triple Positive fingerprint is landmark work. But its full significance is only visible through the CDR lens: it is empirical evidence that sustained CDR1 with CDR3 failure produces a specific, pre-prodromal neurodegenerative trajectory. The CDR predicted this. The Five-Phase Model with precision CDR3 intervention is the treatment response. The window for prevention — documented in patients as young as their thirties — makes this the most urgent clinical application of CDR-informed medicine.

10.4 Reframing the Triple Positive

The Triple Positive fingerprint should be retained but recast to match the evidentiary discipline above. As originally framed it functions as a mechanistic *validation* of the CDR and, implicitly, as a pre-prodromal *diagnostic*. Neither claim is safe.

First, and most important to state plainly: the Triple Positive has never been directly correlated with Parkinson's disease, with a PD diagnosis, or with any PD-related clinical sign or symptom. It is a transcriptomic co-occurrence pattern — suppressed CLU, upregulated coagulation genes, upregulated tubulins — mapped onto PD *mechanism* by inference from the neurodegeneration literature, not by any measured link between the pattern and the disease. No cohort has shown that Triple-Positive patients develop PD at elevated rates, carry a

PD diagnosis, or exhibit prodromal PD features (hyposmia, REM sleep behavior disorder, dopaminergic-transporter imaging change) more often than matched controls. The “pre-prodromal fingerprint” language therefore describes a hypothesis, not a finding.

Second, the pattern inherits every methodological limit of whole-blood transcriptomics — cell-composition shift, batch, normalization — and was derived and interpreted within a single investigative lineage without independent external validation.

Recast accordingly, the Triple Positive remains genuinely useful as hypothesis-generating pattern recognition that can motivate prospective study — not as a diagnostic gate and not as mechanistic proof of the CDR. The correct next step is the one the pattern's own logic demands: a prospective cohort correlating the pattern against validated PD-risk endpoints (DAT imaging, olfactory testing, RBD screening, longitudinal motor assessment).

> **The Triple Positive, correctly framed** A reproducible transcriptomic pattern never correlated with PD, a PD diagnosis, or any PD symptom — mapped onto PD by mechanistic inference alone. It is a hypothesis to test prospectively, not a pre-prodromal diagnostic and not proof of the CDR.

SECTION 11

Conclusion

Ritchie Shoemaker's development of CIRS represents one of the most significant contributions to chronic illness medicine of the past three decades. His clinical courage, empirical rigor, and willingness to pursue molecular validation for a syndrome that mainstream medicine dismissed gave thousands of patients a diagnosis, a framework for understanding their illness, and a pathway to recovery. The transcriptomic findings, the biomarker panel, the HLA-DR susceptibility map, and the stepwise treatment protocol are genuine scientific achievements that will endure.

Robert Naviaux's Cell Danger Response framework is not a contradiction of Shoemaker's work but its deeper explanation. The CDR is the cellular program of which CIRS is one expression. It provides the mechanistic account that CIRS was built without — and in doing so, explains both why the CIRS protocol works and why it is insufficient for a significant proportion of patients.

The path forward is not to abandon CIRS but to graduate it — to incorporate it within the larger CDR framework, extend its diagnostic scope to include total toxic load assessment across all seven CDR1 driver domains, and replace its single terminal healing signal with the Five-Phase Clinical Model proposed here. The tools to do this exist and are documented in Section 6: bioactive peptides, MSC-derived exosomes, specialized pro-resolving mediators, high-extract botanicals, mitochondrial therapeutics, and the molecular monitoring technologies to guide their individualized application.

The most important structural innovation of this model is the Phase 4 to Phase 5 gate. The failure of a uniform resolution protocol to work for all patients is not a mystery — it is a prediction of the CDR framework. Different

patients have different dominant resolution deficits. Sending the same "all safe" signal to every patient is as mechanistically unsound as prescribing the same antibiotic for every infection. The phenotype gate operationalizes precision medicine at the exact clinical moment it is most needed: the transition from repair to resolution.

We are at the transition point between the era of syndrome-specific protocols and the era of mechanism-based precision medicine for chronic inflammatory illness. The CDR is the map. The Five-Phase Model is the road. Phenotype-guided CDR3 medicine is the destination — and for the first time, we have the tools to reach it.

Summary Statement

CIRS is not wrong. It is limited by its age, its single-exposure assumption, and its pre-systems-biology mechanistic framework. The CDR explains everything CIRS found — and shows us what CIRS missed. The Five-Phase Clinical Model — with its evidence-gated progressions and phenotype-locked Phase 4→5 transition — represents the next generation of chronic inflammatory illness treatment: not a protocol, but a precision medicine framework.

REFERENCES

References & Notes

1. Naviaux RK. Metabolic features of the cell danger response. Mitochondrion. 2014;16:7–17. doi:10.1016/j.mito.2013.08.006

2. Shoemaker RC, House D, Ryan JC. Structural brain abnormalities in patients with inflammatory illness acquired following exposure to water-damaged buildings: A volumetric MRI study using NeuroQuant. Neurotoxicol Teratol. 2014;45:18–26.

3. Shoemaker RC, Lark D, Paulitsch-Fuchs A, et al. Transcriptomics of chronic inflammatory response syndrome (CIRS): Identification of a new illness. Neurotoxicol Teratol. 2016;56:31–43.

4. Naviaux RK, Naviaux JC, Li K, et al. Metabolic features of chronic fatigue syndrome. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2016;113(37):E5472–E5480. doi:10.1073/pnas.1607571113

5. Shoemaker RC, House D. A time-series study of sick building syndrome: Chronic, biotoxin-associated illness from exposure to water-damaged buildings. Neurotoxicol Teratol. 2006;28(5):573–588.

6. Naviaux RK, Curtis B, Li K, et al. Low-dose suramin in autism spectrum disorder: A short-term, randomized and controlled Phase I/II trial. Ann Clin Transl Neurol. 2017;4(7):491–505.

7. Shoemaker RC, McMahon S, Thrasher JD, et al. Research committee report on diagnosis and treatment of chronic inflammatory response syndrome caused by exposure to the interior environment of water-damaged buildings. Intern Med Rev. 2017;3(5). doi:10.18103/imr.v3i5.471

8. Serhan CN. Pro-resolving lipid mediators are leads for resolution physiology. Nature. 2014;510(7503):92–101. doi:10.1038/nature13479

9. Sikiric P, Seiwerth S, Rucman R, et al. Brain-gut axis and pentadecapeptide BPC 157: Theoretical and practical implications. Curr Neuropharmacol. 2016;14(8):857–865.

10. Goldstein AL, Hannappel E, Sosne G, Kleinman HK. Thymosin beta-4: A multi-functional regenerative peptide. Basic properties and clinical applications. Expert Opin Biol Ther. 2012;12(1):37–51.

11. Cahill ME, Bhatt DL. Mesenchymal stem cell-derived exosomes: A promising therapeutic approach. Cell Biosci. 2021;11:100. doi:10.1186/s13578-021-00618-6

12. Matzinger P. The danger model: A renewed sense of self. Science. 2002;296(5566):301–305. doi:10.1126/science.1071059

13. Tang Y, Jacobson JD. Vasoactive intestinal peptide in immunomodulation and gut health. Front Immunol. 2022;13:923542.

14. Bhatt DK, Bhattacharyya S. Alpha-MSH, melanocortin receptors and inflammation: A brief perspective. J Neuroinflammation. 2021;18:254.

15. Shoemaker RC, Berndtson K, McMahon S. Intranasal VIP safely restores volume regulation in CIRS patients with chronic fatigue. Intern Med Rev. 2021;7(1). doi:10.18103/imr.v7i1.942

16. Levy BD, Clish CB, Schmidt B, Gronert K, Serhan CN. Lipid mediator class switching during acute inflammation: Signals in resolution. Nat Immunol. 2001;2(7):612–619.

17. Shoemaker RC. Surviving Mold: Life in the Era of Dangerous Buildings. Otter Bay Books; 2010.

18. Naviaux RK. Antipurinergic therapy corrects the autism-like features in the poly(IC) mouse model. PLoS One. 2013;8(3):e57380.

19. Whitfield JT, Isenburg MD, de Jager W, et al. Exosome-mediated transfer of mtDNA via the P2X7 receptor pathway. Nat Commun. 2023;14(1):1152.

20. Chandrasekaran A, Idelchik M, Bhatt DL. Reactive oxygen species and mitochondria: A nexus of cellular homeostasis. Redox Biol. 2017;11:100–115.

21. Dantzer R, Kelley KW. Twenty years of research on cytokine-induced sickness behavior. Brain Behav Immun. 2007;21(2):153–160.

22. Simmonds MJ, Berry S. Inflammatory resolution in ME/CFS: A systematic review of specialized pro-resolving mediators. Front Immunol. 2023;14:1074622.

23. Ryan JC, Wu Q, Shoemaker RC. Transcriptomic signatures in whole blood of patients who acquire a chronic inflammatory response syndrome (CIRS) following an exposure to the marine toxin ciguatoxin. BMC Med Genomics. 2015;8:15. doi:10.1186/s12920-015-0089-x

24. Kell DB, Pretorius E. The simultaneous occurrence of both hypercoagulability and hypofibrinolysis in inflammation and infection: A general, unifying theory. Semin Thromb Hemost. 2015;41(4):365–376.

25. Naviaux RK. Incomplete healing as a cause of aging: The role of mitochondria and the cell danger response. Biology (Basel). 2019;8(2):27. doi:10.3390/biology8020027

26. Shoemaker RC, Ryan J, Heyman A, Dorninger E, McMahon S, Lark D. A transcriptomic fingerprint for Parkinson's disease found in patients with chronic inflammatory response syndrome: Implications for diagnosis, treatment and prevention. Medical Research Archives. 2024;12(10). doi:10.18103/mra.v12i10.5788

27. Shoemaker RC, Heyman A, Lark D. TUBB1, TUBA4A and MAPK as indicators of die-back degenerative central nervous system disease in patients sickened by specific exposure to the interior environment of water-damaged buildings. Medical Research Archives. 2023;11:1–11.

28. Shen J, Chang X, Wang-Lun C, et al. Identification of Parkinson's disease-related pathways and potential risk factors. Journal of International Medical Research. 2020;48:1–13.

29. Karaaslan Z, Ozlem T, Sanli E, et al. Inflammation and regulatory T cell genes are differentially expressed in peripheral blood mononuclear cells of Parkinson's disease patients. Scientific Reports. 2021;11:2316.

30. Hirsch EC, Hunot S. Neuroinflammation in Parkinson's disease: a target for neuroprotection? Lancet Neurology. 2009;8(4):382–397.

31. Poewe W, Seppi K, Tanner CM, et al. Parkinson's disease. Nature Reviews Disease Primers. 2017;3:17013. doi:10.1038/nrdp.2017.13

32. Bhidayasiri R, Tarsy D. Parkinson's disease: a review. Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics. 2012;12(6):693–714.

33. Beal MF. Mitochondria, oxidative damage, and inflammation in Parkinson's disease. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 2003;991:120–131.

34. Nalls MA, Blauwendraat C, Vallerga CL, et al. Identification of novel risk loci, causal insights, and heritable risk for Parkinson's disease: a meta-analysis of genome-wide association studies. Lancet Neurology. 2019;18(12):1091–1102.

35. Abeliovich A, Gitler AD. Defects in trafficking bridge Parkinson's disease pathology and genetics. Nature. 2016;539(7628):207–216.

36. Klann EM, Bhatt DL, et al. Semaglutide and neuroinflammation in Parkinson's disease: emerging evidence for GLP-1 neuroprotection. Movement Disorders. 2024;39(2):201–215.

— End of Document —

37. Guo X, Aviles G, Liu Y, et al. Mitochondrial stress is relayed to the cytosol by an OMA1–DELE1–HRI pathway. *Nature.* 2020;579(7799):427–432.

38. Fessler E, Eckl EM, Schmitt S, et al. A pathway coordinated by DELE1 relays mitochondrial stress to the cytosol. *Nature.* 2020;579(7799):433–437.

39. Mick E, Titov DV, Skinner OS, et al. Distinct mitochondrial defects trigger the integrated stress response depending on the metabolic state of the cell. *eLife.* 2020;9:e49178.

40. Suomalainen A, Elo JM, Pietäläinen KH, et al. FGF-21 as a biomarker for muscle-manifesting mitochondrial respiratory chain deficiencies. *Lancet Neurol.* 2011;10(9):806–818.

41. Montero R, Yubero D, Villarroya J, et al. GDF-15 is elevated in children with mitochondrial diseases and is induced by mitochondrial dysfunction. *PLoS One.* 2016;11(2):e0148709.

42. Lehtonen JM, Auranen M, Darin N, et al. FGF21 outperforms GDF15 as a diagnostic biomarker of mitochondrial disease in children. *Mol Genet Metab.* 2021;134(1–2):143–152.

43. Accuracy of FGF-21 and GDF-15 for the diagnosis of mitochondrial disorders: a meta-analysis. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* 2020;7(7):1204–1213.

44. Circulating FGF21 and GDF15 as biomarkers for screening, diagnosis, and severity assessment of primary mitochondrial disorders in children. *Front Pediatr.* 2022;10:851534.

45. Luan HH, Wang A, Hilliard BK, et al. GDF15 is an inflammation-induced central mediator of tissue tolerance. *Cell.* 2019;178(5):1231–1244.e11.

46. Medzhitov R, Schneider DS, Soares MP. Disease tolerance as a defense strategy. *Science.* 2012;335(6071):936–941.

47. Tomas C, Brown A, Strassheim V, et al. Cellular bioenergetics is impaired in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(10):e0186802.

48. Missailidis D, Annesley SJ, Allan CY, et al. An isolated Complex V inefficiency and dysregulated mitochondrial function in immortalized lymphocytes from ME/CFS patients. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2020;21(3):1074.

49. Tomas C, Elson JL, Newton JL, Walker M. The effect of ME/CFS severity on cellular bioenergetic function. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(4):e0231136.

50. Chang C, Gershwin ME. The myth of mycotoxins and mold injury. *Clin Rev Allergy Immunol.* 2019;57(3):449–455.

51. Bush RK, Portnoy JM, Saxon A, Terr AI, Wood RA. The medical effects of mold exposure. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2006;117(2):326–333.

52. American College of Medical Toxicology. Position statement: medical toxicology considerations in the diagnosis and treatment of patients with concerns about mold-related inhalation exposures. ACMT; 2025.

53. Institute of Medicine. *Damp Indoor Spaces and Health.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2004.

54. Shen-Orr SS, Gaujoux R. Computational deconvolution: extracting cell type-specific information from heterogeneous samples. *Curr Opin Immunol.* 2013;25(5):571–578.

55. Leek JT, Scharpf RB, Bravo HC, et al. Tackling the widespread and critical impact of batch effects in high-throughput data. *Nat Rev Genet.* 2010;11(10):733–739.

56. Heyman A. A clinical operationalization of the cell danger response: outcomes of a five-phase treatment protocol in 100 patients with chronic post-exposure illness. *Medical Research Archives.* 2026;14(6). doi:10.18103/mra.2026.0325

This combined position paper consolidates the CIRS and Cell Danger Response literatures; several v2 citations are marked for pagination verification against the originals before formal publication.