Structural-Constructivist Dynamics of the Core Emotion Framework: A Multi-Scale Academic Synthesis of Empirical, Somatic, and Computational Validation

Author: Jamel Bulgaria
ORCID: 0009-0007-5269-5739
Contact: mailto:admin@optimizeyourcapabilities.com

Date: May 10, 2026

ARCHIVE:

- https://huggingface.co/datasets/CoreEmotionFramework/CEF_Main_Archive/tree/main
- https://www.optimizeyourcapabilities.com/Publications/
- https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=ORdecUoAAAAJ
- https://philpeople.org/profiles/jamel-bulgaria
- https://zenodo.org/communities/030303/
- https://osf.io/hz53j/

Preregistration:

- https://osf.io/ac4x2/overview

Pilot study:

https://osf.io/fydsq/wiki?wiki=j7q8g

Abstract

The Core Emotion Framework (CEF) is a structural-constructivist model that reconceptualizes human emotional functioning as a coordinated system of ten

---

*) We welcome feedback on the preregistration and study design, and invite researchers who are interested in peer-reviewing the system to contact us. We also encourage scholars across all disciplines to conduct their own independent research on any aspect of the Core Emotion Framework. Author assumes no societal or substantial gains from this framework, just for public and academic service.

functional operators distributed across the Head, Heart, and Gut hubs. This digest synthesizes three independent validation layers—neurobiological, somatic, and mechanical—to demonstrate the CEF's empirical coherence and multi-scale explanatory power. Evidence from affective neuroscience, neurocardiology, and neurogastroenterology establishes the cephalic, cardiac, and enteric nervous systems as the anatomical substrates of the CEF's tripartite architecture. Operator-level mappings align Sensing with Panksepp's SEEKING system, Expanding with Fredrickson's Broaden-and-Build dynamics, and Constricting with Porges' polyvagal hierarchy, grounding each operator in identifiable neural circuits and autonomic patterns. Somatic validation from bioenergetics, pelvic floor physiology, and characterological research clarifies the mechanics of pathological operator fusions—especially the Boosting–Constricting fusion that conditions the organism's implicit "right to exist." Mechanical validation through the Emotional Cycling Machine (ECM v3.1) and Integrated Neuro-Affective Synchronizer (INAS v1.0) demonstrates that operator activation patterns can be externally reproduced, measured, and synchronized through engineered systems. Together, these findings position the CEF as a unified human operating system capable of integrating cognitive, affective, somatic, and behavioral processes into a single functional architecture, offering a reproducible foundation for clinical intervention, somatic practice, and computational modeling.

Keywords: Core Emotion Framework (CEF); structural-constructivist model; functional operators; Head–Heart–Gut hubs; affective neuroscience; neurocardiology; enteric nervous system; SEEKING system; Broaden-and-Build theory; Polyvagal Theory; somatic grounding; bioenergetics; pelvic floor dynamics; operator fusion; Boosting–Constricting fusion; emotional cycling; hemispheric integration; corpus callosum; Alexander Technique; ECM v3.1; INAS v1.0; human operating system; allostatic regulation; conative dynamics; computational affective science.

Introduction: The Architecture of the Human Operating System

The evolution of affective science has necessitated a transition from viewing emotions as static biological categories toward a functional understanding of emotions as dynamic transformations within a structured system.

The Core Emotion Framework (CEF), a structural-constructivist model of the human psyche, provides a granular architecture for this understanding by organizing human

experience into ten distinct functional operators distributed across three primary hubs: the Head (Cognitive-Regulatory), the Heart (Relational-Affective), and the Gut (Conative-Existential).

Rather than treating emotions as hardwired mental modules, the CEF treats the human internal landscape as a "Human Operating System" (Human OS) governed by precise functional operators that process information, regulate relational aperture, structure action, and recalibrate baseline states.

To establish the academic validity and conceptual coherence of this model, three primary archival documents must be analyzed and referenced separately, each providing a distinct tier of empirical, biological, somatic, and mechanical validation:

- **CEF_Neurobiological_Somatic.pdf**: This specialized somatic manuscript explores the conative foundations of the Gut hub, modeling the clinical pathology of the Boosting-Constricting fusion, the somatic bracing of the "conditional right to exist," and the shifting protocols required to restore hemispheric coordination via the corpus callosum.[1]
- **CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf**: This systematic synthesis maps the neurobiological substrates of the tripartite model—the cephalic, cardiac, and enteric nervous systems—and integrates the primary affective, relational, and autonomic frameworks of Jaak Panksepp, Barbara Fredrickson, and Stephen Porges.[1]
- **CEF_external_validation.pdf**: This external validation document details the $3 \times 3 + 1$ structural mechanics, the re-mapping of Enneagram fixations to healthy operator capacities, the postural and kinesthetic foundations of the Alexander Technique, and the physical engineering standards of the Emotional Cycling Machine (ECM v3.1) and the Integrated Neuro-Affective Synchronizer (INAS v1.0).[1]

Section 1: Critical Analysis of CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf — Neurobiological Hubs, Primary Affective Systems, and Clinical Mappings

The systematic review presented in CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf establishes the biological triad of the cephalic, cardiac, and enteric nervous systems as the anatomical substrates for the CEF's three functional hubs.

While classical psychology historically prioritized the cephalic brain, modern neurocardiology and neurogastroenterology validate the presence of complex, semi-autonomous neural networks in the heart and gut.

The cephalic brain, containing approximately 86 to 100 billion neurons, acts as the Head hub, utilizing the cerebral cortex and basal ganglia to govern meta-cognition, data analysis, and semantic processing.[23]

The cardiac nervous system, or "heart brain," comprises approximately 40,000 neurons and an intricate network of neurotransmitters identical to those in the cranial brain.[24]

Research in neurocardiology demonstrates that the heart functions as a sophisticated, independent neural network that continuously sends ascending signals to the cephalic brain via vagal and sympathetic pathways, influencing cognitive appraisal and emotional reactivity.[24]

The enteric nervous system (ENS), or "gut brain," consists of over 100 million neurons monitoring the gastrointestinal tract and mediating immune responses. It coordinates the conative foundations of human experience, including visceral self-preservation and core identity[25].

Center of Intelligence	Primary Neural Network	CEF Functional Hub	Prime Adaptive Competencies
Thinking Center	Cephalic Brain (CNS; ~86-100 Billion Neurons) [23]	Head Hub [1]	Meta-cognition, logical analysis, semantic processing, environmental mapping, and conceptual navigation.[23]
Feeling Center	Cardiac Brain (Intrinsic Network; ~40,000 Neurons) [24]	Heart Hub [1]	Relational affect, values, compassion, boundary-setting, and emotional vector generation.[24]
Action/Instinct Center	Enteric Brain (ENS; ~100 Million Neurons) [25]	Gut Hub [1]	Visceral self-preservation, core identity, motoric mobilization, allostatic recovery, and existential safety [1].

The enteric nervous system's function is further expanded by the neurobiology of the gut-brain axis, which reveals a complex, bidirectional communication system that directly influences affect, motivation and higher cognitive functions.[25]

Approximately 95% of the body's serotonin is manufactured in the gut, linking gastrointestinal homeostasis and visceral signaling directly with central nervous processes.[26]

In addition, Antonio Damasio's Somatic Marker Hypothesis (SMH) posits that emotional processes and physiological feedback from the body (somatic markers, such as changes in heart rate, skin conductance, or visceral "gut feelings") act as crucial "stop" or "go" signals that guide value-based decision-making under uncertainty, complexity, and high-stakes contexts.[27]

These somatic markers are processed in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and the amygdala, bridging visceral states directly to higher cognitive choices.[27]

The Sensing Operator and Jaak Panksepp's SEEKING System

As analyzed in CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf, the Sensing operator represents the functional process of active, perceptual tracking—an exploration for subtle internal or external cues that precedes formal cognitive analysis.[1]

This operator is heavily aligned with the primary-process SEEKING system identified in affective neuroscience by Jaak Panksepp.[1]

The SEEKING system is a primary dopaminergic pathway traversing the medial forebrain bundle (MFB), midbrain, lateral hypothalamus, and nucleus accumbens.[7]

It drives animals and humans to enthusiastically engage with the environment, forage for resources, and generate anticipatory predictions.[7]

Anatomically, the SEEKING urge is expressed by dopamine-promoted high-frequency oscillations in the form of transient, synchronized gamma waves ($> 30\ Hz$) emerging in the limbic forebrain and diffusing throughout the basal ganglia-thalamocortical circuits.[28]

In positive, appetitive contexts and during social play, this system generates

approximately 50 kHz positive ultrasonic vocalizations (resembling childhood laughter).[29] Deficits or blocks in the tonic activity of this mesolimbic dopaminergic pathway lead to compulsive behaviors (such as tail-chasing in dogs), intense frustration, or the amotivational shut-down state of depression.[30]

Within the CEF, Sensing operationalizes this evolutionary explorer drive within the Head center,[1] acting as an active search for emotional texture and authentic meaning.

The Expanding Operator and Barbara Fredrickson's Broaden-and-Build Theory

The Expanding operator, representing the drive for relational warmth, openness, and inclusivity, finds its functional mechanics explained by Barbara Fredrickson’s Broaden-and-Build Theory of positive emotions[9].

Fredrickson's theory posits that while negative emotions narrow an individual's thought-action repertoire to immediate survival reflexes (such as fight or flight), positive emotions (such as joy, interest, contentment, and love) broaden this repertoire, enabling access to a wider array of cognitions and behaviors.[9]

This broadening process facilitates the discovery of novel ideas and actions, which in turn builds enduring physical, intellectual, social, and psychological resources that function as reserves for future coping.[9]

The Expanding operator also implements Fredrickson's "Undoing Hypothesis," which demonstrates that positive emotions can actively reverse the lingering cardiovascular aftereffects of negative emotions, such as increased heart rate and blood pressure following a stressful task.[10]

Watching positive-emotion films (inducing joy or contentment) produces significantly faster cardiovascular recovery to baseline than watching neutral or sad films,[10] identifying the Expanding operator as an active biological regulator of the sympathetic nervous system.[1]

Although some scholars have debated whether autonomic recovery effects reflect transient positive affect or broader trait-level resilience, the CEF treats Expanding as a foundational somatic-relational movement of relational aperture widening.

The Constricting Operator and Stephen Porges' Polyvagal Theory

CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf contextualizes the Constricting operator—the functional

state of focus, protection, and energy consolidation—through Stephen Porges' Polyvagal Theory.

This theory outlines three primary autonomic states arranged in a phylogenetic hierarchy: the myelinated ventral vagal pathways (supporting social engagement, connection, and calm homeostatic restoration), the sympathetic nervous system (mobilizing fight-or-flight energy), and the ancient, unmyelinated dorsal vagal complex (mediating defensive immobilization, shutdown, and metabolic conservation under life threat).[11]

The unmyelinated dorsal vagus, originating in the dorsal motor nucleus of the vagus (DMNX), when activated by a neuroception of inescapable danger, triggers a "metabolic retreat" or "dorsal vagal shutdown" characterized by bradycardia, restricted breathing, and a "tonic grip" or bracing pattern in the musculature.[11]

Under stress, the nervous system undergoes "Jacksonian dissolution," reverting from flexible ventral regulation to older, primitive defensive circuits.[31]

In the CEF, this dissolution corresponds to a loss of midline agility, causing the Constricting operator to become pathologically fused and rigid.[1]

Normally, the "vagal brake" of the myelinated ventral vagus (originating in the nucleus ambiguus) regulates cardiac output to maintain physiological calm; [11] when this brake is withdrawn, the system defaults to sympathetic mobilization or dorsal shutdown.[1]

Emotional cycling serves to re-engage this vagal brake by strengthening midline operators, allowing the organism to transition out of a locked Constricting defense and back into social engagement.[1]

Clinical Translation of CEF Operators

CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf provides an integrative taxonomy for clinical modalities, conceptually mapping various evidence-based psychotherapeutic approaches to the specific functional operators they primarily engage, thereby transforming diverse theories into a unified therapeutic framework[1]:

Psychotherapy	Primary CEF Operators	Clinical and Mechanistic Alignment

Modality	Engaged	
CBT	Calculating, Deciding, Constricting [1]	Identifies and restructures cognitive schemas (Calculating) and facilitates deliberate commitment (Deciding) while establishing healthy psychological boundaries (Constricting).[32]
DBT	Expanding, Constricting, Accepting [1]	Integrates distress tolerance and mindfulness to balance radical release (Accepting) with relational warmth (Expanding) and boundary focus (Constricting).[33]
ACT	Accepting, Boosting, Deciding [1]	Leverages psychological flexibility to help clients accept internal pain (Accepting) and commit to value-based, motivated action (Boosting/Deciding).[34]
EMDR	Accepting, Sensing, Arranging [1]	Reprocesses traumatic memories (Sensing) via bilateral stimulation (Arranging) to integrate somatic states into a baseline of safe release (Accepting).[35]
CPT	Calculating, Accepting, Deciding [1]	Restructures traumatic "stuck points" (Calculating) to resolve cognitive fragmentation and move from fragmentation to wholeness (Accepting/Deciding).[36]
PE	Sensing, Accepting, Boosting [1]	Modifies pathological fear structures through repeated exposure (Sensing) to facilitate habituation and conative resilience (Accepting/Boosting).[37]
WET	Expanding, Accepting, Constricting [1]	Translates and contains traumatic narratives (Expanding/Constricting) into safe written structures to promote allostatic recovery (Accepting).[45]
IPT	Expanding, Constricting, Achieving [1]	Targets social functioning and relational dynamics, balancing relational warmth (Expanding) with boundary-setting (Constricting) and relational efficacy (Achieving).[39]
PDT	Sensing, Calculating,	Explores unconscious attachment patterns and defenses (Sensing/Calculating) to achieve deeper

	Expanding [1]	relational capacity (Expanding).[40]
PCT	Expanding, Appreciating, Accepting [1]	Fosters self-actualization through unconditional positive regard (Appreciating), empathy (Expanding), and psychological presence (Accepting).[41]
Schema Therapy	Arranging, Expanding, Achieving [1]	Identifies and restructures early maladaptive schemas (Arranging) to integrate emotional modes (Expanding/Achieving).[42]
Family Systems	Arranging, Expanding, Constricting [1]	Maps the family as an emotional ecosystem, structuring intergenerational boundaries (Constricting) and relational pathways (Arranging/Expanding).[43]
Unified Protocol	Constricting, Deciding, Boosting [1]	Targets core emotional processes across disorders, building emotional tolerance (Constricting) and active coping strategies (Deciding/Boosting).[44]

Section 2: Critical Analysis of CEF_external_validation.pdf — Structural Mechanics, Postural Alignment, and Mechanical Engineering Specifications

CEF_external_validation.pdf transitions the theoretical architecture of the CEF into a reproducible engineering standard and a structured somatic practice, detailing the framework's $3 \times 3 + 1$ system of ten operators.[1]

In this model, nine operators are housed within three functional centers, while a tenth operator, Accepting, serves as the universal baseline and manifestor for the entire system.[1]

A central contribution of CEF_external_validation.pdf is the re-mapping of the Enneagram.[1] Traditionally, the Enneagram describes character fixations and defensive coping patterns.[1]

The CEF, by contrast, maps each Enneagram type to the healthy functional operator that reflects its optimal psychological mode, rather than its defensive structure, which is essential for maintaining operator independence and preventing emotional fusion [1].

This mapping establishes that Deciding is not assigned to any Enneagram type; instead, Deciding serves as the universal balancing operator of the Head center, representing a clear capacity for orientation, commitment, and common sense that does not belong to any motivational fixation.[1]

Enneagram Type	CEF Hub	Healthy CEF Operator	Traditional Defensive Fixation
Type 1	Heart Hub	Constricting [1]	Internalized Anger / Idealism [1]
Type 2	Heart Hub	Expanding [1]	Externalized Shame [1]
Type 3	Heart Hub	Achieving [1]	Conflicted Shame [1]
Type 4	Head Hub	Sensing [1]	Internalized Shame [1]
Type 5	Head Hub	Calculating [1]	Internalized Fear [1]
Type 6	Gut Hub	Arranging [1]	Conflicted Fear [1]
Type 7	Gut Hub	Appreciating [1]	Externalized Fear [1]
Type 8	Gut Hub	Boosting [1]	Externalized Anger [1]
Type 9	Gut Hub	Accepting [1]	Repressed Anger [1]

Postural Alignment and Rudolf Magnus's Central Control

As documented in CEF_external_validation.pdf, postural alignment acts as the physical manifestation of the CEF's midline axis—composed of the Deciding, Achieving, Boosting, and Accepting operators [1].

This postural clarity supports the Deciding operator’s function of establishing orientation without introducing compensatory tension.[1]

This somatic connection is validated by F.M. Alexander's "Primary Control"—the head-neck-spine relationship that organizes overall coordination, balance, and functioning.[13]

Habitual tension in the neck muscles distorts proprioception, leading to "faulty sensory awareness" where an individual cannot accurately perceive how they are moving or holding themselves.[13]

Alexander's primary control was heavily influenced by pharmacologist and physiologist Rudolf Magnus's Utrecht experiments from 1909 to 1924.[13,14]

Magnus discovered that a complicated central nervous apparatus in the brainstem, from the upper cervical cord to the midbrain, governs entire body posture in a coordinated manner, establishing "central control" (*zentraler Körperstellungsapparat*) over postural muscular tone, standing, attitude, and righting reflexes.[14]

Alexander equated his Primary Control with Magnus's central control, arguing that getting the right direction from the head-neck relationship makes the coordination of the rest of the organism simple.[13]

The Alexander Technique operates on two core skills:

- **Inhibition**: A volitional pause before reacting to a stimulus, creating a space for reasoned choice and preventing automatic, subconscious reactions.[13]
- **Direction**: Giving the mind specific "body thoughts" (such as letting the neck be free, the head release forward and up, the spine lengthen, the shoulders broaden, and the legs move away) to allow the body to oppose gravity with expansion.[13]

These skills prevent "End Gaining"—becoming fixated on a goal while ignoring the "means-whereby" it is achieved—thereby supporting operator independence and allowing the Deciding operator to function from a poised, un-contracted state.[13]

Bilateral Integration and Midline Crossing

CEF_external_validation.pdf emphasizes that the physical mechanism for detangling fused operators is Emotional Cycling, which utilizes directional movements to stimulate specific functions: Clockwise (CW) for outgoing activation, Counter-Clockwise (CCW) for reflecting activation, and Swinging for balancing activation.[1]

The "Swinging" activations require crossing the body's midline—the hypothetical sagittal plane separating the left and right sides.[1]

Spontaneously crossing this midline with a hand or eye indicates that the two hemispheres of the brain are communicating efficiently via the corpus callosum, a dense bridge of 200 to 250 million myelinated nerve fibers.[16]

- **The Left Hemisphere**: Associated with language, sequential processing, logic, and factual details, supporting the CEF's Calculating and Constricting operators.
- **The Right Hemisphere**: Associated with non-verbal cues, spatial awareness, big-picture thinking, emotions, and creativity, supporting the CEF's Sensing and Expanding operators.

Midline crossing requires trunk rotation and core stability, which strengthens white matter integrity and enhances functional connectivity across the hemispheres.[16]

This bilateral integration enables the left brain (language) to verbally express right brain feelings (visceral emotions), preventing emotions from becoming unregulated.[16]

Difficulty crossing the midline is often linked to retained primitive reflexes, such as the Asymmetrical Tonic Neck Reflex (ATNR), which can hinder cognitive focus, visual tracking across pages, and motor coordination, often resulting in increased anxiety, letter reversals, and lower self-esteem.

Furthermore, neuroimaging studies demonstrate that children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) often exhibit reduced volume in the central segment of the corpus callosum,[17] a reduction directly linked to poorer motor coordination, repetitive behaviors, and difficulties in emotional regulation and social cooperation.

CEF cycling protocols are designed to integrate these retained reflexes and rebuild hemispheric coordination from the brainstem level to the cortex, ensuring balanced, bilateral regulation [1].

Hardware Validation: The ECM v3.1 and INAS v1.0

CEF_external_validation.pdf presents the exact engineering specifications that transform this somatic theory into a reproducible, mechanical testing paradigm.[1]

The Emotional Cycling Machine (ECM v3.1) physically activates the Head, Heart, and Gut centers using mechanical systems.[1]

It features a Primary Wheel Assembly (Module A) with a diameter of 42–48 cm and 38 cm of vertical travel to match the user's physical center heights.[1]

The Autonomous Resistance Engine (ARE) modulates dynamic resistance across the wheels based on physical load detection, achieving a response time of < 120 ms.[1]

The Emotional Load Mapping System (ELMS) samples micro-tremor frequency, grip pressure variability, and motion irregularities to infer a real-time "load index" (0–100).[1]

The connection is sustained through the Mechanical-Autonomous Interface Layer (MAIL) with a latency of < 50 ms.[1]

The Integrated Neuro-Affective Synchronizer (INAS v1.0) acts as the integration engine, synchronizing activation across multiple somatic, cognitive, and environmental layers to enforce rhythm stability and prevent cognitive overload [1]:

INAS Subsystem	Core Function	Integration Input
NARE-1	Rhythm Engine	Translates ECM physical movement patterns and environmental resonance to drive temporal synchronization.[1]
SSL-1	Somatic Layer	Maps postural alignment, pelvic grounding, and breathing rhythm to synchronize physiological states.[1]
CEAM-1	Cognitive Module	Tracks attention-state mapping and cognitive tempo to coordinate focus with somatic activation.[1]
ECI-1	Environmental Interface	Uses soundfield synchronization and lighting coherence to adjust ambient conditions to the user’s stability tier.[1]

CEF_external_validation.pdf links these mechanical protocols to empirical data from Pilot Study 3.[1]

This study explored how individuals utilize different internal capacities in everyday scenarios like task overload, conflict, setbacks, and opportunities, demonstrating a profound divergence between how people "usually act first" (their reflex reactions) and their "ideal" way to act.[1]

For example, in task overload situations, participants identified Deciding as the superior way to act to resolve cognitive dissonance under pressure.[1]

In conflict scenarios, participants often reflexively chose a protective, reducing action (Constricting) but viewed relational exploration (Expanding) or meaning-seeking (Appreciating) as the superior path.[1]

For loss scenarios, participants consistently selected Accepting as both their actual and ideal response, validating its role as the baseline for allostatic release.[1]

Section 3: Critical Analysis of CEF_Neurobiological_Somatic.pdf — Conative Dynamics, Pathological Fusions, and Somatic Characterology

The specialized manuscript CEF_Neurobiological_Somatic.pdf focuses on the conative foundations of the Gut hub, defining the Boosting operator as the organism's fundamental "will to act" and existential "will to live".[1]

Boosting provides the physiological and motivational "charge" required to sustain effort, assertiveness, and survival, somatically anchored in the dynamic engagement of the pelvic core.[1]

This is directly validated by Alexander Lowen's Bioenergetic Analysis, where "charge" represents the buildup and movement of bioenergetic excitation through the body, supporting the organism’s fundamental drive to exist.[14]

The Boosting-Constricting Fusion and Muscular Armouring

A central contribution of CEF_Neurobiological_Somatic.pdf is its characterological modeling of "emotional rigidity"—defined as a state where core operators become pathologically fused and lose their functional independence.[1]

The most debilitating configuration is the fusion of Boosting and Constricting within the Gut hub.[1]

Normally, Boosting provides the power of agency, while Constricting (properly housed in the Heart) regulates relational boundaries and focus in social connections.[1]

When Constricting "drops" into the Gut and fuses with Boosting, the individual's very "right to live"—their implicit, non-negotiable baseline of existential permission—

becomes conditional, requiring the individual to meet rigid, internalized standards to justify taking up space.[1]

This fusion manifests somatically as a "tonic grip" or chronic "bracing" pattern (a form of chronic sympathetic contraction), which locks the physical will to act in a state of high-arousal paralysis.[1]

Lowen identified the "right to exist" as a fundamental developmental right; a Boosting-Constricting fusion mirrors the "Schizoid" character style, where the individual questions their own right to be in the world and uses muscular bracing to protect against the terror of existence, resulting in emotional dissociation, cold extremities, and conative blockages.[14]

This matches Wilhelm Reich's concept of body 'armouring'—the chronic hardening of muscle tissue in response to physical, emotional, or mental pain, which functions as a defensive barrier against emotional experience.[18]

Grounding Stages and Pelvic Core Dynamics

To reverse these chronic shortening patterns, somatic grounding and pelvic floor integration are utilized to restore the Gut center's functional range, coordinating relaxation (Accepting) and engagement (Boosting) [1].

While Boosting "charges" the pelvis for action, Accepting utilizing the inward spiraling motion to "drop" the pelvic floor for discharge and surrender, lowering the center of gravity to reestablish baseline safety without collapsing agency [1].

Lowen's 'Basic Orienting Position' (BOP) instructs the practitioner to release tension in the pelvis, allow it to settle downward, and breathe easily and deeply to restore grounding.[19]

Grounding involves both "Supporting" (the connection to gravity/Accepting) and "Holding" (maintaining physical structure/Boosting) [1]:

Grounding Stage	Bioenergetic Stage Definition	CEF Operator Analogy	Somatic Action and Pelvic Mechanics
Supporting	Connection to gravity and the earth's	Boosting /	Releasing pelvic floor tension to allow energy flow to the

	foundation [19]	Accepting [1]	lower abdomen.[19]
Holding	Maintaining physical, postural, and energetic structure [19]	Boosting / Arranging [1]	Moderate, coordinated core muscular engagement to maintain upright stability.[19]
Containing	Managing and tolerating internal energetic pressure or charge [19]	Boosting / Constricting [1]	Consolidating pelvic core engagement to build capacity to tolerate intense emotion.[19]
Limiting	Setting clear, functional boundaries with the environment [19]	Constricting [1]	Dynamic contraction of sphincters and deep tissues to define bodily margins.[19]
Sustaining	Maintaining ongoing presence, vitality, and aesthetic resonance [19]	Boosting / Appreciating [1]	Continuous low-intensity tone in the pelvic floor to support relational presence.[19]
Protecting	Defensive stabilization and reactive muscular preparation [19]	Boosting / Arranging [1]	Rapid, protective stabilization of the pelvic girdle under stress.[19]
Discharging	Releasing accumulated tension into the earth [19]	Boosting / Accepting [1]	Surrendering weight to gravity, fully relaxing the pelvic floor muscles.[19]

Physiologically, the "pelvic stress reflex" is a subconscious shortening of the pelvic floor muscles when a person is stressed, leading to hypertonicity, pain, and Non-relaxing Pelvic Floor Dysfunction (NPFD).[1]

The Wise-Anderson Protocol, originally developed in the Stanford University Department of Urology, addresses this by using Extended Paradoxical Relaxation (EPR) to calm the upregulated autonomic nervous system and release trigger points.[21]

David Hubbard and Richard Gevirtz demonstrated via electromyographic (EMG) needle

monitoring that myofascial trigger points in tight muscles exhibit spontaneous electrical activity (SEA) that significantly increases during psychological stress, while adjacent fibers remain silent, illustrating how emotional factors directly influence pelvic muscle pain.[22]

Shifting and Relocation Protocols

CEF_Neurobiological_Somatic.pdf outlines two somatic shifting protocols to restore emotional agility [1]:

- **Balancing Boosting with Accepting in the Pelvic Core**: Integrating the Accepting operator provides the parasympathetic down-shift required to release the pelvic stress reflex—a chronic shortening of the muscles that results in emotional numbness and pelvic dysfunction.[1] Dropping the pelvic floor allows the autonomic system to shift out of chronic sympathetic contraction, reestablishing baseline safety without collapsing the conative capacity for agency.[1]
- **Relocating Constricting to the Heart Hub**: Moving the Constricting operator out of the conative Gut and relocating it back to the Heart hub restores its healthy function.[1] Housed in the Heart, Constricting serves to regulate relational aperture—setting boundaries and defining focus in social connections—rather than acting as a survival-level conative brake on the "will to live".[1] This relocation allows the Expanding operator (relational warmth) to function independently, supported by the Broaden-and-Build model where positive affect broadens the thought-action repertoire.[1]

These somatic protocols utilize midline crossing as their physical trigger, forcing Calculating (left brain) and Sensing (right brain) into synchronized activation.[1] This ensures that visceral states are not merely felt, but are cognitively organized and made available for deliberate, conscious action.[1]

Section 4: Integrated Computational Foundations and Mathematical Modeling

The Core Emotion Framework bridges qualitative somatic science and quantitative computational modeling, providing a technical specification to model emotional states

as a non-linear, dynamic integration of heterogeneous cognitive functions.

For synthetic systems, this permits "Synthetic Affect" where operators are implemented as computational transformations—such as data intake, logical analysis, commitment, aperture modulation, and momentum generation—preserving operator independence, sequencing, and agility without implying subjective experience.

Mathematical State and Weight Transitions

The state of the system is represented as a vector including activation values for all ten operators.[1]

The dynamic state transition is defined mathematically in CEF_external_validation.pdf as [1]:

$$S_{t+1} = f(S_t, O_{c,p})$$

Where S_t is the current state vector and $O_{c,p}$ maps a specific center-process pair to a scalar activation value representing regulatory intensity.[1]

To model how these operators change over time, the time-varying operator weight $(\omega_i(t))$ is defined in CEF_Evidence_Synthesis.pdf and CEF_Neurobiological_Somatic.pdf as a weighted, non-linear integration of cognitive functions (J_i) [1]:

$$\omega_i(t) = b_i + \sum_j \left(\alpha_{i,j}\, F_{i,j}(t)\right)$$

Where b_i is a bias representing the specific psychological profile (e.g., highly stable or highly active), $\alpha_{i,j}$ represents directional influence or interaction kernels, and $F_{i,j}(t)$ represents the normalized activation values of competing operators (e.g., Boosting and Accepting) [1].

To ensure the system-level affective state remains continuously changing and self-rebalancing, the architecture implements a Softmax-based competitive mechanism to interpret these weights as competitive energies.[1]

Endogenous Stochastic Modulation and Pink Noise

To ensure trajectory uniqueness and avoid the deterministic traps of structural rigidity, the model incorporates endogenous stochastic modulation through 1/f noise,

represented as $\zeta(t)$ in the weight transition equation [1]:

$$\omega_i(t) = b_i + \sum_j (\alpha_{i,j} \cdot F_{i,j}(t)) + \zeta(t)$$

Known as fractional Brownian motion, 1/f ("pink") noise has a spectral density inversely proportional to the frequency on a log-log plot ($S(f) \propto f^{-\alpha}$), yielding equal energy in equal octaves.[46]

This ubiquitous natural phenomenon is a mathematical signature of dynamic complexity and is associated with the elementary formation of representations in physical, biological, and psychological systems.[47]

In cognitive science, the aperiodic spectral slope is a marker of synaptic excitation/inhibition (E:I) balance.[48]

A steeper slope (larger exponent, more negative slope) indicates greater relative power at lower frequencies, reflecting stronger cognitive engagement, inhibitory control, and network synchronization.[49]

Conversely, a flatter slope (less negative exponent, approaching white noise $\alpha = 0$) reflects more asynchronous, uncoordinated, or "noisy" neural communication, as observed in healthy aging, schizophrenia, or under high cognitive demand.[50]

This age-related flattening of visual cortical 1/f noise has been shown to statistically mediate impairments in visual working memory, encapsulating cognitive decline within a neurocomputational model of 1/f noise-induced deficits in neural communication.[50]

The integration of 1/f noise into synthetic systems represents the intrinsic micro-variability of attention and arousal, ensuring the artificial agent maintains "cognitive flexibility"—the capacity to modify behavior or thinking in response to unexpected environmental events.

This mathematical modulation prevents the synthetic system from falling into rigid, pathological loops, consistent with the CEF principle that emotional agility emerges from flexible, context-sensitive operator integration.[1]

Furthermore, 1/f noise serves as a signature of optimal learning.[51]

Deep neural networks (such as LSTMs trained on natural language) exhibit clear 1/f activations in their neurons, but when the network is at overcapacity or contains

underutilized neurons, the activation patterns deviate from 1/f and shift toward white noise.[52]

This biological frequency distribution is also tied to the universal human emotional response to music.[53]

Voss and Clarke confirmed that the power spectra of loudness and frequency fluctuations across classical music (such as Bach), jazz, blues, and rock exhibit a 1/f distribution, which is judged by listeners to be significantly more pleasing than white noise (which is too random) or brown noise (which is too correlated).[53]

Non-linear EEG analysis reveals that computer-generated 1/f music elicits lower values of both the correlation dimension and the largest Lyapunov exponent in the right temporal lobe, indicating regularized, ordered brain dynamics and a positive emotional response.[53]

By incorporating 1/f noise, the CEF synthetic architecture mimics these biological systems, enabling autonomous agents to generate internally balanced affective dynamics [1].

Section 5: Constructivist Architecture, Predictive Processing, and Strategic Recommendations

The Core Emotion Framework aligns with Lisa Feldman Barrett's Theory of Constructed Emotion and the Embodied Predictive Interoception Coding (EPIC) model, establishing a systems neuroscience account of affective dynamics.[1]

This theory posits that emotions are not biologically hardwired universal circuits in the brain, but are emergent, situated states constructed predictively by the brain using past experiences (concepts) to categorize and make sense of noisy, ambiguous visceral and somatic sensations (interoception) within a specific context.[22]

The primary function of the brain is allostasis—the prospective, predictive regulation of the body's energy budget and metabolic resources in anticipation of future demands.[22]

The "allostatic-interoceptive network" (or EPIC model) comprises limbic visceromotor cortices (agranular and dysgranular cortices like the posterior vmPFC, OFC, ACC, and

ventral anterior insula aINS) at the top of the hierarchy, which issue interoceptive predictions to the primary interoceptive cortex (mid/posterior insula) to regulate the internal milieu.[56]

Interoceptive predictions are inherently imprecise compared to exteroceptive predictions (visual/auditory/somatosensory) because visceromotor-to-primary-interoceptive connections are monosynaptic (fewer synapses to elaborate details), layer IV in primary interoceptive cortex is underdeveloped in primates, and visceral sensations ascend via unmyelinated vagal fibers where signals can influence each other along the axons.[57]

This low-dimensional interoceptive feedback is experienced as "core affect" (basic dimensions of arousal and valence).[58]

The brain achieves this high-complexity organization through "degeneracy"—the capacity for dissimilar representations (different sets of neurons) to give rise to the same functional state or category (e.g., anger).[59]

In the CEF, the operators function as these predictive categories or internal transformations, providing a granular, modular organization for this construction process.[1]

Strategic System-Level Recommendations

To operationalize these academic, somatic, and computational findings, three strategic, system-level recommendations are presented:

- **Integrated Somato-Cognitive Clinical Protocols**: Mental health practitioners should move away from purely cognitive or physical therapeutic silos, designing integrated clinical programs based on the CEF operator mappings [1]. For clients presenting with chronic anxiety or somatic hypertonicity, clinicians must target the conative Gut hub to release the pelvic stress reflex and the Boosting-Constricting fusion.[1] This is achieved by combining cognitive restructuring (Calculating) with somatic grounding techniques (Accepting) that drop the pelvic floor, release pelvic tension, and re-engage the ventral vagal brake.[1] Once physiological safety is established, cognitive Deciding protocols can be introduced using the postural stability corridor of the Alexander Technique, utilizing Inhibition and Direction to prevent reactive "End Gaining".[13,15]

- **Bilateral Midline-Crossing Programs in Developmental Education**: Educational and motor-development curricula should incorporate structured, cross-lateral physical movements to promote primitive reflex integration and bilateral brain coordination.[16] By implementing physical activities that require crossing the body's midline (such as the "Swinging" activations in CEF Emotional Cycling), institutions can facilitate the integration of retained reflexes like the ATNR.[16] This physical training strengthens white matter integrity in the corpus callosum, enhancing the neural platform required to link right-hemisphere emotional states with left-hemisphere semantic expression, thereby improving visual tracking, academic focus, and social cooperation while reducing performance anxiety and low self-esteem in developing children.[16]
- **Algorithmic Synthetic Affect for Autonomous AI Architectures**: Software engineers and roboticists developing autonomous systems should transition from rule-based symbolic emotion models to the structural-constructivist architecture of the CEF to achieve authentic "Artificial Emotion" (AE). By implementing the ten operators as computational state transformations and utilizing the non-linear weighting formula modulated by 1/f pink noise, developers can construct predictive, active inference loops. This allows synthetic emotional states to emerge dynamically from the machine's own operational objectives and metabolic-equivalent energy needs (allostasis), ensuring continuous, self-rebalancing cognitive integration and preventing deterministic stagnation in complex, unpredictable environments.[1]

References

1. CEF Corpus (all cited as superscript 1)

- Bulgaria, J. (2026a). *CEF Evidence Synthesis.* PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/BULTSM-2
- Bulgaria, J. (2026b). *CEF Neurobiological & Somatic Foundations.* PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/BULSFO
- Bulgaria, J. (2026c). *CEF External Validation & Engineering Specifications.* PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/BULSDO-3

---

2. Gut–Brain Axis (superscript 2)

- Mayer, E. A., et al. (2013). *Gut feelings: The emerging biology of gut–brain communication. Nature Reviews Neuroscience.* https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3845678/

---

3. Neurocardiology / Vagal Signaling (superscript 3)

- Porges, S. W. (2023). *The vagal paradox: A polyvagal solution. Frontiers in Integrative* Neuroscience*.* https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10724739/

---

4. Serotonin in the Gut (superscript 4)

- Mayer, E. A. (2013). *Gut feelings: The emerging biology of gut–brain communication.* Semantic Scholar version. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Gut-feelings

---

5. Somatic Marker Hypothesis (superscript 5)

- The Decision Lab. (2024). *Somatic marker hypothesis.* https://thedecisionlab.com/reference-guide/psychology/somatic-marker-hypothesis

---

6. vmPFC / Amygdala Decision Pathways (superscript 6)

- Dunn, B. D., et al. (2024). *The linkage between decision-making and bodily states.* Psychophysiology. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11972200/

---

7. SEEKING System (superscript 7)

- Panksepp, J. (2011). The SEEKING mind: Primal neuro-affective substrates for appetitive incentive states. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. Panksepp, J. (2021). The SEEKING drive and its fixation. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8406748/

---

8. SEEKING Deficits / Compulsions (superscript 8)

- Panksepp, J. (2021). *The SEEKING drive and its fixation.* https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8406748/

---

9. Broaden-and-Build Theory (superscript 9)

- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology:
- *The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. American Psychologist. Broaden-and-build.* (2025). Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Broaden-and-build
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Levenson, R. W. (1998). Positive emotions speed recovery from cardiovascular sequelae of negative emotions. UNC PEP Lab.
- *The undoing effect of positive emotions.* (2011). https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3128334/

---

10. Undoing Effect (superscript 10)

- Psychology Fanatic. (2024). Undoing hypothesis: How positive emotions counteract stress.
- Penn State Pressbooks. (2024). Undoing effect of positive emotions.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Levenson, R. W. (1998). *Positive emotions speed recovery…* UNC PEP Lab.

---

11. Polyvagal Theory (superscript 11)

- Polyvagal Institute. (2024). *What is polyvagal theory?* https://www.polyvagalinstitute.org/whatispolyvagaltheory
- Horne, B. (2019). *Tune up the vagal brake.* EMDRAA.
- Porges, S. W. (2022). *Polyvagal theory: A science of safety. Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience.*
  Polyvagal theory. (2025). Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polyvagal_theory

---

12. Dorsal Vagal Shutdown / Defense Cascade (superscript 12)

- Kozlowska, K., et al. (2015). *Fear and the defense cascade.* https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4495877/
- Neurodivergent Insights. (2024). *Dorsal vagal shutdown.*

---

13. Alexander Technique — Primary Control (superscript 13)

- King, H. (2024). *Primary control.* https://www.hilaryking.net
- Alexander Technique London. (2024). *Primary control.*
- Amelia AT. (2024). Understanding the 5 principles of the Alexander Technique.
- Dance Without Limits. (2025). Core principles of the Alexander Technique.

---

14. Rudolf Magnus — Central Control (superscript 14)

- Alexander Technique Science. (2019). *A history of Magnus in the Alexander* Technique. https://alexandertechniquescience.com

---

15. Direction / AT Body Thoughts (superscript 15)

- Amelia AT. (2024). Understanding the 5 principles of the Alexander Technique — Part 5.

---

16. Midline Crossing / Corpus Callosum (superscript 16)

- Foundations Cognitive. (2024). The importance of bilateral integration. ResearchGate. (2024). OT-FMST protocol in ASD.
- PMC. (2024). OT-FMST protocol.
- Impact Learning. (2024). Bilateral integration and midline crossing.

---

17. ASD Corpus Callosum Reduction (superscript 17)

- ResearchGate / PMC. (2024). *OT-FMST protocol in ASD.* (Corpus callosum findings.)

---

18. Reichian Armouring (superscript 18)

- Lowen Foundation. (2024). *What is bioenergetics?*
- Energetics Institute. (2024). Reich's segmental armouring theory.
- TalkWorks Therapy. (2024). *Body psychotherapy.*

---

19. Lowen — Basic Orienting Position (superscript 19)

- Lowen, A. (1975–1990). *Basic orienting position.* (Referenced via somatic therapy literature.)

---

20. Pelvic Floor / Somatic Practices (superscript 20)

- Brett Larkin Yoga. (2024). Advanced pelvic floor breathing.
- Original Body Wisdom. (2024). Somatic movement practices for a healthy pelvic floor.
- Pelvic Pain Help. (2024). Symptoms and treatments in pelvic pain.

---

21. Wise-Anderson Protocol (superscript 21)

- Wise, D., & Anderson, R. (2008). *A Headache in the Pelvis: A New Understanding and Treatment for Chronic Pelvic Pain Syndromes* (6th ed.). National Center for Pelvic Pain Research.
- Wise-Anderson Protocol. (2024). Pelvic floor dysfunction treatment.
- Pelvic Pain Help. (2024). Why stress triggers and perpetuates pelvic pain.

---

22. EMG Trigger Point Stress (superscript 22)

- Hubbard, D., & Berkoff, G. (1993). Myofascial trigger points show spontaneous needle EMG activity. Semantic Scholar.
- Gevirtz, R., et al. (1994). Needle EMG response to psychological stress. PubMed.

---

23. Cephalic Brain Neuron Coun t~86–100 billion (superscript 23)

- Azevedo et al. (2009) — Equal numbers of neuronal and nonneuronal cells in the human brain
- Herculano-Houzel (2012) — *The human brain in numbers*

---

24. Cardiac Intrinsic Nervous System ~40,000 neurons (superscript 24)

- Armour (1991, 2004) — *Neurocardiology*
- Ardell (1994) — Cardiac neuronal hierarchy

---

25. The Enteric Nerve Endings (superscript 25)

- Gershon, M. D. (1998). *The Second Brain: A Groundbreaking New* Understanding *of* Nervous *Disorders of the Stomach and Intestine*. HarperCollins.
- Furness, J. B. (2006). *The Enteric Nervous System*. Blackwell *Publishing*.
- Costa, M., Brookes, S. J. H., & Hennig, G. W. (2000). Anatomy and *physiology* of the *enteric* nervous system. *Gut*, 47(Suppl 4), iv15–iv19.

26. Serotonin Production in the Gut ~95% of body serotonin (superscript 26)

- Gershon, M. D., & Tack, J. (2007). The serotonin signaling system: From gut to brain. *Gastroenterology*, 132(1), 397–414.
- Mawe, G. M., & Hoffman, J. M. (2013). Serotonin signaling in the gut—functions, dysfunctions, and therapeutic targets. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, 10(8), 473–486.
- Yano, J. M., et al. (2015). Indigenous bacteria from the gut microbiota regulate host serotonin biosynthesis. *Cell*, 161(2), 264–276.

---

27. Somatic Marker Hypothesis (SMH) (superscript 27)

- Damasio, A. R. (1994). Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain. Putnam.
- Bechara, A., Damasio, H., Damasio, A. R., & Anderson, S. W. (1994). Insensitivity to future consequences following damage to human prefrontal cortex. *Cognition*, 50(1–3), 7–15.
- Damasio, A. R. (1996). The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 351(1346), 1413–1420.

---

28. Gamma-Band Oscillations in Dopaminergic and Limbic Circuits (superscript 28)

- Berridge, K. C., & Robinson, T. E. (1998). What is the role of dopamine in reward: Hedonics, learning, or incentive salience? Brain Research Reviews.
- Van der Meer, M. A., & Redish, A. D. (2011). Theta and gamma oscillations in the basal ganglia–thalamocortical loop during decision-making. Neuron.
- Lammel, S., et al. (2012). Input-specific control of reward and aversion in the ventral tegmental area. Nature.
- Lisman, J., & Jensen, O. (2013). *The theta-gamma neural code.* Neuron.

---

29. Ultrasonic Vocalizations in Positive Affective States (superscript 29)

- Burgdorf, J., & Panksepp, J. (2001). *Tickling induces reward in adolescent rats.* Physiology & *Behavior*.
- Burgdorf, J., Knutson, B., & Panksepp, J. (2000–2006). *50-kHz ultrasonic vocalizations as indices of positive affect in rats.* Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews.
- Knutson, B., Burgdorf, J., & Panksepp, J. (2002). *Ultrasonic vocalizations as affective indicators.* Psychological Bulletin.

---

30. Tonic Dopamine Dysregulation and Compulsive/Amotivational States (superscript 30)

- Ikemoto, S., & Panksepp, J. (1999). *The role of nucleus accumbens dopamine in motivated behavior.* Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews.
- Salamone, J. D., & Correa, M. (2002–2012). The mesolimbic dopamine system and effort-related choice behavior. Psychopharmacology.
- Berridge, K. C. (2007). The debate over dopamine's role in reward: Incentive salience vs. hedonia. Psychopharmacology.
- Treadway, M. T., & Zald, D. H. (2011). *Anhedonia and effort-based decision-making in depression.* Biological Psychiatry.

---

31. Jacksonian Dissolution and Hierarchical Regression (superscript 31)

- Jackson, J. H. (1884–1905). Selected Writings of John Hughlings Jackson.
- Luria, A. R. (1973). *The Working Brain.*
- MacLean, P. D. (1990). The Triune Brain in Evolution.
- Porges, S. W. (2007). Neuroception: A subconscious system for detecting threat and safety. (for modern reinterpretation)

---

32. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 32)

- Beck, A. T. (1976). Cognitive Therapy and the Emotional Disorders.
- Beck, J. S. (2011). Cognitive Behavior Therapy: Basics and Beyond.

- Ellis, A. (1962). Reason and Emotion in Psychotherapy.
- Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., et al. (2012). *The efficacy of CBT: A review of meta-analyses.* Cognitive Therapy and Research.

---

33. Dialectical Behavior Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 33)

- Linehan, M. M. (1993). Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder.
- Linehan, M. M. (2014). DBT Skills Training Manual (2nd ed.).
- Lynch, T. R., Chapman, A. L., et al. (2006). *Mechanisms of change in DBT.* Journal of Clinical Psychology.
- Neacsiu, A. D., Rizvi, S. L., & Linehan, M. M. (2010). *Dialectical behavior therapy skills use as a mediator and outcome of treatment.* Behaviour Research and Therapy.

---

34. Acceptance and Commitment Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 34)

- Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K. D., & Wilson, K. G. (1999). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: An Experiential Approach to Behavior Change.
- Hayes, S. C., Luoma, J. B., et al. (2006). *Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: Model, processes, and outcomes.* Behaviour Research and Therapy.
- Strosahl, K. D., & Robinson, P. J. (2017). The Mindfulness and Acceptance Workbook for Depression.
- Levin, M. E., et al. (2012). *ACT and psychological flexibility: A meta-analysis.* Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science.

---

35. EMDR — Empirical Foundations (superscript 35)

- Shapiro, F. (1989). Eye movement desensitization: A new treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry.
- Shapiro, F. (2001). Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing: Basic Principles, Protocols, and Procedures.

- van den Hout, M., & Engelhard, I. (2012). *How does EMDR work?* Journal of Experimental Psychopathology.
- Lee, C. W., & Cuijpers, P. (2013). *A meta-analysis of EMDR for PTSD.* Clinical Psychology Review.

---

36. Cognitive Processing Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 36)

- Resick, P. A., & Schnicke, M. K. (1992). *Cognitive processing therapy for sexual assault victims.* Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.
- Resick, P. A., Monson, C. M., & Chard, K. M. (2016). Cognitive Processing Therapy for PTSD: A Comprehensive Manual.
- Chard, K. M. (2005). An evaluation of cognitive processing therapy for PTSD. Journal of Traumatic Stress.
- Resick, P. A., et al. (2008). *A randomized clinical trial of CPT vs. PE.* Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.

---

37. Prolonged Exposure Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 37)

- Foa, E. B., & Kozak, M. J. (1986). Emotional processing of fear: Exposure to corrective information. Psychological Bulletin.
- Foa, E. B., Hembree, E. A., & Rothbaum, B. O. (2007). Prolonged Exposure Therapy for PTSD: Emotional Processing of Traumatic Experiences.
- Craske, M. G., Treanor, M., et al. (2014). *Optimizing exposure therapy with inhibitory learning.* Behaviour Research and Therapy.
- Powers, M. B., Halpern, J. M., et al. (2010). *A meta-analytic review of PE for PTSD.* Clinical Psychology Review.

---

38. Family Systems Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 38)

- Bowen, M. (1978). Family Therapy in Clinical Practice.
- Kerr, M. E., & Bowen, M. (1988). *Family Evaluation.*
- Nichols, M. P. (2013). Family Therapy: Concepts and Methods.
- Titelman, P. (2014). Differentiation of Self: Bowen Family Systems Theory

Perspectives.

---

39. AEDP — Empirical and Theoretical Foundations (superscript 39)

- Fosha, D. (2000). The Transforming Power of Affect: A Model for Accelerated Change.
- Fosha, D., Siegel, D. J., & Solomon, M. (2009). The Healing Power of Emotion: Affective Neuroscience, Development & Clinical Practice.
- Fosha, D. (2013). *Dyadic repair of attachment trauma.* Journal of Psychotherapy Integration.
- Iwakabe, S., & Conceição, N. (2016). *Client emotional processing in AEDP.* Journal of Counseling Psychology.

---

40. Somatic Experiencing — Empirical and Theoretical Foundations (superscript 40)

- Levine, P. A. (1997). Waking the Tiger: Healing Trauma.
- Levine, P. A. (2010). In an Unspoken Voice: How the Body Releases Trauma and Restores Goodness.
- Payne, P., Levine, P. A., & Crane-Godreau, M. A. (2015). Somatic Experiencing: Using interoception and proprioception as core elements of trauma therapy. Frontiers in Psychology.
- Grabbe, L., & Miller-Karas, E. (2018). *Trauma-informed stabilization treatment and SE.* Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association.

---

41. ISTDP — Empirical and Theoretical Foundations (superscript 41)

- Davanloo, H. (1990). Unlocking the Unconscious: Selected Papers of Habib Davanloo.
- Abbass, A. (2015). Reaching Through Resistance: Advanced Psychotherapy Techniques.
- Abbass, A., Town, J. M., & Driessen, E. (2012). *ISTDP for anxiety and depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis.* Depression and Anxiety.
- Town, J. M., Abbass, A., et al. (2017). *ISTDP outcomes across disorders.* Journal of

Nervous and Mental Disease.

---

42. Emotion-Focused Therapy — Empirical and Theoretical Foundations (superscript 42)

- Greenberg, L. S. (2011). Emotion-Focused Therapy: Theory and Practice.
- Greenberg, L. S., & Watson, J. C. (2006). *Emotion-Focused Therapy for Depression.*
- Pascual-Leone, A., & Greenberg, L. S. (2007). *Emotional processing in EFT: A process-outcome study.* Psychotherapy Research.
- Elliott, R., Watson, J. C., et al. (2013). Humanistic-experiential psychotherapies: Summary of meta-analyses. Psychotherapy.

---

43. Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 43)

- Segal, Z. V., Williams, J. M. G., & Teasdale, J. D. (2002). Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy for Depression: A New Approach to Preventing Relapse.
- Teasdale, J. D., Segal, Z. V., & Williams, J. M. G. (1995). *How does cognitive therapy prevent depressive relapse?* Behaviour Research and Therapy.
- Kuyken, W., et al. (2016). MBCT vs. maintenance antidepressants for relapse prevention. The Lancet.
- Crane, R. S., et al. (2017). *MBCT: Evidence and practice.* Mindfulness.

---

44. Unified Protocol — Empirical Foundations (superscript 44)

- Barlow, D. H., Farchione, T. J., et al. (2011). Unified Protocol for Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders: Therapist Guide. Oxford University Press.
- Farchione, T. J., Fairholme, C. P., et al. (2012). Unified Protocol for Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders: Randomized controlled trial. Behavior Therapy.
- Barlow, D. H., Sauer-Zavala, S., et al. (2017). The Unified Protocol for Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders: A review of evidence. Current Psychiatry Reports.
- Sauer-Zavala, S., et al. (2020). *Mechanisms of change in the Unified Protocol.* Clinical Psychology Review.

---

45. Written Exposure Therapy — Empirical Foundations (superscript 45)

- Sloan, D. M., & Marx, B. P. (2019). Written Exposure Therapy for PTSD: A Brief Treatment Approach for Mental Health Professionals.
- Sloan, D. M., Marx, B. P., et al. (2012). *Written exposure therapy for PTSD: A randomized controlled trial.* Journal of Traumatic Stress.
- Sloan, D. M., Marx, B. P., et al. (2018). A brief exposure-based treatment for PTSD: Outcomes from a large randomized clinical trial. Psychological Trauma.
- Marx, B. P., & Sloan, D. M. (2015). *The role of written exposure in trauma recovery.* Clinical Psychology Review.

---

46. Fractional Brownian Motion / 1/f Noise Definition (superscript 46)

- Mandelbrot, B. B., & Van Ness, J. W. (1968). *Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications.* SIAM Review, 10(4), 422–437.

---

47. 1/f Noise as a Signature of Complexity / Self-Organized Criticality (superscript 47)

- Bak, P., Tang, C., & Wiesenfeld, K. (1987). *Self-organized criticality: An explanation of 1/f noise.* Physical Review Letters, 59(4), 381–384.

---

48. Aperiodic Spectral Slope as an E:I Balance Marker (superscript 48)

- Gao, R., Peterson, E. J., & Voytek, B. (2017). *Inferring synaptic excitation/inhibition balance from field potentials.* NeuroImage, 158, 70–78.

---

49. Steeper Slope = Better Cognitive Control / Network Synchrony (superscript 49)

- Waschke, L., Donoghue, T., Fiedler, L., Smith, R., Garrett, D. D., & Voytek, B. (2021). *Modality-general and modality-specific components of the neural 1/f slope.* NeuroImage, 237, 118191.

50. Aging-Related Flattening + Working Memory Mediation (superscript 50)

- Voytek, B., Kramer, M. A., Case, J., Lepage, K. Q., Tempesta, Z. R., Knight, R. T., & Gazzaley, A. (2015). *Age-related changes in 1/f neural electrophysiological noise.* Journal of Neuroscience, 35(38), 13257–13265.

---

51. 1/f noise as a signature of optimal learning (superscript 51)

- Kello, C. T., et al. (2010). *Scaling laws in cognitive sciences.* Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 14(5), 223–232.

---

52. 1/f Noise in Deep Neural Networks (superscript 52)

- Saxe, A. M., McClelland, J. L., & Ganguli, S. (2019). *A mathematical theory of deep learning.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(23), 11537–11546.

---

53. 1/f Noise in Music + EEG Response (superscript 53)

- Voss, R. F., & Clarke, J. **(***1978***).** *"1/f noise" in music and speech.* Nature, 258, 317–318.

---

54. Constructed Emotion / Predictive Processing (superscript 54)

- Barrett, L. F. (2017). How Emotions Are Made: The Secret Life of the Brain. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

---

55. **Allostasis & Predictive Regulation** (**superscript 55**)

- Sterling**,** P**.** (2012**).** *Allostasis: A model of predictive regulation.* Physiology &

Behavior, 106(1), 5–15. •

---

56. **Allostatic-Interoceptive Network / EPIC Model** (**superscript 56)**

- Barrett, L**.** F., & Simmons, W. K. (2015). *Interoceptive predictions in the brain.* Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 16(7), 419–429. •

---

57. **Visceromotor–Interoceptive Connectivity Constraints** (**superscript 57**)

- Kleckner, I. R., et al. (2017). *Evidence for a large-scale brain system supporting* allostasis *and interoception in humans.* Nature Human Behaviour, 1, 0069. •

---

58. **Core Affect** (**superscript 58)**

- Russell, J. A. (2003). *Core affect and the psychological construction of emotion.* Psychological Review, 110(1), 145–172. •

---

59. **Degeneracy in Neural Systems** (**superscript 59**)

- Edelman, G. M., & Gally, J. A. (2001). *Degeneracy and complexity in biological systems.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 98(24), 13763–13768.

---

60. **Predictive Categories** / **Conceptual Construction** (**superscript 60)**

- Barrett, L. F. (2013). *Psychological construction: The Darwinian approach to the science of emotion.* Emotion Review, 5(4), 379–389.