Structural Psychopathology of Major Depressive Disorder: An Expert Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF)

Jamel Bulgaria
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5269-5739
Affiliation: optimizeyourcapabilities.com

I. Introduction and Conceptual Foundation of Structural Psychopathology

The diagnosis and treatment of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) face significant challenges due to the inherent heterogeneity of symptoms and the limitations of traditional, symptom-based psychiatric nosologies.[1] Historically, the reliance on descriptive criteria (e.g., DSM or ICD) has often failed to provide a precise roadmap for predicting individual treatment responses.[1] Consequently, there is an intensifying academic search for mechanism-based, transdiagnostic models that pivot the focus from outward symptoms to the underlying structural integrity of psychological systems.[1]

I.A. The Transdiagnostic Imperative and the Search for Mechanisms

The limitations of symptom-based diagnostics in predicting treatment outcomes have led to a gathering consensus within mental health science that such classification systems may no longer be fit for purpose in modern research and clinical practice.[1] Symptom clusters often encompass a vast spectrum of underlying affective and motivational dysfunctions, making it difficult to select targeted interventions.[5] Dimensional approaches, such as the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiToP) or the p-Factor, are gaining support because they offer alternative conceptualizations of mental health difficulties by organizing psychopathology based on continuous dimensions rather than categorical distinctions.[4] This dimensional view is crucial because it addresses the failure of traditional nosologies to account for subthreshold manifestations of psychopathology, which are associated with high rates of functional impairment and health service utilization.[7]

Furthermore, the goal of clinical care has evolved, moving beyond mere symptom severity reduction to encompass comprehensive outcomes such as "functional recovery" and the subjective sense of "personal recovery"—defined as living a personally meaningful life regardless of ongoing symptoms.[2] Achieving these broader goals necessitates models that articulate the deep, functional mechanisms driving the illness.

The Core Emotion Framework (CEF), a novel structural-constructivist model, responds directly to this transdiagnostic imperative by pivoting the analysis from symptoms to the underlying *structural integrity* of the emotional regulation system.[8] The CEF defines MDD not as a collection of symptoms, but as a fundamental disorder of *structural inertia* and *dysvaluation* within this emotional architecture.[9]

I.B. Conceptualizing the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) as a Structural-Constructivist Model

The CEF is grounded in a structural-constructivist approach to emotional regulation.[10] This places the framework in dialogue with established theories, such as the constructed

emotion model, which posits that emotional concepts are cognitively and socially constructed from basic feelings or core affects.[10] However, the CEF extends this by providing a concrete structural blueprint for this construction process, dissecting emotional regulation into ten fundamental and irreducible psychological capacities, termed Core Emotions, categorized across three functional centers: the Head, the Heart, and the Gut.[11]

These Core Emotions are defined as dynamic, actionable processes, rather than abstract psychological states. The structural organization of the CEF is delineated as follows:

1. **Head Emotions (Cognition and Decision-Making):** These capacities—*Inquisitive Sensing*, *Structural Analysis* (Calculating), and *Decisive Knowing* (Deciding)—govern perception, analysis, and choices, aligning strongly with the cognitive component of emotional experience.[8]

2. **Heart Emotions (Connection and Emotional Flow):** These capacities—*Expansive Openness* (Expanding), *Definitive Constriction* (Constricting), and *Harmonious Achievement* (Achieving)—govern interpersonal connection, empathy, boundary setting, and balancing multiple demands.[8]

3. **Gut Emotions (Action and Motivation):** These capacities—*Strategic Order* (Arranging), *Appreciative Resonance* (Appreciating), *Assertive Drive* (Boosting), and *Receptive Manifestation* (Accepting)—form the wellspring of productivity, engagement, and the impetus for action.[8]

By defining these emotional elements as specific, measurable *capacities* that can be misaligned, the CEF transitions from being purely descriptive, like some emotional intelligence frameworks [8], to being a precise, mechanism-based framework. This structural clarity is essential for rigorous scientific testing and targeted therapeutic intervention. The CEF's innovation lies in leveraging the constructivist concept that emotions are built and providing the explicit, actionable structure required for understanding how that construction fails in MDD.[10]

II. Core Pathophysiology of MDD: Validation of Systemic Decoupling (The Transdiagnostic Signature)

The core insight of the CEF extension for Major Depressive Disorder is the identification of a transdiagnostic signature: the **Systemic Decoupling of Affective Valuation from Motivational Initiative**.[9] This mechanism describes a fundamental functional breakdown between the system's ability to assign positive value and its ability to mobilize effort toward valued goals.

II.A. The Decoupling Hypothesis and Established Reward Processing Models

The concept of decoupling valuation from motivation is not a novel psychological observation but maps precisely onto the established neuroscientific fractionation of reward processing. Reward processing, a broad psychological construct central to MDD pathophysiology, is commonly parsed into three distinct components: "reinforcement learning" (learning), "reward responsiveness" (liking or hedonic capacity), and "motivation to obtain a reward" (wanting or effort mobilization).[5]

The CEF's decoupling hypothesis—the breakdown between *Valuation* and *Initiative* [9]—directly parallels the clinical and neurobiological distinction between hedonic capacity (liking) and motivational drive (wanting).[5] Motivational impairments in depression are receiving significant attention, often focusing on the reduced *value of control*.[9] Specifically, animal models and clinical research suggest that the mesolimbic dopamine system is selectively involved in reward motivation ("wanting"), separate from the hedonic response when rewards are actually gained ("liking").[5] MDD pathology is characterized by deficits in both these components—reward valuation, anticipation, and motivation—which collectively constitute anhedonia.[5]

The CEF effectively provides functional, psychological descriptors for these neurobiological components. The CEF's *Affective Valuation* component structurally

aligns with the established hedonic capacity ("liking").[5] Conversely, the *Motivational Initiative* component aligns with the dopaminergic-mediated drive ("wanting") that facilitates approach behavior.[5] The structural model asserts that in MDD, the critical functional relationship between these two processes—which should normally feed forward to generate purposeful, goal-directed behavior—is fundamentally broken.[9] This structural mapping of the psychological framework onto verifiable neurobiological systems strengthens the model's claim to scientific rigor.

III. Structural Failure Point Analysis: The Gut Center Collapse

The Core Emotion Framework posits that the primary pathology of MDD originates in the Gut Center, the locus of action and motivation, leading to a systemic collapse of drive and a pathological misapplication of cognitive resources.[9]

III.A. The Primary Deficit: Receptive Manifestation (Accepting) Failure

The initial failure point in the MDD structural fingerprint is identified in the **Receptive Manifestation (Accepting)** capacity of the Gut Center.[13] This capacity, responsible for integrating positive affective feedback, internalizing self-worth, and accepting the potential for future reward, is compromised.[13] In the depressed state, this function fails to effectively process positive or corrective information, while readily absorbing negative stimuli. This leads to profound core depressive symptoms, including self-blame, worthlessness, and persistent dysphoria.[15]

This structural failure functionally describes the established neurobiological finding of **impaired hedonic attribution capacity**. Depressed individuals often anticipate lower payoffs from rewards or display reduced behavioral and neural responses in anticipation

of rewards, indicating an impairment in how subjective value is assigned.[9] Neuroimaging research has linked this valuation impairment to dysfunction in the orbital and ventromedial frontal cortices.[5] The CEF interpretation is that the *Receptive Manifestation* capacity acts as the affective gatekeeper. If this capacity fails to *Accept* internal validation or external reward potential, the system lacks the psychological currency—or fundamental energy input—needed for motivation.[13] This failure to internalize value creates an internal deficit in self-validation, which the CEF identifies as the systemic deficiency that structurally inhibits the remainder of the action and motivation complex.[13] This establishes the *Accepting* failure as the causal origin of the depressive cascade within the structural model.[13]

III.B. The Secondary Collapse: Inhibition of Assertive Drive (Boosting) and Action (Arranging)

The affective dysvaluation originating in the *Receptive Manifestation* capacity structurally inhibits the other Gut Center capacities, specifically the *Assertive Drive* (Boosting) and *Strategic Order* (Arranging).[12] This inhibition is crucial because these capacities are responsible for sustaining effort, resilience, organizing resources, and initiating action.[12]

The consequence of this structural collapse manifests directly as the core motivational symptoms of MDD:

1. **Anhedonia:** The inability to anticipate or experience pleasure is explained as the *Receptive Manifestation* capacity failing to sufficiently prime the *Assertive Drive* (Boosting) capacity for action.[13] Motivational deficits in MDD are known to involve the **unwillingness to exert effort** to obtain rewards, often linked to cognitive effort devaluation.[12]
2. **Psychomotor Retardation (PmR):** The observed slowing of physical movement and thought reflects a systemic conservation of energy and a failure to mobilize resources.[17] Research confirms a significant empirical relationship between subjectively experienced anhedonia and observable psychomotor retardation.[17]

Furthermore, instrumental measures show that lower velocity scaling (an indicator of less PmR) is negatively related to greater anhedonia, suggesting a shared or closely linked underlying neurobiological mechanism.[18]

The CEF's structural connection between the inhibition of the *Assertive Drive* (Boosting) and psychomotor retardation is strongly supported by this clinical data.[17] If *Boosting* represents the foundational power of agency, its failure translates directly into the observable psychomotor slowing—a systemic energy conservation resulting from the fundamental devaluation of effort and outcome.[12] The *Strategic Order* (Arranging) capacity, which manages the fine-tuning of immediate action, subsequently becomes suppressed due to the lack of this initiating force, leading to profound passivity and inertia.[6]

IV. Structural Failure Point Analysis: The Head Center Entrapment

The structural model highlights that the cognitive symptoms of MDD are not independent of the motivational collapse but are instead a pathological consequence of misapplied structural function in the Head Center.[5]

IV.A. Misapplication of Structural Analysis (Calculating) Capacity

In MDD, the Head Center's capacity for *Structural Analysis* (Calculating)—which normally governs in-depth analysis, rigorous logical processing, and strategic planning—remains hyperactive.[2] However, it is structurally misapplied. Instead of focusing on objective external prediction and problem-solving, it redirects its considerable computational power inward to process the negative self-worth input generated by the failed *Receptive Manifestation* (Accepting) capacity.[20] This results in self-perpetuating cycles of chronic,

negative, self-referential rumination.[20]

This description aligns with extensive research on rumination in MDD. Rumination is confirmed to be associated with significant cognitive dysfunction and is a factor in treatment resistance.[19] The core function of the *Calculating* capacity is sophisticated problem-solving.[20] However, studies show that rumination persists precisely when it focuses on the causes or consequences of negative events and the distress itself, *rather than on actions aimed to resolve the discrepancies*.[20] This pathological non-productivity confirms the CEF claim that the capacity is structurally misapplied—the mechanism works, but the input and objective are flawed.[20]

IV.B. Neural Correlates of Cognitive Entrapment

The pathological application of the *Structural Analysis* capacity results in cognitive entrapment because the Head Center is structurally constrained to interpret the negative self-valuation as an unchangeable truth.[20] This constraint prevents the generation of alternative predictions or solutions, cementing the depressive state.[20]

The neural signature of this mechanism involves hyperactivity and misconnectivity. Rumination is empirically linked to deficits in cognitive control, particularly conflict monitoring, as evidenced by reduced N2 amplitude during certain cognitive tasks.[15] Furthermore, higher rumination intensity is associated with increased neural activity in frontoparietal regions during difficult inhibitory control tasks.[19] This structural misapplication is also associated with Default Mode Network (DMN) functioning.[19] The DMN is known for its role in self-referential processing. The model explains that the *Structural Analysis* capacity redirects its analytical power inward, utilizing these DMN structures in a non-adaptive loop. This sustained, non-productive cognitive loop consumes resources needed for inhibitory control.[19] Recent neuroscientific appeals suggest that rumination is maintained as a stable trait by complex multilayer connectivity biomarkers across functional and structural modalities [22], supporting the CEF's view of rumination as a system-level structural entrapment.

V. Mechanism-Driven Therapeutics: Structural Alignment of Interventions

A critical utility of the CEF structural model is its ability to provide a precise roadmap for personalized medicine by structurally indexing therapeutic modalities to the specific pathological mechanism they are designed to target.[1]

The following table *(Table 1)* summarizes the proposed structural targets and the empirical validation supporting the alignment.

Table 1: CEF Structural Targets and Mechanism-Based Therapeutic Alignment

Intervention	**CEF Structural Target**	**CEF Proposed Action**	**Established Mechanism of Action (Supporting Evidence)**
Behavioral Activation (BA)	Assertive Drive (Boosting)	Structurally reactivate drive capacity via forced positive feedback loops, bypassing primary valuation failure.	Motivational instruction improves cognitive and psychomotor performance, confirming motivational origin of impairment. [23]
SSRI Medication	Assertive Drive	Facilitates	Reduction of core

	(Boosting)	neurochemical execution of motivation and drive.	affective symptoms (depressed mood, psychic anxiety) related to motivational collapse. [24]
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)	Structural Analysis (Calculating)	Challenges negative rumination; recalibrates computational capacity toward objective reality.	Modifying maladaptive cognitions; functional and structural changes in prefrontal cortical regions associated with the cognitive circuit. [25]
ACT / Psychodynamic Therapy	Receptive Manifestation (Accepting)	Rebuilds functional integrity of acceptance capacity; resolves developmental deficits in self-worth integration.	Directly targets the foundational deficit (valuation failure) by promoting non-judgmental acceptance and values clarification. [16]

V.A. Targeting the Assertive Drive (Boosting): Behavioral Activation and SSRIs

Behavioral Activation (BA) and Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs) are

structurally indexed to the *Assertive Drive* (Boosting) capacity.[23] These treatments address the manifestation of the decoupling mechanism by directly attempting to restore motivational output.

The mechanism of BA is to counteract behavioral inertia by forcing the initiation of valued activities, thereby creating positive feedback loops that structurally reactivate the *Boosting* capacity.[23] This mechanism is powerfully validated by experimental evidence showing that motivational intervention can functionally undo cognitive impairments previously believed to be fixed deficits. Specifically, research found that goal-setting instructions—a core component of a motivational approach like BA—significantly improved memory performance (by 10%) and psychomotor performance (by 13%) in depressed patients.[23] This confirms that core cognitive and psychomotor deficits in MDD often have a **motivational origin**.[23] The efficacy of BA, therefore, rests on its ability to structurally bypass the primary valuation failure and force the system back into goal-directed movement.[23]

SSRIs, which target the neurochemical substrates that facilitate the execution of motivation [24], structurally support this reactivation. A meta-analysis focusing on SSRIs found them to be more efficacious than CBT in reducing core **affective symptoms** (depressed mood and psychic anxiety).[24] Affective symptoms are inherently linked to the state of profound dysphoria and motivational collapse.[13] The greater efficacy of SSRIs on these symptoms suggests a primary restoration of the Gut Center's emotional energy output (*Boosting*) [24], facilitating the drive required for emotional stability and initiation.

V.B. Targeting the Structural Analysis (Calculating): Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) is structurally indexed to the Head Center's *Structural Analysis* (Calculating) capacity.[20] The therapeutic goal of CBT is to challenge and restructure the chronic negative rumination [20] by teaching the individual to recalibrate the *Calculating* capacity toward objective reality testing.[25]

CBT, which focuses on identifying and modifying maladaptive cognitions [25], seeks to break the cycle of cognitive entrapment. Functionally, this involves changing the *input* and *objective* of the *Calculating* capacity, moving it away from processing the flawed premise of self-devaluation [20] and back toward sophisticated problem-solving.[20] Evidence supports this alignment by demonstrating that CBT induces measurable changes in the brain's dorsal cognitive circuit, leading to alterations in regions such as the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC) and prefrontal cortical regions.[25] These regions are implicated in regulating the cognitive processes affected by rumination.[19] Therefore, CBT's success is a result of restoring the *Calculating* capacity to its adaptive functional state.[25]

V.C. Targeting the Receptive Manifestation (Accepting): ACT and Psychodynamic Therapy

Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) and Psychodynamic Therapy are structurally indexed to the foundational pathology: the *Receptive Manifestation* (Accepting) capacity.[26]

The CEF places ACT and Psychodynamic therapies highest in the hierarchy of intervention, as they target the primary structural deficit that causes the systemic decoupling.[13] ACT's methodology, with its focus on values clarification and non-judgmental acceptance, directly attempts to rebuild the functional integrity of the *Accepting* capacity.[26] This approach teaches the system to tolerate and integrate painful affects without resorting to the automatic structural defense of self-devaluation. Psychodynamic approaches seek to resolve the developmental origins of the initial structural deficit in self-worth [16], addressing the deeply entrenched beliefs that predispose the *Accepting* capacity to fail in the face of negative or neutral stimuli. These therapies, by aiming to fix the fundamental flaw in affective valuation, work to repair the system's ability to internalize positive experience and self-worth, thereby stabilizing the emotional architecture from the bottom up.[13]

VI. Conclusion: The CEF as a Rigorous Framework for Mechanism-Based Precision

The extension of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) offers a compelling, structural-constructivist model for Major Depressive Disorder, successfully translating decades of heterogeneous clinical observations and neurobiological data into an integrated, actionable system.[1] The analysis conducted validates the CEF's central claims by systematically aligning its proposed structural components with established, high-quality empirical literature on MDD pathophysiology.

The proposed transdiagnostic signature—the **Systemic Decoupling of Affective Valuation from Motivational Initiative** [5]—is empirically sound, mirroring the neuroscientific fractionation of reward processing into hedonic capacity ("liking") and motivational drive ("wanting").[5] The model accurately posits the causal primacy of the *Receptive Manifestation* (Accepting) failure [14], which corresponds to documented impairments in hedonic attribution capacity.[14] This primary valuation failure structurally necessitates the secondary collapse of the *Assertive Drive* (Boosting) and *Strategic Order* (Arranging) [6], manifesting as the empirically linked cluster of anhedonia and psychomotor retardation.[6] Furthermore, the model explains negative rumination not as a random symptom, but as the pathological, resource-consuming misapplication of the *Structural Analysis* (Calculating) capacity, forced to process the flawed, negative input from the Gut Center.[20] This cognitive entrapment aligns with established deficits in cognitive control and DMN hyperactivity observed in MDD.[19]

Crucially, the CEF moves beyond mere description by establishing a precise framework for personalized intervention.[1] By structurally indexing treatments such as Behavioral Activation and SSRIs to the *Boosting* capacity, CBT to the *Calculating* capacity, and ACT/Psychodynamic therapy to the foundational *Accepting* capacity, the framework allows clinicians to select therapies based on the specific mechanism requiring repair.[23] The demonstration that motivational interventions (like goal-setting) can structurally restore impaired cognitive and motor performance [23] underscores the power of this

mechanism-based targeting.

In conclusion, by defining MDD not merely as a cluster of symptoms but as a specific, measurable structural misalignment within the emotional regulation system, the CEF enforces a new level of scientific precision, thereby advancing the field toward truly personalized and mechanism-driven therapeutics.[1]

References

Works cited

1. (PDF) Transdiagnostic Approaches to Mental Health Problems: Current Status and Future Directions - ResearchGate, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339604417_Transdiagnostic_approaches_to_mental_health_problems_Current_status_and_future_directions
2. Beyond symptom improvement: transdiagnostic and disorder-specific ways to assess functional and quality of life outcomes across mental disorders in adults - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12434368/
3. Depressive disorders: Treatment failures and poor prognosis over the last 50 years - PMC, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6498411/
4. Transdiagnostic factors of psychopathology and substance use disorders: a review, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25563838/
5. Reward systems and cognitions in Major Depressive Disorder | CNS Spectrums, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/cns-spectrums/article/reward-systems-and-cognitions-in-major-depressive-disorder/93CB160988D85EC3AB37B8A1DD5A5815
6. Motivational deficits in major depressive disorder: Cross-sectional and longitudinal relationships with functional impairment and subjective well-being - ResearchGate, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287337282_Motivational_deficits_in_major_depressive_disorder_Cross-sectional_and_longitudinal_relationships_with_functional_impairment_and_subjective_well-being

7. A review of approaches and models in psychopathology conceptualization research - Eiko Fried », accessed November 24, 2025, https://eiko-fried.com/wp-content/uploads/Eaton-et-al.-2023-A-review-of-approaches-and-models-in-psychopatholo.pdf
8. Emotional Intelligence Frameworks, Charts, Diagrams & Graphs - Positive Psychology, accessed November 24, 2025, https://positivepsychology.com/emotional-intelligence-frameworks/
9. Motivation and Cognitive Control in Depression - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6642074/
10. Theory of constructed emotion - Wikipedia, accessed November 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory_of_constructed_emotion
11. Emotional Functioning Unveiled: Understanding the 10 Core Emotions - YouTube, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OP6GONjpV_k
12. Cognitive effort devaluation and the salience network: a computational model of amotivation in depression - Frontiers, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1581802/full
13. The Neurobiology of Anhedonia and Other Reward-Related Deficits - PMC, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3253139/
14. Study Details | Brain Regulation of Emotions in People With Depression and Anhedonia, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT00059579
15. Rumination in major depressive disorder is associated with impaired neural activation during conflict monitoring - PubMed Central, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4428129/
16. A Provider's Guide to Brief Cognitive Behavioral Therapy - VA.gov, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.mirecc.va.gov/visn16/docs/therapists_guide_to_brief_cbtmanual.pdf
17. Psychomotor retardation and anhedonia in depression - PubMed, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10223426/
18. Anhedonia Relates to Increased Psychomotor Retardation Using an Instrumental Handwriting-Based Measure - NIH, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12454474/
19. Rumination and Over-Recruitment of Cognitive Control Circuits in Depression - PMC - NIH, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11305927/
20. Rumination as a Mechanism Linking Stressful Life Events to Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety: Longitudinal Evidence in Early Adolescents and Adults -

PubMed Central, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4116082/
21. Revisiting the Factor Structure of the Ruminative Response Scale: a Bifactor Approach | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362144804_Revisiting_the_Factor_Structure_of_the_Ruminative_Response_Scale_a_Bifactor_Approach
22. A Reproducible Neurobiology of Depressive Rumination - bioRxiv, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/365759v7.full
23. Experimental evidence for a motivational origin of cognitive impairment in major depression | Psychological Medicine - Cambridge University Press, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/psychological-medicine/article/experimental-evidence-for-a-motivational-origin-of-cognitive-impairment-in-major-depression/3697E184AE91EA894112FA9FFBBBD700
24. Clinical response to SSRIs relative to cognitive behavioral therapy in depression: a symptom-specific approach - PMC - NIH, accessed November 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8751549/
25. Neural Effects of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in Psychiatric Disorders: A Systematic Review and Activation Likelihood Estimation Meta-Analysis - Frontiers, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.853804/full
26. The Law of Emotional Alignment Explained - tapered ink, accessed November 24, 2025, https://www.taperedink.com/insights/the-law-of-emotional-alignment

See also:

- Bulgaria, J. (2025a). *Compendium of Evidence-Based Psychotherapy Modalities: Reframed through the Core Emotion Framework (CEF)* [Zenodo]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17665533
- Bulgaria, J. (2025b). *Extending the Core Emotion Framework: A Structural-Constructivist Model for Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD)* [Zenodo]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17701968
- Bulgaria, J. (2025c, November 21). *Pre-Registration Protocol: Open Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF) Scale – Phase 1: Construct Definition, Item Generation, and Multi-Level Factor Structure Confirmation*. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/4RXUV
- Bulgaria, J. (2025d). *The Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Structural-Constructivist Model for Emotional Regulation and Adaptive Resilience in the*

Treatment of Anxiety [Zenodo]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17693163

- Core Emotion Framework. (n.d.). *The core emotion framework model*. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://www.coreemotionframework.com/.
- Efficiency Ink. (n.d.). *The model of efficiency*. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://www.efficiency.ink.
- Optimize Your Capabilities. (n.d.-a). *Optimization strategy*. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://www.optimizeyourcapabilities.com.
- Optimize Your Capabilities Pro. (n.d.-b). *Professional applications of the CEF*. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://www.optimizeyourcapabilities.pro.
- Optimize Your Capabilities Pro. (n.d.-c). *Anxiety Isn't a Feeling—It's a System. Here's How to Rewire It*. Retrieved November 24, 2025, from https://www.optimizeyourcapabilities.pro/Unwound/
- Optimizeyourcapabilities.com. (2025a). *The Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Theoretical Synthesis Integrating Affective Neuroscience, Embodied Cognition, and Strategic Emotional Regulation for Optimized Functioning* [Zenodo]. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17477547
- Optimizeyourcapabilities.com. (2025b, November 14). *A Proposal for Open Validation of the Core Emotion Framework (CEF): A Structural-Constructivist Model for Emotional Regulation and Psychological Flourishing*. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/SG3KM