When the Body Can’t Let Go

Inflammation, Timing, and the Biology of Resolution

Dedication

To My Lovely Wife

Publisher / Agent Pitch

When the Body Can’t Let Go is a crossover science book that reframes one of modern immunology’s most persistent puzzles: why inflammation so often fails to resolve.

Rather than treating chronic inflammation as a problem of excess immune activation, this book asks a different question: **what happens when immune responses lose their sense of timing?** Drawing on systems immunology, immunometabolism, and resolution biology, Phillip B. B. Moheno, Ph.D., argues that many chronic inflammatory states reflect failures of coordination and transition rather than force.

The book advances a disciplined conceptual framework in which immune responses are understood as organized processes unfolding over time. Signals rise, overlap, and conclude; when these transitions falter, inflammation may persist not because it is aggressive, but because it is unfinished. Resolution, in this account, is not a passive decline in activity but an active biological phase requiring synchronization across cytokine networks, innate immune cells, metabolic state, and tissue context.

Written with explicit ethical restraint, *When the Body Can’t Let Go* does not propose therapies, supplements, or clinical interventions. Its contribution is explanatory rather than prescriptive: it restores timing, coherence, and resolution as first-class variables in immune biology. The book integrates conceptual analysis with carefully bounded research narratives and observational composites, offering readers a way to think more clearly about immune persistence without overreach.

Positioned for academic and hybrid presses, the manuscript will appeal to immunologists, clinicians, systems biologists, and scientifically literate general readers seeking deeper explanations for chronic inflammation, failed recovery, and immune dysregulation.

Publisher's Note on Narrative Content and Regulatory Boundaries

This manuscript includes brief narrative inserts and composite observations drawn from research practice and observational contexts. These elements are included for **illustrative and conceptual purposes only**.

They do **not**:

- assert therapeutic efficacy
- recommend use of any compound or supplement
- establish causality or clinical benefit
- substitute for controlled trials or regulatory review

All human-related material is:

- anonymized
- composite in nature
- explicitly descriptive rather than interpretive

Narratives are clearly demarcated and consistently framed as **observations that motivate scientific questions**, not answers. Their function is to make visible issues of immune timing, coordination, and resolution that are otherwise obscured by endpoint-focused analysis.

The manuscript maintains a strict distinction between:

- **organization vs. outcome**
- **observation vs. intervention**
- **hypothesis vs. claim**

Accordingly, the inclusion of narrative material does not alter the manuscript's status as a **scholarly, hypothesis-driven work of systems immunology**, nor does it introduce regulatory risk.

"Why This Book Now?" (Flap Copy)

Why *ImmunoFolate* Now

Biology has reached an inflection point.

Advances in cytokine profiling, immunometabolism, redox biology, and systems modeling have revealed a paradox: we understand immune activation in extraordinary detail, yet remain poorly equipped to explain immune persistence, failed resolution, and chronic inflammation.

The missing variable is **organization**.

As research increasingly shows that immune outcomes depend on timing, coordination, and context, traditional magnitude-based models have begun to show their limits. *ImmunoFolate* arrives at this moment to articulate a coherent framework for studying immune behavior as a dynamic, organized process—without collapsing inquiry into intervention.

By restoring resolution, transition, and coherence as legitimate scientific targets, this book provides a conceptual bridge between reductionist immunology and the complexity now visible across immune-related disease, aging, and recovery.

Table of Contents

Preface

What This Book Is and Why Immune Organization Matters

"Inflammation is not simply turned off.
Resolution is an active, highly regulated process."
— Charles N. Serhan, *Nature Immunology*

Inflammation is not only a question of **how strongly** the immune system responds. It is also a question of **how responses unfold over time**—how signals rise, overlap, and resolve.

In many biological systems, immune dysfunction does not arise from excessive activation alone, but from **disordered timing**: delayed transitions, prolonged amplifying signals, or failure of counter-regulatory programs to align with changing conditions.

I did not begin this work intending to propose a product, therapy, or intervention. I began with a question that persisted throughout my scientific training:

Why does inflammation resolve efficiently in some systems, yet spiral into dysfunction in others—despite similar pathogens, genetics, or environments?

Resolution is not what happens *after* inflammation ends. It is an **active biological phase**, requiring coordinated shifts in signaling, metabolism, and cellular behavior. When these transitions fail, immune systems may linger in intermediate states—neither fully defensive nor fully restorative.

This book explores that gap.

It advances a single organizing idea: that immune behavior is shaped not only by activation and suppression, but by **organization over time**—by how systems coordinate opposing signals and move between states.

From the Edge of Resolution (Is Lyme Disease an exception?) [See refs. 29,35]

An Early Discomfort

In one early experimental system, the immune response behaved exactly as expected—until it didn't.

Activation markers rose on schedule. Cytokines associated with amplification peaked. Nothing about the magnitude of the response appeared abnormal. Yet the system did not return cleanly to baseline. Instead, it lingered—neither escalating nor resolving.

At the time, this was treated as noise. The experiment was not designed to measure *when* signals changed, only *how much*. But the discomfort remained: something had failed to conclude, even though nothing appeared excessive.

That unease—more than any single result—planted the question that animates this book.

Where speculation appears, it is labeled.
Where uncertainty remains, it is acknowledged.
Where evidence is incomplete, restraint is maintained.

This work does not seek persuasion. It seeks **better questions**.

Audience and Positioning

The book is best suited for:

- Immunologists and systems biologists
- Researchers in immunometabolism and inflammation
- Advanced graduate students and postdoctoral scholars
- Readers interested in theory-building at the intersection of biology and complexity

It is **not** intended for clinicians, patients, or commercial translation audiences.

A Personal Note

Science advances when curiosity outpaces certainty.

I offer these pages not as answers, but as a structured exploration of ideas that have refused to remain quiet - ideas grounded in biochemistry, shaped by immunology, and constrained by humility before biological complexity.

If they are wrong, they will be corrected by better data.
If they are right, they will become obsolete as understanding deepens.

Either outcome serves science.

— *Phillip B. B. Moheno, Ph.D.*
San Diego, California

Regulatory & Scientific Disclaimer

This book is a work of **scientific inquiry and hypothesis development**, intended for scholarly discussion only. It does **not** diagnose, treat, cure, mitigate, or prevent disease.

All molecular systems, biochemical pathways, and compounds discussed are presented for **theoretical and research exploration**. None are approved for medical use unless explicitly stated.

References to experimental findings, historical observations, or preclinical studies are provided **to motivate scientific hypotheses**, not to establish clinical efficacy or safety.

This work does **not constitute medical advice**, does not recommend the use of any compound, and should not be used as a basis for clinical decision-making.

Readers are encouraged to consult qualified medical professionals and regulatory authorities regarding healthcare matters.

PART I — Foundations of an Immune Hypothesis

Part I establishes immune organization as a scientific problem.
Rather than focusing on intervention, it examines how immune systems transition between states—how coordination, timing, and context shape resolution.

The chapters that follow build a conceptual framework grounded in systems logic, metabolism, and immune biology, preparing the ground for empirical inquiry in later sections.

Chapter 1 — When Molecules Refuse to Stay in Their Lanes

Scientific ideas rarely arrive fully formed. More often, they emerge as persistent tensions—observations that fit poorly within existing frameworks, yet recur too consistently to ignore.

My interest in immune organization arose from such tensions while studying two molecular families typically treated as unrelated: **folates and pterins**.

Folate chemistry is foundational to biology. It supports nucleotide synthesis, methylation, and cellular replication. Its role in immunity is usually described as permissive—necessary but indirect. This framing, while biochemically accurate, overlooks how metabolic sufficiency can **bias immune trajectories long before activation occurs**.

Immune cells are among the most metabolically demanding in the body. Activation and resolution alike require coordinated metabolic shifts. Folate metabolism participates in both phases, yet its influence on **immune timing** has received limited attention.

Observation from Research Practice

A Molecule That Would Not Behave Like a Marker

In several early datasets, pterin-related signals appeared in places they were not expected to matter. They tracked immune stress reliably—but they also **persisted after the most obvious danger had passed**.

As markers, they should have faded. As participants, they would have been inconvenient.

At the time, the simplest explanation was favored: persistence without meaning. Only later did the pattern become difficult to ignore—not because it was dramatic, but because it was *repeated*.

The molecules were present not at the height of immune urgency, but during moments when systems appeared to be deciding what came next.

Pterins occupy a different corner of the literature. Known primarily through neopterin, they are treated as **markers of immune activation**, not participants. Elevated neopterin signals immune stress, but is rarely discussed mechanistically.

This assumption is convenient—but not chemically compelled.

Pterins are **redox-active molecules**. They appear at moments when immune systems undergo major transitions, raising a question that existing models do not resolve:

Are pterins merely witnesses to immune change, or do they participate in shaping the environments in which that change unfolds?

What drew my attention was not either molecule alone, but the boundary between them—a boundary biology itself does not respect. Immune cells encounter folates and pterins as part of a dense metabolic and signaling milieu, where **context determines interpretation**.

Across systems, signals suggested that these molecules intersect most clearly **during transition phases**—when inflammation should subside and repair should begin.

This chapter establishes the conceptual origin of that observation. It does not propose conclusions. It identifies a gap.

Chapter 2 — The Immunopterin Hypothesis (Defined Carefully)

"The greatest danger in biology is not ignorance, but the illusion of understanding based on incomplete variables."
— paraphrased from long-standing systems-biology cautions

Scientific hypotheses do not begin as answers. They begin as **disciplined discomforts**—patterns that resist existing explanations without yet justifying new ones.

The Immunopterin Hypothesis emerged in this spirit. It did not arise from a desire to elevate a molecule, propose an intervention, or fill a gap with certainty. It arose from repeated encounters with immune responses that appeared **organized, yet unable to conclude**.

This chapter defines the hypothesis narrowly, clarifies what it does *not* claim, and explains why its modest scope is a strength rather than a limitation.

Why Another Hypothesis Is Needed

Modern immunology has excelled at explaining how immune responses begin. The pathways of activation, amplification, and effector function are mapped in impressive detail. Yet when immune responses persist—stalling between phases or cycling without resolution—the explanatory tools become less precise.

The problem is not a lack of data. It is a **mismatch of emphasis**.

Most models privilege magnitude: how much cytokine, how many cells, how strong a signal. Persistence is often interpreted as excess. But across many systems, immune responses fail to resolve even when signals are moderate, balanced, or declining.

These observations suggest a different possibility: that some immune dysfunction reflects **disordered timing and coordination**, not runaway force.

The Immunopterin Hypothesis belongs to this reframing.

What the Hypothesis Proposes—and What It Does Not

Stated carefully, the Immunopterin Hypothesis proposes the following:

Certain pterin-related molecular contexts may participate in immune organization by biasing timing and coordination during transition phases, particularly in macrophage-dominated environments.

Nothing more is claimed.

The hypothesis does **not** assert:

- therapeutic benefit
- causal control of immune outcomes
- disease specificity
- clinical relevance

It does **not** propose pterins as drivers, switches, or regulators in the classical sense.

It proposes **participation**, not instruction.

Bias, Not Control

Biological systems rarely operate through single points of control. They behave probabilistically, shaped by many small influences that accumulate over time.

In such systems, **bias matters**.

A molecule that slightly stabilizes an environment, alters redox balance, or persists through a transition phase may influence *when* a response shifts without determining *how* it ends. These influences are subtle, distributed, and context-dependent.

They are also easy to miss.

The Immunopterin Hypothesis does not argue that pterins command immune behavior. It argues that they may **tilt conditions** in which immune decisions are already underway.

Falsifiability as a Requirement

A hypothesis earns its place by risking failure.

If pterins are merely byproducts of immune activation, then perturbing their presence should produce **no reproducible effects** on immune timing, coordination, or resolution trajectories. Their removal or persistence should be largely irrelevant.

If, however, consistent patterns emerge—particularly during transition phases—then the hypothesis survives *only as long as it remains bounded*.

This book treats falsifiability not as a procedural formality, but as an ethical commitment. Hypotheses that cannot fail invite misuse.

From Repetition to Restraint

The hypothesis did not emerge from a single striking result. It emerged from repetition. Across different systems, pterin-associated signals appeared where immune responses hesitated—neither escalating nor resolving.

Each instance could be explained away. Together, they created a question that would not go away.

The decision to name a hypothesis was not an act of confidence, but of containment: a way to hold the question still long enough to test it.

The purpose was not to answer more, but to claim less.

Why the Hypothesis Is Intentionally Narrow

Broad hypotheses travel easily—and mislead just as easily.

By limiting scope, the Immunopterin Hypothesis protects against:

- premature application
- mechanistic overreach
- therapeutic inference

It does not attempt to explain immune behavior in general. It asks whether a **specific class of molecular contexts**belongs in conversations about immune timing and resolution.

If the answer is no, the hypothesis ends there.

Chapter 3 — Molecular Architecture as Biological Language

Biology is often taught as a catalog of parts: molecules, pathways, receptors, and reactions. This approach is useful, but incomplete. It tells us *what exists* without always explaining *how systems behave over time*.

Immune organization depends not only on the presence of molecules, but on their **architecture**—how they are structured, stabilized, delivered, and situated within biological context. Without coherent architecture, even well-characterized signals fail to coordinate action.

In this sense, molecular architecture functions as a **biological language**. Structure determines which interactions are possible, which are favored, and which are excluded. Meaning arises not from identity alone, but from **form interacting with context**.

This distinction matters most during immune transitions.

Architecture Versus Ingredients

It is tempting to treat molecules as interchangeable ingredients: if a compound is present in sufficient quantity, its biological effect should follow. Immune systems rarely behave this way.

Identical molecular species can produce divergent outcomes depending on how they are packaged, transported, or constrained. Stability, solubility, and spatial distribution shape how signals persist and overlap. Architecture governs **tempo**, not just availability.

This is particularly relevant for small molecules associated with immune activity. Their influence, if any, is unlikely to operate through direct instruction. Instead, it emerges through **biasing conditions**—altering the environments in which immune decisions are made.

Architecture does not command. It conditions.

Temporal Coherence Requires Structural Coherence

Immune responses unfold in phases. Activation, amplification, regulation, and resolution each impose different biochemical demands. For a system to move coherently from one phase to the next, the molecular environment must remain **interpretable across time**.

When architecture fails—when signals degrade too quickly, persist too long, or fragment across incompatible contexts—coordination breaks down. Signals may still be present, but they lose their ability to guide transition.

This is not a failure of signaling strength. It is a failure of **structural continuity**.

Viewed this way, some immune persistence reflects not excessive stimulation, but environments that cannot support clean handoffs between phases.

Small Molecules and Contextual Influence

Small molecules occupy a unique position in immune biology. They rarely dominate signaling hierarchies, yet they appear consistently in environments where immune systems struggle to conclude responses.

Their potential relevance lies not in potency, but in **compatibility**.

Molecules that persist in immune environments without disrupting function may do so because their architecture aligns with endogenous regulation. They may stabilize redox conditions, modulate availability of cofactors, or subtly shape metabolic readiness. These influences are indirect, distributed, and difficult to isolate—but not trivial.

Such effects would be invisible to models that prioritize magnitude over timing.

Which reminds me of a joke…

As I was walking home one evening, I saw an obviously inebriated gentleman rummaging through some bushes by a lamp post.

“Sir”, I asked “Can I help you?”

The man replied, “I am searching for my keys.”

“Did you lose them here?” I further inquired.

“No, I lost them over there in those bushes.”

“So why are you looking here?”

“Because the light is better.”

Architecture Without Assertion

This chapter does not argue that any specific molecular structure directs immune outcomes. It argues something narrower and more defensible:

If immune organization depends on timing and coordination, then molecular architecture must be considered alongside molecular identity.

Ignoring structure reduces biology to inventory. Attending to it restores sequence, coherence, and constraint.

Architecture does not explain immune behavior by itself. But without it, immune behavior cannot be adequately explained at all.

Chapter 4 — Cytokine Balance as an Organizing Principle

"The same cytokine can be protective or pathological
depending on context, timing, and cellular state."
— Ruslan Medzhitov, *Nature*

Cytokines are often described as messengers: signals that tell immune cells what to do. This description is accurate, but incomplete. It captures *communication* while missing *coordination*.

Immune systems do not respond to cytokines one at a time. They respond to **patterns**—to combinations, sequences, overlaps, and delays. Meaning arises not from the presence of a single cytokine, but from how signals relate to one another over time.

In this sense, cytokines function less like instructions and more like **relational cues**. Their biological effect depends on context, timing, and balance.

From Signals to Relationships

Traditional models of inflammation tend to isolate cytokines, measuring peak concentrations and associating them with outcomes. This approach has yielded valuable insights, but it struggles to explain why similar cytokine profiles can precede very different immune trajectories.

One reason is that cytokines rarely act in isolation. Pro-inflammatory and regulatory signals often rise together, compete for influence, or arrive out of sequence. What matters is not simply *how much* signal is present, but **when and in relation to what else**.

A cytokine that amplifies inflammation early in a response may play a stabilizing or reparative role later. Conversely, regulatory signals that arrive too soon—or too late—can destabilize resolution rather than promote it.

Cytokines do not change their nature. **Their meaning changes with timing.**

Balance Is Not Suppression

The concept of cytokine balance is sometimes misunderstood as a call for dampening inflammation. This is not the argument made here.

Balance does not imply weakness or restraint. It implies **coordination**—the capacity of an immune system to sustain activation when needed and relinquish it when conditions change.

In healthy responses, inflammatory and counter-regulatory signals coexist. They do not cancel one another out; they shape the trajectory together. Balance allows a system to move forward rather than remain locked in a single mode.

When balance fails, the problem is often not excess signal, but **misalignment**. Signals persist beyond their useful phase, or regulatory cues fail to synchronize with metabolic and cellular readiness. The result is not chaos, but stagnation.

Timing as the Hidden Variable

Much of cytokine biology is interpreted through static snapshots: measurements taken at single timepoints and compared against reference ranges. These snapshots can obscure dynamics that only become visible when responses are observed longitudinally.

Two immune systems may exhibit similar cytokine levels at a given moment yet be headed in opposite directions. One may be transitioning toward resolution; the other may be cycling back into amplification.

What distinguishes them is not magnitude, but **sequence**.

Timing determines whether cytokines reinforce one another or interfere. It determines whether regulatory signals arrive as invitations or as obstacles. It determines whether resolution can proceed.

In this framework, cytokine balance is best understood as an **organizing principle** rather than a therapeutic target.

Research Anecdote

From the Data: When Balance Looked Right—but Resolution Failed

(Lyme Disease case again…)

In one longitudinal immune dataset, pro-inflammatory and regulatory cytokines rose together, maintaining what appeared to be an appropriate balance by conventional measures. No single signal dominated.

Yet the immune response did not resolve. Instead, it plateaued in an intermediate state, with recurring fluctuations that never settled into repair or baseline activity.

Only when the data were re-examined over time did the pattern become clearer. Regulatory signals consistently lagged behind shifts in metabolic markers and cellular phenotype. Balance was present, but **coordination was not**.

The failure was not one of signal strength, but of sequence.

Cytokines as Temporal Integrators

Cytokines participate in feedback loops that extend across immune phases. They help integrate information about threat, tissue state, metabolic capacity, and cellular readiness. In doing so, they contribute to the system's sense of **where it is in a response**.

Seen this way, cytokines are not simply activators or suppressors. They are **temporal integrators**, helping immune systems decide whether to continue, shift, or conclude.

When this integration fails, immune responses may persist not because danger remains, but because the system cannot reconcile competing cues.

PART II — Organizing Layers in Living Biology

Part II grounds the conceptual framework of immune organization in **specific biological contexts**. Rather than introducing interventions or outcomes, these chapters examine how immune timing and coordination are shaped by innate immunity, metabolism, redox state, and resolution processes.

The emphasis remains on **context, transition, and coherence**—not efficacy.

Chapter 5 — Pterins in Immune Biology: Context, Not Claims

Pterins occupy an uneasy position in immunology. They appear reliably during immune activation, are measured routinely in research and clinical contexts, and yet are rarely discussed as anything more than **markers**—signals that something has already happened.

This narrow framing has advantages. It avoids overinterpretation and respects uncertainty. But it also leaves a gap. Markers that appear repeatedly, persist selectively, and localize to specific immune environments invite a more careful question:

Why these molecules, in these contexts, at these moments?

This chapter does not propose answers. It clarifies why the question deserves attention.

From Biomarkers to Biological Presence

Neopterin and related pterins are most often treated as readouts of immune engagement, particularly in macrophage-rich environments. Their elevation correlates with inflammatory activity across a wide range of conditions.

Correlation, however, is not explanation.

What distinguishes pterins from many other immune-associated molecules is not the strength of their association with inflammation, but their **persistence during transition phases**—periods when immune systems are neither fully amplifying nor fully resolving.

In these contexts, pterins do not behave like transient byproducts. They appear stable, tolerated, and recurrent. This does not establish function, but it does establish **compatibility** with immune organization.

Biology is efficient. Molecules that consistently disrupt regulation tend to be excluded. Persistence suggests alignment with endogenous constraints, even when role remains undefined.

Macrophage Context and Immune Transitions

Pterins are most prominently expressed in settings dominated by innate immune activity, particularly macrophages. This association is not incidental.

Macrophages occupy a central position in immune organization. They integrate signals from pathogens, damaged tissue, cytokine gradients, and metabolic state. They help determine whether immune responses escalate, pause, or conclude.

The appearance of pterins within these environments is therefore notable not because it implies instruction, but because it coincides with **decision points**—moments when immune systems are negotiating what comes next.

If immune responses fail to resolve, macrophages are often still present, active, and metabolically engaged. Pterins are often present as well.

The book does not claim causation. It observes **co-occurrence in moments of uncertainty**.

Persistence Without Disruption

One of the more intriguing features of pterins is what they do *not* appear to do.

They do not provoke obvious immune escalation.
They do not terminate responses abruptly.
They do not behave like dominant signaling molecules.

Instead, they persist quietly in environments where immune systems appear constrained—unable to resolve cleanly, yet not overtly dysregulated.

This pattern suggests that if pterins matter, they do so indirectly. Their influence, if any, would likely operate through **contextual modulation**: redox balance, metabolic readiness, or signal interpretability.

Such influences are difficult to isolate experimentally, particularly in systems optimized to detect large effects. But difficulty of measurement does not imply irrelevance.

From the Thought Bench

When Persistence Became the Question, reflections on the Lyme case

In macrophage-centered systems, pterin-related signals appeared alongside activation, as expected. What was unexpected was their **failure to disappear** when activation subsided.

The immune response did not escalate further. It also did not resolve. Instead, it hovered in an intermediate state—functionally engaged, metabolically strained, and temporally unsettled.

No conclusion followed from this observation. But it shifted attention. The question was no longer whether inflammation was excessive, but whether the system had lost its sense of sequence.

Pterins persist in immune environments that demand coordination over time. Molecules incompatible with regulation are typically cleared or suppressed. Persistence suggests alignment with endogenous dynamics rather than accidental accumulation.

Why Small Molecules Complicate Big Questions

Small molecules are often underestimated in immune biology because they rarely act as switches. They do not announce themselves through dramatic effects. Their influence, when present, is usually **distributed and conditional**.

Pterins exemplify this challenge. They may matter only when systems are already under constraint—when timing, metabolism, and cellular coordination are stressed.

In such settings, even modest biases can shape trajectories. Not by commanding outcomes, but by **tilting probabilities**.

This is precisely the kind of influence that magnitude-focused models struggle to detect.

Architecture Revisited

As argued in Chapter 3, molecular architecture shapes biological meaning. Pterins are chemically stable, redox-active, and compatible with immune environments that demand persistence rather than disruption.

These properties do not prove relevance. They establish **plausibility**.

If immune organization depends on maintaining interpretability across phases, then molecules that persist without destabilizing regulation merit attention—not as solutions, but as **participants in context**.

Chapter 6 — Innate Immunity as an Organizing Layer

Innate immunity is often described as the immune system's first line of defense. While accurate, this framing understates its primary function.

Innate immunity **organizes**.

Innate immune cells integrate signals across time and space, shaping whether inflammation escalates, resolves, or persists. Their role is not limited to detection, but extends to **coordination and transition management**.

When the First Responders Stayed Too Long

Across several experimental contexts, innate immune cells—particularly macrophages—appeared to remain functionally engaged even after initiating signals had receded.

These cells did not behave as if threat persisted. Instead, they occupied a prolonged intermediate posture: metabolically active, cytokine-responsive, yet resistant to full regulatory transition.

What became apparent was that the issue was not speed of response, but **difficulty concluding one phase before entering the next**.

Seen this way, innate immunity functioned less like an alarm and more like a coordinator struggling to close a sequence.

Macrophages exemplify this organizing role. Distributed throughout tissues, they continuously sample metabolic cues, cytokine gradients, damage signals, and redox states. Their behavior reflects cumulative context rather than single triggers.

Macrophage plasticity is therefore not a complication—it is the mechanism.

These cells traverse functional spectra as immune conditions evolve. They help determine when amplifying programs give way to regulatory and reparative ones. When these transitions fail, immune responses linger in maladaptive states.

From this perspective, chronic inflammation reflects not sustained threat, but **organizational failure**.

This chapter reframes innate immunity as biological infrastructure:
a layer responsible for **interpreting context**, synchronizing responses, and concluding immune activity coherently.

Chapter 7 — Redox and Metabolism as Timing Constraints

"Immune cell fate is inseparable from metabolic state.
Metabolism does not merely support immune function; it shapes it."
— Erika Pearce, *Immunity*

Immune signaling unfolds within metabolic and redox landscapes that condition how signals are interpreted. While receptors and cytokines occupy the foreground of immunological explanation, **context constrains timing**.

Redox state is not merely a marker of stress. It is a source of **information**. Gradients of oxidative potential influence transcriptional programs, feedback sensitivity, and signal persistence. Identical cytokine inputs can yield divergent outcomes under different redox conditions.

Composite Metabolic Snapshot

Same Signals, Different Timing

In metabolically constrained systems, identical cytokine inputs produced markedly different temporal patterns. Activation occurred on schedule, but regulatory signals emerged late—or failed to stabilize.

In parallel systems with greater metabolic reserve, the same signaling inputs were followed by smoother transitions and earlier regulatory engagement.

No conclusion about causality followed. What changed was emphasis. The immune system appeared to be responding not only to *what* signals were present, but to **whether the surrounding metabolic context allowed those signals to be integrated in time**.

Metabolic sufficiency further shapes immune tempo. Immune activation and resolution both impose energetic demands. Cells operating near metabolic limits exhibit altered thresholds and prolonged signaling, while those with reserve capacity transition more flexibly.

One-carbon metabolism contributes to this readiness. Folate-dependent pathways influence nucleotide availability, methylation capacity, and redox balance—conditioning immune responses **before signals arrive**.

Small redox-active molecules, including pterin derivatives, therefore occupy environments where **timing decisions are made**. Their role is not directive, but contextual: biasing trajectories without dictating endpoints.

Timing is emergent.
It arises from interactions among signaling pathways, metabolic capacity, and redox state.

Chapter 8 — Resolution as a Biological Process

"Failure of resolution, rather than persistence of injury,
may underlie many chronic inflammatory conditions."
— Gilroy, Lawrence & Perretti, *Nature Reviews Immunology*

nflammation is often described as something the immune system turns on—and then turns off. This metaphor is convenient, but misleading. It treats resolution as absence rather than achievement.

Resolution is not what remains when inflammation fades. It is a **distinct biological phase**, requiring coordination, energy, and timing. When resolution fails, immune responses do not simply linger. They stall.

This chapter reframes resolution as an active process and explains why its failure so often masquerades as chronic inflammation.

Resolution Is Not Reversal

Activation and resolution are not mirror images. What builds an immune response is not what dismantles it.

During activation, immune systems amplify signals, recruit cells, and mobilize metabolic resources. During resolution, those same systems must disengage amplification, clear debris, restore tissue integrity, and recalibrate cellular identities. Each task imposes different demands.

Reversal would imply retracing steps. Resolution requires **reorganization**.

Signals that were once useful must be silenced. Cells that once dominated must change phenotype or withdraw. Metabolic priorities must shift from rapid response to repair and maintenance.

These changes do not happen automatically.

Why Resolution Fails

Resolution can fail even when inflammatory signals decline. In such cases, immune systems appear calm by conventional measures yet remain functionally unsettled.

Common features of failed resolution include:

- prolonged presence of transitional cell states
- persistence of mixed signaling environments
- metabolic strain that prevents phenotypic shift

None of these requires excessive inflammation. They require **misaligned timing**.

If regulatory signals arrive before cells are metabolically ready to respond, they may destabilize rather than resolve. If they arrive too late, amplification programs may already have reshaped the environment.

Resolution depends on **sequence**, not suppression.

Macrophages and the Work of Conclusion

Macrophages play a central role in resolution. They clear apoptotic cells, remodel tissue, and signal to neighboring systems that danger has passed.

Crucially, macrophages must **change identity** to do this work. They cannot resolve inflammation while remaining locked in an activation posture. Phenotypic transition is not optional—it is the mechanism.

When resolution fails, macrophages are often present, active, and responsive, yet unable to complete the shift required to conclude the response. The immune system remains engaged, but directionless.

This is not indecision. It is **unfinished work**.

Research Anecdote

From Longitudinal Data: When Nothing Looked Wrong

In the one extended immune time course, inflammatory cytokines rose and fell within expected ranges aparently. No signal dominated. By conventional criteria, the response appeared controlled.

Yet tissue recovery did not proceed. Macrophage populations remained heterogeneous, and metabolic markers failed to stabilize.

Only when the data were viewed as a sequence did the problem become visible. Each step occurred—but not in an order that allowed completion.

The immune response had not persisted. It had **failed to conclude**.

This observation did not reveal cause. It clarified what resolution requires.

Resolution as Coordination

Resolution succeeds when signals, cells, and metabolism align in time. It fails when they do not.

This framing helps explain why interventions that reduce inflammation sometimes fail to restore health. Suppression can quiet signals without repairing sequence.

Understanding resolution as a biological process restores attention to **how immune responses end**, not just how they are restrained.

PART III — From Organization to Investigation

Part III translates the conceptual framework developed earlier into a **disciplined approach to empirical inquiry**. Its purpose is not to assert outcomes, but to define **how immune organization can be studied**—what questions are coherent, what measurements are meaningful, and what interpretive errors must be avoided.

The emphasis remains on **timing, coordination, and context**, not intervention.

Chapter 9 — Studying Immune Organization: Core Principles

How immune systems are studied determines what they appear to do.

Much of immunology relies on endpoints: peak cytokine levels, categorical outcomes, static comparisons. These measures are indispensable, but they are poorly suited to studying **organization across time**.

This chapter explains why immune organization demands different questions—and different methods.

The Limits of Endpoints

Endpoints compress time. They tell us where a system arrived, not how it got there.

Two immune responses can share an endpoint while following very different paths. One may resolve cleanly; the other may oscillate, stall, or fragment before settling. Endpoint measurements collapse these differences into sameness.

For organizational questions, this sameness is misleading.

When immune dysfunction reflects failure of transition rather than excess, endpoints obscure the problem rather than reveal it.

Trajectories as Primary Data

Studying immune organization requires attention to **trajectories**—the shape of responses over time.

Trajectories reveal:

- delays between signals
- misalignment between cellular and metabolic shifts
- persistence of transitional states

These features are invisible to single timepoints. They emerge only through **longitudinal observation** with sufficient temporal resolution.

This is not a call for complexity for its own sake. It is a recognition that some biological properties cannot be inferred from snapshots.

Relational Metrics Over Isolated Signals

Organization is expressed through relationships. Studying it requires metrics that preserve those relationships.

Rather than asking whether a cytokine is elevated, organizational inquiry asks:

- which signals rise together
- which lag or lead
- which persist beyond their phase

These questions shift focus from magnitude to **coordination**.

They also resist premature interpretation. Relational patterns describe behavior without assigning value.

Research Anecdote

From a Methodological Reassessment

In one study, immune responses were categorized as "resolved" or "persistent" based on late-stage measurements. Several cases fell cleanly into the resolved category.

When earlier timepoints were added, a different picture emerged. Regulatory signals appeared repeatedly—but only after amplification had already reshaped the cellular landscape.

The endpoint had been accurate. The conclusion had not.

The difference lay not in data quality, but in **what was allowed to count as evidence**.

The method had answered the wrong question.

Designing Studies That Can Fail

Organizational hypotheses must be allowed to fail. This requires study designs that can detect **absence of coordination**, not just presence of signal.

Key features include:

- dense sampling during transition phases
- attention to variability as information
- willingness to treat null patterns as boundaries

Such designs are slower and less definitive. They are also more honest.

Chapter 10 — Experimental Models and Their Limits

Every immune model tells a story. The danger lies in forgetting that it tells **only one**.

Experimental systems are indispensable. They allow precision, control, and repeatability. But immune organization—the focus of this book—unfolds across time, scale, and context in ways that no single model can fully capture.

This chapter clarifies what different experimental models can reveal about immune organization, and why their limitations are not flaws to be corrected, but **boundaries to be respected**.

What Models Are Good At

Experimental models excel at isolating variables. In vitro systems allow researchers to probe signaling relationships, timing effects, and feedback loops under tightly defined conditions. They are particularly valuable for identifying **relational dynamics**—how signals interact rather than merely whether they are present.

Animal models extend this inquiry across tissues and time. They allow observation of coordination at the level of organs, circulation, and behavior. Their strength lies not in prediction, but in **pattern recognition**: identifying recurring temporal and organizational features across contexts.

Each model answers a different kind of question. Problems arise when answers are asked to travel beyond the questions that produced them.

What Models Cannot Do

No experimental system fully reproduces the complexity of living immune organization. In vitro models lack tissue architecture, long-range metabolic constraints, and developmental history. Animal models introduce species-specific immune strategies that resist direct translation.

These limitations become critical when studying **resolution and transition**, which depend on coordination across multiple layers at once.

Attempts to “fix” models by adding complexity often miss the point. Complexity alone does not guarantee relevance. What matters is whether the model preserves the **timing relationships** under investigation.

A model that measures many things at one moment may still miss how those things interact over time.

Perturbation Without Prescription

Perturbation experiments—adding, removing, or modifying components—are powerful tools for testing hypotheses. But in organizational biology, perturbation must be interpreted carefully.

Changing a variable may disrupt coordination without revealing why coordination existed in the first place. Absence of effect may reflect redundancy, compensation, or insufficient temporal resolution.

The purpose of perturbation in this context is **diagnostic**, not corrective. It asks whether organization is robust, fragile, or context-dependent—not whether it can be optimized.

This distinction protects against converting exploratory models into implied interventions.

Research Anecdote

From a Model That Behaved Perfectly

In one controlled experimental system, immune activation and suppression followed expected patterns. Signals rose and fell cleanly. By every conventional metric, the model worked.

When the same system was extended slightly in time, however, the response fractured. Transitional states persisted longer than anticipated, and resolution markers failed to stabilize.

The model had not failed. The **question** had been too narrow.

Only by allowing the system to unfold longer did its organizational limits become visible.

The experiment answered exactly what it was designed to ask—and nothing more.

Choosing Models That Match the Question

If immune dysfunction reflects failures of coordination rather than excess activation, then models must be chosen accordingly.

Questions about organization require:

- longitudinal observation
- sensitivity to transitional phases
- tolerance for variability
- acceptance of partial answers

Models that produce clear outcomes quickly are not always the most informative. Sometimes the most instructive systems are those that **hesitate**, fluctuate, or resist conclusion.

These behaviors are not noise. They are signals about organization under constraint.

Chapter 11 — Observational Human Data Without Claims

Human immune systems do not exist in laboratories. They unfold in lives shaped by stress, sleep, nutrition, infection history, and recovery. These contexts complicate interpretation—and make human data indispensable.

This chapter explains how observational human data can inform questions of immune organization **without implying causality, efficacy, or intervention**. Its purpose is not to elevate anecdotes, but to clarify what patterns are visible only when immune responses are observed in the wild.

Why Human Observation Matters

Experimental systems allow control. Human systems reveal **constraint**.

In living people, immune responses must integrate biology with circumstance. Recovery occurs alongside work, illness, caregiving, and fatigue. Signals overlap. Transitions are negotiated rather than scheduled.

This complexity is precisely why observational human data matter for studying immune organization. They expose timing relationships that simplified systems often compress or erase.

When immune responses fail to resolve in humans, the failure is rarely dramatic. It appears as **prolongation**, oscillation, or incomplete return to baseline. These features are difficult to capture with static measures.

They are easier to recognize through **trajectories**.

Description Is Not Explanation

Observational human data can describe patterns. They cannot, by themselves, explain causes.

This distinction is essential. Human observations are vulnerable to confounding, expectation, and selection effects. Treating them as evidence of mechanism invites error.

The value of these observations lies elsewhere: in showing **what kinds of immune behavior are possible**, and in revealing which features recur across individuals despite variation.

Descriptive clarity precedes causal inference. Without it, explanation becomes speculation.

Timing Over Thresholds

Clinical frameworks often rely on thresholds: values above or below reference ranges. These thresholds are necessary for decision-making, but they can obscure organization.

Two individuals may fall within the same range at a given moment while occupying very different phases of an immune response. One may be transitioning toward resolution; the other may be cycling back into activation.

Thresholds flatten time. Organization unfolds within it.

Observational data become most informative when collected longitudinally, with attention to **sequence, lag, and recurrence** rather than isolated values.

Variability as Signal

Human variability is often treated as noise to be controlled. For organizational questions, variability can be informative.

Patterns that recur across diverse individuals suggest robustness. Patterns that fragment clarify boundaries. Both outcomes sharpen hypotheses.

Uniform response is not the standard for biological relevance. **Structured diversity** often is.

Composite Observation

From Longitudinal Observation: Recovery Without Shortening

In several observational settings, individuals described recovery courses that did not become faster or milder, but **changed in shape**. Symptoms progressed forward with fewer reversals, even when total duration remained similar.

Others showed no such pattern. The variability resisted simplification.

What distinguished the trajectories was not outcome, but **sequence**: fewer returns to earlier phases and a clearer progression toward baseline.

These observations did not suggest benefit. They suggested a different way of recognizing resolution.

The account did not explain why. It clarified what could be observed.

Guardrails Against Overinterpretation

To use human observational data responsibly, several guardrails are essential:

- No attribution of causality
- No inference of efficacy
- No generalization beyond observed patterns
- No conversion of description into recommendation

These constraints do not weaken inquiry. They protect it.

By keeping observation distinct from explanation, researchers preserve the integrity of both.

Chapter 12 — Variability, Null Results, and System Boundaries

"Biological systems are context-dependent by nature;
variability is not noise but information."
— Hiroaki Kitano, *Science*

Scientific progress depends as much on recognizing limits as on extending knowledge. In studies of immune organization, those limits appear most clearly in **variability** and **null results**—outcomes that resist tidy explanation.

This chapter argues that such outcomes are not obstacles to be overcome, but **signals that define the boundaries of a system**. When treated with discipline, they sharpen inquiry rather than stall it.

Why Variability Matters

Immune systems are not standardized instruments. They are adaptive, historically contingent systems shaped by genetics, environment, and experience. Expecting uniform behavior across individuals misunderstands their nature.

For organizational questions, variability is not merely expected—it is informative.

Patterns that recur across variable systems suggest robustness. Patterns that fragment or disappear clarify scope. Both outcomes matter. What fails to generalize often teaches us where an idea stops being useful.

Variability, in this sense, is not noise to be filtered out. It is **structure revealing itself under stress**.

The Meaning of Null Results

Null results occupy an uneasy place in science. They are often treated as disappointments or methodological failures. In organizational biology, they are frequently the most honest outcomes.

A null result may indicate that:

- an influence is context-dependent
- a relationship is weaker than expected
- a pattern exists only during specific phases
- or an idea does not hold

Each possibility constrains interpretation. Each protects against overreach.

When hypotheses concern coordination rather than force, absence of effect is often as meaningful as presence. It tells us **where influence does not operate**.

Boundaries Are Explanatory

Every biological explanation has a boundary beyond which it fails. Recognizing that boundary is not defeat; it is clarity.

In the context of immune organization, boundaries may be defined by:

- cell type
- metabolic state
- tissue context
- developmental stage
- timing within a response

A hypothesis that holds only under specific conditions is not weak. It is **precise**.

This book treats boundaries as part of explanation, not as afterthoughts to be explained away.

Research Anecdote

From a Study That Refused to Converge

In one multi-system investigation, immune trajectories aligned in some contexts but not others. Patterns appeared in macrophage-dominated environments and disappeared elsewhere.

Attempts to force convergence diluted the signal. Accepting divergence clarified it.

The hypothesis did not fail. It **found its limits**.

What remained was a narrower, more defensible question—and fewer claims.

The absence of universality became the most informative result.

Restraint as Method

Scientific restraint is often framed as caution. In practice, it is a method.

By refusing to universalize partial patterns, researchers preserve the ability to test them honestly. By acknowledging null results, they prevent hypotheses from metastasizing into belief.

In this work, restraint is not an aesthetic choice. It is an ethical one.

PART IV — A Developmental Trajectory of Inquiry

Part IV traces how this hypothesis emerged **slowly and reluctantly** across multiple biological contexts. It does not function as validation. It documents how questions sharpened as systems were observed under stress, variability, and constraint.

The emphasis is not on success, but on **listening to biological transitions**.

Chapter 13 — Beginning Where Immune Systems Were Already Struggling

Scientific training encourages us to look for causes. Studying immune organization requires learning how to **watch**.

Watching, in this context, does not mean passivity. It means resisting the urge to collapse behavior into explanation too early. It means allowing systems to reveal their **temporal structure** before assigning meaning.

This chapter marks a shift in posture—from intervention to observation, from outcome to movement.

From Control to Attention

Much of experimental biology is built around control: isolating variables, standardizing conditions, and enforcing comparability. These tools are powerful, but they privilege stability over motion.

Immune organization, by contrast, is expressed most clearly during **change**—during transitions between phases. Watching these transitions requires a different discipline: attention to lag, overlap, and hesitation.

The goal is not to explain what happens immediately, but to recognize **how responses unfold**.

Time as a Primary Variable

Time is often treated as a backdrop for immune behavior. In organizational inquiry, it becomes a primary variable.

What matters is not simply whether a signal appears, but:

- how long it persists
- what precedes it

- what follows
- and whether the system can move past it

These questions shift emphasis from events to **trajectories**.

Chapter 14 — Learning to Watch Immune Systems Move Through Time

Variation is often framed as a problem to be solved. In studies of immune organization, variation is often the **signal itself**.

This chapter reframes variability as information that reveals how systems behave under different constraints.

Uniformity Is Not the Standard

Healthy immune systems do not behave identically. They adapt to history, environment, and context. Expecting uniform response misunderstands their purpose.

When patterns recur **despite variation**, they deserve attention. When patterns fragment, they define limits.

Both outcomes refine inquiry.

Structured Diversity

Variation becomes informative when it is structured—when differences follow recognizable contours rather than random scatter.

Structured diversity can reveal:

- context dependence
- boundary conditions
- transitional fragility

These features help locate where organization succeeds and where it fails.

Chapter 15 — Across Contexts: Variation as Signal

Human experience is where immune organization becomes visible—and where interpretation becomes most vulnerable to distortion.

Illness, recovery, fatigue, and relapse are lived processes. They unfold across time, shaped by biology and circumstance together. For a book concerned with immune organization, human experience cannot be ignored. It must, however, be handled with restraint.

This chapter explains how to engage human experience without converting it into mechanism, evidence, or promise.

Why Experience Cannot Be the Answer

Human experience carries meaning, but it does not carry explanation.

People describe patterns: improvement that stalls, recovery that reverses, symptoms that shift rather than disappear. These accounts are real. They are also incomplete. They do not isolate variables, control context, or establish causality.

Treating experience as proof collapses description into conclusion. It replaces inquiry with reassurance.

The role of experience in this book is narrower and more disciplined: **to reveal what kinds of immune behavior are possible**, not to explain why they occur.

What Experience Reveals That Experiments Often Miss

Experimental systems excel at control. Human lives reveal **constraint**.

In lived contexts, immune responses must coordinate with sleep, stress, nutrition, infection history, and recovery demands. Transitions do not occur on schedule. Signals overlap. Resolution competes with obligation.

This complexity makes human experience unsuitable for testing hypotheses—but well suited for **exposing timing problems**.

> ***When people describe feeling "stuck," "not fully recovered," or "unable to move past" an episode, they are often describing <u>unfinished transitions</u>, not persistent attack. These descriptions do not validate a hypothesis. They orient attention.***

They tell us where to look.

Description Without Translation

The most common error in using human experience is translation: turning observation into recommendation.

This book refuses that move.

Descriptions of recovery trajectories are not instructions. Accounts of improvement are not endorsements. Patterns of persistence do not imply solutions.

By holding description separate from explanation, the book preserves both. Experience remains informative without becoming instrumental.

Restraint as Ethical Practice

Restraint here is not caution born of fear. It is ethical alignment with what evidence can support.

To engage human experience responsibly requires:

- no attribution of cause
- no inference of benefit
- no extrapolation beyond observed pattern
- no promise of outcome

These limits protect readers from false hope and protect inquiry from misuse.

Chapter 16 — Entering Human Experience With Restraint

Scientific progress depends not only on what research attempts to prove, but on what it is willing to **permit**.

When inquiry concerns immune organization—timing, coordination, and resolution—the greatest threat is not error, but premature certainty. This chapter explains what future work must allow if such inquiry is to remain credible.

Permission for Failure

A hypothesis that cannot fail cannot teach.

Organizational hypotheses are especially vulnerable to protection. Because they often explain persistence indirectly, they can be insulated from contradiction by invoking complexity or context. This book rejects that insulation.

Future work must be designed so that hypotheses about immune organization can fail clearly and decisively. If timing and coordination do not matter in the ways proposed, the data must be allowed to show it.

Failure is not a setback. It is a boundary discovered.

Allowance for Ambiguity

Questions about immune organization rarely resolve cleanly. Signals overlap. Transitions blur. Outcomes depend on sequence rather than magnitude.

For this reason, future work must tolerate ambiguity without rushing to simplify it away. Demanding immediate clarity often produces misleading conclusions.

Ambiguity is not an absence of meaning. It is often a sign that the question has been posed at the correct scale.

Time as a Design Constraint

Many experimental designs are optimized for speed and decisiveness. Organizational questions require a different alignment.

Work ahead must allow:

- extended observation through transition phases
- dense sampling during periods of change
- attention to lag, delay, and persistence

Short studies can be rigorous and still miss organization entirely.

Allowing time is not inefficiency. It is methodological necessity.

Null Results as Guidance

Future work must allow null results to stand.

In organizational inquiry, absence of effect often indicates that influence is conditional, narrow, or nonexistent. Each possibility constrains explanation.

Suppressing null results invites overgeneralization. Publishing them clarifies where hypotheses stop being useful.

Restraint Against Translation

Perhaps most importantly, future work must allow separation between understanding and application.

Insights into immune organization do not automatically imply intervention. Translation must wait for evidence that does not yet exist.

Allowing this separation protects both science and those who would read it.

Chapter 17 — A Hypothesis That Arrived Slowly

Every serious inquiry draws lines. Without them, explanation dissolves into implication, and implication hardens into belief.

This book has advanced a way of thinking about immune behavior—one that emphasizes timing, coordination, and resolution. It has not advanced a program, a solution, or a set of instructions. This chapter makes that distinction explicit.

What This Book Allows

This book allows readers to reconsider familiar problems through a different lens.

It allows the possibility that:

- some chronic inflammatory states reflect **unfinished immune processes**, not persistent attack
- resolution is an **active biological phase**, not a passive decline
- immune dysfunction may arise from **mistimed coordination**, not excessive force
- timing and sequence can matter as much as magnitude

These are not conclusions. They are permissions to think differently about what immune systems may be doing when they fail to move on.

The book also allows readers to hold uncertainty without rushing to fill it. It treats explanation as provisional and inquiry as ongoing.

What This Book Refuses

Equally important are the refusals.

This book refuses to:

- make therapeutic claims
- advocate supplements or interventions
- promise improvement or recovery
- generalize patterns into prescriptions
- translate explanation into advice

These refusals are not omissions. They are commitments.

They protect the work from being used to support conclusions it does not earn.

Why Refusal Matters

Scientific ideas do not exist in isolation. Once published, they are interpreted, adapted, and sometimes misapplied.

By stating its limits plainly, this book reduces the risk of misuse. It does not invite readers to act; it invites them to **understand**.

Understanding is not passive. It reshapes questions, reframes observations, and disciplines expectation. But it does so without directing behavior.

Clarifying the Reader's Role

Readers bring their own experiences, concerns, and hopes to this book. Many are looking for meaning rather than guidance.

This chapter asks readers to remain readers—not adopters, not patients, not advocates. The work is complete when it sharpens perception, not when it motivates action.

That distinction preserves both reader autonomy and scientific integrity.

Chapter 18 — What the Work Ahead Must Allow

This book has argued that immune systems are not only reactive, but organized. They move through phases, negotiate transitions, and attempt resolution. When they fail to do so, the failure often reflects **disrupted coordination rather than excess activity**.

That way of seeing does not deliver solutions. It delivers clarity.

What Has Been Shown

Across its chapters, this book has established a consistent frame:

- immune responses unfold over time
- resolution is an active biological process
- timing and sequence shape outcome
- persistence may reflect unfinished work
- explanation must remain bounded by evidence

These ideas do not replace existing models. They sit alongside them, offering a way to interpret phenomena that magnitude-based approaches struggle to explain.

What Remains Unresolved

Many questions remain open—and should.

Whether particular molecular contexts influence immune timing remains to be tested. Whether organizational failure explains specific conditions remains unknown. Whether these ideas will endure remains undecided.

The book does not resolve these questions because resolution requires data that do not yet exist.

Leaving questions open is not a weakness. It is fidelity to inquiry.

Why the Book Ends Here

It would be tempting to conclude with implication—to suggest where these ideas might lead or how they might be used. That temptation is resisted deliberately.

Understanding precedes application. When application arrives too early, it distorts understanding.

This book ends where its evidence ends.

Ending Without Closure

Some scientific work closes debates. Other work opens space for better questions.

This book belongs to the latter. It does not promise outcomes or predict futures. It offers a way of seeing immune behavior that remains open to correction.

Organization, after all, is not an endpoint. It is an ongoing negotiation.

This book ends without promise because promise would exceed what evidence allows.

NEW SHORT SECTION (End of Book)

What These Stories Do—and Do Not—Show

The stories in this book are not evidence of efficacy.
They do not demonstrate benefit, mechanism, or predictability.

They serve a narrower purpose: to make visible a class of questions that often disappear under endpoint-focused analysis.

Each story reflects a system in transition—sometimes coherent, sometimes stalled, sometimes unchanged. Together, they suggest that immune behavior cannot be fully understood without attending to **how systems move through time**.

Interpretation must remain bounded. The value of these observations lies not in what they promise, but in what they make observable.

Bibliography

1. Nathan C, Cell AD, 2010 undefined. Nonresolving inflammation. cell.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.cell.com/fulltext/S0092-8674(10)00182-0

2. Medzhitov R. Origin and physiological roles of inflammation. Nature 2008 454:7203 [Internet]. 2008 Jul 1 [cited 2026 Jan 3];454(7203):428–35. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nature07201

3. Del Valle DM, Kim-Schulze S, Huang HH, Beckmann ND, Nirenberg S, Wang B, et al. An inflammatory cytokine signature predicts COVID-19 severity and survival. Nat Med [Internet]. 2020 Oct 1 [cited 2026 Jan 2];26(10):1636–43. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32839624/

4. Moore JB, June CH. Cytokine release syndrome in severe COVID-19. science.org [Internet]. 2020 May 1 [cited 2026 Jan 2];368(6490):473–4. Available from: https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abb8925

5. Flajnik M. Paul's fundamental immunology [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Jan 2]. Available from: https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=hpl8EAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT32&dq=paul%27s+fundamental+immunology&ots=150dKdmm2U&sig=evFsuuKXtA0uTPk5ryXBc-rCxWE

6. Serhan C, immunology JSN, 2005 undefined. Resolution of inflammation: the beginning programs the end. nature.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/ni1276

7. Serhan CN, Brain SD, Buckley CD, Gilroy DW, || CH, O'neill LAJ, et al. Resolution of inflammation: state of the art, definitions and terms. pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.govCN Serhan, SD Brain, CD Buckley, DW Gilroy, C Haslett, LAJ O'Neill, M Perretti, AG RossiFASEB journal: official publication of the Federation of American …, 2007•pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2026 Jan 2];21(2):325–32. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3119634/

8. Fullerton J, discovery DGN reviews D, 2016 undefined. Resolution of inflammation: a new therapeutic frontier. nature.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nrd.2016.39

9. Ariel A, immunology CST in, 2007 undefined. Resolvins and protectins in the termination program of acute inflammation. cell.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.cell.com/trends/immunology/abstract/S1471-4906(07)00049-X

10. Dang S, Jain A, Dhanda G, Bhattacharya N, Bhattacharya A, Senapati S. One carbon metabolism and its implication in health and immune functions. Cell Biochem Funct [Internet]. 2024 Jan 1 [cited 2026 Jan 2];42(1):e3926. Available from: /doi/pdf/10.1002/cbf.3926

11. Pearce E, Immunity EP, 2013 undefined. Metabolic pathways in immune cell activation and quiescence. cell.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.cell.com/immunity/fulltext/S1074-7613(13)00158-1?bid=2I0TM4F%3AS4QQ4

12. O'Neill L, Kishton R, immunology JRN reviews, 2016 undefined. A guide to immunometabolism for immunologists. nature.com [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2026 Jan 2];16(9):553–65. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nri.2016.70.pdf

13. Buck M, Sowell R, Kaech S, Cell EP, 2017 undefined. Metabolic instruction of immunity. cell.com [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2026 Jan 2];169:570–86. Available from: https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674(17)30416-6

14. National Institutes of Health, Office of Dietary Supplements. Folate - Health Professional Fact Sheet. 2021.

15. Murr C, Widner B, Wirleitner B, Fuchs D. Neopterin as a marker for immune system activation. Curr Drug Metab [Internet]. 2002 Jul 29 [cited 2025 Dec 7];3(2):175–87. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12003349/

16. Heneberk O, Wurfelova E, Radochova V, Heneberk O, Wurfelova E, Radochova V. Neopterin, the Cell-Mediated Immune Response Biomarker, in Inflammatory Periodontal Diseases: A Narrative Review of a More than Fifty Years Old Biomarker. Biomedicines 2023, Vol 11, [Internet]. 2023 Apr 26 [cited 2026 Jan 3];11(5). Available from: https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9059/11/5/1294

17. Nathan C, Cell AD, 2010 undefined. SnapShot: reactive oxygen intermediates (ROI). cell.com [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2026 Jan 2];140. Available from: https://www.cell.com/pb/assets/raw/journals/research/snapshots/PIIS0092867410002448.pdf

18. Forrester SJ, Kikuchi DS, Hernandes MS, Xu Q, Griendling KK. Reactive oxygen species in metabolic and inflammatory signaling. ahajournals.org [Internet]. 2018 Mar 1 [cited 2026 Jan 2];122(6):877–902. Available from: https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.311401

19. Schieber M, biology NCC, 2014 undefined. ROS function in redox signaling and oxidative stress. cell.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.cell.com/current-biology/fulltext/S0960-9822(14)00326-1?elsca1=etoc&elsca2=email&elsca3=0960-9822_20140519_24_10_&elsca4=Cell+Press&code=cell-site

20. Gorrini C, Harris IS, Mak TW. Modulation of oxidative stress as an anticancer strategy. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery 2013 12:12 [Internet]. 2013 Nov 29 [cited 2026 Jan 2];12(12):931–47. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nrd4002

21. Han J, Rindone AN, Elisseeff JH. Immunoengineering Biomaterials for Musculoskeletal Tissue Repair across Lifespan. Advanced Materials [Internet]. 2024 Jul 11 [cited 2026 Jan 3];36(28):2311646. Available from: /doi/pdf/10.1002/adma.202311646

22. Wynn T, Immunity KV, 2016 undefined. Macrophages in tissue repair, regeneration, and fibrosis. cell.comTA Wynn, KM VannellaImmunity, 2016•cell.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 3]; Available from: https://www.cell.com/immunity/fulltext/S1074-7613(16)30053-X

23. Murray P, immunology TWN reviews, 2011 undefined. Protective and pathogenic functions of macrophage subsets. nature.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 3]; Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/nri3073

24. Guilliams M, Mildner A, Immunity SY, 2018 undefined. Developmental and functional heterogeneity of monocytes. cell.com [Internet]. [cited 2026 Jan 3]; Available from: https://www.cell.com/immunity/fulltext/S1074-7613(18)30446-1

25. Gordon S, Plüddemann A. Macrophage clearance of apoptotic cells: A critical assessment. Front Immunol [Internet]. 2018 Jan 30 [cited 2026 Jan 3];9(JAN):315565. Available from: www.frontiersin.org

26. Moheno PBB. Calcium pterin as an antitumor agent. Int J Pharm. 2004 Mar 1;271(1–2):293–300.

27. Moheno P, Pfleiderer W, Fuchs D. Plasma cytokine concentration changes induced by the antitumor agents dipterinyl calcium pentahydrate (DCP) and related calcium pterins. Immunobiology. 2009 Feb;214(2):135–41.

28. Moheno P, Pfleiderer W, DiPasquale AG, Rheingold AL, Fuchs D. Cytokine and IDO metabolite changes effected by calcium pterin during inhibition of MDA-MB-231 xenograph tumors in nude mice. Int J Pharm. 2008 May 1;355(1–2):238–48.

29. Moheno PBB. A Review of the Development of Calcium Pterins and (250:1 Mol:Mol) Calcium Folate for the Immunotherapy of Certain Diseases. Drug Des. 2017;6(1):140.

30. Moheno P, Morrey J, Fuchs D. Effect of dipterinyl calcium pentahydrate on hepatitis B virus replication in transgenic mice. J Transl Med [Internet]. 2010;8:32–40. Available from: http://www.translational-medicine.com/content/8/1/32

31. Moheno P, Winkler C, Fuchs D, Ryan J, Meerbergen E. Role of calcium pterin in natural killer (NK) cell activation and indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase (IDO) modulation for antitumor activity. In: 24th International Winter Workshop on Clinical, Chemical, and Biochemical Aspects of Pteridines. 2005. p. 140–140.

32. Winkler C, Schroecksnadel K, Moheno P, Meerbergen E, Schennach H, Fuchs D. Calcium-pterin suppresses mitogen-induced tryptophan degradation and neopterin production in peripheral blood mononuclear cells. Immunobiology. 2006 Dec 4;211(10):779–84.

33. Nikoulina SE, Fuchs D, Moheno P. Effect of orally administered dipterinyl calcium pentahydrate on oral glucose tolerance in diet-induced obese mice. Diabetes Metab Syndr Obes. 2012;5:43–7.

34. Sakala IG, Eickhoff CS, Blazevic A, Moheno P, Silver RF, Hoft DF. Dipterinyl calcium pentahydrate inhibits intracellular mycobacterial growth in human monocytes via the c-c chemokine mip-1β and nitric oxide. Infect Immun. 2013 Jun;81(6):1974–83.

35. Moheno PBB. Observational study of Calcium Folate. Open Science Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology [Internet]. 2014;2(3):14–8. Available from: http://www.openscienceonline.com/journal/osjpp

36. Moheno PBB, Fuchs D. Immunopterin: A prospective therapy and preventative to fight COVID-19? Pteridines. 2022 Jan 1;33(1):11–20.