When the Alarm Won't Turn Off

The real science of chronic symptoms, expectation, and recovery, and the order of operations that leads to real answers.

Dr. Anthony Beck

A systems-biology, data-driven guide to persistent symptoms

HOW TO READ THIS GUIDE

You are being told your brain, not your body, makes your symptoms.

There is a powerful idea moving through health media right now: that chronic symptoms are produced by the brain rather than the body, and that you can think your way out of them. Like most viral health claims, it is built on a real and important scientific finding that has been stretched into something it cannot support. This guide does two things. It gives you the actual neuroscience, labeled by how strong the evidence is. And it gives you the order of operations that separates responsible recovery from wishful thinking.

> **How evidence is labeled in this guide**
> Claims are tagged so that strong and weak findings are not treated the same. [Model] is a theoretical or mechanistic framework. [RCT] is a randomized controlled trial. [Meta-analysis] pools many studies. [Consensus] is a formal expert classification. Where the evidence is thin, this guide says so plainly.

STAGE 1 | WHAT IS REAL

Your nervous system does not measure damage. It makes a prediction.

Pain and physical symptoms were long taught as simple signals: damage in a tissue travels up a nerve, and you feel it in proportion to the damage. That model is incomplete. Your brain does not passively receive sensation. It actively predicts what is happening in and around your body, then checks those predictions against incoming signals. What you consciously feel is the brain's best guess, weighted by expectation, prior experience, and context. [Model]

> *"You do not feel a symptom only because you detect it. You feel it because your nervous system predicts it, then weighs the evidence."*

This is not fringe. It is mainstream neuroscience published in the field's most rigorous journals. When people were given an inert cream they believed was a painkiller, brain imaging showed reduced activity in pain-processing regions, not merely a change in what they reported. [Wager 2004] Later work using spinal cord imaging showed that expectation dampens the pain signal as early as the spinal cord itself, which means the effect is real physiology, not politeness or imagination. [Eippert 2009] The security-guard image is a fair one. The system's job is not to report tissue state accurately. Its job is to ask a blunter question: how dangerous is this, and should I raise the alarm.

STAGE 2 | WHERE IT GETS DISTORTED

The popular version quietly swaps four true things for four false ones.

The moment this science reaches social media it tends to mutate. Here is exactly where it breaks, and why each break matters clinically.

Distortion 1: "Normal scans mean nothing is wrong."

Standard imaging misses a great deal: early inflammatory disease, small-fiber neuropathy, and many metabolic, hormonal, and visceral drivers. A normal image narrows the possibilities. It does not close the case. Treating a normal scan as proof that no physical driver exists is how real disease gets missed.

Distortion 2: "It is all in your head, so you are doing this to yourself."

Amplified nervous-system processing, described in the next section, is a genuine physical change, not imagination and not a character flaw. Blame is not a mechanism. A message that makes you responsible for your own illness is not science, it is a burden.

Distortion 3: "Change your belief and any illness resolves."

The evidence is about turning down symptom perception, especially pain. It is not evidence that belief reverses autoimmune tissue destruction, hormone deficiency, infection, or structural disease. Relief of a symptom is not the same as cure of a disease.

Distortion 4: "One mindset fix works for every symptom and every person."

This collapses a complex, multi-input system into a single lever. It is the oldest move in health marketing, and it is wrong for the same reason every time: the body is not a single switch.

Two patterns to recognize. Complexity Collapse reduces a whole system to one switch. Certainty Inflation sells promising early research as settled fact. Once you can name them, you can spot them.

STAGE 3 | THE MISSING BIOLOGY

There are two different systems, and confusing them is the whole problem.

To use this science safely, hold two layers apart.

Layer one: the drivers.

These are the tissue and organ level causes: mechanical or structural problems, inflammation, infection, hormonal and metabolic dysfunction, nutrient status, and more. They are measurable. They are the body's actual inputs.

Layer two: the processing.

This is how the nervous system filters, weights, and interprets those inputs. When the processing layer becomes sensitized, the alarm can stay loud even after the original driver has quieted or resolved. Pain scientists call this central sensitization, and the broader category is nociplastic pain: pain that arises from altered processing in the nervous system rather than ongoing tissue damage. [Consensus: Woolf 2011; Kosek 2016, 2021; Nijs 2021] This is a formally defined mechanism, not a polite word for imagined.

Why two people with the same diagnosis feel so differently

Expectation is one input, not the explanation. Differences in sensitization history, sleep, mood, immune and inflammatory tone, context, and genetics all shape the final experience. Watch for a common misuse: research showing that people differ in how strongly they respond to a placebo [J Neurosci 2011] is about differences in placebo response, not about why one person's underlying disease is worse than another's. Those are different questions and should not be blurred.

Extending the model to interoceptive symptoms.

The same predictive logic applies beyond pain to interoception, the sense of your body's internal state: fatigue, gut sensations, breathlessness, dizziness, and awareness of your own heartbeat. The brain predicts these signals too, and under certain conditions those predictions can become self-sustaining. [Model: Barrett and Simmons 2015; Seth 2011; Van den Bergh 2017; Ongaro and Kaptchuk 2019] Two honesty flags belong here. First, this is a strong and well-argued model, but the treatment evidence for retraining interoceptive symptoms is thinner than for pain. Second, the formal nociplastic criteria were validated for the musculoskeletal system, not for visceral symptoms, so applying the label to gut or cardiac sensations is reasonable as a model and premature as a diagnosis.

How big is the effect, really?

Honesty about magnitude protects you from both hype and dismissal. The largest pooled brain-imaging analysis of placebo pain relief found that the neural effects are real but small and spread across several systems, and likely reflect a mixture of changes in the pain signal itself and in the emotional and decision-making processes around pain. [Meta-analysis: Zunhammer 2021] In plain terms, expectation is a genuine dial, not a master switch. And the dial turns both ways: negative expectation and alarming language can amplify symptoms, which is the nocebo effect. [Colloca and Barsky 2020] How a symptom is explained to you is itself an input into how it feels.

The boundary that keeps this honest

This science governs symptom perception and some automatic nervous-system and hormonal output. It does not govern the underlying disease process. A nervous system can be retrained to stop amplifying a pain signal. It cannot be believed into repairing a thyroid, clearing an infection, or reversing an autoimmune attack. Keep relief and cure in separate boxes.

STAGE 3B | THE HOPEFUL PART, BOUNDED

What is learned can be retrained, in the right person, with real methods.

Here is the encouraging part, stated at its true strength. When persistent pain is driven mainly by the processing layer, structured treatments that retrain the brain's threat appraisal can produce large and durable relief.

- In a randomized trial of primary chronic back pain, a four-week brain-focused therapy left 66 percent of patients pain-free or nearly pain-free, versus 20 percent for a placebo injection and 10 percent for usual care, with most gains holding at one year. [RCT: Ashar 2022] At five years, more than half of the

treated group remained nearly or completely pain-free, with no booster sessions. [RCT follow-up: Ashar 2025]

- A related emotion-focused therapy has outperformed standard cognitive behavioral therapy for conditions such as fibromyalgia and chronic musculoskeletal pain in several trials. [RCT: Lumley 2017; Yarns 2024]

> **Read the fine print, because it matters**
>
> These results are genuinely impressive, and they are specific. The back-pain trial was in primary pain, where no clear structural cause was found, and the authors were explicit that it is not intended for pain rooted in ongoing injury or active disease. The emotion-focused trials are promising but relatively small, and even in the best results only about a third of participants reached a 50 percent reduction in pain, which means many did not. These are structured, evidence-based protocols delivered by trained clinicians. They are not a slogan about reprogramming your subconscious.

STAGE 4 | HOW TO TELL THE DIFFERENCE

A quick test for any "your brain makes your symptoms" claim.

Use this the next time you meet the confident version of this idea online.

The distorted version	The rigorous version
Says normal scans prove nothing is wrong	Treats normal scans as narrowing the search, not ending it
Implies you are causing your own illness	Treats sensitization as real physiology, never as blame
Promises one method fixes every symptom	Specifies which symptoms, which patients, which evidence
Sells certainty and urgency in the first few seconds	Leads with mechanism and states its own limits
Skips measurement and goes straight to the fix	Measures first, intervenes, then measures again

One rule ties it together: if a message hooks you on fear, identity, or certainty before it gives you a mechanism, treat it as distortion until proven otherwise.

STAGE 5 | THE ORDER OF OPERATIONS

Measure first. The sequence is the medicine.

The reason the popular version is dangerous is not that the brain-body science is wrong. It is that skipping straight to "retrain your brain" without first characterizing your biology can leave a treatable driver undiscovered, and can turn a useful tool into a way to talk yourself out of a real diagnosis. The Balance Protocol GPS approach sequences it deliberately.

- **1. Quantify the drivers.** Establish objective baselines across the body's core systems with biomarker testing, so that inflammatory, metabolic, hormonal, nutrient, and other measurable drivers are ruled in or out rather than assumed. You cannot contextualize a symptom you have not measured.

- **2. Map the inputs.** Sleep, nutrition, environmental exposures, physical load, and autonomic and stress state all feed both layers. They are modifiable and measurable.
- **3. Address the processing layer.** Once treatable drivers are managed and inputs are corrected, the predictive and threat-appraisal layer becomes a legitimate, evidence-based target using the structured methods described above.
- **4. Measure again.** Re-test to confirm what actually changed. Perception is informative, but objective change is the proof.

This is the Q2M2 discipline: Quantify, Measure, Modify, Measure again. It is what turns a compelling story into an individualized, verifiable result.

Start by measuring, not by guessing.

Balance Protocol GPS is built to run this sequence: a systems-biology, data-driven framework that measures your biology first, interprets it in your individual context, and sequences interventions in the right order. If your symptoms have persisted past the usual explanations, begin with the GPS Systems Performance Scorecard to see which of your body's systems to measure first.

A persistent symptom is not your identity and it is not your fault. It is a signal to be measured, understood, and, when the biology allows, retrained.

REFERENCE BASE

The evidence behind this guide.

These are the primary sources for the claims above, grouped by theme and graded by strength. This list is the source foundation for this project, not a set of generic citations. Where this guide made a bounded or cautious claim, it is because these sources support only the bounded version.

Expectation, placebo, and nocebo neuroscience

Wager TD, Rilling JK, Smith EE, et al. Placebo-Induced Changes in fMRI in the Anticipation and Experience of Pain. Science. 2004;303(5661):1162-1167.

Eippert F, Finsterbusch J, Bingel U, Buchel C. Direct Evidence for Spinal Cord Involvement in Placebo Analgesia. Science. 2009;326(5951):404.

Buchel C, Geuter S, Sprenger C, Eippert F. Placebo Analgesia: A Predictive Coding Perspective. Neuron. 2014;81(6):1223-1239.

Wager TD, Atlas LY. The neuroscience of placebo effects: connecting context, learning and health. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2015;16(7):403-418.

Wager TD, Atlas LY, Leotti LA, Rilling JK. Predicting Individual Differences in Placebo Analgesia: Contributions of Brain Activity during Anticipation and Pain Experience. J Neurosci. 2011;31(2):439-452.

Kaptchuk TJ, Miller FG. Placebo Effects in Medicine. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(1):8-9.

Colloca L, Barsky AJ. Placebo and Nocebo Effects. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(6):554-561.

Zunhammer M, Spisak T, Wager TD, Bingel U; Placebo Imaging Consortium. Meta-analysis of neural systems underlying placebo analgesia from individual participant fMRI data. Nat Commun. 2021;12:1391.

Central sensitization and nociplastic pain

Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: implications for the diagnosis and treatment of pain. Pain. 2011;152(3 Suppl):S2-S15.

Kosek E, Cohen M, Baron R, et al. Do we need a third mechanistic descriptor for chronic pain states? Pain. 2016;157(7):1382-1386.

Kosek E, Clauw D, Nijs J, et al. Chronic nociplastic pain affecting the musculoskeletal system: clinical criteria and grading system. Pain. 2021;162(11):2629-2634.

Nijs J, George SZ, Clauw DJ, et al. Central sensitisation in chronic pain conditions: latest discoveries and their potential for precision medicine. Lancet Rheumatol. 2021;3(5):e383-e392.

Predictive processing and interoception

Ongaro G, Kaptchuk TJ. Symptom perception, placebo effects, and the Bayesian brain. Pain. 2019;160(1):1-4.

Barrett LF, Simmons WK. Interoceptive predictions in the brain. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2015;16(7):419-429.

Seth AK, Suzuki K, Critchley HD. An interoceptive predictive coding model of conscious presence. Front Psychol. 2011;2:395.

Van den Bergh O, Witthoft M, Petersen S, Brown RJ. Symptoms and the body: taking the inferential leap. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2017;74(Pt A):185-203.

Learned symptoms and retraining (treatment evidence)

Ashar YK, Gordon A, Schubiner H, et al. Effect of Pain Reprocessing Therapy vs Placebo and Usual Care for Patients With Chronic Back Pain: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Psychiatry. 2022;79(1):13-23.

Ashar YK, et al. Pain Reprocessing Therapy vs Placebo and Usual Care for Patients With Chronic Back Pain: 5-Year Follow-Up of a Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Psychiatry. Published online July 30, 2025.

Lumley MA, Schubiner H, Lockhart NA, et al. Emotional awareness and expression therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, and education for fibromyalgia: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. Pain. 2017;158(12):2354-2363.

Yarns BC, Jackson NJ, Alas A, et al. Emotional Awareness and Expression Therapy vs Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Chronic Pain in Older Veterans: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Netw Open. 2024;7(6):e2415842.

Moseley GL, Butler DS. Fifteen Years of Explaining Pain: The Past, Present, and Future. J Pain. 2015;16(9):807-813.

This guide is educational and supports, rather than replaces, individualized clinical evaluation. Its central message is the order of operations: proper measurement comes first.