THE LOCUS COERULEUS BRIDGE

Coupled Withdrawal of Noradrenergic Tone
and Trans-Synaptic Tau Propagation
as the Phase I Phase II Transition Mechanism

Braak · Del Tredici · Heneka · Weinshenker · Mather
Butovsky · Diamond · Lee · Bu · Stockwell · Conrad

in dialogue with the Bioenergetic Collapse and Homeostatic Microglial Collapse theses

Prepared under the ONS Methodology

AdultCognitiveDisease.com

Dr. James Truchard & Benjamin Aaron Gustafsson

21 May 2026

Companion to Bioenergetic Collapse and Homeostatic Microglial Collapse

Contents

Abstract

The three-phase framework that has emerged from the Oskar Fischer Prize corpus — Bioenergetic Ignition in the locus coeruleus and dorsal raphe during the third through fifth decades; Microglial Bridgehead in the hippocampus, oligodendrocyte, and microglial network during the sixth and seventh decades; and Structural Disintegration of the perineuronal-net sheaths around parvalbumin-positive interneurons in the eighth decade and beyond — provides a temporally explicit ordering of the principal substrates of late-onset Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis but does not specify the mechanism by which Phase I gives way to Phase II. The Bioenergetic Collapse thesis establishes the locus coeruleus as the earliest locus of catecholaminergic and NAD-related failure under chronic oxidative stress mediated by PARP-1 hyperactivation; the Homeostatic Microglial Collapse thesis establishes the Butovsky-defined TGF-β/SMAD-maintained homeostatic signature as the proximate substrate whose loss generates the disease-associated microglial trajectories. The two theses, however, are mechanistically disjoint: there is no specified pathway by which the failure of brainstem aminergic nuclei produces the parenchymal homeostatic collapse of forebrain microglia decades later, nor any account of why the hippocampus rather than any other LC-projection target should be the site at which the second phase consolidates. This paper proposes that the transition mechanism is dual and that its two arms travel along the same anatomical substrate: the ascending efferents of the locus coeruleus. The first arm is the progressive withdrawal of tonic noradrenergic suppression of microglial activation through β2-adrenergic-receptor signaling, which is established in the Heneka program and which constitutes one of the principal extracellular brakes maintaining the Butovsky homeostatic state alongside CX3CR1-fractalkine, CD200-CD200R, and astrocytic TGF-β. The second arm is the trans-synaptic templated propagation of pretangle tau seeds from LC neurons to their projection targets, established in the Braak staging program from 2011 onward, with the hippocampus receiving the seeds through the same axonal projection that previously delivered the noradrenergic brake. We argue that the simultaneous withdrawal of the noradrenergic brake and arrival of the templated tau seed along the same wiring is what produces the hippocampal bridgehead, and that the apparent puzzle of why a brainstem lesion produces a forebrain disease is resolved by recognizing that the LC's anatomy is the disease's anatomy: a small nucleus of ~50,000 neurons in the human projects to the entire forebrain, and its progressive failure delivers both the loss of suppressive signaling and the gain of pathogenic templating along the same axons. We further consider, in a separately marked section, a third candidate arm — the pre-sensitization of hippocampal oligodendrocytes for ferroptotic collapse by the systemic oxidative output of Phase I catecholamine metabolism — and we treat this arm as mechanistically plausible but presently less established than the noradrenergic and propagation arms. The integrated transition model has direct therapeutic implications for the Phase I preventive window: a PARP-inhibitor or NAD-sparing strategy that preserves LC neurons is not merely neuroprotective for the brainstem but is disease-arresting for the forebrain, because LC preservation interdicts the

Phase II ignition before it can begin. The paper concludes with the implications for the perineuronal-net axis articulated in the companion theses, in which the Phase III disintegration becomes the predictable downstream consequence of the Phase II bridgehead consolidation that the Phase I Phase II transition has produced.

1. Introduction: The Transition Problem

The three-phase framework articulated in the recent integration of the Bioenergetic Collapse, Homeostatic Microglial Collapse, and Convergent Synaptic Collapse theses partitions the natural history of late-onset Alzheimer's disease into three temporally and anatomically distinct phases, each with its own locus, driver, and therapeutic window. Phase I, the Bioenergetic Ignition, runs from approximately the third through the fifth decade of life, is localized to the locus coeruleus and dorsal raphe, is driven by NAD depletion under PARP-1 hyperactivation in the face of chronic oxidative stress, and is opened to a preventive therapeutic window through PARP inhibitors and NAD-sparing strategies. Phase II, the Hippocampal Bridgehead, runs from approximately the fifth through the seventh decade, is localized to the hippocampus and to the oligodendrocyte and microglial networks within it, is driven by oligodendrocyte ferroptosis and the homeostatic-to-disease-associated transition of microglia accompanied by lysosomal acidification failure of the PANTHOS type, and is open to a disease-modifying therapeutic window through GPX4 stabilizers and iron-chelating strategies including deferiprone. Phase III, the Structural Disintegration, runs from approximately the seventh decade onward, is localized to the perineuronal-net sheaths of parvalbumin-positive interneurons, is driven by matrix metalloproteinase 9 and ADAMTS family digestion of aggrecan and brevican with consequent loss of gamma-frequency drive, and is open only to a symptomatic late-life therapeutic window through MMP-9 inhibitors and TIMP-3 restoration.

The framework's principal value is its temporal explicitness: it distinguishes the preventive, disease-modifying, and symptomatic windows on the basis of which phase is currently active rather than on the basis of clinical diagnostic status, and it identifies the therapeutic class appropriate to each window. But the framework as currently articulated has a structural lacuna at each of the two phase boundaries. The Phase II Phase III boundary is the better-specified of the two, because the perineuronal-net axis developed in the companion theses identifies the matrix metalloproteinase program of post-homeostatic microglia as the direct executor of perineuronal-net degradation, so the Phase II microglial collapse and the Phase III matrix disintegration are connected by a single effector mechanism. The Phase I Phase II boundary, by contrast, is mechanistically unspecified. Nothing in the Bioenergetic Collapse thesis explains why LC degeneration should drive hippocampal homeostatic collapse twenty years later, and nothing in the Homeostatic Microglial

Collapse thesis identifies LC degeneration as an upstream input to the Butovsky signature failure it describes. The two theses are mechanistically disjoint at precisely the boundary at which the temporal staging framework most depends on a mechanistic link.

This paper proposes that the transition mechanism is dual, that both arms travel along the same anatomical substrate — the ascending efferents of the locus coeruleus to the entire forebrain — and that the apparent coincidence of a brainstem lesion producing a forebrain disease is not a coincidence at all but a reflection of the LC's unusual projection geometry. The paper develops the argument in six stages. We first review the case for the locus coeruleus as the obligatory Phase I locus, drawing on the Braak staging evidence and on the cellular biology of catecholamine metabolism. We then develop the first arm of the transition mechanism, the withdrawal of tonic noradrenergic suppression of microglial activation through β2-adrenergic-receptor signaling, drawing on the Heneka program and on the broader literature on neuron-to-microglia tonic signaling. We then develop the second arm, the trans-synaptic templated propagation of pretangle tau from LC neurons to forebrain targets, drawing on the Braak ascending staging model and on the Diamond strain literature. We then identify the structural convergence of the two arms — that they travel along the same axons, with the loss of the suppressive signal and the arrival of the seed delivered together — and argue that the hippocampus is the site of bridgehead consolidation because it is the first major LC-projection target with the receptor density to internalize the seed efficiently. We then consider, in a separately marked section, the possible third arm of oligodendrocyte pre-sensitization. We close with the therapeutic implications for the Phase I window.

2. The Locus Coeruleus as the Obligatory Phase I Locus

The Bioenergetic Collapse thesis identifies the locus coeruleus as the Phase I locus on the basis of a cluster of cellular-biological observations that together specify why a small brainstem nucleus of approximately 50,000 noradrenergic neurons in the human should be the first cellular population to fail under the cumulative pressure of late-onset Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis. The case rests on three independent considerations.

The first is the Braak staging evidence. Heiko Braak and Kelly Del Tredici's reconstruction of the pretangle tau distribution in young human brains, published in *Acta Neuropathologica* in 2011 and extended in subsequent papers, established that hyperphosphorylated tau immunoreactivity appears in the locus coeruleus and other brainstem aminergic nuclei in individuals in their twenties and thirties, decades before any clinical evidence of disease and decades before the appearance of the

same pathology in the entorhinal cortex, the hippocampus, or any other forebrain target. The LC pretangle stage, designated stage 0 or stages 1a–1b in the Braak system, is found in roughly half of human brains examined at autopsy beginning in early adulthood, and its prevalence rises with age in a manner consistent with the Phase I age range of the three-phase framework. The Braak evidence is the strongest available demonstration that the locus coeruleus is the temporally earliest site of late-onset Alzheimer's disease pathology, and it is the empirical anchor of the Phase I designation.

The second is the cellular biology of catecholamine metabolism. The locus coeruleus produces norepinephrine through the action of dopamine β-hydroxylase on dopamine, and this metabolic chain generates a continuous flux of reactive oxygen species and quinone intermediates that constitute a chronic oxidative load on the parent neuron. The neuromelanin granules characteristic of mature LC neurons are the byproducts of this metabolism: oxidized catecholamine polymers that accumulate over the lifespan and that themselves bind redox-active iron, generating a positive-feedback loop between catecholamine oxidation and iron-mediated Fenton chemistry. The result is that LC neurons exist throughout adult life in a state of elevated baseline oxidative stress that no other neuronal population in the brain experiences to a comparable degree, and that this baseline stress is intrinsic to their core function rather than imposed externally. The Bioenergetic Collapse thesis identifies this configuration as the substrate of PARP-1 hyperactivation: the chronic single-strand DNA damage produced by the elevated ROS flux drives PARP-1 to consume NAD at a rate that exceeds the regenerative capacity of the cell, and the consequent NAD depletion compromises mitochondrial oxidative phosphorylation, sirtuin-mediated transcriptional regulation, and the broader metabolic fitness of the neuron. LC neurons are, in this account, the cells most susceptible to bioenergetic collapse because they are the cells most chronically taxed by the metabolic consequences of their own neurotransmitter chemistry.

The third is the experimental literature on LC vulnerability in transgenic models. The work of David Weinshenker and colleagues, extending across two decades, has established that selective lesioning of the locus coeruleus with the noradrenergic-specific neurotoxin DSP-4 accelerates amyloid plaque deposition, exacerbates microglial inflammation, and produces cognitive deficits in multiple amyloidogenic mouse lines, including 5xFAD, APP/PS1, and Tg2576. The DSP-4 model is the cleanest experimental demonstration available that LC loss is a causal driver rather than a consequence of forebrain Alzheimer pathology, because the lesion is introduced exogenously and the downstream effects on the forebrain follow rather than precede the brainstem cell loss. The model also establishes the directionality of the effect: LC degeneration accelerates forebrain disease, and forebrain disease does not produce reciprocal LC loss on the same timescale, indicating that the LC-to-forebrain pathway is the dominant causal arrow in the Phase I Phase II transition.

Together, these three considerations establish the LC as the obligatory Phase I locus and frame the transition problem in its proper form. The question is not whether LC degeneration drives

forebrain disease — the Braak, Weinshenker, and broader transgenic literatures together establish that it does — but rather how the LC degeneration is mechanistically transmitted to the forebrain to produce the specific phenotype of Phase II homeostatic microglial collapse in the hippocampus.

3. The First Arm: Withdrawal of the Noradrenergic Brake on Microglial Activation

The first transmission mechanism is the loss of tonic noradrenergic suppression of microglial inflammatory output. The relevant biology has been developed principally by Michael Heneka and colleagues over more than two decades and has been refined into a specific molecular account that constitutes one of the load-bearing components of the modern understanding of LC-driven neuroinflammation.

The starting observation is anatomical. The locus coeruleus, despite containing only approximately 50,000 noradrenergic neurons in the human, projects diffusely to the entire forebrain through an unusual axonal geometry in which each LC neuron supports an enormously branched and varicosed axonal tree that releases norepinephrine through extrasynaptic en passant boutons across broad parenchymal territories rather than through point-to-point synaptic contacts. The result is that the LC functions as a forebrain-wide tonic source of NE, with relatively uniform delivery across cortical and hippocampal targets and with a release pattern that approximates volume transmission rather than wired transmission. Every parenchymal microglial cell in the cortex and hippocampus is therefore continuously exposed to a low-level NE signal under physiological conditions, and the integrity of this signal depends entirely on the continued function of the LC.

The receptor biology is the second component. Parenchymal microglia express the β2-adrenergic receptor at substantial levels, and this expression is preserved across the homeostatic microglial state defined by Butovsky and colleagues. β2-AR signaling, like other Gs-coupled receptor signaling, produces an increase in intracellular cAMP, activation of protein kinase A, and subsequent inhibitory phosphorylation of multiple inflammatory transcription factors, most importantly NF-κB. The functional consequence, established in the Heneka 2002 *J Neurosci* paper and confirmed in many subsequent studies, is that β2-AR signaling in microglia tonically suppresses the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines including tumor necrosis factor α, interleukin-1β, and interleukin-6, and tonically suppresses the upregulation of inflammatory effector programs that would otherwise be activated by ambient signals from the parenchymal environment. The β2-AR pathway is, in functional terms, a brake on microglial inflammatory output, and the tonic NE input

from the LC keeps that brake continuously engaged in the healthy adult brain.

The third component is the coordination with the other tonic brakes that maintain the Butovsky homeostatic signature. The Homeostatic Microglial Collapse thesis identifies the TGF-β/SMAD signaling axis as the proximate maintainer of the homeostatic state, with TGF-β supplied principally by astrocytes and by neurons through both basal secretion and activity-dependent release. The β2-AR pathway operates in functional synergy with TGF-β/SMAD, in that both pathways converge on the suppression of inflammatory gene expression and on the maintenance of the surveillance-rather-than-effector phenotype that defines homeostatic microglia. The CX3CR1-fractalkine and CD200-CD200R pathways supply additional tonic suppressive signals through complementary mechanisms. The homeostatic signature is therefore maintained not by a single signaling input but by a coordinated system of multiple tonic brakes, each of which depends on the continued integrity of a distinct upstream cellular population: TGF-β depends on astrocytes and neurons, fractalkine depends on neuronal CX3CL1 expression, CD200 depends on neuronal CD200 expression, and NE depends on the locus coeruleus.

When the LC degenerates under the cumulative pressure of Phase I bioenergetic collapse, the NE-β2AR brake on microglial activation is released. The remaining tonic brakes — TGF-β, fractalkine, CD200 — continue to operate, and they are sufficient to maintain a homeostatic-like state for a period of time, which is why the Phase II clinical manifestations do not follow immediately on the Phase I LC loss. But the released brake increases the steady-state demand on the remaining brakes, and the cumulative demand against a slowly aging astrocytic and neuronal TGF-β supply eventually exceeds the maintenance capacity of the system. The homeostatic-to-disease-associated transition becomes thermodynamically permissible at the moment when the NE brake is released sufficiently to lower the activation threshold below the ambient stimulus level provided by accumulating amyloid, by accumulating tau, and by the routine cellular debris of the aged forebrain. This is the first arm of the Phase I Phase II transition.

The Heneka program has confirmed the relevance of this mechanism through experimental and pharmacological evidence. DSP-4 lesioning of the LC in 5xFAD mice accelerates microglial inflammatory output, increases plaque burden, and worsens cognitive performance, all in a manner that is reversed by β2-AR agonist supplementation. β-blocker use in human populations has been associated, in epidemiological studies, with altered Alzheimer's risk profiles in a manner consistent with the importance of the NE-β2AR brake, although the human pharmacological evidence is confounded by the cardiovascular indications for which β-blockers are prescribed and is therefore less clean than the mouse evidence. The mechanism is, in any case, mechanistically explicit, experimentally testable, and integrated into the broader homeostatic-collapse framework through the multiple-tonic-brake architecture of the Butovsky signature.

4. The Second Arm: Trans-Synaptic Templated Tau Propagation Along the LC Projection

The second transmission mechanism operates along the same anatomical substrate but in the opposite direction of signaling. Where the first arm is a loss of suppressive signaling, the second arm is the gain of pathogenic templating, and the substrate of both is the ascending axonal projection of the LC to the forebrain.

The Braak ascending staging model, developed by Heiko Braak and Kelly Del Tredici over more than three decades and most precisely articulated in the 2011 *Acta Neuropathologica* paper and the subsequent extensions through 2016, holds that tau pathology in late-onset Alzheimer's disease propagates along a stereotyped anatomical sequence that begins in the locus coeruleus and adjacent brainstem aminergic nuclei (stages 0 and 1a–1b), proceeds to the transentorhinal cortex (stage I), then to the entorhinal cortex proper (stage II), then to the hippocampal CA1 region (stage III), and only then to broader temporal, parietal, and frontal cortices (stages IV–VI). The staging is supported by systematic autopsy series spanning the full age range from early adulthood through extreme old age, and it is confirmed by tau PET imaging studies in living humans that have reproduced the spatial sequence using AV-1451 and second-generation tau tracers.

The mechanism of propagation along this sequence is now understood, in light of the Diamond, Lee, and Bu programs and the broader propagation literature surveyed in the companion HMSP synthesis, to involve the trans-synaptic templated transfer of misfolded tau seeds from affected neurons to their projection targets. Affected presynaptic neurons release tau seeds into the extracellular space at synaptic terminals; the seeds are taken up by postsynaptic neurons through receptor-mediated endocytosis, principally via low-density lipoprotein receptor-related protein 1 (LRP1) and heparan sulfate proteoglycans on the postsynaptic membrane; and the internalized seeds template the misfolding of native tau in the recipient neuron, producing a new generation of seeds that propagate forward along the same projection. The mechanism is iterative, anatomical, and strain-faithful, in that the conformational properties of the seed are preserved through successive rounds of templating.

The implication for the Phase I Phase II transition is direct. The LC neurons that fail in Phase I are not merely failing in place; they are also the source of the pretangle tau seeds that propagate trans-synaptically along the LC efferents to their projection targets. The same axonal arbor that previously delivered the noradrenergic brake to the forebrain becomes, in Phase I and into early Phase II, the delivery system for tau seeds to those same forebrain targets. The hippocampus is among the densest LC-projection territories in the human brain, with the dentate

gyrus and CA1 region receiving substantial noradrenergic innervation, and it is also among the targets in which LRP1 and HSPG expression on neuronal membranes is most pronounced. The hippocampus therefore receives, from the same LC axons, both the cessation of the noradrenergic brake and the arrival of the templated tau seed, in approximately the same temporal window.

The Braak staging evidence shows that the entorhinal cortex receives the seed slightly earlier than the hippocampal CA1 region — the transentorhinal stage precedes the hippocampal stage — and this is consistent with the LC's projection geometry, in which the medial temporal lobe receives heavy direct innervation. The CA1 region then receives the seed both directly from LC efferents and indirectly through the trans-entorhinal-hippocampal projection chain. The result is a convergent arrival of tau seeding pressure on the hippocampus from multiple anatomical directions, all of which are downstream of the LC and all of which become active in approximately the same temporal window of Phase I Phase II transition.

5. The Convergence: One Anatomy, Two Signals

The structural claim of this paper is that the two arms of the transition mechanism are not independent processes that happen to occur in the same temporal window but are two aspects of a single process that operates on a single anatomical substrate. The LC efferents are doing two things simultaneously as they degenerate: they are ceasing to deliver noradrenergic suppression to their forebrain targets, and they are delivering tau seeds to those same targets. The two effects travel together along the same wires, and they arrive together at the same destination.

This framing resolves the puzzle of why a brainstem lesion in Phase I produces a forebrain disease in Phase II. The puzzle is only a puzzle if one treats the LC and the forebrain as anatomically separate compartments connected by some unspecified causal pathway that would have to be identified post hoc. Once one recognizes that the LC's projection arbor extends to the entire forebrain and that this arbor is itself the disease's anatomy, the brainstem-to-forebrain transmission becomes the expected geometric consequence of LC degeneration rather than a problem requiring separate explanation. The LC, in functional terms, is the forebrain's noradrenergic tonic regulator; in pathological terms, in Phase I and into Phase II, it becomes the forebrain's tau seed delivery system. The same axons execute both roles, and their failure executes both the loss of regulation and the delivery of pathology along the same projection.

The hippocampus becomes the bridgehead, in this framing, because it is the first major LC-projection target that meets three conditions simultaneously. First, it receives heavy and direct

LC innervation, so the noradrenergic brake withdrawal is locally substantial. Second, it expresses LRP1 and HSPG on its principal neuronal populations at densities sufficient to internalize the templated tau seed efficiently. Third, it contains the parvalbumin-positive interneuron populations whose perineuronal-net ensheathment makes them, in Phase III, the most vulnerable cells to the matrix metalloproteinase output of post-homeostatic microglia. The hippocampus is therefore not merely the recipient of the transition but the cellular environment in which the transition consolidates into a self-sustaining Phase II pathology, because it contains within itself the substrates that the released microglial program will eventually attack.

The convergence has a further consequence for the broader three-phase framework. The Phase II bridgehead is consolidated by the combined action of NE-brake withdrawal and tau-seed arrival, but its progression to Phase III depends on a separate process — the matrix metalloproteinase digestion of perineuronal nets — that has its own driver in the homeostatic-collapse-driven microglial program. The transition from Phase II to Phase III therefore does not require any further input from the LC, which by that point has been substantially destroyed, but proceeds along its own course once the Phase II bridgehead is established. This is consistent with the observation in the companion theses that the Phase III disintegration is the most autonomous of the three phases in the sense that its drivers are internal to the hippocampal-cortical network rather than dependent on inputs from elsewhere in the brain. The LC's role is therefore limited to the Phase I Phase II transition, and once that transition has occurred, the LC's contribution to the further course of the disease is effectively complete.

6. A Possible Third Arm: Oligodendrocyte Pre-Sensitization

A third candidate arm of the Phase I Phase II transition deserves separate treatment because, while mechanistically plausible, it is presently less rigorously established than the noradrenergic and propagation arms, and the integration of the three-phase framework with the existing literature should be honest about the differential evidentiary status of its components.

The Phase II driver in the three-phase framework includes oligodendrocyte ferroptosis alongside the homeostatic-to-DAM microglial transition. Oligodendrocytes are uniquely susceptible to ferroptotic cell death because of their unusual cellular biology: they are responsible for the elaboration and maintenance of the myelin sheath, which requires the synthesis and trafficking of enormous quantities of membrane lipids; they accumulate iron at levels well in excess of other glial populations because of the iron requirement of myelin synthesis; and they maintain a glutathione peroxidase 4 (GPX4) buffer that is sufficient for physiological conditions but is modest in absolute

terms relative to the lipid peroxidation flux they must continuously suppress. The Stockwell, Conrad, and Hambright programs have established that GPX4 loss in oligodendrocytes triggers ferroptotic cell death with a characteristic lipid-peroxidation signature, and that the susceptibility of oligodendrocytes to this mode of death exceeds that of most other CNS cell populations by a substantial margin.

The question for the Phase I Phase II transition is whether the systemic and regional oxidative output of Phase I LC catecholamine metabolism contributes to the pre-sensitization of hippocampal oligodendrocytes for ferroptotic collapse in Phase II. The candidate mechanism is the following. LC neurons in Phase I produce a continuous flux of ROS through catecholamine quinone chemistry and Fenton iron chemistry, and a fraction of this oxidative output is delivered to their forebrain projection targets through the same axonal arbor that delivers norepinephrine. The hippocampus, as a heavily LC-innervated region, receives a chronic low-level oxidative input from Phase I LC activity, and the hippocampal oligodendrocyte population may, over decades, be pre-sensitized to ferroptosis by the cumulative depletion of their GPX4 buffer and by the cumulative accumulation of lipid peroxidation products in their membranes.

If this third arm is correct, then the Phase II oligodendrocyte ferroptosis is not an independent process initiated in the hippocampus but a continuation, in a different cell type, of the Phase I oxidative damage that initiated in the LC. The transition would then be tripartite: NE-brake withdrawal acts on microglia, tau propagation arrives at neurons, and accumulated oxidative pre-sensitization tips oligodendrocytes into ferroptosis, with all three arms emerging from the same Phase I substrate and arriving at the hippocampus through the same anatomical pathway.

We treat this third arm as a candidate hypothesis rather than as an established mechanism for two reasons. First, the relevant experimental literature has not yet established the trans-axonal transmission of oxidative load from LC neurons to forebrain targets at the level of specificity that would be required to make the mechanism rigorous; the broader literature on LC-driven oxidative stress in projection targets is suggestive but not definitive. Second, the timescale of oligodendrocyte ferroptotic pre-sensitization is poorly characterized in any tissue, and the question of whether Phase I LC output is sufficient over decades to produce Phase II oligodendrocyte vulnerability is open. The arm is therefore proposed as a candidate mechanism that would, if established, complete the three-phase framework's transition specification, but it is not asserted as established in the way that the noradrenergic and propagation arms are.

7. Therapeutic Implications: The Phase I Window as Disease-Arresting

The integrated transition model has direct therapeutic implications for the framework's Phase I preventive window. The three-phase framework designates the Phase I window as preventive on the grounds that it opens decades before clinical symptoms and that the appropriate therapeutic class — PARP inhibitors such as veliparib, NAD-sparing strategies including nicotinamide riboside and nicotinamide mononucleotide supplementation, sirtuin activators, and selective antioxidant strategies targeted to the catecholamine-metabolism substrate — operates on the bioenergetic substrate of LC vulnerability. The transition model articulated in this paper sharpens the therapeutic logic by specifying what the Phase I intervention is in fact protecting against.

A Phase I intervention that preserves LC neurons does three things simultaneously by the transition logic developed above. First, it preserves the source of the noradrenergic brake on microglial activation in the forebrain, so the β2-AR-mediated suppression of microglial inflammatory output continues to operate, and the homeostatic signature in the hippocampal and cortical microglia is maintained against ambient pressures that would otherwise destabilize it. Second, it preserves the LC as a source of tau seeds, in the sense that LC neurons that do not develop pretangle tau pathology do not become sources of templated propagation along their efferents, and the hippocampus consequently does not receive the trans-synaptic seed delivery that would otherwise initiate Phase II tau accumulation. Third, if the third arm of oligodendrocyte pre-sensitization is operative, the Phase I intervention reduces the trans-axonal oxidative load delivered to hippocampal oligodendrocytes and slows the timeline of their ferroptotic vulnerability.

The therapeutic consequence is that the Phase I intervention is not merely neuroprotective for the LC itself but is disease-arresting for the entire downstream cascade. A PARP inhibitor or NAD-sparing intervention applied to a 35-year-old at-risk individual is, on this account, doing something qualitatively different from a Phase II ferroptosis-inhibitor intervention applied to a 60-year-old early-MCI individual or a Phase III MMP-9-inhibitor intervention applied to a 75-year-old demented individual. The Phase I intervention prevents the Phase II ignition from occurring; the Phase II intervention slows the progression of Phase II once it has begun but cannot undo the LC-derived seed deposition that initiated it; and the Phase III intervention preserves residual circuit function but cannot reverse the microglial collapse or the seed accumulation. The three windows are not different points on the same intervention curve; they are interventions on different substrates with different time horizons and different theoretical maxima of efficacy.

This logic has been implicit in the three-phase framework but has not been articulated as a consequence of a specific transition mechanism. The articulation matters because it converts the framework's window-classification from a descriptive feature of the staging into a mechanistic claim

about why each window has the character it does, and it provides the basis for the design of intervention trials whose endpoints are matched to the phase being targeted rather than to the symptomatic endpoint conventional for late-stage disease. A Phase I trial should not be expected to produce cognitive benefit on a short timescale; it should be evaluated on the prevention of LC neuron loss, on the preservation of noradrenergic tone in the forebrain, and on the absence of pretangle tau development in the LC over the trial period. These are biomarker-driven endpoints whose validation against eventual clinical outcomes requires a generational rather than a five-year follow-up, and the regulatory and trial-design implications of that requirement are substantial.

8. What This Resolves, What This Does Not

The transition model developed in this paper resolves the Phase I Phase II boundary problem in the three-phase framework by specifying a dual mechanism that operates on a single anatomical substrate, and it does so in a way that integrates the existing Bioenergetic Collapse and Homeostatic Microglial Collapse theses without modifying the architecture of either. It identifies the locus coeruleus's projection arbor as the disease's anatomy in the Phase I Phase II window, and it explains the hippocampal localization of the Phase II bridgehead as a geometric consequence of LC projection patterns combined with the receptor density of hippocampal neurons for templated tau uptake. The therapeutic implications for the Phase I window follow directly from the transition mechanism rather than being added separately to the framework.

Several questions remain unresolved and are flagged here as candidates for further work. The first is the empirical status of the third arm — oligodendrocyte pre-sensitization through trans-axonal oxidative load delivery — which is mechanistically plausible but presently under-evidenced, and whose establishment would close the loop on the framework's account of the oligodendrocyte ferroptotic component of Phase II. The second is the relationship of the dorsal raphe nucleus, which is identified alongside the LC in the Phase I locus, to the transition mechanism; the serotonergic projection from the dorsal raphe to the forebrain has its own anatomy, its own tonic-suppression effects on microglia through 5-HT receptors, and its own susceptibility to early pretangle pathology, and a parallel transition mechanism through the raphe-to-forebrain projection may operate alongside the LC mechanism with distinct downstream consequences for limbic versus neocortical targets. The third is the role of the APOE-isoform and lipid-availability variables identified in the HMSP integration as upstream gates on receptor function: the LRP1-mediated tau seed uptake at the hippocampal target is sensitive to APOE genotype and to lipid-availability variables, and the integration of the APOE/lipid gate with the transition model articulated here is a natural next step that the current paper does not undertake.

These open questions notwithstanding, the central claim is straightforward and, we believe, mechanistically defensible: the transition from Phase I to Phase II is the coupled withdrawal of noradrenergic suppression and arrival of templated tau, both delivered along the ascending efferents of the locus coeruleus, with the hippocampus as the receiving territory by virtue of its dense LC innervation and its high LRP1 and HSPG expression. The LC is, in functional terms, the brain's noradrenergic tonic regulator and, in pathological terms, its tau seed distribution system, and its progressive failure in Phase I executes both roles along the same anatomical substrate. The three-phase framework's transition problem is, on this account, not a separate mechanistic puzzle but the expected consequence of the projection geometry of the nucleus the framework has already identified as the Phase I locus.