The Energy-Gated Tauopathy

Günter Höglinger's Complex-I → Tau Program Re-Evaluated

Annonacin, Mitochondrial Inhibition, and the Mechanistic Bridge from Bioenergetic Failure to Tau Hyperphosphorylation — A Companion Re-Evaluation under the ONS Methodology

ONS Methodology — Companion Re-Evaluation

AdultCognitiveDisease.com

May 2026

Re-evaluation of Oskar Fischer Prize entrant #140 (Günter Höglinger) in dialogue with Bioenergetic Collapse and Convergent Synaptic Collapse.

Dr. James Truchard & Benjamin Aaron Gustafsson

Prepared under the ONS Methodology *AdultCognitiveDisease.com* 22 May 2026

This paper is a companion to Bioenergetic Collapse *and* Convergent Synaptic Collapse. *It evaluates the research program of Oskar Fischer Prize entrant #140, Günter Höglinger, through the integrated Collapse framework, with particular attention to mitochondrial Complex I inhibition as the proximate energetic cause of the tau-redistribution event that produces tauopathy.*

Abstract

The Bioenergetic Collapse thesis treats mitochondrial dysfunction as one of the convergent upstream substrates of AD but does not yet specify the molecular mechanism by which a bioenergetic deficit is converted into a tau-specific pathology. Günter Höglinger's research program supplies the missing conversion step. His work on the atypical parkinsonian syndrome of Guadeloupe — caused by chronic dietary exposure to annonacin from *Annona* fruits — provided the first dose-controlled, single-toxin demonstration that Complex I inhibition is *sufficient* to cause a four-repeat tauopathy clinically and pathologically indistinguishable from progressive supranuclear palsy. His subsequent rodent and cell-culture work established that the mechanism is ATP depletion □ loss of axonal transport □ tau redistribution from the axon to the somatodendritic compartment □ tau hyperphosphorylation □ neuronal death, and that the dose–response is monotonic across multiple natural and synthetic Complex I inhibitors (annonacin, rotenone, MPP□).

The submission's framing as an *environmental-toxin etiology* hypothesis emphasized the Guadeloupe epidemiology and the toxicological angle. This framing produced the modest CSC score (Relevancy 61.2, TKQ 50.0) because the narrative read as a niche-etiology argument rather than as the substrate-level mechanism it actually is. Re-evaluated against the Bioenergetic Collapse framework, Höglinger's program is one of the strongest pieces of mechanistic evidence in the corpus for the claim that energetic failure is upstream of tauopathy — not merely correlated with it. Re-scored against the trilogy mechanism registry, the program scores 9/10 on

Bioenergetic Collapse tier-1 mechanisms (Complex I, ATP depletion, OXPHOS dysfunction, mitochondrial quality control) and supplies the explicit energetic-gate variable the thesis section on tau pathology had invoked but not specified.

1. The Strategic Submission vs. the Mechanistic Program

Höglinger's Fischer Prize submission frames AD as an outcome of chronic Complex I inhibition by environmental toxins, with annonacin and rotenone as the prototype agents and Guadeloupe parkinsonism as the natural experiment. The submission emphasizes the toxicological detective work — dietary exposure ☐ tauopathy — and proposes that AD shares an etiological mechanism with this rare parkinsonian syndrome.

The framing was epidemiologically rigorous but strategically narrow. The substantive claim of the submission is not that annonacin causes AD (it almost certainly does not, at any dose Western populations encounter), but that *any* sufficient Complex I inhibition is capable of producing a tauopathy. This is the generalizable substrate claim. The submission's emphasis on the toxicological angle obscured the much more consequential mechanistic claim: that mitochondrial Complex I activity is the energetic gate whose closure converts cellular stress into tau redistribution, and that this gate is closed by *any* sufficiently severe Complex I dysfunction — whether from environmental toxin, normal aging, oxidative damage, or genetically determined Complex-I-assembly deficits.

The scoring penalty was therefore not a penalty against the mechanism but a penalty against the narrative frame. The mechanism — Complex I inhibition ☐ ATP depletion ☐ axonal-transport failure ☐ tau redistribution — is one of the few in the AD literature that is dose-controlled, reversible at sub-lethal doses, and reproducible across multiple molecularly unrelated Complex I inhibitors. It is exactly the kind of substrate-level mechanism the Bioenergetic Collapse thesis is built to score highly, and the scoring system failed to capture it because no bioenergetic node existed.

2. The Energetic Gate Between Substrate Failure and Tauopathy

The Convergent Synaptic Collapse and Bioenergetic Collapse theses both invoke "tau redistribution" or "tau hyperphosphorylation" as load-bearing variables. Neither thesis has, until now, identified the proximate energetic trigger that converts a bioenergetic deficit into the tau-specific phenotype. Höglinger's program supplies this trigger.

The mechanism is the following sequence:

- **Complex I inhibition** lowers cellular ATP below the threshold required for sustained axonal transport.
- **Axonal transport failure** disrupts the kinesin-mediated trafficking of tau from cell body to axon.
- **Tau redistribution** occurs from the axon into the somatodendritic compartment.
- **Tau hyperphosphorylation** follows, both because somatodendritic kinases (GSK-3β, CDK5) have access to tau they would not normally encounter and because phosphatases (PP2A) are inhibited under conditions of low ATP and high oxidative stress.
- **Tau aggregation** and **neuronal death** complete the cycle.

This sequence has three properties that make it consequential for the trilogy:

- **It is energy-gated, not toxin-gated.** Höglinger's lab has shown the same sequence occurs under MPP□, rotenone, and annonacin exposure, but also under genetic Complex I deficiency and under ageing-related Complex I loss. The toxin is interchangeable; the gate is the energetic threshold.
- **It is dose-monotonic.** Sub-lethal Complex I inhibition produces tau redistribution; lethal Complex I inhibition produces neuronal death without redistribution time-course. This dose–response confirms that the redistribution event is the proximate consequence of the energetic deficit, not an artifact of cell death.
- **It is partly reversible.** Restoration of Complex I activity (or supplementation with metabolic substrates that bypass Complex I — e.g., methylene blue, NADH precursors) reverses tau redistribution at sub-lethal doses. This identifies the gate as a candidate therapeutic target.

The mechanism also resolves an old puzzle in the AD literature: the *spatial* discordance between sites of high amyloid burden (cortical) and sites of earliest tau pathology (locus coeruleus ☐ entorhinal ☐ hippocampal). The energy-gated tauopathy mechanism predicts tau pathology should appear first in cells with the highest baseline ATP demand and lowest Complex I reserve — which is exactly the LC noradrenergic neurons (Phase I of the Bioenergetic Collapse Model) and the entorhinal cortex layer II neurons whose axonal projection lengths are among the largest in the brain.

---

3. The Höglinger–Swerdlow Convergence

The Bioenergetic Collapse thesis Section 3 ("The Mitochondrial Cascade: Swerdlow's Upstream Claim") describes Swerdlow's argument that mitochondrial dysfunction is upstream of amyloid in AD. Swerdlow's evidence is principally biochemical and epidemiological: maternal-inheritance patterns, mtDNA heteroplasmy correlations, and cybrid-cell experiments. Höglinger's evidence is principally pharmacological and pathological: dose-controlled Complex I inhibition produces tauopathy with known kinetics.

The two programs are complementary and together close a load-bearing gap. Swerdlow's program establishes that mitochondrial dysfunction is upstream in time and inheritance. Höglinger's program establishes that mitochondrial dysfunction (specifically Complex I inhibition) is upstream in mechanism — i.e., that the specific energetic deficit causally produces a specific protein pathology. The combined claim is stronger than either program alone: AD-relevant mitochondrial dysfunction is upstream of tau pathology because Complex I inhibition is sufficient to produce tau redistribution at sub-lethal doses, and this sufficiency is observed across multiple chemically unrelated inhibitors.

This convergence should be made explicit in the thesis text. The current §3 references Swerdlow alone; a new §3a or §3.5 should bring in Höglinger's mechanism as the proximate energetic gate that converts Swerdlow's upstream mitochondrial deficit into tauopathy.

---

4. Implications for the Spectrum of Tauopathies

Höglinger's lab has extended the energy-gated mechanism beyond AD to PSP and corticobasal degeneration, both four-repeat tauopathies. Annonacin exposure produces a tauopathy clinically indistinguishable from PSP. This is not a peripheral observation — it is a constraint on what the Bioenergetic Collapse thesis can claim about AD specificity.

If Complex I inhibition is sufficient to produce a tauopathy, then the question "why AD and not PSP?" becomes a question about which cells are first to cross the energetic threshold. The answer depends on the cell-type-specific Complex I reserve, baseline ATP demand, and axonal-projection length distribution. AD's preferential involvement of LC ☐ entorhinal ☐ hippocampal ☐ cortical regions reflects the early energetic vulnerability of these cells; PSP's preferential involvement of brainstem nuclei (substantia nigra, subthalamic nucleus) reflects the early energetic vulnerability of those cells. The disease *taxonomy* is downstream of the cell-type-specific energetic reserve, not upstream.

This is a non-trivial implication. It means the Bioenergetic Collapse framework, properly extended, is not merely an AD model — it is a generic substrate model whose disease-specific phenotype depends on which cell types fail first under bioenergetic stress. The Höglinger program is the strongest empirical support for this generalization.

---

5. Ten Key Questions Re-Evaluation

---

6. CSC Re-Evaluation with Trilogy-Relevance Overlay

Revised relevancy score: 73.5/100 (vs original 61.2).

The score gap of +12.3 confirms the audit's classification of Höglinger as a **framing-penalty** blindspot. The submission's environmental-toxin framing produced a specificity that masked the generalizability of the mechanism.

---

7. Integration Recommendations for the Bioenergetic Collapse Thesis

Recommendation 1 — Add §3.5 "The Energetic Gate: Complex I Inhibition and Tau Redistribution"

The current §3 (Mitochondrial Cascade: Swerdlow) and §4 (Quality Control Machinery: Youle) treat mitochondrial dysfunction as upstream of disease but do not specify the mechanism by which an energetic deficit becomes a tau-specific pathology. A new subsection §3.5 should treat the Höglinger energy-gated tauopathy mechanism as the proximate conversion step. Suggested text length: ~600 words. Position: between §3 and §4.

Recommendation 2 — Revise §11 "The Bioenergetic Collapse Model"

The current Phase I (LC PARP-NAD□) □ Phase II (microglial bioenergetic failure) □ Phase III (synaptic disintegration) structure should be revised to explicitly identify the **energetic gate** between Phase I and the first appearance of tau pathology. The current model invokes "tau redistribution" without specifying its energetic trigger; the Höglinger mechanism supplies the trigger.

Recommendation 3 — Extend §13 "Therapeutic Implications"

Add a subsection on Complex-I-bypass strategies: methylene blue (electron carrier bypassing Complex I deficit), NAD□ precursors (NR/NMN — providing substrate for Complex I-independent ATP generation via glycolysis and Complex II/III), and rationally designed Complex I stabilizers. Note that the Höglinger mechanism predicts these strategies should reduce tau pathology specifically, which is the testable cross-substrate prediction.

Recommendation 4 — Cross-link to the Synaptic Collapse thesis

The CSC thesis §11 (Cytoskeletal Collapse Node) currently treats tau redistribution as a downstream consequence of multiple upstream causes. It should be revised to identify Complex I inhibition / ATP depletion as the *proximate* trigger of redistribution, with other upstream causes (oxidative stress, calcium dyshomeostasis) modeled as ways of arriving at the same energetic deficit. The Höglinger mechanism is the conversion step the CSC thesis was implicitly invoking.

Recommendation 5 — ADC website integration

The Bioenergetic Collapse monograph on the ADC site currently anchors on PARP-1 and LC vulnerability. The energy-gated tauopathy mechanism is the natural transition piece between the Bioenergetic monograph and the Synaptic monograph — it explains how a bioenergetic deficit *becomes* the tau pathology that the Synaptic monograph then traces through the Braak staging hierarchy. A new "transition page" between the two monographs, anchored on the Höglinger mechanism, would close the cross-monograph mechanistic gap that currently exists.

---

8. Conclusion

Günter Höglinger's research program supplies the energetic-gate mechanism the Bioenergetic Collapse thesis had implicitly invoked but never specified. Complex I inhibition is sufficient to produce a four-repeat tauopathy at sub-lethal doses; the mechanism is dose-monotonic, reversible at sub-lethal doses, and replicable across multiple chemically unrelated inhibitors. This makes the Höglinger program one of the strongest pieces of mechanistic evidence in the corpus for the claim that bioenergetic failure is upstream of tauopathy *in mechanism*, not merely in correlation.

The submission's environmental-toxin framing masked the generalizability of the mechanism and produced the modest original score. Re-evaluated against the Collapse Trilogy mechanism registry, the program scores 9/10 on Bioenergetic Collapse tier-1 mechanisms and supplies the proximate energetic trigger for tau redistribution that connects the Bioenergetic and Synaptic substrates. Revised composite: TKQ 70, CSC relevancy 73.5 — placing Höglinger in the top quartile of the

corpus and warranting both a focused thesis integration (Bioenergetic §3.5) and a dedicated cross-monograph transition slot in the ADC website.

References

• Höglinger GU, Carrard G, Michel PP, et al. Dysfunction of mitochondrial complex I and the proteasome: interactions between two biochemical deficits in a cellular model of Parkinson's disease. *J Neurochem* 2003;86(5):1297–1307.

• Champy P, Höglinger GU, Féger J, et al. Annonacin, a lipophilic inhibitor of mitochondrial complex I, induces nigral and striatal neurodegeneration in rats. *J Neurochem* 2004;88(1):63–69.

• Höglinger GU, Lannuzel A, Khondiker ME, et al. The mitochondrial complex I inhibitor rotenone triggers a cerebral tauopathy. *J Neurochem* 2005;95(4):930–939.

• Caparros-Lefebvre D, Steele J, Kotake Y, Ohta S. Geographic isolates of atypical parkinsonism and tauopathy in the tropics: possible synergy of neurotoxins. *Mov Disord* 2006;21(10):1769–1771.

• Höglinger GU, Respondek G, Stamelou M, et al. Clinical diagnosis of progressive supranuclear palsy: the Movement Disorder Society criteria. *Mov Disord* 2017;32(6):853–864.

• Audit: Submission-Program Divergence Blindspots, kb/wiki/meta/audit*submission*program_blindspots.md (2026-04-17).

• Companion thesis: ONS*BioenergeticCollapse*Thesis.md.

• Companion thesis: ONS*SynapticCollapse*Thesis.md.