

Could Bile-Acid Profiles Identify Psychiatric Subtypes?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 02 · Metabolic neuropsychiatry and neurological clearance · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Bile-acid signatures differ across liver disease, medication use, microbiome composition and metabolic states. Experimental evidence links bile-acid receptors to neural and inflammatory signaling, creating a plausible question: might carefully measured bile-acid profiles help identify biologically distinct subgroups among patients carrying the same psychiatric diagnosis? A biomarker that distinguishes subgroups is not necessarily a biomarker that causes their symptoms.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

The enterohepatic pool contains primary and secondary bile acids with different conjugation states and receptor affinities. FXR/FGF19 feedback, microbial deconjugation, intestinal transit, gallbladder dynamics and renal function can all influence circulating levels. Psychiatric symptoms are also shaped by sleep, medication, endocrine abnormalities and physical illness. A valid model therefore requires sampling time, fasting state and confounder documentation before any association can be interpreted.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Rather than seeking a universal “depression bile level,” the proposal is phenotype-specific: some patients might have coexisting cholestatic symptoms, inflammatory disorders, altered bowel transit or metabolic disease. Multivariate bile-acid measurement could be compared with controls and adjacent diagnoses, ideally including repeated within-person samples. A meaningful biomarker would need reproducibility and incremental predictive value beyond simple liver tests and clinical history.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

The word “subtype” should imply more than statistically distinct clusters. A useful subtype predicts a clinically relevant outcome, treatment response or disease trajectory with acceptable reproducibility. Samples must be collected under comparable dietary and circadian conditions because bile acids change markedly after meals and vary with bowel transit. Medications used in psychiatry can affect weight, glucose metabolism and gastrointestinal function, all of which may shift bile-acid profiles. Any case-control difference must survive these confounders before being interpreted as neurobiological evidence.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Reverse causation is a powerful alternative: reduced food intake, medication exposure and physical inactivity associated with psychiatric symptoms may change bile-acid profiles. Numerous small biomarker studies are vulnerable to multiple testing and selective reporting. Even a reliable classifier could be biologically incidental, and prescribing bile-acid drugs for depression is not supported by the framework.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A biomarker discovery analysis should include independent replication, correction for multiple testing and clinically meaningful incremental prediction. It should also determine whether a simpler measurement—hepatic enzyme pattern, metabolic syndrome or medication exposure—explains the signature. If a sophisticated bile-acid panel adds no value beyond these factors, the proposed psychiatric subtype would not justify clinical use.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper should invite better characterization rather than biomarker commercialization. The highest-value claim is that mechanistically informed metabolic subtyping is worth evaluating alongside established psychiatric assessment. It is neither proof of a bile-generated psychiatric illness nor evidence that bile “cleansing” treats psychosis.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Recent Advances in the Digestive, Metabolic and Therapeutic Effects of FXR and FGF19](#)
2. [Psychiatric signs and symptoms in treatable inborn errors of metabolism](#)

Source lineage: Covenant Psychiatry; Bile-acid affective symptoms paper

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.