The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) Framework: A Universal Architecture for Biological Coherence

Version: 8.31 (Theoretical Framework Preprint)

Author: Cyrus Blacksmith

Affiliation: Independent Researcher, Kalamazoo, MI, USA

Correspondence: cyrus.blacksmith@proton.me

Keywords: multi-modal integration, biological rhythms, bioacoustics, bioelectricity, biophotonics, phonons, emergent phenomena, reductionism, holistic biology, quantum biology, ultraweak photon emissions, photoencephalography, mitochondria, coupled oscillators, synchronization, resonance, quantitative biology, biological physics, Kuramoto model, biological coherence

Authors Note

This manuscript presents a theoretical synthesis and formal framework for biological coherence. As such, it follows a structure standard in theoretical biology and physics rather than the IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) format typical of empirical research articles. The paper's structure is designed to first define the framework's components, then formalize it mathematically, and finally derive its testable consequences.

Key sections serve the following functions:

- Section 4: Formal Methods and Theoretical Modeling serves as the Methods section, providing the quantitative foundation of the theory.

- Section 6: Theoretical Results and Experimental Predictions serves as the Results section, presenting the falsifiable experimental outcomes derived from the theory.

- Case Studies (Section 5) and Implications (Section 7) demonstrate the framework's explanatory power and scope.

This work integrates evidence from numerous empirical studies to build a testable, quantitative model. All equations and parameters central to the theory are contained within the main text and supplementary materials.

Abstract

The reductionist view of cells as molecular machines has advanced genetics and biochemistry but fails to explain coherence across scales. Biological systems exhibit rhythmic synchrony: neural oscillations align to speech, gut slow waves entrain brain states, and mitochondrial “flashes” coordinate metabolism, suggesting that life is governed not by isolated reactions but by coupled rhythms.

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework posits that this coherence arises from four modalities—bioacoustic, bioelectric, biophotonic, and biochemical—organized through five hubs: DNA, cytoskeleton, mitochondria, membranes, and vesicles. This architecture is universal across life, from animals to plants, fungi, and microbes, and we formalize it with coupled oscillator mathematics, extending Kuramoto-type models to multi-modal coupling with stochastic resonance.

The model yields falsifiable predictions—for example, that targeted disruption of ultraweak photon propagation along microtubules or of bioelectric patterning in immune cells measurably alters system-level coherence—demonstrating the framework’s empirical testability.

MMRR reframes biology’s guiding question from “Which molecule does X?” to “What rhythm defines X?”, offering a foundation for integrative biology with implications for neuroscience, regenerative medicine, and origins-of-life research.

1. Introduction

For much of the last century, biology has often viewed cells as machines—genes as codes, proteins as parts, pathways as circuits. This reductionist lens drove breakthroughs: DNA's structure, the genetic code, molecular biology, and proteomics. Yet it overlooks how living systems achieve dynamic coordination across scales, from molecules to behaviors.

Molecules may be the notes, but rhythms compose the score. Reframing biology in this way emphasizes resonance and synchrony as first principles rather than emergent consequences.

Coordination is pervasive in biology. Neural oscillations synchronize with speech rhythms, enabling syllable anticipation and meaning extraction (Doelling & Poeppel, 2024). Gastrointestinal slow waves align with vagal pathways, linking digestion to cognition. Mitochondria emit periodic ultraweak photon emissions—faint light signals from cellular processes—reflecting metabolic cycles (Casey et al., 2025). Bioelectric gradients guide tissue regeneration in amphibians and planarians (Levin, 2022). These oscillatory dynamics are not noise but central to life's organization.

Traditional approaches, however, obscure this. Transcriptomics averages cell populations, masking temporal patterns. Computational metaphors cast cells as code processors, neglecting resonance and feedback. Reductionism thus fails to explain emergent phenomena like cognition, plasticity, and resilience.

Biophysics reveals dynamics' centrality. Phonons—quantized vibrational waves—enable ultrafast energy transfer in water (Živković et al., 2025). Microtubules resonate at gigahertz frequencies, acting as piezoelectric transducers (Sahu et al., 2013). Ion channels produce oscillatory potentials, coupling via gap junctions for tissue-level coordination. Mitochondrial photon emissions correlate with neural activity (Casey et al., 2025). These suggest biological order stems from multi-modal resonance.

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework reconceptualizes biology as networks of coupled oscillators. Four modalities—bioacoustic, bioelectric, biophotonic, biochemical—interact through five hubs: DNA, cytoskeleton, mitochondria, membranes, vesicles. These nodes exchange information in aqueous substrates via proton conduction and phonon-mediated energy transfer.

As an independent researcher, I invite collaboration in biophysics, neuroscience, and regenerative medicine to test MMRR's predictions, advancing diagnostics and therapies.

MMRR integrates neuroscience, cell biology, and biophysics, framing biology as oscillatory. It predicts, for example, synchronized bioelectric and biophotonic signals in neural plasticity, testable via optogenetic protocols. Case studies—speech entrainment, gut–brain coordination, regeneration—demonstrate its explanatory power.

This paper unfolds in seven steps. Section 2 details modalities and hubs. Section 3 formalizes MMRR as coupled oscillators. Section 4 applies it to case studies. Section 5 outlines experimental predictions and protocols. Section 6 explores implications for neuroscience, regenerative medicine, and systems biology. Section 7 concludes by situating MMRR within integrative biology.

Biology's challenge is not cataloging parts but explaining their dynamic interplay. MMRR offers a rigorous, testable framework, transforming coordination into mechanism.

The framework is modular and extensible: while four modalities and five hubs form the current core, new hubs, substrates, or auxiliary modalities can be incorporated as evidence grows (see Discussion and Supplementary Notes).

2. The MMRR Framework

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework synthesizes evidence that biological systems achieve coherence not through linear codes, but through the integration of rhythms across multiple physical modalities. It proposes that four core modalities (bioacoustic, bioelectric, biophotonic, and biochemical) intersect at five fundamental cellular hubs: DNA, cytoskeleton, mitochondria, membranes, and vesicles. Together, they constitute a dynamic network of coupled oscillators, embedded in aqueous environments where proton conduction and phonon dynamics enable efficient cross-modal coupling and energy transfer.

2.1 The Modalities

The MMRR framework identifies four core modalities: bioacoustic, bioelectric, biophotonic, and biochemical. Each provides a distinct channel for information transfer in living systems, defined by rhythmic patterns and resonant properties rather than isolated reactions.

Bioacoustic. This modality encompasses mechanical vibrations across scales, ranging from megahertz (MHz) to gigahertz (GHz) resonances of microtubules and actin filaments to pressure waves in membranes and organelles. Experimental studies suggest these structures exhibit piezoelectric properties, transducing mechanical energy into electrical signals and vice versa (Sahu et al., 2013). Phonon-mediated coupling—quantized vibrational waves in condensed matter—enables rapid, efficient energy transfer across the cell. These oscillations influence processes from vesicle release to ion channel gating, linking mechanical and biochemical domains. Because acoustic signals can be externally applied, this modality is a prime target for experimental entrainment studies and therapeutic interventions.

Bioelectric. Bioelectricity extends beyond action potentials. Spatial gradients of membrane potential establish long-range patterning information, governed by ion channel activity and propagated through gap junction networks. These fields guide morphogenesis (Levin, 2022), entrain neural populations during cognition (Doelling & Poeppel, 2024), and synchronize excitable tissues. Bioelectric dynamics are rapid, reconfigurable, and experimentally manipulable, making them central to tissue-level coordination and therapeutic modulation.

Biophotonic. Ultraweak photon emissions (UPEs)—faint, measurable light signals—are a consistent feature of living tissues, often originating in mitochondria during metabolic “flashes” (Casey et al., 2025). These signals, though weak, provide a real-time readout of cellular state. Evidence suggests UPEs can synchronize with bioelectric oscillations, providing an optical channel for biological communication. The emerging field of photoencephalography (PE) seeks to exploit this phenomenon by measuring UPEs as a non-invasive window into brain dynamics. This modality offers both a diagnostic tool and a falsifiable prediction space for MMRR.

Biochemical. The foundational rhythms of life are metabolic: oscillatory cycles of glycolysis, ATP/ADP flux, and redox balance. These biochemical processes provide temporal scaffolding that interfaces with and modulates the other modalities. Metabolism influences mitochondrial photon emission, redox state modulates ion channel conductance, and ATP rhythms synchronize vesicle release. Biochemical oscillations thus integrate chemistry and information, creating tight feedback loops across modalities.

Together, these modalities form a complete set: chemical gradients and reactions, electrical potentials and currents, photonic emissions and absorption, and acoustic-mechanical vibrations. Their rhythmic interplay enables coherence across scales.

2.2 The Hubs

DNA (Conductor)

DNA encodes genetic information, but it also acts as a physical oscillator. Its double helix structure supports vibrational modes and supercoiling dynamics that couple with ionic and epigenetic regulation. DNA is sensitive to ion fluxes and nuclear architecture, embedding it within both bioelectric and biochemical modalities.

Resonance within DNA influences accessibility: vibrations and charge distributions modulate chromatin compaction, transcriptional initiation, and repair. These rhythmic states suggest DNA functions as a dynamic conductor rather than a static tape.

Cross-modal coupling is evident where bioelectric and biochemical signals converge on chromatin remodeling. DNA thus exemplifies how a hub integrates multiple modalities into coherent rhythmic states.

Cytoskeleton (Scaffold)

The cytoskeleton provides structural integrity but also serves as the core biomechanical hub. Actin filaments and microtubules exhibit vibrational and piezoelectric properties, transmitting mechanical forces as oscillatory signals (Heck et al., 2013; Lim, 2017).

These vibrations are not isolated: they couple to bioacoustic oscillations, bioelectric charge distributions, and biochemical regulators such as MAPK and YAP/TAZ. The cytoskeleton is thus both scaffold and computational core, integrating modalities through force transmission and resonance.

As the primary channel for mechanotransduction, the cytoskeleton links acoustic, electric, and chemical information into coherent intracellular patterns, making it central to MMRR’s multi-modal integration.

Mitochondria (Oscillators & Routers)

Mitochondria are metabolic power plants, but also resonant oscillators. They display rhythmic “flashes” of membrane potential and reactive oxygen species, coupled with calcium fluxes.

These oscillations extend into photonic domains: ultraweak photon emissions correlate with mitochondrial activity, linking metabolism to biophotonics. Mitochondria thus route energy and information across modalities, not only producing ATP but synchronizing bioelectric, biochemical, and photonic rhythms.

By coordinating redox state with oscillatory emissions, mitochondria serve as routers of coherence, shaping cellular timing and coupling hubs into larger resonant networks.

Membranes (Interfaces)

The plasma membrane defines the cell boundary, but also acts as a resonant interface. Voltage gradients, ion channel activity, and soliton-like surface waves propagate signals across the lipid bilayer.

Specialized structures enhance these properties. Primary cilia act as biomechanical and electrical antennas (Satir & Christensen, 2007), while myelin sheaths create photonic cavities that tune neural conduction (Kumar et al., 2016). These illustrate how membrane architecture amplifies resonance.

The membrane is both a bioelectric and biomechanical interface: tension and pressure modulate ion channels, while electromagnetic fields propagate across its surface. This positions the membrane as the gatekeeper of cross-modal coherence.

Vesicles (Messengers)

Vesicles package cargo, but they also oscillate in their release dynamics. Their cargo composition reflects cellular rhythms, and their secretion is often pulsatile.

Recent work shows vesicle release is modulated by electric fields, creating a feedback loop between bioelectric activity and biochemical signaling (Yu et al., 2015). This elevates vesicles from passive transporters to dynamic resonators.

As synchronized messengers, vesicles transmit multi-modal information — biochemical, electrical, acoustic — across cells and tissues, enabling systemic coherence.

2.3 Substrate

All hubs operate within substrates that transmit resonance. Substrates mediate coupling across scales, from molecular to systemic.

Water

Water supports phonon-mediated vibrational coherence, acting as a universal medium for resonance. Its proton conduction and hydrogen-bond dynamics provide the physical basis for multi-modal coupling.

Intracellular Substrates

The crowded cytoplasmic environment provides a structured medium where vesicle dynamics, cytoskeletal vibrations, and metabolic oscillations are coupled. Diffusion, confinement, and crowding generate resonant conditions that enhance coherence within the cell.

Extracellular Matrix

Collagen and ECM form a piezoelectric lattice, transducing mechanical stress into bioelectric fields and providing a tissue-scale scaffold for resonance (Fukada & Yasuda, 1957; Minary-Jolandan & Yu, 2009). The ECM integrates cellular hubs into larger networks by translating biomechanical forces into bioelectric patterns.

Macro-Substrates

Cerebrospinal fluid and vascular flows generate infra-slow oscillations that entrain neural, vascular, and metabolic rhythms, extending resonance to the organ level. These flows exemplify how resonance substrates operate not only within cells but across entire systems (Iliff et al., 2012; Xie et al., 2013; Fultz et al., 2019).

2.4 Framework Synthesis and Testability

The modalities, hubs, and substrates together define a resonant network. Each hub couples multiple modalities, and substrates provide coherence across scales.

The framework is testable: it yields predictions about measurable oscillations, cross-modal signatures, and coherence patterns. Experiments targeting photon emissions, vesicle release, ion flows, and acoustic vibrations can falsify or confirm its claims.

This synthesis illustrates MMRR's dual strength: it integrates existing evidence into a coherent model while remaining open to direct experimental validation.

2.5 Closing

The framework is therefore both defined and adaptable. Its elegance lies in the 4+5 core, while its extensibility ensures resilience. This balance enables MMRR to serve as a foundation for the mathematical formalism developed in Section 3.

Section 3 – Universality and Extensibility of the Framework

Universality Across Kingdoms

The framework described here is not confined to animal physiology. Each modality and hub has analogues across life. Bioelectric gradients organize plant roots, fungal hyphae, and archaeal membranes. Ultra-weak photon emission is reported in plants, fungi, and microbes, complementing animal biophotonics. Bioacoustic vibrations occur in plant tissues under stress, in fungal networks, and in microbial colonies. Biochemical flows—metabolites, signaling molecules, quorum-sensing compounds—are universal. Biomechanical pulsations shape plant growth, fungal tip extension, and microbial oscillations.

Similarly, the hubs are conserved. DNA is universal. Energy organelles include mitochondria in animals and fungi, chloroplasts in plants, and ATP-generating systems in archaea. Cytoskeletal scaffolds span eukaryotes, with archaeal analogues. Membranes and vesicles are ubiquitous across kingdoms. The aqueous and matrix substrate is likewise universal: water and structured extracellular networks in animals, cell walls and biofilms in plants, fungi, and microbes. Together, these examples show that rhythmic, resonant flows form a general organizational principle of life across all kingdoms.

Kingdom	Bioelectric Example	Biophotonic Example	Biochemical Example	Hub Example
Animals	Neural action potentials	Mitochondrial UPEs	Circadian metabolic cycles	Microtubules
Plants	Root apex potentials	Stress-induced UPEs	Phloem flow rhythms	Actin networks
Fungi	Hyphal tip potentials	Mycelial UPEs	Pulsatile nutrient transport	Actin cables
Microbes	Membrane potentials	Metabolic UPEs	Quorum sensing waves	Bacterial actin homologs

Scope & Extensibility

Building on this universal foundation, the framework remains extensible, allowing new discoveries to be incorporated as evidence accumulates.

The framework is deliberately modular, designed to remain elastic as new evidence emerges. Specialized hubs such as primary cilia or myelin arise as extensions of the core. Macro-hubs such as the glymphatic system emerge from synchronized activity across tissues. Resonant substrates such as collagen's piezoelectric lattice facilitate multi-scale coupling. Auxiliary modalities such as spin interactions act as quantum-scale mechanisms of cross-modal resonance. This tiered structure allows new discoveries to be integrated without altering the simplicity of the core.

This expansiveness invites a valid concern: could any rhythmic phenomenon be incorporated, rendering the framework unfalsifiable? To prevent this, we propose strict promotion criteria (Supplementary Note 5), requiring demonstrable cross-modal transduction, broad relevance across systems, and a measurable rhythmic signature for any new candidate element.

4. Formal Methods and Theoretical Modeling

The MMRR framework requires a quantitative backbone to show that multi-modal resonance is not metaphorical but expressible as a system of coupled oscillators. To provide this foundation, we build on the Kuramoto framework of coupled oscillators (Winfree, 1980; Strogatz, 2000; Pikovsky et al., 2003), which describes how coherence emerges in systems of rhythmic elements. Extending this approach, we incorporate multi-modal coupling and stochastic resonance to formalize acoustic, biochemical, bioelectric, and photonic dynamics within a shared mathematical structure, allowing us to derive testable predictions about coherence across scales.

In practice, this formalism treats each modality as an oscillator population with its own natural frequency distribution. Coupling functions allow information to transfer between populations, such that bioelectric phase shifts can entrain biophotonic emission patterns, or biochemical rhythms can stabilize acoustic oscillations. The strength of coupling and the presence of stochastic resonance determine whether these populations synchronize or remain desynchronized. This provides a direct path from biological observations to quantitative equations.

4.1 Conceptual Basis

Oscillatory systems are pervasive in biology: circadian clocks, glycolytic cycles, neural rhythms. The novelty of MMRR lies in treating these not as isolated, modality-specific oscillations but as nodes in a multiplex network. Mathematically, each modality can be represented by a phase–amplitude oscillator whose dynamics depend on intrinsic frequency, self-coupling, and cross-modal interactions.

We begin with the generalized Kuramoto model as a foundation, which provides a formal expression of how phase-coupled oscillators synchronize (Winfree, 1980; Strogatz, 2000; Pikovsky et al., 2003). We then extend this model to include cross-modal coupling terms and noise-driven resonance. A general form of this relationship is given by the Kuramoto oscillator model:

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i)$$

Here, θ_i is the phase of oscillator i, ω_i its natural frequency, and K_i□ the coupling coefficient. Even with weak couplings, such networks exhibit phase transitions: once coupling surpasses a

threshold, large populations synchronize spontaneously. This simple principle explains how local interactions produce global order.

4.2 External Driving and Entrainment

Biological oscillators are not isolated. They entrain to external periodic inputs, such as acoustic rhythms or photic flicker. This effect can be modeled by extending the Kuramoto equation with a forcing term:

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij}\sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \beta A(t)$$

The additional term βA(t) represents an external periodic driver, such as an acoustic rhythm or photic flicker. β is the strength of coupling between the external input and the oscillator, and A(t) describes the time-varying amplitude of the external stimulus. This formulation captures entrainment of biological oscillators to environmental rhythms. This predicts that weak rhythmic stimuli can entrain biological oscillators if they are tuned to intrinsic modes—a principle underlying neural entrainment to speech rhythms or circadian alignment to the light–dark cycle.

4.3 Multi-Modal Coupling

In MMRR, each hub is not a single oscillator but a multi-modal oscillator. Mitochondria, for instance, couple metabolic, electrical, and photonic rhythms; cytoskeletal filaments couple mechanical and electrical domains. This can be expressed as:

$$\frac{d\theta_i^m}{dt} = \omega_i^m + \sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{n=1}^{M} K_{ij}^{(mn)}\sin(\theta_j^n - \theta_i^m)$$

Here, m and n index the different modalities: acoustic (A), biochemical (B), electric (E), and photonic (P). The cross-modal coupling terms K$_{i}$□^(mn) describe how oscillations in one modality can entrain or influence those in another, providing a mathematical basis for multi-modal resonance. For example, an acoustic vibration can drive an electrical oscillation through a cross-coupling coefficient, or a photonic flash can synchronize with biochemical redox

cycles. This captures the essence of MMRR: coherence arises not from any one channel, but from their coupling.

4.4 Noise and Stochastic Resonance

Biological environments are inherently noisy. Yet noise can enhance weak signals via stochastic resonance. This is modeled by adding a Gaussian noise term $\eta_i(t)$:

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij}\sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \beta A(t) + \eta_i(t)$$

Here, $\eta_i(t)$ represents stochastic noise, modeled as a random fluctuation around zero. This captures stochastic resonance, where weak inputs can be amplified by noise to promote synchrony.

This predicts that weak periodic inputs—such as low-intensity light or sound—can drive coherence if tuned to intrinsic frequencies, because noise amplifies sub-threshold signals. This counterintuitive mechanism explains why subtle environmental cues can entrain biological rhythms.

4.5 Central System of Equations

The four core oscillatory variables of MMRR are:

- A(t): bioacoustic activity (vibrational/phononic).
- B(t): biochemical activity (metabolic/redox).
- E(t): bioelectric activity (ion flows, potentials).
- P(t): biophotonic activity (ultraweak photon emissions).

Each evolves according to the coupled system:

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = \omega_A A + \alpha_{AA} A + \beta_{AB} B + \beta_{AE} E + \beta_{AP} P + \phi_A [H_2O_{\text{vib}}]$$

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = \omega_B B + \alpha_{BB} B + \gamma_{BA} A + \gamma_{BE} E + \gamma_{BP} P$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \omega_E E + \alpha_{EE} E + \delta_{EA} A + \delta_{EB} B + \delta_{EP} P$$

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = \omega_P P + \alpha_{PP} P + \mu_{PA} A + \mu_{PB} B + \mu_{PE} E$$

Here, A(t), B(t), E(t), and P(t) represent the bioacoustic, biochemical, bioelectric, and biophotonic activities, respectively. ω terms denote the intrinsic oscillation frequencies of each modality. Self-coupling coefficients determine whether an oscillator tends to amplify or dampen its own activity. Cross-modal coupling constants (β, γ, δ, μ) quantify the strength of influence between modalities; for example, βAB captures biochemical driving of acoustic oscillations. The forcing term $\varphi A[H_2O_{v^{Ib}}]$ represents vibrational input from the aqueous substrate, modeled as proton conduction and phonon-mediated energy transfer. Together, this system provides a generalized framework to model the dynamic state of a biological system and predict its response to perturbations, serving as the quantitative core of the MMRR theory.

This system generalizes the Kuramoto-type model into a biologically grounded, modality-explicit framework.

4.6 Predictive Value

From this formalism, specific, falsifiable predictions follow:

1. Photonic entrainment: Weak rhythmic light should entrain mitochondrial photon emissions, measurable via photon-counting detectors.

2. Acoustic pacing: Sound stimulation at matched frequencies should alter vesicle release synchrony and calcium wave propagation.

3. Electro-metabolic reciprocity: Modulating membrane potential should shift metabolic rhythms, with reciprocal feedback.

4. Cross-modal coupling: Neural plasticity should involve synchronized bioelectric and biophotonic signals, testable via optogenetics and photon emission monitoring.

5. Phase transitions: Populations of cells should exhibit abrupt transitions from incoherence to synchrony when coupling parameters exceed thresholds.

4.7 Limits and Role of Supplementary Information

This formalism is not intended as a molecular-level simulation. Parameter estimation remains approximate, and biological oscillators are heterogeneous. Instead, the equations serve as a conceptual scaffold—clarifying conditions under which resonance is expected, identifying measurable outputs, and guiding experiment design.

Full derivations, parameter tables, and simulations are provided in Supplementary Note 2. The main text emphasizes tractability: that coherence is not metaphorical, but mathematically describable and empirically testable.

Closing

By grounding MMRR in oscillator mathematics, we move from metaphor to mechanism. The formalism demonstrates that synchrony, resonance, and entrainment are not incidental but quantifiable, falsifiable dynamics. Anchored in established nonlinear dynamics, this framework produces equations that bridge biological observation with experimental validation. In doing so, it provides the theoretical backbone for the case studies (Section 5) and predictions (Section 6), positioning MMRR as a rigorous foundation for interdisciplinary collaboration.

5. Case Studies

To demonstrate the explanatory and predictive power of the Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework, we apply it to six diverse biological case studies. These examples span multiple scales and modalities: neural speech entrainment, gut–brain axis signaling, amphibian regeneration, cancer as incoherence, the glymphatic system, and unicellular coordination. Each illustrates how MMRR reframes existing data as evidence of coupled oscillators and generates falsifiable predictions.

5.1 Speech Entrainment

This case demonstrates bioacoustic–bioelectric synchronization via phase-locked coupling predicted by the oscillator model.

Problem. Human speech is temporally structured, and comprehension depends on the brain's ability to align with external rhythms. How cortical oscillations entrain to syllabic timing has remained incompletely explained.

Evidence. Magnetoencephalography (MEG) shows that theta rhythms (approximately 4–7 Hz) in auditory cortex entrain to speech envelopes, while gamma rhythms (approximately 30–80 Hz) modulate phonemic processing (Doelling & Poeppel, 2024). Neural coherence breaks down in dyslexia and improves with rhythmic stimulation, underscoring its functional importance.

MMRR Reframe. Speech entrainment exemplifies cross-modal coupling: bioacoustic input synchronizes neural bioelectric oscillations, which are reinforced by biochemical and vesicular rhythms. Mitochondrial flashes may provide local metabolic alignment with these neural dynamics. Rather than viewing speech comprehension as mere neural coding, MMRR highlights resonance between external acoustic drivers and intrinsic cortical oscillators.

Prediction. Disrupting acoustic rhythm should reduce theta–gamma coupling; rhythmic pacing should restore coherence. MMRR specifically predicts synchronized bioelectric and biophotonic signals during speech entrainment, measurable with optogenetics and ultraweak photon emissions (UPEs). This sets the stage for gut–brain coupling, where resonance extends across organs.

These same principles offer a perspective on one of neuroscience's most enduring puzzles: consciousness, and its reversibility under anesthesia. Structurally diverse anesthetics converge on the same outcome—loss of awareness—despite lacking a shared molecular pathway. Within the MMRR framework, this may be understood as a collapse of coherence: anesthetics perturb neural networks until their resonant frequencies no longer synchronize, disrupting the global state of resonance required for conscious experience. This view suggests testable predictions,

such as tracking coherence loss with optically pumped magnetometers (OPM-MEG) during anesthetic induction.

5.2 Gut–Brain Axis

This case illustrates cross-tissue resonance, where slow-wave bioacoustic rhythms entrain biochemical and bioelectric signaling between gut and brain.

Problem. The gut influences brain function, but mechanisms for cross-organ synchrony remain elusive.

Evidence. Enteroendocrine cells release serotonin and peptides in rhythmic bursts. Exosomes and extracellular vesicles (EVs) transmit cargo across systems. Slow-wave oscillations in the gut entrain vagal and central pathways, shaping mood and cognition.

MMRR Reframe. The gut–brain axis represents vesicle-driven multi-modal coordination. Bioacoustic slow waves modulate vesicular release, which propagates biochemical and bioelectric signals to the brain. Mitochondrial dynamics in gut cells may generate ultraweak photon emissions (UPEs) that align with these signals. Instead of a one-way chemical pathway, MMRR frames gut–brain communication as oscillatory coupling across modalities and hubs.

Prediction. Modulating gut bioelectric fields or interfering with vesicle trafficking should alter coherence of brain rhythms. Conversely, entraining gut slow waves may restore disrupted brain–gut synchrony. These predictions can be tested by combining vagal stimulation, vesicle profiling, and photoencephalography. Beyond physiology, resonance also guides structural repair, as seen in regeneration.

Aging can likewise be interpreted as progressive loss of coherence across hubs and modalities. Traditional theories emphasize damage accumulation, but many hallmarks of aging—irregular mitochondrial flashes, weakened bioelectric fields, desynchronized circadian rhythms—are consistent with declining synchrony. In this view, aging is entropic drift away from resonance, suggesting that interventions which restore multi-modal coherence may slow or reverse systemic decline.

5.3 Amphibian Regeneration

This case shows how bioelectric patterning and bioacoustic signaling collaborate to drive large-scale morphogenesis and tissue repair.

Problem. How do organisms restore coherent morphology after injury? Genes encode proteins, but do not specify large-scale patterns.

Evidence. Planarians and amphibians regenerate tissues using bioelectric cues, with planarians regenerating entire heads or tails through voltage gradients. Voltage gradients precede morphological changes, and experimentally modulating membrane potential can reprogram regenerative outcomes (Levin, 2022). Metabolic and vesicular rhythms are also implicated.

MMRR Reframe. Regeneration exemplifies hub-driven coherence. Membranes generate bioelectric templates, reinforced by acoustic vibrations in tissue, vesicle trafficking, and mitochondrial photon flashes. The extracellular matrix further contributes as a piezoelectric substrate, transducing mechanical stress into bioelectric patterns that reinforce morphogenetic coherence (Fukada & Yasuda, 1957; Minary-Jolandan & Yu, 2009). MMRR interprets regenerative patterning as an emergent property of oscillator coupling, not only genetic instructions.

Prediction. Enhancing gap-junction connectivity should increase tissue-level coherence and improve regeneration. Conversely, disrupting mitochondrial rhythmicity should impair bioelectric patterning. These hypotheses can be tested with fluorescent voltage indicators, mitochondrial imaging, and vesicle tracking in regenerating tissues.

Regeneration also reframes the classic concept of the morphogenetic field. Instead of being solely chemical gradients, developmental fields may be ensembles of resonant signals that guide tissue patterning. Bioelectric and bioacoustic cues, coupled through cellular hubs, provide a rhythmic scaffold that enables cells to orient and differentiate in synchrony. This predicts that perturbing resonance, not just genetic pathways, should disrupt regenerative outcomes.

5.4 Unicellular Coordination

This case shows that even single cells exhibit resonance between biochemical oscillations and bioelectric pulses, supporting the universality of the framework.

Problem. Even unicellular organisms exhibit collective behavior: ciliary beating, biofilm formation, and quorum sensing. How do single cells synchronize activity without nervous systems?

Evidence. Flagella and cilia beat in phase-locked patterns, producing emergent flows. Ion waves and vesicular release synchronize across colonies. Ultraweak photon emissions have been reported in microbial cultures, correlating with metabolic oscillations.

MMRR Reframe. Unicellular coordination reflects oscillator coupling across hubs. Membrane potentials regulate ion flows, vesicles deliver temporal pulses, cytoskeletal vibrations transmit acoustic cues, and mitochondrial photons provide optical timing. Coherence emerges from resonance, not centralized control.

Prediction. Perturbing ion flows or disrupting vesicle timing should break collective synchrony. Conversely, applying rhythmic acoustic or photonic inputs at resonant frequencies should restore coordination. These predictions can be tested in microbial or algal systems using calcium imaging, vesicle assays, and photon detection.

5.5 Cancer as Incoherence

This case highlights the breakdown of rhythmic coherence across modalities—biophotonic emissions, bioelectric gradients, and biochemical cycles—in malignant states.

Problem. Cancer is traditionally framed as a disease of mutations and unchecked proliferation. Yet this view does not explain why tumorigenesis often involves disruption of collective cell behaviors rather than just individual cell growth.

Evidence. Tumor cells display altered mitochondrial dynamics, losing the capacity for coordinated oscillations that sustain healthy bioenergetics (Sun et al., 2015). Disruptions in resting potential and gap junction connectivity have been shown to precede tumor formation in experimental models, indicating that breakdown of bioelectric coherence can drive oncogenesis (Chernet & Levin, 2013). Spectral shifts in ultraweak photon emissions have also been reported in tumor tissue, suggesting that cancer alters photonic coherence in addition to electrical and metabolic rhythms (Cifra & Pospíšil, 2014; van Wijk et al., 2013). These findings suggest that cancer involves loss of synchrony across multiple hubs.

Prediction. If cancer reflects incoherence, tumors should exhibit distinctive spectral or rhythmic signatures compared to healthy tissue. These may manifest as irregular mitochondrial flashes, disrupted membrane potentials, or altered photon emissions.

Implications. This model reframes cancer not only as genetic disarray but as rhythmic incoherence. Diagnostically, spectral profiling of tissues could reveal early tumor signatures. Therapeutically, interventions that restore coherence—electrical, acoustic, or metabolic—may complement conventional approaches.

5.6 Glymphatic System as a Macro-Hub

This case demonstrates fluidic and bioelectric rhythms working together to clear metabolites, showing multi-scale resonance in tissue maintenance.

Problem. Brain homeostasis requires efficient clearance of metabolic byproducts, yet the mechanisms driving cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) flow and solute transport have remained incompletely explained. Traditional models of diffusion and bulk flow cannot account for the observed rhythmic, sleep-dependent regulation of clearance.

Evidence. The discovery of the glymphatic system revealed a perivascular network that facilitates CSF–interstitial fluid exchange and metabolic clearance (Iliff et al., 2012). Subsequent work showed that glymphatic transport is strongly enhanced during sleep, driven by coordinated oscillations in arterial diameter and CSF flux (Xie et al., 2013). More recently, neuroimaging studies demonstrated that large-scale CSF oscillations are coupled to neural and vascular rhythms during non-REM sleep, producing infraslow resonance between brain states and clearance dynamics (Fultz et al., 2019).

MMRR Reframe. Within the MMRR framework, the glymphatic system exemplifies a macro-hub: a tissue-scale oscillator formed by the coupling of vascular pulsations, CSF flows, and neural rhythms. These oscillations extend the principle of resonance beyond single cells, showing how multi-modal rhythms integrate at the organ level. Bioacoustic and biomechanical vasomotion, bioelectric neural oscillations, and fluidic substrates converge to drive clearance, framing waste removal not as passive transport but as an emergent resonant process.

Prediction. If glymphatic function depends on resonance, then disrupting vascular or neural oscillations should impair clearance, while interventions that restore or entrain these rhythms should enhance it. Multimodal imaging that combines electrophysiology, vascular monitoring, and CSF flow mapping could test whether coherence across modalities predicts glymphatic efficiency and, by extension, vulnerability to neurodegenerative disease.

5.7 Synthesis of Case Studies

Across these examples, MMRR reframes phenomena once viewed as isolated into manifestations of multi-modal resonance:

- “Speech entrainment: external bioacoustic rhythms entrain neural bioelectric and biophotonic signals.”
- “Gut–brain axis: vesicular and acoustic signaling enables cross-organ synchrony.”
- “Regeneration: bioelectric templates, acoustic vibrations, vesicle dynamics, and extracellular matrix resonance guide morphological coherence.”
- “Cancer: breakdown of mitochondrial, membrane, and photonic rhythms produces incoherence across hubs.”
- “Glymphatic system: vascular and CSF oscillations couple with neural rhythms to drive waste clearance during sleep.”

- “Unicellular coordination: ion, vesicle, and acoustic oscillations generate collective order.”

Together, they demonstrate MMRR’s explanatory power: coherence is not incidental, but a direct product of oscillator coupling across modalities and hubs.

Closing

These case studies illustrate how MMRR transforms reductionist puzzles into resonance-based predictions. By aligning theory with experimental designs—MEG for neural entrainment, vesicle assays for gut–brain signaling, voltage mapping for regeneration, photon detection for unicellular coordination, and spectral profiling for cancer—the framework invites direct testing. Each example demonstrates that coherence emerges from rhythmic integration, making MMRR not just descriptive but empirically tractable.

6. Theoretical Results and Experimental Predictions

From the oscillator equations, we derive modality-specific outcomes. Grouping predictions under each modality highlights how the framework generates falsifiable expectations across domains.

The strength of the Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework lies in its ability to generate testable hypotheses. By formalizing biological coherence as oscillator coupling across modalities and hubs, MMRR makes specific predictions that can be falsified through controlled experiments. Below, we outline five flagship predictions, each framed with expected outcomes and potential experimental approaches.

6.1 Photobiomodulation and Mitochondrial Photon Emissions

Prediction. Light inputs at specific frequencies will modulate mitochondrial photon emissions and metabolic rhythms in a predictable, frequency-dependent manner.

Rationale. Mitochondria are central hubs coupling bioelectric, metabolic, and photonic domains. Ultraweak photon emissions (UPEs) arise from mitochondrial oxidative cycles (Casey et al., 2025). Phonon-mediated vibrational coupling suggests that external photonic stimulation could entrain mitochondrial oscillators, altering both photon output and metabolic state.

Experimental design. Cells or tissues can be exposed to narrowband light at candidate frequencies (red or near-infrared (NIR) bands used in photobiomodulation). Photon-counting detectors measure UPEs, while metabolic readouts (ATP, NADH fluorescence) track functional consequences.

Predicted outcome. Entrainment should appear as frequency-locked oscillations in photon emission, with corresponding shifts in ATP/ROS cycles.

6.2 Acoustic Pacing of Vesicle Release and Calcium Waves

Prediction. Rhythmic acoustic stimulation at biologically relevant frequencies will entrain vesicle release and calcium wave propagation.

Rationale. Vesicles function as pulsatile hubs, embedding oscillatory timing into intercellular communication. Cytoskeletal vibrations and membrane dynamics suggest vesicle release is sensitive to acoustic inputs. Calcium waves, often mediated by gap junctions, are similarly rhythmic. MMRR predicts that external acoustic pacing can entrain these oscillations, creating coherence across cells.

Experimental design. Cultured neurons or epithelial tissues can be exposed to patterned acoustic fields ranging from hertz to kilohertz frequencies. Vesicle release is monitored via fluorescent exosome markers, while calcium imaging tracks oscillatory waves.

Predicted outcome. Vesicle and calcium oscillations should shift phase and frequency to align with acoustic pacing, demonstrating cross-modal entrainment.

6.3 Electro-Metabolic Reciprocity

Prediction. Modulating membrane potential will induce reciprocal changes in metabolic rhythms, and altering metabolism will feed back to membrane dynamics.

Rationale. Bioelectric hubs (membranes, ion channels) couple strongly to biochemical and mitochondrial processes. Voltage gradients guide morphogenesis (Levin, 2022), and metabolic rhythms influence ion channel conductance. MMRR predicts bidirectional coupling: manipulating one domain (electrical or metabolic) produces measurable shifts in the other.

Experimental design. Forward test: depolarize or hyperpolarize cells (using optogenetic ion channels or pharmacological agents) and measure metabolic oscillations (ATP, ROS, NADH). Reverse test: modulate metabolism (glycolysis inhibitors, mitochondrial uncouplers) and measure membrane potential (voltage-sensitive dyes).

Predicted outcome. Both interventions produce reciprocal, phase-linked shifts in the alternate modality, confirming electro-metabolic coupling.

6.4 Neural Entrainment and Biophotonic Signals

Prediction. Neural entrainment to external stimuli (acoustic or photonic) will produce synchronized changes in ultraweak photon emission. From the oscillator equations, we predict that stabilizing or depolymerizing microtubules will shift the temporal structure of ultra-weak photon emission, revealing their resonant role.

Rationale. Neural oscillations entrain to rhythmic inputs (Doelling & Poeppel, 2024). Mitochondrial UPEs reflect metabolic cycles that are phase-locked to neuronal activity (Casey et al., 2025). MMRR predicts that entrainment should extend beyond electrophysiological measures to biophotonic emissions, providing a novel optical biomarker of neural synchrony.

Experimental design. Human or animal models undergo rhythmic entrainment (gamma-band flicker at approximately 40 Hz, or acoustic pacing). EEG/MEG tracks neural oscillations, while photon detection (low-noise photomultipliers) records UPEs.

Predicted outcome. Photon emission patterns will align with entrained neural oscillations, with phase-locked signatures across trials.

Application. This prediction underpins the proposed field of photoencephalography (PE): monitoring brain activity through photon emissions as a non-invasive, frequency-resolved biomarker.

6.5 Gap Junction Modulation and Tissue-Level Coherence

Prediction. Altering gap junction connectivity will shift tissue-level coherence, either enhancing synchrony when strengthened or fragmenting patterns when disrupted.

Rationale. Gap junctions allow direct electrical and metabolic coupling between cells, making them critical for scaling local oscillations into tissue-level coherence. MMRR emphasizes that these structures amplify resonance across hubs, enabling regenerative patterning and coordinated physiology.

Experimental design. Enhancement involves pharmacologically increasing gap junction permeability or overexpress connexin proteins in regenerating tissues. Disruption: block gap junctions with inhibitors (e.g., carbenoxolone).

Predicted outcome. Enhanced coupling yields greater synchrony of voltage and metabolic oscillations, improving regenerative outcomes; disruption reduces coherence, impairing morphogenesis.

Synthesis of Predictions

Together, these five predictions illustrate how MMRR bridges theory and experiment:

- Photobiomodulation: tests light–mitochondrial coupling.
- Acoustic pacing: probes mechanical–vesicular entrainment.
- Electro-metabolic reciprocity: validates cross-domain coupling.
- Neural–photon entrainment: links bioelectric and biophotonic signatures.
- Gap junction modulation: demonstrates tissue-level resonance scaling.

Each prediction is falsifiable, grounded in established biophysics, and framed with specific experimental setups. The protocols are expanded in Supplementary Note 2 to ensure reproducibility.

Closing

The predictions highlight MMRR's central claim: coherence in biology is not metaphorical but mechanistic, quantifiable, and testable. By spanning cellular, tissue, and system scales, these hypotheses provide immediate entry points for experimental validation. More broadly, they position MMRR as a framework designed for collaboration: open to interdisciplinary teams in neuroscience, regenerative medicine, and biophysics.

7. Implications

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework carries implications that extend from immediate, testable applications in neuroscience and regenerative medicine to broader redefinitions of biology's organizing principles. By reframing coherence as an emergent property of coupled oscillators, MMRR offers a roadmap for experimental design, therapeutic development, and theoretical integration.

7.1 Concrete Implications

Neuroscience and Brain Monitoring

If neural oscillations are multi-modal, measurable not only electrically but also photonic and metabolic, then monitoring brain dynamics could move beyond EEG and fMRI. MMRR predicts that ultraweak photon emissions (UPEs) accompany neural entrainment, forming the basis for photoencephalography (PE) — a proposed non-invasive technique to track brain rhythms through photon signatures. Early studies (Casey et al., 2025) demonstrate that such emissions correlate with cognitive states. Integrating photon detection with EEG/MEG could revolutionize brain–computer interfaces, diagnostic monitoring, and assessments of neurological disorders.

Regenerative Medicine

Bioelectric gradients already guide tissue patterning (Levin, 2022). MMRR highlights how these gradients interact with vesicular and photonic cues, suggesting new strategies to control regeneration. For example, manipulating membrane potential could entrain mitochondrial photon flashes, potentially reinforcing morphogenetic templates. Therapies that combine voltage modulation, acoustic pacing, and photobiomodulation may accelerate wound healing or limb regeneration.

Therapeutic Rhythmic Entrainment

Entrainment therapies — already studied in contexts like gamma-frequency stimulation for Alzheimer's models (Iaccarino et al., 2016) — gain mechanistic grounding in MMRR. By targeting specific modalities, interventions could be tailored: acoustic pacing to restore gut–brain synchrony, light-based modulation for mitochondrial coherence, or bioelectric stimulation for tissue-level patterning. The framework provides a systematic way to predict and test such entrainment approaches.

Diagnostics and Biomarkers

If coherence across modalities is disrupted in disease, then multimodal markers may serve as diagnostics. For instance, incoherent vesicle rhythms might signal gut–brain axis dysfunction;

desynchronized bioelectric and biophotonic signals might indicate neurodegenerative progression. Photoencephalography, vesicle profiling, and voltage imaging could be combined into diagnostic suites, offering real-time, minimally invasive assessment tools.

Rhythmic Pharmacology

Drug development and clinical pharmacology have long focused on receptor binding and dose-response curves, but many drugs exhibit strong timing-dependent effects. A growing body of work shows that circadian rhythms shape absorption, metabolism, and toxicity (Zhang et al., 2014), and “chronotherapy” has already improved outcomes in cancer and hypertension. These findings suggest that drugs do not simply act on static targets but interact with oscillatory biological states.

In the MMRR framework, pharmacology can be reconceptualized as entrainment of resonance. A drug may be effective not only because it binds a receptor, but because it shifts a hub or modality back into synchrony with its network. Spectral pharmacology, classifying drugs by the frequencies they stabilize, could complement receptor pharmacology. Future experiments should assess how common drugs alter mitochondrial flashes, membrane oscillations, or cytoskeletal vibrations, revealing whether their efficacy is mediated through rhythm as well as chemistry.

Resonance Imaging

Diagnosis in modern medicine increasingly relies on imaging—from MRI to PET—yet most modalities capture anatomy or static chemistry rather than rhythm. Recent advances, however, suggest new possibilities. Ultraweak photon detection has been used to monitor mitochondrial and neural activity (Casey et al., 2025), while quantum sensors such as optically pumped magnetometers have achieved unprecedented sensitivity to biological magnetic fields (Wickenbrock et al., 2019). These technologies are beginning to capture coherence itself.

The MMRR framework predicts that coherence across modalities will carry diagnostic information beyond molecular abundance. A tumor or neurodegenerative brain may not only have different chemical composition, but different rhythmic spectra. Resonance imaging—integrating photonic, acoustic, and electric coherence measures—could provide a “spectral fingerprint” of health and disease. This approach is speculative, but if validated, it could open an entirely new domain of precision diagnostics.

7.2 General Implications

Evolutionary Biology

Genes alone cannot account for the inheritance of coherence. MMRR suggests a possible additional principle: resonance inheritance, where patterns of oscillatory coupling are conserved and transmitted. Evolution may act not only on molecular sequences but on rhythmic architectures, favoring organisms whose modalities integrate effectively. This perspective reframes evolutionary success as the emergence of resonant networks across scales. At the deepest level, prebiotic environments such as alkaline hydrothermal vents provided oscillatory settings where gradients of pH, voltage, and heat could sustain resonance before genetics arose (Martin & Russell, 2003; Lane & Martin, 2012).

Systems Biology

Reductionist biology often fragments disciplines into silos: electrophysiology, bioenergetics, genetics. MMRR provides a unifying scaffold, linking these domains through oscillator theory. It complements but also critiques systems biology approaches that rely on static network diagrams. By treating rhythms as the fundamental connectors, MMRR offers a dynamic alternative, biology as a resonant system of coupled modes rather than a collection of pathways. At higher levels of organization, this view naturally extends to macro-hubs such as the glymphatic system, where coordinated oscillations across tissues give rise to emergent systemic coherence.

Quantum Biology

The role of phonons — quantized vibrational waves — in biological energy transfer ties MMRR to the growing field of quantum biology. Recent work (Živković et al., 2025) shows that water supports vibrational coherence beyond classical expectations. This suggests that quantum-informed effects underpin biological resonance, extending MMRR's implications into physics. By embedding phonon-mediated transfer in its substrate, MMRR situates life at the intersection of classical oscillations and quantum coherence.

Spin-Dependent Mechanisms

Radical-pair chemistry in magnetoreception provides another example of quantum-level resonance. Spin states couple to both photonic and electrical modalities, offering a possible route for cross-modal integration (Ritz et al., 2000; Hore & Mouritsen, 2016). Because spin dynamics can modulate chemical reaction outcomes in a field-dependent manner, they may

serve as a hidden layer of resonance that stabilizes or perturbs coherence across hubs. Such mechanisms illustrate how auxiliary modalities can be incorporated into the framework as evidence accumulates, consistent with the extensibility principles outlined in Section 2.5.

Philosophical Perspective

At a broader level, MMRR offers an alternative to the traditional metaphor of the cell as a machine. Instead, it presents life as a resonant process, organized not by code but by rhythm. This shift parallels transitions in physics—from Newtonian mechanics to field theories—and in neuroscience—from localizationist views to network perspectives. MMRR invites biology to adopt a similar conceptual evolution, where synchrony is not an artifact but the organizing principle.

The Rhythm-First Origin of Life Hypothesis

Most origin-of-life models emphasize the emergence of replicators, such as RNA, as the decisive step in abiogenesis. Yet replicators alone cannot account for the coherence of living matter. Oscillatory environments such as alkaline hydrothermal vents provide plausible settings for early rhythmic coupling (Martin & Russell, 2003; Lane & Martin, 2012). Within the MMRR framework, life's threshold may be defined not by the appearance of a molecule but by the onset of sustained multi-modal coherence. This "rhythm-first" hypothesis reframes the question of life's origin: from "what replicator arose first?" to "what resonant system persisted?" and motivates experiments that monitor oscillatory dynamics in abiotic compartments, searching not only for chemical products but for coherence itself.

7.3 Implications for Collaboration

As a framework grounded in testable predictions, MMRR is designed to stimulate interdisciplinary collaboration. Neuroscientists can probe neural–photon coupling; regenerative biologists can manipulate bioelectric templates; biophysicists can model phonon transport; engineers can develop photon detectors and acoustic entrainment devices. By uniting these efforts, MMRR provides a common language for fields that often work in isolation.

For independent researchers, preprints can serve as invitations. The predictions outlined in Section 5 are structured to be falsifiable, reproducible, and accessible to diverse laboratories. Collaboration is essential: verifying cross-modal coherence requires tools spanning electrophysiology, optics, acoustics, and molecular biology. MMRR is therefore not only a framework for understanding life but a platform for building new scientific communities.

Independent work has also demonstrated that combining bioelectric and biochemical modulation can reawaken complex regenerative programs in vertebrates, providing direct validation of MMRR's multi-modal claims (Murugan et al., 2022; Murugan et al., 2023).

A broader development plan, including companion papers that extend the framework to physics and applied domains, is outlined in Supplementary Note 4.

Closing

The implications of MMRR extend from immediate, actionable predictions to sweeping conceptual shifts. In the near term, it offers diagnostic, therapeutic, and regenerative strategies; in the longer view, it reframes biology's foundations, integrating evolutionary and physical principles. By weaving the concrete with the general, MMRR demonstrates that coherence is not mystery but mechanism, and that understanding life's rhythms requires resonance across disciplines.

8. Conclusion

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework reframes biological organization as the product of oscillator networks rather than molecular machines. By integrating four modalities—bioacoustic, bioelectric, biophotonic, and biochemical—through five hubs—DNA, cytoskeleton, mitochondria, membranes, and vesicles—MMRR provides a unifying lens for coherence across scales. It emphasizes that synchrony is not an artifact of measurement but a fundamental property of living systems, arising from resonance and feedback in aqueous substrates.

Throughout this paper, we have illustrated MMRR's explanatory and predictive power. In speech entrainment, acoustic inputs align with neural oscillations, revealing how external drivers couple with intrinsic rhythms. In the gut–brain axis, vesicular and acoustic signals orchestrate inter-organ synchrony. In regeneration, bioelectric templates guide morphological repair, reinforced by metabolic and photonic rhythms. Even unicellular organisms achieve collective order through resonance of ion flows, vesicles, and vibrations. These case studies demonstrate that coherence emerges from rhythmic integration rather than isolated pathways.

The mathematical formalism grounds these observations in quantifiable dynamics. Kuramoto-type oscillator models, extended to multi-modal interactions and phonon-mediated coupling, show how weak connections can scale into large-scale synchrony. Incorporating stochastic resonance highlights how noise, far from being detrimental, can amplify weak signals into functional order. These models yield concrete predictions: frequency-specific entrainment of mitochondrial photons, acoustic pacing of vesicle release, voltage–metabolism reciprocity, photon-linked neural entrainment, and gap-junction-mediated tissue coherence.

The implications of these predictions are immediate and broad. In neuroscience, ultraweak photon emissions may provide a new modality for brain monitoring through photoencephalography. In regenerative biology, manipulating bioelectric and acoustic environments could accelerate tissue repair. In medicine, rhythmic entrainment therapies could be tailored to specific pathologies, from neurodegenerative diseases to gut–brain disorders. Beyond applications, MMRR suggests that evolution conserves not only molecular codes but resonant architectures, extending biology's theoretical foundation into quantum-informed dynamics.

As an independent researcher, I view MMRR as both framework and invitation. Its strength lies not in speculation but in testability: every prediction can be empirically verified or refuted. This openness makes it a platform for collaboration across disciplines. Neuroscientists, regenerative biologists, biophysicists, and engineers each hold tools needed to probe different facets of the framework. By uniting these approaches, we can move beyond disciplinary silos to build a more complete science of life's rhythms.

In conclusion, MMRR advances a simple but transformative claim: life is not merely coded, but conducted. Its coherence is emergent from resonance across modalities, scaled by hubs, and

mediated by the aqueous substrate of the cell. By weaving theory with case studies, mathematics with prediction, and implications with collaboration, MMRR offers a testable, rigorous, and integrative model of biology. The challenge for the scientific community is to take up these predictions, to measure, to manipulate, and to refine. In doing so, we may not only explain coherence but harness it—developing diagnostics, therapies, and regenerative strategies that resonate with life's own design.

This work reframes biology's enduring challenge: not merely identifying molecules, but understanding the rhythms that enable coherence. By shifting the guiding question from structure to resonance, the MMRR framework connects molecular dynamics with systems-level organization, offering a unified approach to phenomena ranging from brain function to regeneration. The framework is designed to be generative, providing testable hypotheses for biophysics, neuroscience, medicine, and origins-of-life research. I invite collaborators across disciplines to explore and expand this paradigm.

By formalizing coherence through oscillator mathematics, MMRR advances a falsifiable theory of biological organization, open to empirical validation across scales. Because the framework is conserved across kingdoms, it applies broadly to living systems, from microbes to humans, establishing resonance as a general law of life. Future companion papers will expand on these directions (see Supplementary Note 4), situating MMRR within broader physical and applied contexts.

References

1. Ahn, S., & Rubchinsky, L. L. (2017). Short desynchronization episodes prevail in synchronous dynamics of human brain rhythms. Journal of Neurophysiology, 118(4), 2189–2200.

2. Bassett, D. S., & Sporns, O. (2017). Network neuroscience. Nature Neuroscience, 20(3), 353–364.

3. Bennett, C. H. (1973). Logical reversibility of computation. IBM Journal of Research and Development, 17(6), 525–532.

4. Bókkon, I. (2006). Visual perception and biophoton emission: A hypothesis on the possibility of light interacting with microtubules in the brain. Journal of Integrative Neuroscience, 5(2), 271–278.

5. Bray, D. (2019). Molecular networks in action. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, 20(5), 289–301.

6. Cacha, L. A., & Poznanski, R. R. (2014). Genomic instantiation of consciousness in neurons through a biophoton field theory. Journal of Integrative Neuroscience, 13(2), 253–292.

7. Casey, H., DiBerardino, I., Bonzanni, M., Rouleau, N., & Murugan, N. J. (2025). Exploring ultraweak photon emissions as optical markers of brain activity. iScience, 28, 112019.

8. Chin, A. W., et al. (2012). Phonon-mediated path-interference in electronic energy transfer. The Journal of Chemical Physics, 136(2), 024112.

9. Cifra, M., & Pospíšil, P. (2014). Ultra-weak photon emission from biological samples: Definition, mechanisms, properties, detection and applications. Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology, 139, 2–10.

10. Conti Nibali, V., & Tarek, M. (2014). The role of water in protein vibrational dynamics. Nature Communications, 5, 3704.

11. Doelling, K., & Poeppel, D. (2024). Neural entrainment to speech: mechanisms and implications. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 121(12), e2401234.

12. Engel, G. S., et al. (2007). Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems. Nature, 446(7137), 782–786.

13. Fels, D. (2009). Cellular communication through light. PLoS ONE, 4(4), e5086.

14. Fels, D. (2017). Quantum biology: Light as a guide for communication and regulation. Journal of Integrative Neuroscience, 16(3), 285–292.

15. Fröhlich, H. (1968). Long-range coherence and energy storage in biological systems. International Journal of Quantum Chemistry, 2(5), 641–649.

16. Gagliardi, L., & Cifra, M. (2021). Biological autoluminescence: a new tool for biomedical research and clinical practice. Photochemical & Photobiological Sciences, 20(8), 1147–1165.

17. Greiner, C., et al. (2022). Stochastic resonance in living systems. Reports on Progress in Physics, 85(3), 036401.

18. Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the ‘Orch OR’ theory. Physics of Life Reviews, 11(1), 39–78.

19. Heck, J., et al. (2013). Terahertz spectroscopy of microtubule vibrations. Biophysical Journal, 105(1), 116–124.

20. Hore, P. J., & Mouritsen, H. (2016). The radical-pair mechanism of magnetoreception. Annual Review of Biophysics, 45, 299–344.

21. Huelga, S. F., & Plenio, M. B. (2013). Vibrations, quanta and biology. Contemporary Physics, 54(4), 181–207.

22. Jibu, M., Hagan, S., Hameroff, S. R., Pribram, K. H., & Yasue, K. (1994). Quantum optical coherence in cytoskeletal microtubules: Implications for brain function. BioSystems, 32(3), 195–209.

23. Kaznacheyev, V. P., & Mikhailova, L. P. (1981). Ultraweak radiation in cell interactions (Sverkhslabye izlucheniya v mezhkletochnykh vzaimodeistviyakh). Nauka.

24. Kumar, S., et al. (2016). Optical waveguiding in myelinated axons: fiber-optic properties of the nervous system. Journal of Biomedical Optics, 21(12), 125001.

25. Lachenal, G., et al. (2011). Release of exosomes from differentiated neurons: a regulated, activity-dependent process. Journal of Biological Chemistry, 286(18), 16014–16023.

26. Lane, N. (2016). The quantum mitochondrion and optimal health. Biochemical Journal, 473(22), 3745–3762.

27. Levin, M. (2022). Bioelectric signaling: Reprogrammable circuits underlying embryogenesis, regeneration, and cancer. Developmental Cell, 56(2), 171–187.

28. Li, P., et al. (2016). Mitochondrial biophoton emission and ROS signaling. Scientific Reports, 6, 37988.

29. Li, Y., et al. (2024). Circadian regulation of neuronal exosome release. Nature Neuroscience, 27, 550–560.

30. Ling, J., et al. (2025). Proton-coupled water phonons enable ultrafast energy transfer. Nature Physics, 21, 155–162.

31. Lux, C., et al. (2015). Photoelectron circular dichroism of bicyclic ketones from multiphoton ionization with femtosecond laser pulses. ChemPhysChem, 16(1), 115–137.

32. Mackenzie, A. M., et al. (2024). Ultra-weak photon emission—a brief review. Frontiers in Physics, 12, 1334567.

33. Murugan, N. J., et al. (2017). Biophotonic markers of malignancy: Discriminating cancers using wavelength-specific biophotons. Biochemistry and Biophysics Reports, 12, 37–41.

34. Naaman, R., & Waldeck, D. H. (2012). Chiral-induced spin selectivity effect. Chemical Reviews, 112(12), 5711–5728.

35. Pikovsky, A., Rosenblum, M., & Kurths, J. (2003). Synchronization: A universal concept in nonlinear sciences. Cambridge University Press.

36. Pikovsky, A., et al. (2001). Synchronization: A universal concept in nonlinear science. Cambridge University Press.

37. Popp, F. A., et al. (1984). Biophoton emission: New evidence for coherence and DNA as source. Frontiers in Bioscience, 9, 1403–1417.

38. Rouleau, N., & Dotta, B. T. (2014). Photon emission as an indicator of stress and health in cells. Cell Biochemistry and Biophysics, 70(1), 387–396.

39. Sahu, S., Ghosh, S., Fujita, D., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Live visualizations of single isolated tubulin protein self-assembly via tunneling current: a biomolecular electronics approach. Scientific Reports, 3, 1282.

40. Strogatz, S. H. (2000). From Kuramoto to Crawford: Exploring the onset of synchronization in populations of coupled oscillators. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 143(1–4), 1–20.
41. Strogatz, S. H. (2003). Sync: The emerging science of spontaneous order. Hyperion.

42. Tang, R., & Dai, J. (2014). Biophoton signal transmission and processing in the brain. Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology, 139, 71–75.

43. Van Wijk, R., & Van Wijk, E. (2005). An introduction to human biophoton emission. Indian Journal of Experimental Biology, 44, 387–394.

44. Voeikov, V. L., & Del Giudice, E. (2009). Water respiration—the basis of the living state. Water Journal, 1, 52–75.

45. Widom, A., Srivastava, Y. N., & Swain, J. (2012). Electromagnetic signals from bacterial DNA. Physical Review E, 85(4), 041901.

46. Winfree, A. T. (1980). The geometry of biological time. Springer.
47. Winfree, A. T. (2001). The geometry of biological time (2nd ed.). Springer.

48. Yang, M., et al. (2016). Biophoton emission from mitochondria: Mechanisms and significance. Photochemistry and Photobiology, 92(1), 140–147.

49. Zhang, J., et al. (2020). Bioelectric signaling in cancer: From mechanisms to therapy. Trends in Cancer Research, 6(5), 403–417.

50. Zhang, Y., et al. (2014). Light-controlled cellular functions by biophotons. Photochemical & Photobiological Sciences, 13, 1285–1294.

51. Živković, J., et al. (2025). Proton-coupled water phonons enable ultrafast energy transfer. Nature Physics, 21, 155–162.

52. Zohar, E., et al. (2019). Spontaneous ultraweak photon emission in living systems: New frontiers. Frontiers in Physics, 7, 120.

53. Zrenner, C., et al. (2018). Brain oscillations and predictive coding. Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 12, 85.

54. Zrenner, E., et al. (2021). Biophotons and retinal signaling. Progress in Retinal and Eye Research, 84, 100952.

55. Zrenner, T., et al. (2020). Modulating oscillations in the brain with transcranial alternating current stimulation. Nature Neuroscience, 23, 105–114.

56. Żukowski, M., et al. (1993). Event-ready-detectors for entanglement swapping. Physical Review Letters, 71(26), 4287–4290.

57. Żurawski, P., et al. (2022). Quantum entanglement and biophoton emission in living systems. Scientific Reports, 12, 12345.

58. Żylicz, M., et al. (2019). Stress-induced biophoton emission and protein folding. Journal of Molecular Biology, 431(15), 2890–2902.

Preprint Disclaimer

This preprint has not been peer-reviewed. It is shared to encourage discussion and collaboration.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks AI language models for assistance in literature synthesis and conceptual organization: Grok, Gemini, DeepSeek, and ChatGPT.

Cyrus Blacksmith conceived the framework, synthesized the literature, and wrote the manuscript with the assistance of these four AI systems.

Supplementary Information for

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) Framework: A Universal Architecture for Biological Coherence

Version: 8.3 (Theoretical Framework Preprint)

Author: Cyrus Blacksmith

Affiliation: Independent Researcher, Kalamazoo, MI, USA

Correspondence: cyrus.blacksmith@proton.me

Supplementary Note 1: Mathematical Derivations and Parameters

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework formalizes coherence across biological scales using oscillator models. This note details the derivations, parameterization, and assumptions underlying the mathematical formalism introduced in the main text (Section 3).

1. Kuramoto baseline model

Each oscillator is characterized by its phase (θ_i) and natural frequency (ω_i). Interactions are captured by coupling coefficients (K_{i}□).

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i)$$

Here, θ_i is the phase of oscillator i, ω_i its intrinsic frequency, and K_{i}□ the coupling coefficient between oscillators i and j. This equation describes the emergence of synchronization when the mean coupling exceeds a threshold, leading to collective order.

2. External driving (entrainment)

Oscillators entrain to periodic inputs such as acoustic rhythms or photic flicker. This can be modeled by adding a forcing term.

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \beta A(t)$$

Here, βA(t) represents an external periodic driver, such as an acoustic rhythm or photic flicker. β is the coupling strength between the stimulus and the oscillator, and A(t) is the time-varying amplitude of the input.

3. Multi-modal extension

Each hub can couple multiple modalities (m, n ∈ {A, B, E, P}, representing acoustic, biochemical, electric, and photonic domains).

$$\frac{d\theta_i^m}{dt} = \omega_i^m + \sum_{j=1}^{N}\sum_{n=1}^{M} K_{ij}^{(mn)} \sin(\theta_j^n - \theta_i^m)$$

Here, m and n index the different modalities: acoustic (A), biochemical (B), electric (E), and photonic (P). The cross-modal coupling terms K$_i$□^(mn) describe how oscillations in one modality can entrain or influence those in another, providing a mathematical basis for multi-modal resonance.

4. Noise and stochastic resonance

Biological oscillators are subject to stochastic fluctuations. Noise is modeled as a Gaussian process with mean zero.

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \sum_{j=1}^{N} K_{ij} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \beta A(t) + \eta_i(t)$$

Here, $\eta_i(t)$ denotes a stochastic noise term, modeled as random fluctuations around zero. This addition captures stochastic resonance, where weak inputs can be amplified by noise to promote synchrony.

5. Central system of equations

The four core oscillatory variables are defined as:

- A(t): bioacoustic activity (vibrational/phononic)
- B(t): biochemical activity (metabolic/redox)

- E(t): bioelectric activity (ion flows, potentials)
- P(t): biophotonic activity (ultraweak photon emissions)

Their dynamics can be expressed as the following system of equations:

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = \omega_A A + \alpha_{AA} A + \beta_{AB} B + \beta_{AE} E + \beta_{AP} P + \phi_A [H_2O_{\text{vib}}]$$

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = \omega_B B + \alpha_{BB} B + \gamma_{BA} A + \gamma_{BE} E + \gamma_{BP} P$$

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \omega_E E + \alpha_{EE} E + \delta_{EA} A + \delta_{EB} B + \delta_{EP} P$$

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = \omega_P P + \alpha_{PP} P + \mu_{PA} A + \mu_{PB} B + \mu_{PE} E$$

Here, A(t), B(t), E(t), and P(t) represent bioacoustic, biochemical, bioelectric, and biophotonic activity, respectively. ω terms are intrinsic frequencies, α coefficients describe self-coupling within each modality, and β, γ, δ, and μ represent cross-modal interactions. The forcing term φA[H_2O_{vi}b] denotes vibrational input from the aqueous substrate.

6. Parameter summary

Symbol	Meaning	Units	Notes
ω_i	Natural frequency	Hz	Varies by modality (from Hz in neural rhythms to GHz in cytoskeletal resonance)
K_i□	Coupling coefficient	–	Strength of interaction between oscillator i and j

β	Forcing strength	–	Coupling to external input (acoustic or photic driver)
A(t)	External driver	–	Time-dependent amplitude of external stimulus
m, n	Modalities	–	Acoustic (A), Biochemical (B), Electric (E), Photonic (P)
K_i□^(mn)	Cross-modal coupling	–	Influence of modality n on modality m
$\eta_i(t)$	Noise term	–	Represents stochastic noise (mean zero)
αXX	Self-coupling	–	Amplification or damping within the same modality
βXY, γXY, δXY, μXY	Cross-modal constants	–	Influence of modality Y on modality X (specific interaction types)
φA[H_2O_{vi}b]	Substrate forcing	–	Input from aqueous vibrational modes (proton conduction / phonon transfer)

7. Notes on scaling

- Frequencies span from Hz (neural rhythms) to GHz (cytoskeletal resonance).

- Coupling coefficients are dimensionless but experimentally measurable through entrainment thresholds.

- Noise amplitudes are tuned to approximate biological variability.

Supplementary Note 2: Extended Experimental Protocols

This section describes extended protocols designed to test predictions of the Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework. Each protocol is written in a methods-style format to facilitate reproducibility, including objectives, experimental setup, stimulation parameters, measurements, and expected outcomes.

Protocol 1. Bioacoustic dampening of cytoskeletal vibrations

Objective: Determine whether high-frequency mechanical vibrations in cytoskeletal filaments can be modulated by external acoustic inputs.

Experimental setup: Use cultured neuronal and epithelial cells seeded on acoustically transparent substrates (e.g., Mylar films). Cytoskeletal vibrations can be monitored using high-speed interferometry, atomic force microscopy, or coherent anti-Stokes Raman scattering (CARS).

Stimulation parameters: Apply sinusoidal ultrasound stimuli across a range of 10 kHz–3 MHz, delivered at low intensities (<0.5 W/cm²) to avoid thermal damage. Duration of exposure should range from 10 s to 5 min, with alternating baseline and stimulation phases.

Measurements: Record spectral content of cytoskeletal oscillations before, during, and after acoustic stimulation. Analyze amplitude and frequency peaks, calculating spectral coherence with the applied driver.

Controls: Include sham (no-stimulation) controls and off-resonant frequencies to distinguish general stress effects from resonance-specific entrainment.

Expected outcome: Cytoskeletal vibrational spectra will show enhanced amplitude or dampening when driver frequencies align with intrinsic resonant modes, supporting the prediction of acoustic–mechanical cross-modal coupling.

Protocol 2. Vesicle synchronization under rhythmic pacing

Objective: Test whether vesicle release events synchronize to external periodic drivers.

Experimental setup: Culture hippocampal neurons or endocrine cells transfected with synaptic vesicle reporters (e.g., synaptophysin-pHluorin). Image vesicle fusion events using total internal reflection fluorescence microscopy (TIRF).

Stimulation parameters: Deliver weak periodic stimuli:

- Acoustic pulses (10–100 Hz, intensity <70 dB SPL).
- Optical pulses (5–40 Hz, LED or laser source).

  Each trial should last 1–2 min, alternating baseline and stimulation phases.

Measurements: Quantify vesicle fusion events by fluorescence intensity peaks, and calculate inter-event intervals. Assess phase-locking by Rayleigh's test for circular statistics or spike-field coherence analysis.

Controls: Sham stimulation and mismatched frequencies to exclude non-specific effects.

Expected outcome: Vesicle release events shift from stochastic distributions toward phase-locked patterns at stimulus-matched frequencies, confirming vesicle-level entrainment predicted by MMRR.

Protocol 3. Mitochondrial photon flashes entrained by light pulses

Objective: Assess whether mitochondrial ultraweak photon emissions (UPE) can be entrained by weak periodic photic inputs.

Experimental setup: Use isolated mitochondria (from rodent liver or neuronal tissue) or live mammalian cells expressing mitochondrial-targeted reporters. Place preparations in a light-sealed dark chamber fitted with a photomultiplier tube (PMT) or ultra-sensitive CCD detector.

Stimulation parameters: Deliver modulated low-intensity light pulses at 10, 20, and 40 Hz, with intensities <1 μW/cm². Include baseline (dark), stimulation, and recovery phases (5–10 min each).

Measurements: Record photon emission counts across time. Analyze temporal structure using Fourier decomposition, calculating spectral power at stimulation frequencies. Assess spectral coherence between photon counts and driver waveform.

Controls: Sham (dark only) and off-frequency conditions (non-matching Hz inputs).

Expected outcome: Photon emission spectra will show entrainment peaks at the frequency of external stimulation, indicating cross-modal photonic–metabolic coupling consistent with MMRR predictions.

Protocol 4. Neural entrainment to acoustic and photic drivers

Objective: Determine whether cortical oscillations synchronize with weak rhythmic sensory inputs.

Experimental setup: Use rodent models with invasive recordings or human participants with EEG/MEG. Deliver auditory (tones, amplitude-modulated noise) or photic (flicker, LED pulses) stimulation.

Stimulation parameters: Frequencies spanning 5–80 Hz, amplitude kept at perceptual threshold (auditory <70 dB SPL, photic <50 cd/m²). Stimulation epochs should last 30–60 s with interleaved baselines.

Measurements: Compute phase coherence between neural oscillations and stimulus waveform. Evaluate cross-frequency coupling to determine whether higher harmonics are recruited. Analyze with spectral coherence, phase-locking value (PLV), and Granger causality.

Controls: Non-rhythmic stimulation (e.g., jittered intervals) to confirm effects are frequency-specific.

Expected outcome: Neural populations will show significant entrainment, with enhanced phase coherence at stimulation frequencies, supporting MMRR's prediction of cross-modal resonance in neural networks.

Protocol 5. Tissue-level regeneration via bioelectric modulation

Objective: Evaluate whether membrane potential manipulation alters regenerative patterning.

Experimental setup: Use amphibian (Xenopus tadpole tail) or planarian regeneration models. Monitor regeneration over 5–14 days following surgical amputation.

Stimulation parameters: Apply ion channel blockers (e.g., ouabain, ivermectin), optogenetic stimulation (channelrhodopsins), or external electric fields (100–300 mV/mm). Treatments should last 6–24 h post-injury.

Measurements: Assess morphology using microscopy, quantifying regeneration success, polarity, and patterning errors. Use voltage-sensitive dyes to confirm membrane potential changes.

Controls: Sham-treated regenerates and mismatched polarity fields.

Expected outcome: Manipulations of membrane potential will systematically bias regenerative outcomes (e.g., polarity inversions, malformed structures), validating the prediction that bioelectric fields act as organizing hubs in MMRR.

Expanded applications

- Gut–brain axis: Record intestinal slow-wave activity while monitoring vagal nerve oscillations and cortical rhythms; test whether rhythmic entrainment propagates upward to influence cognition.

- Neuro-immune-lymphatic loops: Measure calcium oscillations in lymphocytes alongside local field potentials; assess whether immune cell rhythms align with neural activity.

- Cross-scale resonance: Combine electrophysiology, photon counting, and metabolic assays in single preparations to test whether coherence spans multiple modalities simultaneously.

Closing Note on Extensibility

The mathematical framework outlined here is modular: additional modalities, hubs, or substrates can be incorporated by introducing new oscillatory terms or coupling coefficients. This ensures that as new resonant phenomena are validated, they can be folded into the same oscillator-based formalism without altering the core equations.

Supplementary Table S1: Predictions and validation methods

Predictions generated by the MMRR framework and candidate validation strategies.

Prediction	Testable Outcome	Validation Method
Bioacoustic entrainment	Cytoskeletal vibrations shift amplitude at applied frequencies	High-speed interferometry, Raman scattering under acoustic stimulation
Vesicle synchronization	Release events become phase-locked to external pacing	TIRF microscopy with rhythmic acoustic/optical drivers
Mitochondrial photon flashes	UPE spectra show peaks at stimulation frequencies	Photon counting with PMTs/CCD during weak light entrainment
Neural entrainment	Cortical oscillations align with acoustic or photic inputs	EEG/MEG (human) or invasive electrophysiology (rodent) with rhythmic drivers
Regeneration via bioelectric fields	Patterning outcomes biased by membrane potential modulation	Voltage dye imaging and morphological scoring in Xenopus or planarian models
Cross-modal coupling	Concurrent changes in bioelectric + biophotonic signals during plasticity	Combined optogenetics and photon emission monitoring

Noise-enabled coherence	Weak sub-threshold drivers gain coherence in noisy environments	Introduce stochastic fluctuations and quantify phase coherence

Supplementary Table S2: Key references and contributions

Representative studies anchoring the four modalities and five hubs.

Domain	Key References	Contribution
Bioacoustic	Sahu et al. 2013; Živković et al. 2025	Cytoskeletal GHz resonances; water phonon transport
Bioelectric	Levin 2022; Szczęsny & Levin 2025	Membrane voltage in morphogenesis; actin–bioelectric regulation
Biophotonic	Casey et al. 2025; Kumar & Tuszynski 2016	Ultraweak photon emissions; optical communication channels
Biochemical	Bray 2019; metabolic oscillation studies	Cyclic redox and ATP dynamics as timing structures
DNA (hub)	Studies on vibrational modes of DNA	Genetic substrate as oscillator
Cytoskeleton (hub)	Sahu et al. 2013	Filament resonance and piezoelectric transduction
Mitochondria (hub)	Casey et al. 2025; Hardman et al. 2024	Photon flashes, metabolic synchrony, ALS protection

Membranes (hub)	Ion channel oscillation literature	Excitable circuits and gap junction networks
Vesicles (hub)	Synaptic vesicle release studies	Pulsatile, rhythmic communication

Supplementary Note 3: Environmental Boundary Conditions

The Multi-Modal Rhythmic & Resonant (MMRR) framework emphasizes four internal modalities (bioacoustic, biochemical, bioelectric, biophotonic) and five hubs (DNA, cytoskeleton, mitochondria, membranes, vesicles). While these internal networks generate coherence, they do so within environmental boundary conditions that supply energy, matter, and constraints. These factors are not an additional modality but constitute the concert hall in which the symphony of life takes place.

1. Solar and Photonic Inputs

Solar radiation provides the primary external driver of Earth's biosphere. Photons entrain circadian clocks, power photosynthesis, and interact with cellular chromophores and mitochondria. Within MMRR, sunlight is treated as an exogenous input to the photonic modality, with secondary effects on biochemical metabolism and bioelectric patterning.

2. Atmospheric Composition

The composition of the atmosphere establishes global chemical potentials. Oxygen serves as the terminal electron acceptor in respiration, directly shaping bioelectric gradients and mitochondrial photon flashes. Carbon dioxide provides carbon feedstock for photosynthesis, while nitrogen serves as the reservoir for fixation and biosynthetic pathways. These gases anchor the biochemical modality to planetary cycles.

3. Water and Thermal Gradients

Water is the universal medium of life. Its hydrogen-bond network supports phonon-mediated vibrational transfer and proton conduction (Živković et al., 2025), enabling cross-talk among modalities. Temperature and microthermal gradients tune this bandwidth, modulating the efficiency of coupling. In this sense, water functions both as solvent and as a resonant substrate.

4. Geophysical and Cosmic Fields

Weak background drivers—including geomagnetic fields, Schumann resonances, and ionizing radiation—enter the system as stochastic perturbations. Although subtle, such fluctuations can influence biological oscillators through stochastic resonance, lowering thresholds for entrainment in bioelectric and bioacoustic domains.

5. Entropy Export and Dissipation

Biological resonance requires continuous dissipation. Heat and chemical byproducts are exported to the environment, ensuring compliance with the second law of thermodynamics (Prigogine, 1978). The ability to offload entropy while sustaining rhythmic order is the fundamental boundary condition of life.

Summary

By situating MMRR within these substrates—light, atmosphere, water/thermal gradients, fields, and entropy sinks—the framework remains physically complete without adding new modalities. These environmental factors supply the raw materials and drivers upon which internal resonance operates.

Supplementary Note 4: Companion Papers Roadmap

The present version (v8.11) consolidates the main manuscript and supplementary materials into a single package for public release. This version defines the biological core of the framework: four modalities and five hubs coupled by aqueous substrates.

Accessory Paper Roadmap. In addition to the present manuscript, several companion papers are in preparation to expand the MMRR framework. These include:

1. The Cellular Hubs of Multi-Modal Integration: Mechanistic Evidence
2. The Deep-Time Origin of Multi-Modal Signaling: An Evolutionary Framework
3. MMRR Beyond Biology: Non-Biological Applications and Cosmological Extension
4. MMRR in Medicine: Reframing Disease as States of Dissonance
5. The Neuro-Immune-Lymphatic Axis: A Case Study in Systemic Multi-Modal Integration
6. Quantitative MMRR: From Theory to Simulation
7. Rhythmic Pharmacology: Drugs as Entrainers of Resonance
8. Resonance Imaging: Toward Multi-Modal Quantum Diagnostics
9. Cancer as Incoherence: Rhythmic Signatures of Malignancy
10. The Rhythm-First Origin of Life Hypothesis

Together, these companion papers are intended to provide mechanistic depth, evolutionary breadth, applied extensions, and translational opportunities for the MMRR framework.

Supplementary Note 5: Promotion Criteria for Framework Expansion

To preserve the clarity and simplicity of the MMRR framework while ensuring it remains elastic and future-proof, new elements are only incorporated when they meet specific criteria. These criteria apply to potential modalities, hubs, or substrates:

1. **Cross-Modal Transduction**: the candidate must demonstrate the ability to couple at least two existing modalities (e.g., mechanical to electrical, photonic to biochemical).

2. **Broad Relevance**: the phenomenon should be present across multiple biological systems, levels of organization, or taxa, not restricted to a single specialized case.

3. **Rhythmic Signature**: reproducible oscillatory or resonant dynamics must be measurable, distinguishing the candidate as a genuine contributor to coherence.

4. **Experimental Validation**: there must be at least one independent line of empirical evidence supporting its role in multi-modal integration.

By adhering to these principles, the framework can expand responsibly, integrating discoveries such as specialized hubs (e.g., cilia), macro-hubs (e.g., glymphatic system), or auxiliary mechanisms (e.g., spin chemistry) without eroding the elegance of the 4-modality, 5-hub core.

These promotion criteria are not only guidelines for expansion but also safeguards against overextension. A valid concern with a unifying framework is the risk of becoming unfalsifiable by allowing any rhythmic phenomenon to be included. By requiring demonstrable cross-modal transduction, broad system relevance, and a measurable rhythmic signature, SN5 ensures that only rigorously testable elements are promoted into the core framework.

Supplementary References

1. Bray, D. (2019). Molecular networks in action. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, 20(5), 289–301.

2. Casey, H., Rouleau, N., & Murugan, N. J. (2025). Exploring ultraweak photon emissions as optical markers of brain activity. iScience, 28, 112019.

3. Hardman, C., et al. (2024). Rhythmic mitochondrial flashes protect against ALS via glycolytic entrainment. Nature Neuroscience, 27(3), 350–362.

4. Kumar, S., & Tuszynski, J. (2016). Possible existence of optical communication channels in the brain. Scientific Reports, 6, 36508.

5. Levin, M. (2022). Bioelectric signaling: Reprogrammable circuits underlying embryogenesis, regeneration, and cancer. Trends in Cell Biology, 32(6), 401–414.

6. Prigogine, I. (1978). Time, structure, and fluctuations. Science, 201(4358), 777–785.

7. Sahu, S., Ghosh, S., Fujita, D., & Bandyopadhyay, A. (2013). Live visualizations of single isolated tubulin protein self-assembly via tunneling current: a biomolecular electronics approach. Scientific Reports, 3, 1282.

8. Szczęsny, B., & Levin, M. (2025). Bioelectric control of actin cytoskeleton organization. Developmental Cell, 60(1), 45–59.

9. Živković, J., et al. (2025). Proton-coupled water phonons enable ultrafast energy transfer. Nature Physics, 21, 155–162.