



[Home](#) [Licensing](#) [Patents](#) [Articles](#)

Lyra Health Measures Outcomes, Not Coherence Trajectories

by [Nick Clark](#) | Published March 28, 2026 | [PDF](#)

Lyra Health provides evidence-based therapy through a curated provider network and measures clinical outcomes to demonstrate effectiveness. The platform tracks symptom reduction, functional improvement, and return-to-work metrics. The outcome measurement is rigorous and differentiates Lyra from mental health benefits that cannot demonstrate results. But measuring outcomes after treatment is structurally different from modeling the cognitive disruption that caused the symptoms. Outcomes tell you whether treatment worked. Disruption modeling tells you what went wrong and how coherence degraded before symptoms appeared.

What Lyra Health built

Lyra's platform provides access to therapists and coaches who deliver evidence-based treatments, with clinical outcomes measured through validated instruments administered at regular intervals throughout treatment. The measurement approach allows Lyra to demonstrate that its provider network produces measurable improvement and that employer investment in mental health benefits generates quantifiable return.

The outcome measurement tracks symptom severity over the course of treatment. PHQ-9 for depression, GAD-7 for anxiety, and other validated instruments capture whether symptoms are improving, stable, or worsening. This information is valuable for treatment management. But the instruments measure symptoms, not the underlying cognitive dynamics that produce them. Two individuals with identical PHQ-9 scores may have entirely different disruption patterns: one experiencing attention fragmentation, the other experiencing containment collapse. The outcome measurement does not distinguish between these structurally different conditions.

The gap between outcome measurement and disruption modeling

Outcome measurement captures the surface: are symptoms improving? Disruption modeling captures the structure: what pattern of cognitive coherence loss produced these symptoms? The distinction has practical treatment implications. An individual whose symptoms improve because they have developed a coping mechanism that masks the underlying disruption shows positive outcomes on measurement instruments. The disruption model would show that the phase shift on the promotion-containment continuum remains active and the coping mechanism is a containment strategy that defers rather than resolves the disruption.

The five-axis diagnostic framework provides structural specificity that outcome instruments lack. Attention fragmentation produces different symptoms than containment collapse, but both can present as depression on the PHQ-9. The treatment for each is different. The outcome measurement says whether the score improved. The disruption model says which pattern is active and whether the intervention is addressing the actual structure of the disruption rather than its symptomatic surface.

Trajectory monitoring matters for relapse prevention. Outcome measurement captures improvement during active treatment. Disruption modeling tracks the cognitive trajectory continuously, detecting when a previously resolved disruption pattern begins to re-emerge. The early detection enables intervention before symptoms recur, rather than waiting for the next episode to trigger reassessment.

What disruption modeling enables for outcome-measured care

With disruption modeling integrated into Lyra's outcome measurement, treatment progress is measured at both the symptom level and the structural level. A therapist can see not only that PHQ-9 scores are improving but that the specific disruption pattern is resolving: attention fragmentation is reducing, the promotion-containment balance is normalizing, and the individual's cognitive coherence trajectory is stabilizing.

Therapeutic dosing becomes more precise. The disruption model specifies the current phase and severity of the disruption. Treatment intensity can be calibrated to the disruption dynamics rather than to symptom severity alone. An individual in acute phase shift may need intensive intervention regardless of their symptom score. An individual with high symptom scores but a stabilizing disruption trajectory may need maintenance rather than escalation.

The ROI measurement that differentiates Lyra in the employer market becomes more comprehensive. Instead of demonstrating symptom reduction alone, the platform can demonstrate structural coherence restoration, which is a more durable outcome. Employers investing in mental health benefits want sustained workforce capability, not temporary symptom suppression. Disruption modeling provides the measurement framework for durable coherence.

The structural requirement

Lyra Health solved clinical outcome measurement for employer mental health benefits. The structural gap is between measuring symptom change and modeling cognitive disruption trajectories. Disruption modeling provides structural diagnostic specificity beyond symptom instruments, trajectory monitoring for relapse prevention, and therapeutic dosing calibrated to disruption dynamics rather than symptom severity alone.

[Disruption Modeling All 21 steps →](#)

Recognize cognitive disruption before it stabilizes.

Primary Technical Disclosure

◦ [AQ-DSM: Diagnosing Cognitive Disruption as Loss of Coherence](#)

Secondary Technical

◦ [Cognitive Disruption as Architectural Phase-Shift](#)◦ [The Promotion-Containment Continuum](#)◦ [Attention Fragmentation: Reward-Biased Over-Promotion of Speculative Branches](#)◦ [Containment Collapse: Loss of the Speculation-Verification Boundary](#)◦ [Channel-Locked Promotion With Tolerance Escalation](#)◦ [Five-Axis Disruption Diagnostic Framework](#)◦ [Computable Therapeutic Dosing for Cognitive Disruption](#)◦ [Intergenerational Coherence Burden in Agent Lineages](#)◦ [Agent Self-Diagnosis and Autonomous Coherence Monitoring](#)◦ [Phase-Shift Early Warning System for Cognitive Disruption](#)◦ [Coherence Restoration Protocol Library](#)◦ [Positive and Negative Symptom Analogs in Containment Failure](#)◦ [Coherence Authorization Failure: Self-Disabling Execution](#)◦ [Pathological Verification Loop: Recursive Containment Audit Failure](#)◦ [Dissociation as Simulation Bypass: Acting on Unverified Planning](#)◦ [Affective Gradient Collapse: Self-Esteem Floor Lock](#)◦ [Resilience as Structural Capacity for Coherence Restoration](#)◦ [Personality Configuration Analogs From Stabilized Coping Regimes](#)◦ [Structural Dependency Patterns Between Agents](#)◦ [Destabilizing Attachment: Mutual Disruption Amplification](#)◦ [Resource-Depletion Pattern: Cognitive Operation Under Scarcity](#)◦ [Therapeutic Agent Interaction Through Behavioral State Recognition](#)◦ [Companion AI Relational Safety Constraints](#)◦ [Multi-Agent Group Coherence Dynamics](#)

Applications (General)

◦ [Coping Under Empathic Pressure: HSP, Narcissism, and Psychopathy as Control-Loop Intercepts](#)◦ [Two Faces of Codependency: Structural Entrapment vs. Emotional Entrapment Under Empathic Pressure](#)◦ [Starving for Each Other: Anxious-Avoidant Attachment as a Semantic Starvation Loop](#)◦ [Intimacy Collapse: A Structural Model of Trauma and Resilience](#)◦ [Structural Diagnosis: How Reward-Modulated Cognition Phase-Shifts Into ADHD and Schizophrenia](#)◦ [Clinical AI Therapeutic Monitoring Through Phase-Shift Detection](#)◦ [Autonomous Agent Fleet Health Through Coherence Diagnostics](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Workplace Burnout Detection](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Military Operator Resilience](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Financial Trader Monitoring](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Student Mental Health](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for Caregiver Fatigue Detection](#)◦ [Disruption Modeling for First Responder Resilience](#)

Applications (Specific)

[◦ BetterHelp Cannot Detect When Therapy Is Making Things Worse](#)[◦ Talkspace Has No Model of Therapeutic Destabilization](#)[◦ Headspace Cannot Detect When Mindfulness Destabilizes](#)[◦ Noom Tracks Behavior Without Modeling Cognitive Disruption](#)[◦ Spring Health Matches Therapists, Not Disruption Patterns](#)[● Lyra Health Measures Outcomes, Not Coherence Trajectories](#)[◦ Ginger.io Detects Behavioral Signals Without a Disruption Model](#)[◦ Cerebral Prescribes Medication Without Modeling Disruption Dynamics](#)[◦ Modern Health Offers a Care Spectrum Without Disruption Diagnostics](#)[◦ Calm Business Offers Relaxation, Not Disruption Detection](#)
[Disruption Modeling overview →](#)

AQ

deterministic

autonomy

Legal

Subject to one or more pending U.S. and international patent applications, see [Patents](#) for the current list and status. No license, express or implied, is granted. Any use requires a separate written agreement—see [Licensing](#). Patent applications referenced on this site are pending. Claim scope, if any, is subject to examination and may issue in altered form or not at all. See [Legal](#) for terms and conditions.

Adaptive Query™ is a trademark of Nicholas Clark. U.S. federal registration is pending, federal registration. AQ™, AQ Inside™, Adaptive Index™, Adaptive Network™, Semantic Agent™, @AQ™, AQID™, and Adaptive Coin™ are used as trademarks in connection with the Adaptive Query platform and brand. Other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

Platform operated by Adaptive Query LLC, which provides patent and trademark licensing services. Copyright © 2025-2026 Nicholas Clark. All rights reserved.

Last updated: 2026-03-03



- [Inventive Steps](#)
- [Licensing](#)
- [Patents](#)
- [Articles](#)
- [Legal](#)
- [Opportunities](#)
- [Sitemap](#)



-
- nick@qu3ry.net
- 72 28 14 36 01



[Invented by Nick Clark](#) | Founding Investors: Devin Wilkie