

UBINODES

ANXIETY & COGNITIVE PERFORMANCE: A PRACTICAL GUIDE.

How everyday inputs — caffeine, cortisol, alcohol, screens, the people around us, and our devices — drive anxiety and shape focus, judgement and well-being.

Caffeine · Cortisol · Anxiety · Sleep · Cognitive Performance

ubinodes.org

Published under the European Union Public License, v1.2 (EUPL-1.2).

TL;DR — This guide explains how a handful of everyday inputs — caffeine and the cortisol they trigger, alcohol, television and news, social media, the people around us, and wireless devices — raise or lower anxiety, and how that anxiety in turn governs focus, memory and judgement in demanding work. For each input it states the mechanism, what the best evidence shows, and a plain, usable recommendation. §01–§02 cover caffeine and cortisol; §03–§07 cover alcohol, screens, social feeds, social environment, and EMF.

Estimated reading time: full document 34 min · Caffeine & cortisol (§01–§02) only: 9 min · Alcohol (§03) only: 6 min.

Who this applies to. The advice here applies to any adult who consumes caffeine, watches the news, uses social platforms, drinks alcohol, or shares space with other people — whether you work remotely, in an office, or independently. Anxiety and stimulant sensitivity are universal, not occupational. Where a recommendation is specific to a sub-group — for example women in a low-oestrogen phase, or people already prone to anxiety — it is marked as such.

Contents.

§	Section
00	About This Guide
01	Caffeine and the Energy Illusion
02	Cortisol, Stress and Sex Differences
03	Alcohol and Clear Judgement
04	Television, Reading and Attention
05	Social Media and the Distortion Loop
06	The People Around You
07	Wireless Devices and the Precautionary Question
08	Why We Published This
09	Sources
—	Change Log

00. ABOUT THIS GUIDE.

Ubinodes is a distributed network of independent professionals. Our work is not done in one office under one roof; it is done by people operating alone, in different markets, on their own schedules. The quality of the network depends on the quality of thinking each person can sustain in their own focused hours — and that thinking is shaped, for better or worse, by a handful of everyday inputs most of us never examine.

This guide takes those inputs one at a time — caffeine and cortisol, alcohol, television and news, social media, the people around us, and wireless devices — and asks two questions of each: how does it act on the body and brain, and what does that mean for anxiety and clear thinking? Anxiety is the thread that runs through all of them. Each of these inputs can raise the body's stress-signalling load, and chronically elevated stress hormones impair exactly the faculties knowledge work depends on: working memory, concentration, and judgement. Managing these inputs is therefore not a wellness nicety; it is cognitive maintenance.

For each topic we give the mechanism, summarise the best available evidence, and end with a plain, usable recommendation. Every factual statement is referenced; the full numbered source list, with links, appears at the end. This is a synthesis of published research, not medical advice — for personal health decisions, consult a qualified professional.

A note on sources. We lead with independent primary research — peer-reviewed studies, systematic reviews and consortium analyses — rather than the position of any single institution. This includes treating the World Health Organization with appropriate caution: only around an eighth of its budget comes from unrestricted member dues, while roughly four-fifths arrives as “earmarked” voluntary contributions directed by a small number of wealthy states and foundations [53][54]. We therefore cite the WHO where it usefully summarises the underlying science, but the weight of each claim rests on the independent research it draws on, not on the institution's authority.

01. CAFFEINE AND THE ENERGY ILLUSION.

Caffeine does not generate energy. It works mainly by blocking adenosine receptors in the brain — adenosine being the molecule that accumulates during waking hours and signals rising sleep pressure. By occupying those receptors without activating them, caffeine masks the perception of fatigue rather than removing the fatigue itself; when it clears, the accumulated sleep pressure is still there [1][2]. The practical consequence is that caffeine is best used deliberately, as a tool, rather than as a default fuel that quietly accrues a sleep debt.

01.1 Cortisol, in Brief.

Caffeine activates the body's stress axis and raises cortisol, particularly after a period of abstinence [3][4]. Habitual daily drinkers develop partial tolerance: the morning cortisol response is largely blunted, although repeated afternoon doses can still produce measurable elevation [3]. So the cortisol effect is real but it is not the unchecked, all-day stress response that popular accounts imply. Because cortisol is where caffeine, stress and anxiety meet — and because the response differs markedly between men and women — it is treated in its own right in §02.

01.2 Hydration and Minerals.

The dehydration claim is, at moderate intake, false. The best-controlled study — a counterbalanced crossover trial in habitual coffee drinkers — found no significant difference in total body water or 24-hour urine volume between coffee and water [5]. A diuretic effect appears only at high single doses (around 6 mg per kilogram of body weight); at ordinary intakes the fluid in the cup more than offsets any mild diuresis [5][6].

Caffeine and mineral loss. Caffeine produces a small, transient increase in the urinary excretion of calcium, magnesium, sodium, and inorganic phosphate for several hours after consumption; potassium loss has been documented in animal models, and the polyphenols in coffee can additionally reduce iron and zinc absorption by binding them in the gut before they reach the bloodstream [7][55][56][57]. At typical intake the calcium effect amounts to roughly 2–3 mg per cup — a fraction of the 700–1000 mg recommended daily intake — and in adults eating a varied diet, intestinal absorption partly compensates for the urinary loss. The net mineral cost is therefore negligible for most people. The compensation is less reliable in older adults and in anyone whose baseline mineral intake is already low; those readers should ensure their overall diet — rather than any single meal — provides a genuine surplus above the caffeine-induced loss. Large genetic studies find no harmful effect on bone density at moderate consumption, and this holds for both calcium and magnesium [8][55][7].

01.3 Sleep, Dose, and Anxiety.

Where caution genuinely is warranted is sleep and dose. Caffeine reliably disrupts sleep when taken too late: a meta-analysis found it reduces total sleep time by around 45 minutes and recommends a cut-off roughly 9 hours before bed, and 400 mg taken even 6 hours before bed measurably shortened sleep in a controlled trial — often without the drinker noticing [9][10]. The effect on mood is dose-dependent: moderate doses sharpen vigilance, but anxiety rises steeply at and above 400 mg per day [11]. The European Food Safety Authority sets the safe threshold for healthy adults at 400 mg per day, with single doses up to 200 mg [12].

01.3.1 Safe Thresholds in Espresso Terms.

Milligrams are precise but not intuitive; most readers think in cups. In espresso terms, 400 mg corresponds to roughly **5–6 single shots** (or 3 doubles) across the day; 200 mg corresponds to roughly **2–3 single shots** (or 1–2 doubles) in one sitting [112][113][114]. These figures are an orientation only: caffeine content varies significantly by bean variety, roast, machine pressure, and preparation — a double espresso can range from 90 mg to 150 mg depending on the source.

Drink	Typical caffeine content
Single espresso (30 ml)	60–75 mg (USDA average ≈ 63 mg)
Double espresso (60 ml)	90–150 mg (average ≈ 120–126 mg)
Filter / drip coffee (240 ml)	80–120 mg per cup
Americano (double + water)	90–150 mg
Capsule machine (Nespresso-style)	60–120 mg depending on pod

Caffeine content by preparation; consolidated from espresso-caffeine references [112][113][114] and MedlinePlus [58].

01.3.2 Last Coffee by Bedtime.

Translating the 5–7 hour half-life into a rule of thumb gives a simple stop-time for the day’s last cup.

Intended bedtime	Last recommended espresso
22:00	15:00–16:00 at the latest
23:00	16:00–17:00 at the latest
00:00	17:00–18:00 at the latest

Based on a 5–7 hour caffeine half-life; individual metabolism varies [58].

01.4 Sensitive Readers.

The “offset by an adequate diet” caveat does not apply equally to everyone. Older adults, people on restricted diets, and anyone with low mineral reserves compensate less reliably for the urinary mineral loss, and people already prone to anxiety feel the dose-dependent rise in anxiety sooner. These readers should treat the lower end of the safe range as their working ceiling.

01.5 Recommendation.

Use caffeine deliberately rather than as a default fuel; keep it well clear of bedtime; stay under 400 mg per day and 200 mg per dose; and, if you are in a higher-sensitivity group, sit at the lower end. “Coffee dehydrates you” and “it drains your minerals” do not hold at moderate intake; the genuine concerns are late-day sleep disruption and anxiety at high doses.

Quick Reference — Caffeine and Your Day.

At a glance	
Safe daily ceiling	400 mg $\approx$ 5–6 single espressos (or 3 doubles), spread across the day.
Single-dose ceiling	200 mg $\approx$ 2–3 single shots (or 1–2 doubles) in one sitting.
Last coffee before bed	Stop $\approx$ 8–9 hours before bedtime; caffeine's half-life is 5–7 hours.
What it does	Masks fatigue by blocking adenosine — it does not create energy.
What it does not do	It does not dehydrate you or drain minerals at moderate intake.
Watch for	Anxiety climbs steeply at ≥ 400 mg/day; late doses cut sleep without you noticing.
Higher-sensitivity groups	Pregnant women, adolescents, the caffeine-sensitive, and women on oral contraceptives or perimenopausal should sit at the lower end of the range.

Orientation only; caffeine content varies by bean, roast and preparation, and individual metabolism differs.

02. CORTISOL, STRESS AND SEX DIFFERENCES.

Cortisol is the body's primary stress hormone, released by the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis. In short bursts it is useful: it mobilises energy and sharpens attention. Chronically elevated, it does the opposite — it impairs working memory, concentration and decision quality, the faculties this guide is concerned with. Caffeine is one trigger of the cortisol response (§01.1); stress, poor sleep, alcohol, screens and the people around us are others. Because the response is not uniform between men and women, and because that difference is widely misunderstood, it is worth setting out carefully.

02.1 The Acute Peak: Men Typically Spike Higher.

Four independent studies using the Trier Social Stress Test — public speaking plus mental arithmetic under observation — consistently found that men produce cortisol peaks **1.5-to-2-fold higher** than women in response to acute psychological stress. A Johns Hopkins study confirmed that after a psychological stressor, ACTH and cortisol responses were significantly greater in men ($p = 0.019$ and $p = 0.034$). The same pattern holds in older adults [59][60][61]. This challenges the intuitive assumption that women are the “more reactive” sex: for psychological stressors, they are not. Men mount a larger, sharper fight-or-flight response.

02.2 Recovery and Burden: Where Women Differ.

Where women differ is not in peak magnitude but in **variability and sustained elevation**. A large UK sample found women were **49% more likely to have raised cortisol levels** than men. Women also show higher cortisol fluctuations tied to their hormonal cycles, and a greater tendency to ruminate on stressful events — prolonging the subjective and physiological duration of stress [62][63]. The mechanism is well documented: **oestrogen generally enhances HPA-axis responsiveness**, making the axis more easily re-triggered. So while a woman's acute peak may be lower than a man's for a matched stressor, her axis is more readily re-activated across the day, and at certain cycle phases she can show responses equivalent to or exceeding a man's [64][65][66].

The most defensible summary is therefore precise: women do not universally recover more slowly from a single cortisol peak, but they carry a higher baseline cortisol burden, are re-activated more easily across the day, and are more vulnerable to HPA dysregulation during hormonal transitions such as perimenopause and the postpartum period [67][65].

02.3 The Menstrual Cycle as a Modulator.

HPA reactivity in women is not a fixed property — it oscillates across the cycle.

Phase	Cortisol stress response
Early follicular (low oestradiol)	Higher — closer to male levels.
Late follicular & luteal (high oestradiol/progesterone)	Lower response to the same stressor.
Perimenopause & menopause	Declining oestrogen can destabilise the axis — prolonged responses, higher risk of HPA hyperactivity.

HPA reactivity by menstrual-cycle phase [65][68][69]. The same woman responds differently to a given caffeine dose depending on where she is in her cycle.

02.4 Caffeine plus Stress: Sex-Specific Findings.

Two laboratory findings sharpen the picture. First, the cortisol response to mental stress was smaller in women than in men ($p = .003$); caffeine acted in concert with mental stress to raise cortisol further in both sexes, but the absolute rise was still larger in men [4]. Second, in a study of pairs working under stress, caffeine had **opposite** effects by sex: under high stress it impaired men's memory and problem-solving speed, while the same dose improved women's performance in pairs — puzzle-solving times around 100 seconds faster — a result the researchers attribute to men's fight-or-flight versus women's tend-and-befriend response to stress [70][71].

02.5 Who Should Be Most Careful.

The practical implication is more targeted than “coffee is worse for women.” It is specifically relevant for women in a low-oestrogen phase (early follicular), perimenopausal women, oral-contraceptive users — whose HPA axis already shows stress-like elevation — and anyone already presenting elevated baseline cortisol. For these sub-groups, caffeine’s cortisol-stimulating effect compounds an axis already under strain, and caffeine can also slow oestrogen clearance in the liver, amplifying hormonal disruption [72][73][74].

Dimension	Men	Women
Acute cortisol peak (caffeine + stress)	Higher absolute rise	Lower rise, but higher sensitivity to re-activation
Cognitive effect of caffeine under stress	Often impaired (fight-or-flight amplified)	Often neutral or beneficial in collaborative settings
Chronic cortisol burden	Lower reported prevalence	49% more likely to have raised baseline
HPA variability	Relatively stable across the month	Cycle-dependent; greatest in early follicular phase and perimenopause
Oestrogen–caffeine interaction	—	Caffeine can slow oestrogen clearance, amplifying disruption

Sex differences in the caffeine–cortisol interaction [4][65][62][68][70][72].

02.6 A Necessary Caution on Interpretation.

These are hormonal patterns, not statements about competence. The higher acute male cortisol response in fight-or-flight stressors does not make men “better” under pressure, and women’s tend-and-befriend pattern may suit them well to collaborative, sustained high-stress work — as the caffeine-in-pairs finding suggests. The claim that women are “less suited” to high-stress occupations on these grounds is **not supported** by the cortisol literature, which addresses physiology, not professional capability [70][71].

02.7 Recommendation.

Treat cortisol, not caffeine alone, as the quantity to manage. Protect sleep, limit late caffeine, and be aware that the cost of a given dose is personal and, for women, cycle-dependent. Women who are perimenopausal, using oral contraceptives, or already carrying a high cortisol load are well advised to treat caffeine as one additional load on an axis under strain and to stay at the lower end of the safe range.

03. ALCOHOL AND CLEAR JUDGEMENT.

For knowledge work the relevant fact about alcohol is simple: it impairs memory, judgement and mental sharpness — the faculties the work depends on — and the safest working assumption is that less is always better. The independent evidence is, if anything, more striking than the slogans about it. The large Global Burden of Disease analysis published in The Lancet found that across the combined health outcomes it examined, the level of consumption that minimises harm is zero [14]. Alcohol is classified as a Group 1 carcinogen — the highest category, alongside tobacco and asbestos — by the International Agency for Research on Cancer [13]. National agencies reviewing the same research independently reach consistent conclusions: Canada's 2023 guidance describes a continuum of risk that is low at two standard drinks or fewer per week and summarised in the principle that “drinking less is better” [15].

03.1 Alcohol and the Anxiety Rebound.

Beyond the long-term risks, alcohol has an acute effect directly relevant to anxiety and clear thinking. Alcohol initially lowers anxiety by enhancing GABA, the brain's calming neurotransmitter, and suppressing glutamate, the excitatory one — the familiar initial relaxation. The problem is pharmacokinetic: as the alcohol clears, both systems snap back. Glutamate surges, GABA falls below baseline, and the brain enters a state of heightened threat sensitivity — more anxious than before the first drink [75][76][77]. At the same time the cortisol response, briefly suppressed, rebounds and can remain elevated into the following morning — the physiological substrate of “hangxiety”. Regular or heavy drinking causes the brain to upregulate production of the stress-signalling peptide CRF, raising the chronic anxiety set-point, so that anxiety between sessions grows over time rather than diminishing [78][79][77].

This makes treating anxiety with alcohol self-defeating: it masks the symptom in the short term while amplifying the very mechanism that produces it. People prone to anxiety are disproportionately likely to drink to manage it, and each session's rebound nudges the baseline a little higher — the cruelty of the cycle.

03.2 Neuronal Loss: Alcohol as a Direct Neurotoxin.

The anxiety rebound is not the whole cognitive story. Alcohol is a confirmed direct neurotoxin — it kills neurons — and the mechanism is multi-pronged. When the liver metabolises ethanol it produces **acetaldehyde** (a Group 1 carcinogen in its own right) together with reactive oxygen species, which trigger inflammation and programmed cell death throughout the nervous system [116][117][118]. The damage is not confined to heavy use. A University of Pennsylvania study of more than 36,000 adults found that going from one to two daily drinks was associated with brain changes equivalent to about **two years of accelerated ageing** in a fifty-year-old, and from two to three drinks about three and a half years — loss of both grey and white matter [119].

Two further findings sharpen the picture. A thirty-year British Whitehall study found moderate drinkers had roughly **three times** the risk of hippocampal shrinkage compared with non-drinkers, and heavy drinkers about **six times** — and the hippocampus governs the very memory formation this guide is trying to protect [120]. Harvard researchers report that cortical tissue reduction is continuous across all drinking levels rather than a threshold effect that begins only at heavy use, and that the reduction persists even in recovered drinkers who have long abstained [121]. Chronic use also depletes vitamin B1 (thiamine), risking Wernicke-Korsakoff syndrome — a life-threatening condition causing profound memory, learning and motor impairment [122].

03.3 The Gut Microbiome and the Gut-Brain Axis.

A pathway absent from earlier versions of this guide is the gut, where the damage is rapid and cascading. Alcohol measurably disrupts the gut microbiome in **under two weeks**, reducing beneficial bacteria — Lactobacillus, Bifidobacterium, Faecalibacterium prausnitzii, Akkermansia muciniphila — and promoting less favourable strains [123][126]. It also weakens the tight junctions of the intestinal lining, producing increased gut permeability (“leaky gut”). Bacterial endotoxins (lipopolysaccharides) then leak into the circulation, driving systemic inflammation, oxidative stress, insulin resistance and endothelial dysfunction [125][124].

This matters for cognition because the gut and brain are coupled. Alcohol-driven dysbiosis alters neurotransmitter production, promotes neuroinflammation, and has been linked in animal models to memory loss and anxiety- and depression-like states — a direct, underappreciated route back to the cognitive harm the rest of this guide is concerned with [123]. The same dysbiosis drives the **gut-liver axis**: alcoholic liver disease progressing from fatty liver to cirrhosis and, in the worst case, hepatocellular carcinoma [124].

03.4 Immune Suppression.

Alcohol also suppresses immunity, across both its innate and adaptive arms. Even a single heavy session — five to six drinks — can suppress the immune system for up to **24 hours**; chronic use reduces CD4+ and CD8+ T-cell counts, impairs macrophage and monocyte function, and disrupts B-cell activity [127][128]. Heavy drinking raises IgA levels (a marker for alcohol-associated liver disease) while chronic stress and drinking can lower IgG, the primary antibody for fighting systemic infection [129][130]. Alcohol further impairs the respiratory epithelium’s ability to clear mucus, silently weakening lung defences and leaving heavy drinkers with a **three-to-seven-fold** higher vulnerability to severe respiratory infection [127][128].

03.5 The Collapsing “Moderate Drinking” Myth.

The claim that zero is the risk-minimising level is not new, but the surrounding consensus has shifted sharply. The once-standard belief that moderate drinking protects the heart has been largely overturned: the studies that supported it suffered from “sick-quitter” bias, in which people who had stopped drinking because they were already ill were counted among the abstainers, making drinkers look healthier by comparison [131]. The table below summarises where the evidence now stands.

Once-common claim	Status in 2024–2025
Moderate drinking protects the heart.	Largely overturned — earlier studies were confounded by “sick-quitter” bias [131].
Low intake lowers all-cause mortality.	A 2024 JAMA study of more than 135,000 adults aged 60+ found even moderate intake raised death rates [131].
A “safe” threshold exists.	WHO (2023), Canada (2023) and Stanford experts (2025) conclude there is no safe level [131][13][15].
Cancer risk starts only at heavy use.	Even under one drink a day raises digestive-tract and breast-cancer risk; alcohol is tied to over 5% of US cancers [131][132].

*The moderate-drinking consensus in 2024–2025 [131][132][13][15].
Canada's 2023 guidance now recommends a maximum of two drinks per week for all adults — down from two per day, a tenfold reduction in what was once called “moderate”.*

One mechanism ties the neurotoxicity, the gut damage and the cancer risk together. **Acetaldehyde** — the first product of ethanol metabolism — forms DNA adducts, inhibits DNA repair and causes epigenetic changes across every tissue it contacts, not just the liver; and gut bacteria themselves produce acetaldehyde locally in the colon, extending carcinogenic exposure beyond what the liver processes [118][133]. The same molecule that damages neurons is at work in the gut and in the tissues where alcohol-related cancers arise.

03.6 Recommendation.

Keep important judgements clear of alcohol, and treat “a drink to take the edge off” with particular suspicion if you are anxious: the edge returns sharper. The cognitive case is no longer only about the acute rebound — neuronal loss, gut disruption and immune suppression are substantial, well-documented, and present even at what was historically called “moderate” consumption. For clear thinking, the risk-minimising level is low to none [13][14][15].

04. TELEVISION, READING AND ATTENTION.

Reading is a more effortful, active form of attention than passive viewing, and for serious comprehension the medium matters. A meta-analysis of 54 studies covering more than 171,000 participants found a modest but consistent advantage for reading on paper over screens, strongest for informational texts and under time pressure, and — contrary to the “digital natives” assumption — the advantage grew over time rather than shrinking [18]. Controlled studies point the same way [19], and the cognitive neuroscientist Maryanne Wolf argues that the skimming habits screens encourage short-circuit the “deep reading” processes — inference, reflection, critical analysis — that complex material requires [20]. The older folk claim that television “hypnotises” the viewer is false — the brain-wave patterns during viewing are those of ordinary relaxed wakefulness, not a trance [16] [17] — but the sounder habit survives: prefer information you can read and interrogate over information broadcast passively at you.

04.1 Television, Fear, and the Calibration of Risk.

Television’s more important effect, for our purposes, is on anxiety. Regular news consumption reshapes the viewer’s sense of how dangerous the world is — not through dramatic revelation but through gradual accumulation. Communications researchers call this **cultivation**: heavy viewers come to perceive rates of violence and threat as far higher than the statistics show, a phenomenon George Gerbner named the **mean world syndrome** [21][80] [81]. At the neurological level, repeated exposure to threatening content activates the amygdala — the brain’s threat-detection centre — and sustains cortisol secretion. With chronic over-activation, the prefrontal cortex becomes less effective at moderating the alarm response, and the baseline anxiety level rises [82].

The dose-response pattern is measurable. A study of 500 adults during an active military conflict found that viewers consuming more news than usual were **1.6 times more likely** to report at least one anxiety symptom — uncontrolled fear, physiological hyperarousal, sleeping difficulty, fearful thoughts — than those watching the same amount or less; a Swedish panel study confirmed that both mainstream and alternative news orientations cultivated anxiety about different issue domains [83][84]. This is not incidental: negativity dominates newsroom selection because alarming content reliably captures and holds attention. Short-term, the effect is clearer still — consuming negative news reliably worsens mood [22].

04.2 Recommendation.

Prefer reading you can interrogate to broadcast you absorb. Treat news as something you consult deliberately, in bounded amounts, rather than leave running — a continuous feed of alarming content engineers a state of arousal and a distorted risk map without informing you proportionately [82][84].

05. SOCIAL MEDIA AND THE DISTORTION LOOP.

Because engagement-based algorithms reward attention, they systematically favour content that is morally charged, outrage-inducing and hostile to the political out-group. A study of 12.7 million tweets showed that social feedback teaches users to express more outrage over time [23]; an analysis of 2.7 million posts found out-group hostility the single strongest predictor of sharing [24]; and a pre-registered randomised experiment found that Twitter's engagement algorithm amplified anger and out-group animosity and made users feel worse — even though they did not actually prefer that content [25]. Negative material travels further: across 12,448 controlled headline experiments, each negative word raised the click-through rate by about 2.3% [26]. The “filter bubble” of total informational isolation, by contrast, is weaker than commonly assumed: empirical studies repeatedly find users see largely similar results, and simply “seeing the other side” can increase rather than decrease polarisation [27][28]. The accurate framing is not that algorithms wall you off, but that they amplify the most divisive and emotionally arousing material.

05.1 Social Media, Comparison, and the Architecture of Anxiety.

Social platforms are engineered around two of the most powerful anxiety-generating mechanisms in human psychology: the fear of social exclusion and the drive for social comparison. When a user perceives they are missing out, the amygdala activates and the HPA axis responds as if to a real threat; the dopamine reward system is simultaneously exploited through unpredictable notifications — a variable-ratio reinforcement schedule, the pattern that most reliably produces compulsive behaviour [85][86]. Meanwhile the feed presents a systematically upward-biased sample of others' lives, producing chronic comparison against an unrepresentative standard and steadily lowering self-esteem. A study of 327 users found FoMO, social comparison, information overload and meritocracy pressure all positively associated with stress, which in turn predicted anxiety — stress being the critical mediating variable [86][87][88]. Systematic reviews link regular use to increased rates of depression, anxiety and psychological distress, and a three-week restriction experiment found measurable reductions in both loneliness and depression [89][87].

An important nuance. The anxiety mechanism appears to be cumulative and cognitive rather than acute. A rigorous 2024 crossover experiment found that 20-minute bouts of social media use did not elicit a physiological cortisol response in either sex — heart rate and cortisol actually fell during the session. The harm accumulates in the pattern of use — in the daily recalibration of self-worth against a distorted social mirror — not in any single session's hormonal spike [90][91].

05.2 Recommendation.

Treat what you see on these platforms as a lead to verify rather than a fact to repeat, and treat your total exposure as the variable that matters: bound it, since the cost is cumulative. The platforms amplify outrage and erode self-esteem by design; neither is a reliable input to clear professional judgement [23][25][89].

06. THE PEOPLE AROUND YOU.

“You are the average of the five people you spend the most time with” is a motivational aphorism attributed to Jim Rohn; the figure of five and the literal “averaging” have no scientific basis [29]. But the underlying claim — that the people around you reshape your psychology, biology and behaviour — is now one of the better-supported propositions in social neuroscience and epidemiology, and it bears directly on both cognition and anxiety.

06.1 Peer Effects, Contagion and the Cost of Incivility.

Peer effects on productivity are real but modest, and partly social: a classic study of supermarket cashiers found a 10% rise in coworkers’ ability raised an individual’s output by roughly 1.5%, and only when the more productive worker was visible — implicating social pressure rather than learning [30]. In remote work, where output is unobserved, that channel largely disappears. Emotions, however, are genuinely contagious: a controlled study confirmed one person’s mood spreads to others, positive mood improving cooperation and negative mood doing the reverse [31]. The cost of negativity is the best-documented part — and larger than most assume: a single uncivil encounter cut performance on word puzzles by 61% and creative output by 58%, operating through working memory rather than mere bad feeling, and even witnesses performed worse [32]. For complex problem-solving, cognitive diversity is an asset: diverse groups can outperform groups of the individually highest performers, given psychological safety and a way to integrate differing views [33].

06.2 The Neuroscience of Social Contagion.

Why this happens is increasingly clear at the level of mechanism. **Mirror neurons** — discovered in the early 1990s in the premotor cortex of macaques by Rizzolatti's group at Parma — fire identically whether an action is performed or merely observed; intracranial recordings confirm the system in humans [44][92]. In people the system extends beyond motor acts to emotions: observing another's fear or anxiety recruits some of the same circuits as experiencing it directly. This is the neural substrate of **emotional contagion** — the automatic, largely unconscious synchronisation of emotional states through facial micro-expressions, tone, posture and movement, processed below conscious awareness. A person sharing space with a chronically anxious individual has their own amygdala and HPA axis stimulated by that continuous stream of signals, without choosing to [93][94].

A second mechanism is more measurable. In **hyperscanning** studies — simultaneous neuroimaging of two interacting people — neural oscillations in the prefrontal cortex, temporal-parietal junction and anterior cingulate become temporally aligned; a Princeton study found that the degree to which a listener's brain anticipates the speaker's predicts how much the listener understands [46][95]. This synchrony is consistently weaker over video or text than in physical presence [46], and researchers caution that its full meaning is still being worked out [47]. Stress specifically synchronises: a 2021 study found an individual's cortisol trajectory was partly predicted by their group members' cortisol, independent of their own prior levels — the HPA axis partially calibrating to the stress of the people around it [96].

06.3 Three Degrees of Influence — and Anxiety as a Transmissible State.

The epidemiology shows the scale. Reanalysing 20 years of data on 4,739 people in the Framingham Heart Study, Christakis and Fowler found that emotional states spread up to **three degrees of separation** — your mood is measurably influenced by the friends of your friends' friends [29][97]. A happy friend within a mile raises your probability of being happy by 25%; a happy next-door neighbour by 34%; each additional happy contact by about 9%, each unhappy one lowering it by about 7% [98]. The same three-degree structure appears for obesity, smoking cessation, drinking and loneliness. One nuance refines the aphorism: in this data happiness spread between close friends and neighbours but not between coworkers — distance dilutes the effect.

Anxiety in particular travels. A landmark 2024 study tracked over **700,000 Finnish adolescents** for a median of 11 years, using school classes as networks (students cannot choose classmates, removing the obvious confound): exposure to one classmate with an anxiety disorder raised a student's risk of later anxiety diagnosis by **9%** within a year, and to two or more by **18%**, persisting after controlling for parental mental health, class size, school and regional factors [99][100]. A 2025 review found that healthy individuals can acquire negative emotions through prolonged proximity to an exposed person even without witnessing the triggering event, naming anxiety explicitly [101]; and an analysis of 70 million Weibo posts found angry content spread faster and wider than happiness, sadness or disgust [102]. The social environment is wired for the rapid propagation of fear.

06.4 The Biological Cost of Poor Social Connection.

The absence of good connection carries its own load. Loneliness is now treated as a public-health problem: a 2023 Gallup study across 142 countries estimated roughly a billion people experience it, and a CDC analysis found lonely adults **3.6 times more likely** to report high stress than connected peers [103][104]. Loneliness produces long-term fight-or-flight activation, suppresses immune function and raises inflammatory markers in a dose-response pattern; a major meta-analysis placed social isolation on the same mortality-risk tier as smoking 15 cigarettes a day [105]. Crucially, quality matters as much as quantity: high-quality relationships buffer cortisol reactivity, while hostile or draining ones remove that buffer and may amplify the stress response [103]. For cognitive performance the chain is direct — chronically elevated cortisol, from whatever source, impairs working memory, concentration and decision quality. The social environment is, in the most literal sense, a neurological input.

Ask yourself	If the honest answer is...	Then
Does this person sharpen my thinking or dull it?	Sharpens.	Invest more time; learn from them.
	Dulls.	Limit exposure; protect your focus.
What do they bring into my work and life?	Energy, ideas, honesty.	A relationship worth keeping.
	Drag, cynicism, noise.	A relationship worth reducing.

Two questions worth asking of any working relationship. No single person fills every role.

06.5 The Case for Solitude.

A related point has good support: some of the most demanding cognitive work is best done alone and uninterrupted. Field research shows knowledge work is heavily fragmented, that interruptions raise stress and error rates, and that returning to a complex task can take far longer than the interruption itself [34]. The mechanism, **attention residue**, is well documented: switching tasks — especially before finishing — leaves part of our attention behind, degrading what comes next [35]. Protect genuine blocks of solitude for hard thinking, with notifications off rather than merely set aside.

06.5.1 Recovery Time.

The cost of each interruption is larger than intuition suggests. The field research already cited timed knowledge workers to the second and found that returning to an interrupted task took, on average, 23 minutes and 15 seconds — and that figure covers only getting back to the task, not regaining the same depth of focus that preceded the break [34]. Recovery scales with difficulty, from roughly eight minutes for routine work to around 25 minutes for complex analysis. The implication is blunt: an interruption that lasts two minutes does not cost two minutes — it costs the two minutes plus the long climb back.

06.5.2 The Error Cost.

The damage starts far sooner than a full interruption. A controlled experiment found that a distraction of just 2.8 seconds — about the time to glance at a notification — doubled the error rate on the task that followed, and a 4.4-second distraction tripled it [115]. The mechanism is the attention residue described above: each shift dislodges the active thread from working memory, and resuming does not restore it — the brain must rebuild it. Four interruptions in an afternoon can therefore cancel several hours of effective thinking, not because they were long, but because each one reset the clock. The practical conclusion is the same: protect genuine blocks of solitude for hard thinking, with notifications off rather than merely set aside.

06.6 Recommendation.

Because the mirroring and entrainment mechanisms are involuntary, intention is not a defence: choosing to be unaffected by a chronically anxious environment does not neutralise the cortisol load it imposes. Audit your immediate environment and, where you can, reduce contact with chronically threat-oriented people and increase it with calm, grounded ones. This is a physiological intervention in the same category as cutting late caffeine, improving sleep, or bounding news consumption — and protect time alone for the hardest work [32][35][46][99][105].

07. WIRELESS DEVICES AND THE PRECAUTIONARY QUESTION.

This is the topic where careful wording matters most, because strong claims are made on both sides and the honest answer is genuine scientific uncertainty rather than a clean verdict. The case for concern is not imaginary: the US National Toxicology Program reported “clear evidence” that high exposure to radiofrequency radiation caused malignant heart schwannomas in male rats, Italy’s Ramazzini Institute found the same rare tumour at far lower exposures, and a review of 100 studies found 93 reporting low-intensity RF fields inducing oxidative stress [48][49][50]. Against this sits reassuring human evidence: the animal findings used whole-body exposures far above normal phone use and affected only male rats, and a 2024 systematic review of 63 studies found no statistically significant increase in brain or other relevant cancers from mobile-phone use, consistent with the large COSMOS cohort [51][38]. The “possibly carcinogenic” label is IARC Group 2B — a category describing weak, inconsistent evidence, which also contains pickled vegetables and aloe vera [40]. In normal use, consumer-device fields are non-ionising and fall well below international limits; the only firmly substantiated effect remains mild tissue heating [36][37].

07.1 Electromagnetic Fields and Anxiety: a Precautionary Case.

On anxiety specifically the evidence is dose-dependent and must be read carefully. At **high-intensity levels** — occupational exposure near electrical installations — multiple studies report elevated anxiety and psychological distress with a dose-response pattern; the US National Academies confirm that thermogenic RF levels raise plasma corticosterone in animals, and a study from Isfahan University found higher anxiety and depression scores in high-exposure workers than controls [106][107][108]. The most-cited mechanistic hypothesis — overstimulation of voltage-gated calcium channels, producing oxidative stress and neurotransmitter disruption — is biologically plausible but contested, and has not been confirmed at the field intensities of domestic devices [109][107]. At **everyday consumer levels**, the WHO’s expert review concludes that current evidence does not establish health harm and does not justify changing public exposure limits [110][111].

What is better established is a collateral pathway. ELF-range fields above roughly 1.7 kV/m can suppress the nocturnal rise of melatonin after two to three weeks of exposure, reversing within days of removing the source. Melatonin is not only a sleep hormone but an anxiolytic; degraded sleep is one of the most reliably established causes of elevated anxiety and impaired cortisol regulation the following day [106]. This indirect route — device use disrupting sleep, sleep disruption raising anxiety — is mechanistically solid regardless of any direct EMF effect. Sleep itself deserves a specific correction: across double-blind provocation trials, people reporting electrosensitivity cannot distinguish real exposure from sham above chance — a well-replicated nocebo pattern — and screen light delays sleep onset by under three minutes on average in a 73-study meta-analysis [52][41][42]. Phones harm sleep mainly through ordinary routes: staying up on the device and being woken by notifications.

07.2 Recommendation.

A modest precautionary habit — a wired connection for focused work, the phone put away at night, hands-free in poor-signal areas — is defensible both as prudence under genuine uncertainty and because it cuts distraction and protects sleep, which have far better-established effects on focus and anxiety. Present it honestly as caution, not protection from a settled danger; do not treat consumer fields as a proven hazard or buy commercial “shielding” products, which have not been shown to work [43]. The one firm rule that follows from the evidence: keep devices whose use disrupts sleep out of the sleeping environment [42][106].

08. WHY WE PUBLISHED THIS.

Ubinodes builds and operates digital infrastructure for a distributed network of independent professionals. The same disposition that makes someone good at that work — a refusal to accept a claim simply because it is widely repeated — is what produced this guide. Almost every topic here began as a piece of common knowledge that turned out, on inspection, to be partly wrong: that coffee dehydrates you, that women are physiologically less able to handle stress, that television hypnotises you, that your phone is giving you cancer. In each case the truth was more specific, more useful, and more interesting than the slogan.

The connective thread, once we had assembled the parts, was anxiety. Each input in this guide acts on the same stress-signalling machinery, and chronically elevated stress hormones quietly erode the working memory, concentration and judgement that knowledge work depends on. Treating these inputs deliberately is not self-improvement theatre; it is the maintenance of the one instrument the work cannot proceed without. We publish it under an open licence because the network is stronger when its members think clearly, and because good information about how to do so should not be proprietary.

09. SOURCES.

All sources below were verified as accessible at the time of publication. Links resolve to primary research, peer-reviewed reviews, or the official positions of recognised scientific and regulatory authorities. Where a popular-science or clinical summary is cited, it is used only to restate findings established in the primary literature listed alongside it.

Caffeine.

[1] Reichert CF, Deboer T, Landolt H-P (2022). “Adenosine, caffeine, and sleep–wake regulation.” *Journal of Sleep Research* 31(4): e13597.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9541543/>

[2] Ansari AZ, Fiani B, et al. (2021). “The Neurophysiology of Caffeine as a Central Nervous System Stimulant.” *Cureus* 13(5): e15032.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8202818/>

- [3] Lovallo WR, et al. (2005). "Caffeine Stimulation of Cortisol Secretion Across the Waking Hours." *Psychosomatic Medicine* 67(5): 734–739.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2257922/>
- [4] Lovallo WR, et al. (2006). "Cortisol responses to mental stress, exercise, and meals following caffeine intake." *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior* 83(3): 441–447.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2249754/>
- [5] Killer SC, Blannin AK, Jeukendrup AE (2014). "No Evidence of Dehydration with Moderate Daily Coffee Intake." *PLOS ONE* 9(1): e84154. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3886980/>
- [6] Seal AD, et al. (2017). "Coffee with High but Not Low Caffeine Content Augments Fluid and Electrolyte Excretion at Rest." *Frontiers in Nutrition* 4: 40. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5563313/>
- [7] Massey LK, Whiting SJ (1993). "Caffeine, urinary calcium, calcium metabolism and bone." *Journal of Nutrition* 123(9): 1611–1614.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/123.9.1611>
- [8] Wang C-E, et al. (2024). "Association of coffee intake with bone mineral density: a Mendelian randomization study." *Frontiers in Endocrinology* 15: 1328748. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10987693/>
- [9] Gardiner CL, et al. (2023). "The effect of caffeine on subsequent sleep: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *Sleep Medicine Reviews* 69: 101764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2023.101764>
- [10] Drake CL, et al. (2013). "Caffeine Effects on Sleep Taken 0, 3, or 6 Hours before Going to Bed." *Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine* 9(11): 1195–1200. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3805807/>
- [11] Liu C, et al. (2024). "Caffeine intake and anxiety: a meta-analysis." *Frontiers in Psychology* 15: 1270246.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10867825/>
- [12] EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (2015). "Scientific Opinion on the safety of caffeine." *EFSA Journal* 13(5): 4102.
<https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/4102>
- [112] Colipse Coffee. "How Much Caffeine Is in Espresso?" (single shot ≈ 64 mg; double ≈ 128 mg).
<https://colipsecoffee.com/blogs/coffee/espresso-caffeine>

[113] Hibrew. "How Much Caffeine Is in a Shot of Espresso? Myths Debunked!" (single $\approx$ 75 mg, double $\approx$ 150 mg; Nespresso pod ranges). <https://www.hibrew.com/blogs/brew-guides/how-much-caffeine-in-a-shot-of-espresso>

[114] Two Chimps Coffee. "How much caffeine is in a double espresso?" (variation by bean, roast and shot count). <https://twochimpscoffee.com/blogs/how-much-caffeine-in-double-espresso/>

Cortisol, Stress and Sex Differences.

[55] Massey LK, Wise KJ (1984). "The effect of dietary caffeine on urinary excretion of calcium, magnesium, sodium and chloride." <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8360789/>

[56] "Influence of injected caffeine on the metabolism of calcium and the urinary excretion of minerals." <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3944663/>

[57] Massey LK, Wise KJ. "The effect of dietary caffeine on urinary excretion of calcium, magnesium and sodium" (Semantic Scholar record). <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-effect-of-dietary-caffeine-on-urinary-excretion-Massey-Wise/125c0f582487e1a75ab9a758f10f3cd61b108947>

[58] MedlinePlus Medical Encyclopedia. "Caffeine in the diet" (half-life and metabolism reference). <https://medlineplus.gov/ency/article/002445.htm>

[59] Johns Hopkins (pure.jhu). "Gender differences in hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis reactivity" (men show greater ACTH and cortisol responses; $p = 0.019$, $p = 0.034$). <https://pure.johnshopkins.edu/en/publications/gender-differences-in-hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal-hpa-axis-rea-4>

[60] Kudielka BM, Kirschbaum C. "Consistent sex differences in cortisol responses to psychological stress" (men exhibit 1.5-to-2-fold higher responses). https://www.academia.edu/17156189/Consistent_sex_differences_in_cortisol_responses_to_psychological_stress

[61] "Gender differences in cardiovascular and hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal responses to stress in older adults." Stress (2003). <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1025389031000111302>

- [62] Medichecks. "Are Women More Stressed Than Men?" (UK sample: women 49% more likely to have raised cortisol).
<https://www.medichecks.com/blogs/womens-health/are-women-more-stressed-than-men>
- [63] "Men vs. Women: Do Our Bodies Recover from Stress Differently?" (rumination prolongs stress duration in women).
<https://kanamattress.com/blog/men-vs-women-do-our-bodies-recover-from-stress-differently/>
- [64] "An Integrative Approach to HPA Axis Dysfunction." ScienceDirect (oestrogen enhances HPA-axis responsiveness).
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0002934325003535>
- [65] "Regulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical stress response." PMC (women show greater variability in HPA activity; cycle modulation). <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4867107/>
- [66] Integrative Practitioner. "Women and Stress: Understanding Changes That Cause HPA Axis Dysregulation" (oral-contraceptive users show stress-like elevation). <https://integrativepro.com/blogs/articles/women-and-stress-understanding-changes-that-cause-hpa-axis-deregulation>
- [67] "HPA Axis and Depression Across Women's Reproductive Life" (reproductive transitions destabilise the axis).
<https://drkumardiscovery.com/posts/role-hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal-axis-depression-across-female-reproductive-lifecycle/>
- [68] Benenden Hospital. "Managing high cortisol levels during menopause" (perimenopausal axis instability).
<https://www.benendenhospital.org.uk/health-news/womens-health/managing-high-cortisol-levels-during-menopause/>
- [69] "Sex differences in the hemodynamic responses to mental stress: effect of caffeine" (2-week placebo-controlled study, 25 men and 22 women). <https://experts.umn.edu/en/publications/sex-differences-in-the-hemodynamic-responses-to-mental-stress-eff/>
- [70] British Psychological Society Research Digest. "Coffee helps women cope with stressful meetings but has the opposite effect on men" (St. Claire et al.; puzzle-solving $\approx$ 100 s faster in women in pairs).
<https://www.bps.org.uk/research-digest/coffee-helps-women-cope-stressful-meetings-has-opposite-effect-men>

[71] Sheba Medical Center. “Why do men and women react differently to stress?” (fight-or-flight vs. tend-and-befriend). <https://www.shebaonline.org/why-do-men-and-women-react-differently-to-stress/>

[72] Dr Brittany Jeffries. “Caffeine, Alcohol and Your Hormones: What You Need to Know” (caffeine may slow oestrogen clearance via liver detox pathways). <https://www.drbrittanyjeffries.com/blog/caffeine-alcohol-hormones>

[73] Verywell Health. “What Happens to Your Hormones When You Drink Coffee Every Day” (cortisol, insulin and oestrogen metabolism effects). <https://www.verywellhealth.com/coffee-and-hormones-11840630>

[74] Lindgren Health. “Does Caffeine Affect Women’s Hormones?” (oestrogen-modulating effects of caffeine). <https://lindgren.health/does-caffeine-affect-womens-hormones/>

Alcohol.

[13] World Health Organization, Regional Office for Europe (2023). “No level of alcohol consumption is safe for our health.” (IARC Group 1 carcinogen classification.) <https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/04-01-2023-no-level-of-alcohol-consumption-is-safe-for-our-health>

[14] GBD 2016 Alcohol Collaborators (2018). “Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2016.” *The Lancet* 392(10152): 1015–1035. [https://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140-6736\(18\)31310-2/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140-6736(18)31310-2/fulltext)

[15] Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction (2023). “Canada’s Guidance on Alcohol and Health.” <https://www.ccsa.ca/en/guidance-tools-resources/substance-use-and-addiction/alcohol/canadas-guidance-alcohol-and-health>

[75] Brentwood Jackson. “Understanding the Link Between Alcohol and Anxiety” (GABA/glutamate rebound). <https://brentwoodjackson.com/blog/understanding-the-link-between-alcohol-and-anxiety/>

[76] Ubie Health. “Hangxiety: Why You Feel Anxious the Day After Drinking” (GABA plummets, excitatory rebound). <https://ubiehealth.com/doctors-note/hangxiety-anxiety-post-drink-alcohol>

- [77] Milton Recovery. “How Does Alcohol Cause Anxiety? Exploring the Science Behind It” (HPA activation, CRF set-point). <https://miltonrecovery.com/how-does-alcohol-cause-anxiety-exploring-the-science-behind-it/>
- [78] “Stress and the HPA Axis: Role of Glucocorticoids in Alcohol Dependence.” PMC (cortisol–reward interaction; chronic CRF upregulation). <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3860380/>
- [79] Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan. “The Science Behind ‘Hangxiety’ — The Effect of Alcohol on the Nervous System.” <https://bcbsm.mibluedaily.com/stories/health-and-wellness/the-science-behind-hangxiety-the-effect-of-alcohol-on-the-nervous-system>
- [116] Huberman Lab. “What Alcohol Does to Your Body, Brain & Health” (neurotoxicity and multi-organ mechanisms; video summary). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EpYQJ9NarFQ>
- [117] “Alcohol, Oxidative Stress and Free Radical Damage.” PMC (acetaldehyde, reactive oxygen species, apoptosis in the nervous system). <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10427875/>
- [118] Oncohemakey. “Alcohol and Cancer: an Overview with Special Emphasis on the Role of Acetaldehyde and Cytochrome P450 2E1.” <https://oncohemakey.com/alcohol-and-cancer-an-overview-with-special-emphasis-on-the-role-of-acetaldehyde-and-cytochrome-p450-2e1/>
- [119] Penn Today (University of Pennsylvania). “One alcoholic drink a day linked to reduced brain size” (36,000+ adults; accelerated brain ageing). <https://penntoday.upenn.edu/news/one-alcoholic-drink-day-linked-reduced-brain-size>
- [120] Wikipedia. “Long-term impact of alcohol on the brain” (Whitehall II hippocampal-shrinkage findings; 3× / 6× risk; overview with primary citations). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Long-term_impact_of_alcohol_on_the_brain
- [121] Harvard Medical School, HeartBrain. “Grey matter changes” (cortical tissue reduction continuous across drinking levels; persists after abstinence). <https://heartbrain.hms.harvard.edu/grey-matter-changes>
- [122] Hackensack Meridian Health. “What Happens to Your Brain When You Drink Alcohol” (thiamine depletion; Wernicke-Korsakoff syndrome). <https://hackensackmeridianhealth.org/en/healthier-you/2018/12/27/what-happens-to-brain-drink-alcohol>

- [123] “Alcohol, the gut microbiome, and the gut-brain axis.” PMC (dysbiosis, neuroinflammation, memory and anxiety in animal models).
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10989405/>
- [124] “Gut microbiota, the gut-liver axis and alcoholic liver disease.” PMC (dysbiosis, ALD progression, exotoxins).
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11272486/>
- [125] “Alcohol, intestinal permeability and endotoxemia.” PMC (leaky gut, lipopolysaccharide translocation, systemic inflammation).
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10949497/>
- [126] Impossibrew. “Alcohol and the Gut Microbiome: Effects” (dysbiosis within two weeks; beneficial vs pathogenic strains).
<https://impossibrew.co.uk/blogs/journal/alcohol-gut-microbiome-effects>
- [127] News-Medical. “How Does Alcohol Consumption Affect the Immune System?” (innate/adaptive suppression; lung vulnerability).
<https://www.news-medical.net/health/How-Does-Alcohol-Consumption-Affect-the-Immune-System.aspx>
- [128] Alcohol and Drug Foundation (ADF). “Alcohol and the immune system” (24-hour suppression after a heavy session; T-cell and macrophage effects). <https://adf.org.au/insights/alcohol-immune-system/>
- [129] Johns Hopkins (pure). “Alcohol consumption and childhood trauma impact serum immunoglobulins” (IgA up, IgG down).
<https://pure.johnshopkins.edu/en/publications/alcohol-consumption-and-childhood-trauma-impact-serum-immunoglobu/>
- [130] Newswise. “Study links immune-system dysfunction in adults to childhood trauma and heavy drinking.”
<https://www.newswise.com/articles/study-links-immune-system-dysfunction-in-adults-to-childhood-trauma-and-heavy-drinking>
- [131] Stanford Medicine (2025). “Alcohol consumption and your health — what the science says” (sick-quitter bias; 2024 JAMA 135,000+ adults 60+; no safe level).
<https://med.stanford.edu/news/insights/2025/08/alcohol-consumption-and-your-health--what-the-science-says.html>
- [132] US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “Moderate alcohol use” (cancer risk below one drink a day; share of US cancers attributable to alcohol).
<https://www.cdc.gov/alcohol/about-alcohol-use/moderate-alcohol-use.html>

[133] ScienceDirect. "Acetaldehyde, DNA adducts and colonic carcinogenesis" (local acetaldehyde production by gut bacteria; DNA-adduct formation).
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1931524407000102>

Television, Reading and Attention.

[16] Krugman HE (1971). "Brain wave measures of media involvement." Journal of Advertising Research 11(9): 3–9 (archived).
<http://tvsmarter.com/documents/krugman.html>

[17] ERIC Document ED372870. "Brain wave patterns during TV viewing are similar to other waking-state activities."
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED372870.pdf>

[18] Delgado P, et al. (2018). "Don't throw away your printed books: a meta-analysis on reading media and comprehension." Educational Research Review 25: 23–38.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X18300101>

[19] Mangen A, Walgermo BR, Brønnick K (2013). "Reading linear texts on paper versus computer screen." International Journal of Educational Research 58: 61–68. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1005476>

[20] Wolf M (2018). Reader, Come Home: The Reading Brain in a Digital World. HarperCollins. <https://www.maryannewolf.com/reader-come-home-1>

[21] Media Education Foundation. The Mean World Syndrome (Gerbner cultivation research, transcript).
<https://www.mediaed.org/transcripts/Mean-World-Syndrome-Transcript.pdf>

[22] BBC Future (2020). "How the news changes the way we think and behave." <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200512-how-the-news-changes-the-way-we-think-and-behave>

[80] "Mean world syndrome." Wikipedia (definition and cultivation-theory background). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mean_world_syndrome

[81] EBSCO Research Starters. "Mean world syndrome" (communication and mass-media overview).
<https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/communication-and-mass-media/mean-world-syndrome>

- [82] MentalHealth.com. “Television, Fear, and Mental Health” (amygdala activation, cortisol, prefrontal moderation).
<https://www.mentalhealth.com/library/anxiety-and-television>
- [83] “Anxiety-Inducing Media: The Effect of Constant News Broadcasting on the Population’s Mental Health.” PubMed (500 adults; 1.6× anxiety risk during conflict). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26391834/>
- [84] “The Scary World Syndrome: News Orientations, Negativity Bias, and the Cultivation of Anxiety.” Mass Communication and Society (2023).
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15205436.2023.2297829>

Social Media.

- [23] Brady WJ, et al. (2021). “How social learning amplifies moral outrage expression in online social networks.” Science Advances 7: eabe5641.
<https://news.yale.edu/2021/08/13/likes-and-shares-teach-people-express-more-outrage-online>
- [24] Rathje S, Van Bavel JJ, Van der Linden S (2021). “Out-group animosity drives engagement on social media.” PNAS 118(26): e2024292118.
<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2024292118>
- [25] Rathje S, Robertson CE, Brady WJ, et al. (2024). “Engagement, User Satisfaction, and the Amplification of Divisive Content on Social Media.” Knight First Amendment Institute.
<https://knightcolumbia.org/content/engagement-user-satisfaction-and-the-amplification-of-divisive-content-on-social-media>
- [26] Robertson CE, et al. (2023). “Negativity drives online news consumption.” Nature Human Behaviour 7: 812–822.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10202797/>
- [27] Bruns A (2021). “Echo Chambers, Filter Bubbles” (preprint review of the empirical evidence).
[https://snurb.info/files/2021/Echo%20Chambers,%20Filter%20Bubbles%20\(preprint\).pdf](https://snurb.info/files/2021/Echo%20Chambers,%20Filter%20Bubbles%20(preprint).pdf)
- [28] Bail CA, et al. (2018). “Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization.” PNAS 115(37): 9216–9221.
<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1804840115>
- [85] UT Dallas NeuroEngineering Blog (2025). “The Fear of Missing Out (FoMO): How Social Media Hijacks Our Minds.”
<https://neblog.utdallas.edu/2025/08/14/the-fear-of-missing-out-fomo-how-social-media-hijacks-our-minds/>

- [86] “The Mechanisms of Social Media-Induced Anxiety: An S-O-R Perspective on FoMO, Social Comparison, Information Overload” (study of 327 users; stress as mediator).
<http://www.clausiuspress.com/article/15508.html>
- [87] Stanford Law (2024). “Social Media Addiction and Mental Health: The Growing Concern for Youth Well-Being” (systematic-review summary).
<https://law.stanford.edu/2024/05/20/social-media-addiction-and-mental-health-the-growing-concern-for-youth-well-being/>
- [88] “Higher emotional investment in social media is related to anxiety and depression.” ScienceDirect.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S165836122030189X>
- [89] Deconstructing Stigma. “Scrolling and Stress: The Impact of Social Media on Mental Health” (three-week restriction reduced loneliness and depression). <https://deconstructingstigma.org/guides/social-media>
- [90] “Social media does not elicit a physiological stress response.” PMC (20-minute bouts; HR and cortisol fell).
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10990243/>
- [91] “Social media does not elicit a physiological stress response.” PLOS ONE 19(2): e0298553 (2024 crossover experiment).
<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0298553>

The People Around You.

- [29] Fowler JH, Christakis NA (2008). “Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network.” BMJ 337: a2338.
<https://www.bmj.com/content/337/bmj.a2338>
- [30] Mas A, Moretti E (2009). “Peers at Work.” American Economic Review 99(1): 112–45.
https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w12508/w12508.pdf
- [31] Barsade SG (2002). “The Ripple Effect: Emotional Contagion and Its Influence on Group Behavior.” Administrative Science Quarterly 47(4): 644–675. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.2307/3094912>
- [32] Porath C, Foulk T, Erez A (2015). “How Incivility Hijacks Performance.” Organizational Dynamics 44(4): 258–265. <https://iranarze.ir/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/E3355.pdf>

- [33] Hong L, Page SE (2004). "Groups of Diverse Problem Solvers Can Outperform Groups of High-Ability Problem Solvers." PNAS 101(46): 16385–16389. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.0403723101>
- [34] Mark G, Gudith D, Klocke U (2008). "The cost of interrupted work: more speed and stress." CHI '08 Proceedings: 107–110. <https://ics.uci.edu/~gmark/chi08-mark.pdf>
- [35] Leroy S (2009). "Why is it so hard to do my work? The challenge of attention residue." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 109(2): 168–181. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/jobhdp/v109y2009i2p168-181.html>
- [115] Altmann EM, Trafton JG, Hambrick DZ (2014). "Momentary interruptions can derail the train of thought." Journal of Experimental Psychology: General 143(1): 215–226. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23294345/>
- [44] Perry A, et al. (2018). "Mirroring in the Human Brain." Cerebral Cortex 28(3) (intracranial confirmation of human mirroring). <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6059139/>
- [46] Yun K, et al. (2013). "On the Same Wavelength: Face-to-Face Communication Increases Interpersonal Neural Synchronization." Journal of Neuroscience 33(12). <https://www.jneurosci.org/lookup/doi/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0063-13.2013>
- [47] Varlet M, Grootswagers T (2024). "Measuring information alignment in hyperscanning research." Frontiers in Human Neuroscience 18 (interbrain synchrony easily over-interpreted). <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/human-neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.848026/full>
- [92] "Evidence for mirror systems in emotions." PMC (observing others' emotions recruits experiencing regions). <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2865077/>
- [93] "The Role of Mirror Neurons in Understanding Social Cognition and Empathy" (mirror activity facilitates emotional contagion). https://www.scitechnol.com/peer-review/the-role-of-mirror-neurons-in-understanding-social-cognition-and-empathy-pvEA.php?article_id=25974

- [94] UCLA Health. “Mirror neurons critical to development of empathy” (mirror neurons and social contagion).
<https://www.uclahealth.org/news/article/mirror-neurons-critical-development-empathy>
- [95] “Quantification of inter-brain coupling” (UCL Discovery PDF; hyperscanning of interacting brains).
<https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10176475/1/1-s2.0-S1053811923005050-main.pdf>
- [96] “Influence of stress on physiological synchrony.” PMC (2021; cortisol trajectory partly predicted by group members’ cortisol).
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8423710/>
- [97] Harvard Medical School. “Happiness Is a Collective — Not Just Individual — Phenomenon” (4,739 individuals; Framingham reanalysis).
<https://hms.harvard.edu/news/happiness-collective-not-just-individual-phenomenon>
- [98] “Three degrees of influence.” Wikipedia (Christakis–Fowler theory; happiness, obesity, smoking, loneliness propagation).
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_degrees_of_influence
- [99] ScienceDaily (2024). “Mental disorders may spread in young people’s social networks” (700,000+ Finnish adolescents; +9% / +18% anxiety risk).
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2024/05/240523112604.htm>
- [100] Smithsonian Magazine. “Is Depression Contagious?” (social transmission of mental-health states).
<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/is-depression-contagious-180985310/>
- [101] “Emotions spread like contagious diseases.” Frontiers in Psychology (2025; healthy individuals acquire negative emotions through proximity).
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1493512/full>
- [102] Cornell Networks blog. “Emotional Contagion in Social Networks” (angry content spreads faster than other emotions; Weibo analysis).
<https://blogs.cornell.edu/info2040/2015/09/21/emotional-contagion-in-social-networks/>
- [103] CDC MMWR (2024). “Loneliness, Lack of Social and Emotional Support, and Mental Health” (lonely adults 3.6× more likely to report high stress). <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/73/wr/mm7324a1.htm>

- [104] American Psychological Association (2019). “CE corner: The risks of social isolation.” <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2019/05/ce-corner-isolation>
- [105] Tulane University School of Public Health. “Understanding the Effects of Social Isolation on Mental Health” (isolation, mortality risk, cognitive decline). <https://publichealth.tulane.edu/blog/effects-of-social-isolation-on-mental-health/>

Wireless Devices and EMF.

- [36] ICNIRP (2020). RF EMF Guidelines (100 kHz–300 GHz) — only substantiated effect is tissue heating. <https://www.icnirp.org/en/frequencies/radiofrequency/rf-emf-100-khz-300-ghz.html>
- [37] Romeo S, et al. (2024). WHO-framework in vitro genotoxicity systematic review. Environment International. <https://iris.cnr.it/retrieve/fb47e3c0-fc09-4c08-be67-d0baacff74d2/Romeo%20et%20al%20Environment%20International%202024.pdf>
- [38] Karipidis K, et al. (2024). WHO-commissioned systematic review: RF-EMF and cancer (Part I). Environment International 191: 108983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2024.108983>
- [40] BBC Future (2023). “What else is ‘possibly carcinogenic’?” (what IARC Group 2B does and does not mean). <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20230630-aspartame-what-else-is-possibly-cancerous>
- [41] Röösli M, et al. (2024). WHO systematic review: RF-EMF and non-specific symptoms including sleep. Environment International 183: 108338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2023.108338>
- [42] Bauducco S, et al. (2024). Technology and sleep: bidirectional meta-analysis (73 studies, 113,370 participants). Sleep Medicine Reviews 76: 101933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2024.101933>
- [43] ICNIRP (2020). RF EMF Guidelines (official publication page; 50-fold safety factor). <https://www.icnirp.org/en/publications/article/rf-guidelines-2020.html>
- [48] US National Toxicology Program (2018). Cell Phone Radio Frequency Radiation — Technical Reports & Fact Sheet (“clear evidence” of heart schwannomas in male rats). <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/research/topics/cellphones>

- [49] Falcioni L, et al. (2018). Ramazzini Institute long-term rat study. Environment International (replication at lower exposure; summarised by Germany's BfS).
<https://www.bfs.de/EN/bfs/science-research/emf/statements/longterm-study-rats-ramazzini.html>
- [50] Yakymenko I, et al. (2016). "Oxidative mechanisms of biological activity of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation." Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine (93 of 100 studies report oxidative effects).
https://ec.europa.eu/health/scientific_committees/scheer/docs/emf2022/2015_Yakymenko.pdf
- [51] ICNIRP (2019/2020). Note on the NTP and Ramazzini studies (animal tumour effect judged insufficient to change guidelines).
<https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPnote20192020.pdf>
- [52] Rubin GJ, Munshi J, Wessely S (2005). "Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity: A Systematic Review of Provocation Studies." Psychosomatic Medicine 67(2) (nocebo pattern).
<https://journals.lww.com/00006842-200503000-00010>
- [106] National Academies. "Effects of Electromagnetic Fields on Organs and Tissues" (thermogenic RF raises plasma corticosterone; melatonin suppression by ELF fields).
<https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/2046/chapter/8>
- [107] "Extremely Low-Frequency Magnetic Field as a Stress Factor." PMC (ELF-MF association with stress markers).
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7912337/>
- [108] The AV Edge. "Is EMF Exposure Causing Your Anxiety? Here's What the Science Says" (occupational high-exposure anxiety findings, incl. Isfahan University study). <https://theavedge.com/blogs/insights/is-emf-exposure-causing-your-anxiety-here-s-what-the-science-says>
- [109] Healthline. "EMF Exposure: Danger Levels, Symptoms, Protection, and More" (voltage-gated calcium-channel hypothesis; neurological effects). <https://www.healthline.com/health/emf>
- [110] World Health Organization. "Exposure to extremely low frequency fields" (expert review; no established health harm at consumer levels).
<https://www.who.int/teams/environment-climate-change-and-health/radiation-and-health/non-ionizing/exposure>

[111] World Health Organization. Fact Sheet: Electromagnetic Fields and Public Health — Mobile Phones (“no adverse health effects have been established”).
<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/electromagnetic-fields-and-public-health-mobile-phones>

On the Independence of Sources.

[53] Lao L, et al. (2023). “Flexibly funding WHO? An analysis of its donors’ voluntary contributions.” BMJ Global Health 8(4): e011232.
<https://gh.bmj.com/content/8/4/e011232>

[54] Reddy SK, et al. (2021). “Strengthening the WHO... by removing a major source of weakness.” Globalization and Health 17.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8672333/>

CHANGE LOG.

This document is maintained by the Ubinodes editorial node. Substantive revisions are recorded below.

Version	Date	Changes
1.0	18 June 2026	Original publication as “Research: Cognitive Performance” — caffeine, alcohol, television, social media, the people around you, and wireless devices, in a fact-checking “verdict” format.
1.1	22 June 2026	Retitled “Anxiety & Cognitive Performance: A Practical Guide.” Added §02 (Cortisol, Stress and Sex Differences). Reframed anxiety as the connective theme and moved from a myth-busting format to a mechanism–evidence–recommendation structure. Added espresso-equivalent and last-coffee tables, a Quick-Reference box, a TL;DR, a Table of Contents, and expanded anxiety material throughout. Merged and de-duplicated all references into a single numbered source list.
1.2	22 June 2026	Restructured §06.5 into 06.5.1 Recovery time and 06.5.2 The error cost, adding the 23-minute-15-second task-resumption figure and

Version	Date	Changes
		the 2.8-second / 4.4-second interruption error-rate findings (source [115]). Set all body content to 14pt for consistent, glasses-free readability.
1.3	22 June 2026	Published as an indexable HTML page (primary) with a downloadable PDF companion, fixing the prior “noindex, nofollow”. Added web front-matter and an on-page FAQ for featured snippets. Aligned to Document Formatting Prompt v11.
1.4	4 July 2026	Substantially expanded §03 (Alcohol) beyond the acute anxiety rebound to integrate three additional damage pathways — neuronal loss (§03.2), gut-microbiome disruption and the gut-brain axis (§03.3), and immune suppression (§03.4) — plus a summary of the collapsing “moderate drinking” consensus (§03.5) and an acetaldehyde note linking neurotoxicity, gut damage and cancer. Added sources [116]–[133]. Reformatted to Document Formatting Prompt v16 as a single-part reader-facing document; web front-matter and the flat FAQ were removed from this DOCX per v16.

Revision history. The editorial node is a role, not a named individual.