Review Article

ISSN 3071-2904

International Journal of Mental Health Research

The Obsessional Mind: Pattern Recognition, Threat Appraisal, and the Problem of Irresolution

Tatiana Zdyb, PhD*

Mental Health and Wellness Consultant, Clinical Philosopher, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Audacity Health Inc., Canada.

***Correspondence:**
Tatiana Zdyb, PhD, Mental Health and Wellness Consultant, Clinical Philosopher, Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Audacity Health Inc., Canada.

Received: 11 Apr 2026; **Accepted:** 12 May 2026; **Published:** 23 May 2026

Citation: Tatiana Zdyb. The Obsessional Mind: Pattern Recognition, Threat Appraisal, and the Problem of Irresolution. Int J Ment Health Res. 2026; 1(2): 1-4.

ABSTRACT

The obsessional component of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) is frequently framed as a form of hyperactive pattern recognition; a threat-detection system operating beyond its adaptive range. This commentary examines that framing, arguing that while it has heuristic and psychoeducational value, it is mechanistically incomplete and philosophically misleading. Drawing on neurocognitive models of error monitoring, phenomenological accounts of intrusive cognition, and the philosophical literature on intentionality and meaning-making, the piece argues that the defining feature of obsessional experience is not the over-detection of threat per se, but the structural failure to achieve cognitive closure, an inability to file experience as resolved. This reframing has implications for clinical explanation, therapeutic alliance, and the theoretical grounding of exposure-based interventions. Furthermore, it parallels current research in predictive coding and active inference, making this a pivotal moment to update the foundational models shared with clinicians and patients.

Keywords

Predictive processing, Irresolution account, Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder.

The Appeal of the Pattern Recognition Model

Among the more compelling lay framings of obsessional cognition is the analogy to pattern recognition in overdrive. The formulation is intuitive: the human brain is, at its core, a predictive organ, continuously scanning environmental and interoceptive data for signals of threat, incongruity, or unfinished business. In this sense, the obsessional mind does not appear categorically different from the non-clinical mind, it appears to be doing the same thing, only louder and with less ability to stop.

This framing has genuine clinical utility. It is normalizing without being dismissive. It locates the disorder within a continuum of ordinary cognitive function rather than marking the person as categorically broken. It also maps loosely onto the neuroscientific literature: hyperactivity in the orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) and anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) which are both implicated in error detection and conflict monitoring, is among the most replicated findings in OCD neuroimaging research [1,2]. The cortico-striato-thalamo-cortical (CSTC) loop, understood as a gating and filtering system for behavioral output, appears to remain in a kind of persistent alarm state, generating what Saxena and Rauch [2] described as an automatic, recursive "something is wrong" signal that resists habituation.

From a health science standpoint, the metaphor translates into accessible psychoeducation. Telling a person that their brain's threat detector is unusually sensitive, and that the compulsive response functions as a maladaptive attempt to silence a false alarm, provides a coherent explanatory scaffold for the rationale behind exposure and response prevention [3]. It answers the question that patients invariably ask: "If I know it's irrational, why can't I stop?"

Where the Model Begins to Fail

Despite its utility, the pattern recognition model contains a fundamental conceptual error: it locates the primary dysfunction in the detection phase of cognitive appraisal, when the empirical and phenomenological evidence suggests the breakdown occurs substantially later, in the resolution phase. Research by Adam Radomsky and colleagues on responsibility appraisal, and

separately the work of Paul Salkovskis on cognitive-behavioral models of OCD [4], converges on a finding that is philosophically significant: individuals with OCD do not generally detect more threats than controls in neutral conditions. Rather, they appraise certain classes of intrusive thought as more personally significant, more morally weighted, and as requiring a definitive response that never quite arrives [5]. The intrusion is not merely noticed; it is treated as a demand.

This distinction matters for several reasons. A genuine pattern recognition error would, in principle, be correctable through updated evidence: through the cognitive equivalent of recalibrating a detector. But the phenomenology of obsessional experience does not resemble miscalibrated detection. It more closely resembles what philosophers of mind call a failure of intentional saturation: the cognitive system cannot arrive at a state in which the object of concern has been sufficiently addressed to permit disengagement. The thought is not merely present; it is open, in the technical sense, it demands a response, continuation, resolution. The obsessional intrusion does not function as information. It functions as an obligation. This is why reasoning and reassurance-seeking, though experienced as relief-seeking, systematically worsen the condition: they treat the intrusion as a problem to be solved rather than a state to be inhabited.

This is not a subtle distinction. It has direct implications for how clinicians explain the mechanisms of ERP to patients. If the disorder is framed as overactive detection, then inhibiting the compulsion looks like refusing to respond to a fire alarm: dangerous, irrational, requiring an act of will against the grain of common sense. If the disorder is understood as a failure of resolution, then ERP is re-framed more accurately: we are not ignoring a signal, we are learning that the signal does not require a response in order to eventually cease.

The Philosophical Dimension: Meaning, Obligation, and Egodystonia

OCD presents an unusual phenomenological profile that has received insufficient attention in the health science literature: the person suffering from it typically knows, at some level, that the obsessional thought is not veridical. This egodystonic quality (the thought is experienced as alien, unwanted, inconsistent with the person's values and self-concept) distinguishes obsessional cognition from delusion, paranoia, or phobia, all of which involve a more seamless integration of the feared content into the person's operative worldview.

From a clinical philosophy standpoint, egodystonia represents a form of split intentionality: two incompatible appraisals of the same content held simultaneously. The person both knows the thought is irrational and cannot act on that knowledge to extinguish the distress. This is not irrationality in the ordinary sense. It is, rather, a structural gap between propositional and procedural cognition, between what the person explicitly believes and what their affective and behavioral systems are organized around.

Viktor Frankl's logotherapy tradition, and more recently the philosophical work informing Acceptance and Commitment Therapy [6], offers one conceptual vocabulary for this: cognitive fusion [6], in which a thought is not merely entertained but treated as equivalent to reality, as a direct threat rather than a mental event. The pattern recognition model cannot accommodate this distinction, because pattern recognition, as ordinarily understood, is a process that generates outputs, it detects and signals, but does not itself fuse or moralize. The obsessional mind does something additional: it confers meaning on the signal in a way that demands engagement.

Phenomenologically, this is closer to what Husserl called a disturbance of the natural attitude, the background assumption that the world is basically as it appears and that one is adequately oriented within it. In obsessional cognition, that background attitude cannot reassert itself. There is no settling back into the world as ordinary; the intrusive thought keeps the person at a kind of anxious, effortful attention that cannot relax into trust.

Toward a More Adequate Model: The Irresolution Account

Drawing these threads together, we can sketch a more adequate framing of the obsessional component of OCD; one that preserves the heuristic value of the pattern recognition metaphor while correcting its key inadequacy. The obsessional mind is best understood not as a threat-detection system in overdrive, but as a resolution system that cannot close. The intrusive thought arrives (as intrusive thoughts arrive for everyone) but fails to pass through the ordinary cognitive process by which thoughts are categorized as irrelevant, filed as handled, or allowed to decay in salience. Instead, the thought is held open: it continues to make a claim on attention, continues to carry an affective charge, and continues to generate behavioral pressure toward some action that would, hypothetically, resolve it.

This account has several clinical and theoretical advantages. First, it explains why reassurance-seeking and compulsive rituals provide temporary relief but long-term worsening: they complete a partial loop, providing a momentary sense of resolution, but they reinforce the underlying association between the intrusive thought and the need for a specific responsive action. They treat irresolution as a solvable problem. Second, it grounds the rationale for ERP in mechanistic rather than purely behavioral terms: prolonged exposure without response prevention allows the nervous system to learn, at a procedural level, that irresolution is not an emergency, that an open thought can be tolerated without resolution and will, eventually, lose its affective charge without any action taken. Third, it takes seriously the egodystonic phenomenology of the disorder: the person is not confused about the content of the thought; they are caught in its structural demand.

For psychoeducation, this translates into a reframe that many people find both more accurate and more clinically motivating. Rather than "your alarm system is broken", the clinician can offer something closer to: "Your mind has learned to treat certain thoughts as problems that must be solved before you can be okay.

The treatment involves learning, experientially, that you can be okay while the problem remains open, and that when you stop trying to close it, it tends to close on its own".

Theoretical Positioning: Where the Field Currently Stands

A natural question, for clinicians and scholars encountering the irresolution account, is whether this represents a novel contribution or a restatement of existing frameworks. The honest answer is that it occupies a productive middle position: the pattern recognition framing is thoroughly embedded in clinical practice, while the more sophisticated theoretical work is actively, in real time, moving beyond it, making this a moment of genuine transition rather than settled consensus.

The "false alarm" vocabulary has been a fixture of OCD psychoeducation for decades, formalized in widely-used treatment resources and CBT training curricula [3]. It is the dominant lay translation of the CSTC hyperactivity model, and it remains clinically serviceable at the level of first explanation. However, it has not been treated as a rigorous theoretical construct in the academic literature, precisely because its mechanistic adequacy has always been limited.

The most active current theoretical edge is the predictive coding and active inference literature, associated primarily with Karl Friston's free energy principle [7] and its applications to computational psychiatry. Within this framework, the brain is understood not as a detector of incoming signals but as a generative model, a system that actively predicts sensory input and updates itself based on prediction error. Applied to OCD, this account proposes that the disorder involves a dysfunction at sub-linguistic levels of the brain's generative model, where the failure to achieve a predicted state (the world being "just right") is experienced as a persistent sensorimotor and affective demand that compulsive behavior is recruited to satisfy [8,9]. This is, formally, a version of the irresolution account: the system cannot update to a state of satisfied prediction, and so cannot disengage.

The predictive coding account is genuinely current. It is being actively developed, debated, and applied to clinical populations across multiple research groups [7-10], but it has not yet substantially penetrated frontline clinical training or mainstream practitioner discourse. The gap between the theoretical frontier and clinical practice is, in this area, significant. This commentary positions itself in that gap: offering a framing that is more mechanistically adequate than the pattern recognition model while remaining translatable into clinical language, and doing so at a moment when the theoretical scaffolding for such a translation is being actively constructed.

Clinicians, coaches, and practitioners working with OCD are therefore not behind the curve in questioning the pattern recognition framing. They are, in a meaningful sense, ahead of the default clinical curriculum, which has not yet incorporated the implications of predictive processing models, and contemporaneous with the researchers who are working to make those implications explicit.

Implications for Clinical Communication and Therapeutic Alliance

The way a clinician frames a disorder shapes the patient's relationship to their own experience. Framing matters not merely as rhetoric but as a component of the epistemic environment in which treatment occurs. A person who understands the symptoms of OCD that they experience as an overactive alarm may approach ERP as an act of willpower against their own brain. A patient who understands it as a failure of resolution may approach ERP as a process of learning which is less heroic, perhaps, but more sustainable and more aligned with the actual mechanism of change.

From a clinical philosophy standpoint, there is also something important in honouring the egodystonic experience directly. People with OCD have often been told, in various ways, that they are being irrational. The irresolution account implicitly validates their experience: they are not failing to reason correctly; they are caught in a structural feature of their cognition that is not amenable to reason alone. This validation grounded in mechanism rather than merely in empathy can itself be a significant component of therapeutic alliance.

The advanced general reader, encountering this account, might recognize in it something of a broader truth about cognitive systems: that the problem is rarely in what we notice, and almost always in what we cannot stop attending to. In this sense, the obsessional mind illuminates something about mind in general, about the conditions under which thought becomes compulsory, and what it means, structurally, to be free of an idea.

Concluding Note

The pattern recognition framing of obsessional cognition is not wrong; it is incomplete. Its incompleteness is not merely academic. How clinicians explain OCD shapes how patients approach treatment, how they understand their own suffering, and whether they experience the therapeutic process as fighting their brain or working with it. The irresolution account offered here is one attempt to align clinical language more closely with both the neuroscientific evidence and the phenomenological reality of the disorder, and to ground, in mechanism, what ERP achieves that reassurance-seeking cannot. That the theoretical frontier of the field is converging on compatible conclusions, through the distinct vocabulary of predictive processing, suggests that this reframing is not merely a clinical preference but a theoretically warranted move.

References

1. Abramowitz JS, Taylor S, McKay D. compulsive disorder. The Lancet. 2009; 374: 491-499.
2. Saxena S, Rauch SL. Functional neuroimaging and the neuroanatomy of OCD. Psychiatr Clin North Am. 2004; 23: 563-586.
3. Clark DA. Cognitive-behavioral therapy for OCD. Guilford Press. 2004.
4. Salkovskis PM. Obsessional-compulsive problems: A cognitive-behavioural analysis. Behaviour Research and

Therapy. 1985; 23: 571-583.

5. Rachman S. A cognitive theory of obsessions. Behav Res Ther. 1997; 35: 793-802.
6. Hayes SC, Strosahl KD, Wilson KG. Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: The Process and Practice of Mindful Change (2nd ed). Guilford Press. 2012.
7. Friston K. The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2010; 11: 127-138.
8. Pezzulo G, Parr T, Friston K. The evolution of brain architectures for predictive coding and active inference. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B. 2022; 377.
9. Seth AK, Friston KJ. Active interoceptive inference and the emotional brain. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B. 2016; 371.
10. Sprevak M, Smith R. An introduction to predictive processing models of perception and decision-making. Top Cogn Sci. 2023.