Article type: Perspective

Home Page URL: https://www.alliedacademies.org/public-health-policy-planning/

Integrating neurophysiological evidence into public health policy for stress-related disorders.

Sofia Mendes*

Department of Neurophysiology, University of Lisbon, Portugal.

***Correspondence to:** Sofia Mendes**,** Department of Neurophysiology, University of Lisbon, Portugal, E-mail: s.mendes@ulisboa.pt

Received: 03-Apr-2025, Manuscript No. AAPHPP-25-169483; **Editor assigned:** 04-Apr-2025, PreQC No. AAPHPP-25-169483(PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Apr-2025, QC No AAPHPP-25-169483; **Revised:** 21-Apr-2025, Manuscript No. AAPHPP-25-169483(R); **Published:** 28-Apr-2025, DOI:10.35841/aaphpp -9.2.286

Introduction

Stress-related disorders, including anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), represent a significant and growing public health burden. Neurophysiological research has revealed that chronic stress can lead to dysregulation of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis, altered amygdala reactivity, and impaired prefrontal cortex function, contributing to long-term psychological and physical health issues. Public health policy informed by these findings can prioritize early stress detection and prevention programs, reducing both the incidence and severity of stress-related disorders through targeted interventions [1].

Incorporating neurophysiological biomarkers—such as heart rate variability (HRV), electroencephalographic (EEG) patterns, and cortisol rhythms—into public health screening initiatives can facilitate timely identification of individuals experiencing harmful stress levels. These biomarkers provide objective, quantifiable data that can complement self-report measures, thereby increasing diagnostic accuracy. Policy frameworks that promote community-based screening and referral systems could help identify at-risk individuals before symptoms escalate into more severe disorders [2].

Public health initiatives could also integrate neurofeedback and biofeedback training into stress management programs. These interventions, grounded in neurophysiological evidence, enable individuals to regulate their brain and autonomic nervous system activity, fostering resilience and reducing vulnerability to stress-related pathology. Schools, workplaces, and healthcare settings could adopt such programs as part of a preventive health strategy, ensuring broad access across diverse populations [3].

Moreover, neurophysiological studies have highlighted the impact of socioeconomic inequality and environmental factors—such as noise pollution, urban overcrowding, and limited access to green spaces—on stress-related neural pathways. Policies addressing these structural determinants could significantly reduce the chronic stress load on communities, improving overall mental health. For example, urban planning strategies informed by neuroscientific research could promote environments that facilitate relaxation and social cohesion, mitigating stress at the population level [4].

Citation: Mendes S. Integrating neurophysiological evidence into public health policy for stress-related disorders. J Public Health Policy Plan. 2025;9(2):286.

Finally, effective implementation of neurophysiology-informed public health policy requires strong interdisciplinary collaboration. Neuroscientists, public health experts, urban planners, and policymakers must work together to design, evaluate, and refine interventions, ensuring they are culturally relevant, scalable, and cost-effective. Longitudinal research should be supported to track the effectiveness of such policies over time, creating a robust evidence base for future decision-making [5].

Conclusion

By incorporating neurophysiological evidence into public health planning, governments can design more precise and preventive strategies for addressing stress-related disorders. Such integration has the potential to not only improve individual well-being but also to alleviate the broader societal and economic burden of chronic stress.

References

1. Blakely T, Atkinson J, Kvizhinadze G, et al. Patterns of cancer care costs in a country with detailed individual data. Med Care. 2015;53(4):302.
2. Taphoorn MJ, Klein M. Cognitive deficits in adult patients with brain tumours. Lancet Neurol. 2004;3(3):159-68.
3. Langbecker D, Yates P. Primary brain tumor patients' supportive care needs and multidisciplinary rehabilitation, community and psychosocial support services: Awareness, referral and utilization. J Neurooncol. 2016;127:91-102.
4. Heckel M, Hoser B, Stiel S. Caring for patients with brain tumors compared to patients with non-brain tumors: Experiences and needs of informal caregivers in home care settings. J Psychosoc Oncol. 2018;36(2):189-202.
5. Sundararajan V, Bohensky MA, Moore G, et al. Mapping the patterns of care, the receipt of palliative care and the site of death for patients with malignant glioma. J Neurooncol. 2014;116:119-26.

Citation: Mendes S. Integrating neurophysiological evidence into public health policy for stress-related disorders. J Public Health Policy Plan. 2025;9(2):286.