THE SYNERGY HALL
RESEARCH SERIES

AN INITIATIVE OF THE SHEYENE GERARDI FOUNDATION
STRATEGIC SECURITY · SCIENCE · SOCIETY

No. 1
August 2026
ISSN *[pending]*

SynsID: Synergistic Identification

The Heritability of Disposition and the Case for Behavioral Certification in High-Consequence Domains

By Sheyene Gerardi

PUBLISHED BY THE SHEYENE GERARDI FOUNDATION
Research, Systems, and Institutional Studies
Washington, D.C.

ABOUT THE SYNERGY HALL RESEARCH SERIES

The Synergy Hall Research Series is the scholarly monograph series of the Sheyene Gerardi Foundation. It advances interdisciplinary research in institutional design, strategic security, artificial intelligence, systems science, governance, and collective human capability.

Each volume presents original analysis intended to connect scientific knowledge, technological development, and institutional design. The series examines how independent systems may be intentionally coordinated to produce outcomes greater than the sum of their individual contributions.

Each monograph is issued as a separately numbered volume within an ongoing research program intended to develop durable institutional models in service of human flourishing.

PUBLICATION DETAILS

Series title: Synergy Hall Research Series
Series type: Scholarly Research Monographs
Publisher: Sheyene Gerardi Foundation
Research Division: Research, Systems, and Institutional Studies
Place of publication: Washington, D.C., United States
Editor: Sheyene Gerardi
Frequency: Irregular
Language: English
ISSN: *[pending — U.S. ISSN Center, Library of Congress]*
Inaugural Volume: Monograph No. 1, August 2026
Contact: contact@sheyene.org · www.sheyene.org

COPYRIGHT

SUGGESTED CITATION

Gerardi, S. (2026). *SynsID: Synergistic Identification: The Heritability of Disposition and the Case for Behavioral Certification in High-Consequence Domains.* **Synergy Hall Research Series**, Monograph No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Sheyene Gerardi Foundation.

SynsID: Synergistic Identification

The Heritability of Disposition and the Case for Behavioral Certification in High-Consequence Domains

By Sheyene Gerardi

Sheyene Gerardi Foundation · Washington, D.C. · August 2026

---

*SynsID derives from the Greek prefix syn- ("together") and reflects the central premise of this monograph: reliable human evaluation cannot emerge from isolated indicators, but from the integration of biological, psychological, behavioral, and environmental dimensions into a coherent whole. The designation also alludes to the synaptic and serotonergic systems discussed throughout this study, while expressing the broader principle that defines the **Synergy Hall Research Series**:*

The whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts.

Executive Summary

Access to weapons of mass destruction concentrates within a remarkably small number of individuals the capacity to produce irreversible, species-level consequences. Throughout the nuclear age, security doctrine has focused primarily on states, technologies, and deterrence. Far less attention has been devoted to the most unpredictable variable in every high-consequence system: the human being entrusted to operate it.

This paper examines whether contemporary science provides a more rigorous foundation for evaluating personnel reliability in environments where a single human failure could have catastrophic consequences. Drawing upon behavioral genetics, neuroscience, psychology, and personnel reliability research, it evaluates both the potential and the limits of biological approaches to human behavioral assessment.

Three conclusions emerge.

First, human disposition is substantially heritable at the population level. Traits associated with emotional regulation, resilience, and self-regulation consistently demonstrate meaningful genetic influence.

Second, this heritability is distributed across hundreds of interacting genetic loci whose effects are expressed only through continuous interaction with developmental and environmental conditions. Contemporary science therefore does not support deterministic prediction of individual behavior from genetic information alone.

Third, conventional human judgment remains an inherently unreliable instrument for evaluating trustworthiness in high-consequence environments.

Taken together, these findings indicate that neither genetic determinism nor subjective intuition provides an adequate foundation for personnel certification.

This paper therefore introduces **SynsID (Synergistic Identification)** as a conceptual framework for behavioral certification based upon the expressed phenotype—the observable integration of biology, development, environment, and demonstrated behavior—rather than isolated biological markers or subjective personal impressions.

The objective is neither prediction nor exclusion. It is the development of scientifically grounded, ethically bounded, and continuously adaptive certification standards proportional to the magnitude of potential harm.

Part I. The Heritable Basis of Disposition

1. The Genetics of Affect and Well-Being

The proposition that human disposition is partly inherited is among the most consistently replicated findings in modern behavioral genetics. Over several decades, twin, family, and adoption studies have demonstrated that relatively stable characteristics—including affect, resilience, emotional regulation, and subjective well-being—are influenced not only by experience but also by inherited biological variation. These findings constitute the scientific foundation of what is often simplified in popular discourse as the notion of a "happiness gene."

Twin studies of subjective well-being—the relatively stable baseline of life satisfaction sometimes described as a "set point"—have repeatedly estimated its heritability at approximately 40 to 50 percent. In their landmark study of identical and fraternal twins reared together and apart, Lykken and Tellegen concluded that a substantial and enduring component of subjective well-being is genetically influenced, with the stable set-point itself exhibiting an even stronger hereditary component. Subsequent meta-analyses involving large twin cohorts have converged on comparable estimates, placing the heritability of well-being between approximately 36 and 40 percent. These findings remain among the most robust and consistently replicated results in behavioral genetics, indicating that a meaningful proportion of variation in baseline affect across populations is attributable to inherited biological differences.

These findings help explain a familiar observation: individuals differ markedly in their baseline emotional disposition. Some consistently exhibit greater resilience, emotional stability, and resistance to adversity, whereas others remain more vulnerable to psychological distress despite comparable life circumstances. Behavioral genetics demonstrates that these differences are neither entirely inherited nor entirely environmental. Rather, they emerge through the continuous interaction of biological predisposition and lived experience.

It is precisely at this point, however, that popular interpretation diverges from scientific evidence. The concept of a single "happiness gene" is an oversimplification. Contemporary research instead describes a highly distributed biological architecture in which hundreds of genetic variants contribute small effects that are continuously shaped by developmental, social, and environmental influences. Human disposition is therefore best understood not as the product of any single gene, but as the emergent expression of an integrated biological system.

2. Gene–Environment Interaction and the Limits of the Single Gene

If the preceding evidence establishes that disposition is partly heritable, the next question is whether individual genes can reliably explain that inheritance. Decades of research suggest that they cannot. The consistent lesson emerging from molecular genetics is that behavioral traits rarely result from the action of a single genetic variant. Instead, they arise through complex interactions among multiple genes operating within specific environmental contexts.

One of the most extensively studied examples involves the serotonin transporter gene (*SLC6A4*) and its promoter polymorphism, 5-HTTLPR, which regulates serotonin reuptake at the synapse. In their landmark 2003 study, Caspi and colleagues reported that individuals carrying the short allele exhibited a significantly greater risk of depression only when they had also experienced severe stressful life events.5 The genetic variant alone did not predict depression; its influence emerged only through interaction with the environment.

A comparable pattern had previously been observed for the low-activity variant of the *MAOA* gene. Individuals carrying this variant demonstrated a higher likelihood of antisocial behavior primarily when they had also experienced severe childhood maltreatment.3 In both cases, genetic variation functioned as a conditional predisposition rather than a deterministic cause. Biology influenced vulnerability, but environmental experience determined whether that vulnerability became manifest.

The subsequent history of these findings illustrates the importance of scientific caution. A large meta-analysis published in 2009 failed to replicate the original 5-HTTLPR interaction consistently across studies,6 while subsequent evidence regarding *MAOA* has remained mixed, although broader meta-analyses continue to support a modest interaction effect.4,17

The broader conclusion nevertheless remains remarkably consistent across contemporary behavioral genetics. Human disposition develops through continuous interaction between inherited biological predispositions and environmental experience. Genes establish probabilities rather than destinies, and their effects cannot be interpreted independently of the developmental contexts in which they are expressed.

3. From Single Genes to a Network Architecture

The apparent contradiction between substantial heritability and weak individual genetic effects has long been known as the problem of "missing heritability." If behavioral traits are significantly inherited, why have researchers struggled to identify individual genes capable of explaining that inheritance?

The answer appears to lie in the architecture of the trait itself.

Rather than being determined by a small number of genes with large individual effects, human disposition emerges from highly interconnected biological networks composed of hundreds of interacting genetic variants. Each contributes only a modest influence, yet together they produce complex patterns of behavior that no single gene can adequately explain.

A significant advance toward resolving this question came with the work of Zwir and colleagues, who applied a machine-learning approach known as Phenotype–Genotype Many-to-Many Relations Analysis (PGMRA) to genome-wide data. Instead of searching for isolated genetic effects, the method identified networks of interacting genes associated with the self-regulatory dimensions of human character, including self-directedness, cooperativeness, and self-transcendence.1

The analysis identified more than 700 gene loci organized into multiple interacting networks, accounting for approximately 50 to 58 percent of the heritability previously estimated through classical twin studies. The findings were subsequently replicated across independent Finnish, Korean, and German populations, providing strong evidence that human character possesses a distributed polygenic architecture rather than a single-gene foundation.1 A companion investigation reported a similarly complex genetic organization for temperament.2

The significance of these findings extends beyond genetics alone. They fundamentally redefine how behavioral traits should be understood. Character is not encoded within isolated biological components but emerges from the coordinated interaction of numerous genetic networks continuously shaped by development, experience, and environmental conditions.

This insight also establishes one of the central arguments of this paper. The very architecture that explains why disposition is substantially heritable also explains why reliable individual behavioral prediction cannot be achieved through genotyping alone. Complexity is not an obstacle to be overcome; it is an intrinsic property of human behavior. Genetic information provides evidence of biological predisposition, but the expressed phenotype remains the only observable integration of biology, environment, and lived experience. That distinction forms the foundation upon which the SynsID framework is built.

Part II. From Heritability to Prediction

The evidence presented thus far establishes an important distinction. Human disposition is demonstrably heritable, yet its biological architecture is highly distributed, environmentally contingent, and expressed through complex interactions among hundreds of genetic variants. These findings explain why population-level heritability and individual-level prediction are fundamentally different scientific questions.

This distinction carries profound implications for personnel reliability. A characteristic may be strongly heritable across populations while remaining unsuitable as a basis for predicting the future behavior of any single individual. The transition from understanding heritability to evaluating operational reliability therefore requires moving beyond genetics alone toward the observable expression of human behavior.

4. Population Heritability Is Not Individual Prediction

One of the most persistent misconceptions in behavioral genetics is the assumption that high heritability implies accurate individual prediction. In reality, these concepts describe fundamentally different levels of scientific inference.

Heritability measures the proportion of variation in a characteristic that can be attributed to genetic differences within a population. It does not determine the future behavior, abilities, or life outcomes of any particular individual. Population statistics cannot be interpreted as individual forecasts.

Human height illustrates this distinction particularly well. Height is among the most heritable human traits, with heritability estimates approaching 80 percent and thousands of associated genetic loci already identified.10 Yet even after decades of genomic research, DNA alone cannot predict an individual's adult height with the precision necessary for clinical or operational decision-making. If prediction remains limited for one of the most biologically determined human characteristics, the challenge is substantially greater for behavioral traits whose expression depends continuously upon developmental and environmental influences.

Additional methodological limitations further constrain genomic prediction. Polygenic risk scores consistently perform less accurately across populations whose ancestry differs from that of the original training datasets, reducing both predictive validity and equity in diverse populations.11 Moreover, because behavioral outcomes of operational concern remain relatively rare, even statistically meaningful genetic associations generate large numbers of false-positive classifications when applied to individual screening.

The practical implication is straightforward. Contemporary genomics provides valuable scientific insight into the biological architecture of human disposition, but it does not provide a reliable basis for certifying individual trustworthiness. Genetic information describes probabilities across populations rather than certainties about individuals. Consequently, any defensible personnel reliability framework must evaluate the expressed individual rather than the inherited genome alone.

5. The Limits of Unaided Human Judgment

If contemporary genetics cannot provide a sufficiently reliable basis for predicting individual behavior, neither can unaided human judgment. Decades of psychological research have demonstrated that people are remarkably poor at distinguishing trustworthy from untrustworthy behavior based on intuition alone.

A comprehensive meta-analysis encompassing more than two hundred studies found that individuals correctly distinguish truthful from deceptive statements at an average accuracy of approximately 54 percent—only marginally better than chance.9 More importantly, professional experience offers surprisingly little improvement. Law enforcement officers, intelligence personnel, judges, and other experienced evaluators generally perform no better than untrained observers when relying primarily on subjective judgment.

These findings expose a structural limitation rather than an individual shortcoming. Human cognition is susceptible to cognitive biases, emotional influences, confirmation bias, stereotyping, and overconfidence. Such limitations become particularly consequential in high-consequence environments where the cost of a false assessment may extend far beyond the individual being evaluated.

Personnel reliability therefore cannot depend exclusively upon either biological determinism or human intuition. Both approaches possess inherent limitations. Genetics provides valuable population-level knowledge without reliable individual prediction, while subjective judgment offers individual assessment without consistent scientific reliability.

The logical alternative is to evaluate what can be observed directly: the expressed phenotype. Rather than attempting to infer future behavior from inherited biology or immediate personal impressions, personnel certification should rest upon objective, longitudinal, and continuously verifiable evidence of how individuals actually think, behave, regulate emotion, and perform under varying operational conditions. This principle forms the operational foundation of the SynsID framework and represents the transition from biological possibility to evidence-based certification.

Part III. A Certification Framework for High-Consequence Access

The preceding analysis leads to a practical question. If genetic information cannot reliably predict individual behavior, and unaided human judgment cannot consistently identify trustworthy personnel, what should constitute the foundation of certification in environments where a single failure may produce catastrophic consequences?

This paper argues that the appropriate response is neither to abandon biological knowledge nor to replace human judgment entirely. Rather, certification should integrate the strengths of both while avoiding their respective limitations. The objective is not to predict who a person is, but to evaluate how that person consistently functions under observable conditions through evidence that is objective, longitudinal, scientifically grounded, and ethically constrained.

The following framework proposes one possible direction toward that objective.

6. From Deterrence to Certification

For more than seven decades, the security architecture surrounding weapons of mass destruction has been built primarily upon deterrence. The assumption has been that catastrophic weapons remain unused because states anticipate devastating retaliation. While deterrence has contributed significantly to strategic stability, it addresses geopolitical actors rather than the individuals entrusted to operate these systems.

The decisive vulnerability remains human.

Every launch protocol, command structure, or safeguard ultimately depends upon the judgment, emotional stability, and reliability of a relatively small number of individuals. As technological systems become increasingly sophisticated, the probability that catastrophic failure originates from technical malfunction continues to decline relative to the probability of human error, impaired judgment, coercion, or intentional misuse.

This observation suggests that certification standards should be proportional to the magnitude of potential harm. Where the consequences of failure are irreversible, the burden of demonstrating reliability should correspond to the extraordinary level of responsibility entrusted to the individual.

This principle is already reflected in existing high-consequence professions. The United States Personnel Reliability Program (PRP), and its more recent evolution toward Personnel Reliability Assurance, combines security investigations, medical evaluations, psychological assessments, and continuous monitoring to maintain the highest possible standards for personnel with nuclear responsibilities.16 Civil aviation follows a comparable philosophy by requiring pilots to satisfy rigorous medical and psychological standards before and throughout their operational careers.

The framework proposed in this paper extends that principle rather than replacing it. SynsID does not advocate broader exclusion or more intrusive surveillance. Instead, it proposes a more scientifically informed method for evaluating behavioral reliability through continuous assessment of the expressed phenotype. Participation remains limited to exceptional positions whose potential consequences justify exceptional certification standards, while preserving due process, proportionality, scientific transparency, and respect for individual rights.

7. The Operative Instrument: The Expressed Phenotype

The central proposition of the SynsID framework is straightforward: personnel certification should evaluate the expressed phenotype rather than the inherited genotype.

The expressed phenotype represents the observable integration of biology, development, environment, experience, and behavior. It is the measurable expression of how an individual functions under real-world conditions, incorporating the cumulative influence of hundreds of interacting genes together with the environmental factors that shape their expression throughout life.

Unlike genotype, which describes biological predisposition, the expressed phenotype reflects demonstrated capability. It is therefore the only level at which behavioral reliability can be evaluated directly rather than inferred.

Operational assessment should consequently rest upon three complementary pillars.

First, validated neuropsychological and behavioral evaluations should measure characteristics directly associated with operational reliability, including emotional regulation, empathy, impulse control, executive function, stress tolerance, psychopathic traits where clinically appropriate, and broader indicators of neurocognitive integrity.

Second, certification should incorporate a documented developmental and behavioral history. Educational records, professional performance, verified behavioral observations, environmental exposures, and significant life events provide objective longitudinal evidence that cannot be reconstructed through a single interview or psychological examination.

Third, reliability should be understood as a dynamic rather than permanent condition. Continuous evaluation recognizes that human behavior evolves throughout life and that stress, illness, trauma, substance use, or major environmental changes may temporarily alter an individual's capacity to perform safely in high-consequence roles. Certification should therefore remain an ongoing process rather than a one-time determination.

Together, these three components operationalize the fundamental principle of SynsID: individuals should be evaluated according to the integrated expression of their observable behavior rather than isolated biological characteristics or subjective impressions. The objective is neither prediction nor diagnosis, but the continuous verification of demonstrated reliability proportional to the responsibilities entrusted to the individual.

8. Computational Support and Its Boundaries

Advances in artificial intelligence offer an opportunity to strengthen personnel reliability systems, but only when applied within scientifically defensible boundaries. Computational models should augment human decision-making rather than replace it, and their conclusions should remain transparent, explainable, and subject to independent review.

Within the SynsID framework, artificial intelligence functions as a decision-support instrument rather than an autonomous decision-maker. Its principal contribution lies in integrating large volumes of behavioral, historical, psychological, and longitudinal information that exceed the capacity of unaided human analysis. Explainable and causal AI methods may reveal patterns, relationships, and risk trajectories that remain difficult to detect through conventional evaluation while preserving an auditable rationale for every recommendation.

The effectiveness of any computational system, however, remains fundamentally constrained by the quality of its underlying data. Artificial intelligence cannot infer information that does not exist within the evidence provided. Sophisticated algorithms applied to biologically insufficient data cannot overcome the intrinsic scientific limitations of those data.

An instructive example emerged in late 2025, when a Google DeepMind research agent built upon the Gemini architecture, codenamed *Aletheia*, analyzed hundreds of unresolved mathematical conjectures contained within Bloom's Erdős Problems database.18 The system successfully identified solutions to multiple longstanding problems, several through apparently novel reasoning and others by uncovering solutions already present—but largely overlooked—within the existing mathematical literature. Its achievement did not arise from generating information absent from the evidence; rather, it resulted from recognizing relationships that human researchers had not previously connected.

This distinction is fundamental. Artificial intelligence excels at discovering structure within information that already contains meaningful signal. It cannot manufacture predictive capability where the underlying data possess none.

The same principle defines the limits of behavioral genomics. Contemporary genetic data do not contain sufficient individual-level predictive information to determine future behavioral reliability. Consequently, no computational model—regardless of sophistication—can reliably extract conclusions that the biological evidence itself cannot support.

A similar clarification applies to the Cell2Sentence (C2S-Scale) family of single-cell language models developed by Yale University in collaboration with Google Research and Google DeepMind.13,14 These systems represent an important advance in cellular biology, enabling the generation of experimentally testable hypotheses from single-cell transcriptomic data. They were neither designed nor validated to predict personality, character, or behavioral reliability. Any future application of comparable technologies to personnel certification remains hypothetical and would require independent scientific validation before consideration in operational settings.

Within the SynsID framework, artificial intelligence therefore serves a carefully bounded role: not as a substitute for scientific evidence, but as a means of integrating diverse forms of validated evidence into a more transparent, objective, and continuously improving certification process.

9. Ethical and Legal Boundaries, and the Open Door

Any framework intended for high-consequence personnel certification must be defined as much by its ethical boundaries as by its scientific foundations. The greater the potential consequences of an assessment, the greater the obligation to ensure that the assessment remains transparent, proportionate, evidence-based, and respectful of fundamental rights.

Three principles therefore constitute non-negotiable safeguards within the SynsID framework.

First, no biological determinism. Human disposition is probabilistic rather than predetermined. Genetic variation may influence predisposition, but it does not define character, moral worth, or future behavior. Individuals remain capable of growth, adaptation, and change throughout life.

Second, no genetic criterion for certification. Consistent with both contemporary scientific evidence and established principles of genetic nondiscrimination, genotype shall not serve as an independent basis for granting or denying access to high-consequence responsibilities. Current genomic knowledge does not provide reliable individual behavioral prediction, and any use exceeding the available evidence would be scientifically indefensible and ethically unacceptable.15

Third, no stigma. Certification decisions concern the suitability of an individual for a narrowly defined operational role—not their value as a person. An individual determined to be unsuitable for one exceptionally sensitive responsibility should experience no broader implication regarding employment, citizenship, dignity, or participation in society. The certification applies to the position, not to the individual.

These safeguards preserve an equally important principle: scientific openness.

The SynsID framework is intentionally designed to evolve alongside scientific knowledge. Should future research identify biological, behavioral, or computational markers that demonstrate reproducible, individual-level predictive validity under rigorous independent validation, such evidence may be incorporated through the same standards of transparency, proportionality, peer review, and due process that govern every other component of the framework.

Scientific progress should neither be resisted nor accepted uncritically. It should be incorporated only when supported by reproducible evidence and when its application remains consistent with human dignity, legal protections, and the ethical obligations that accompany decisions affecting individual rights.

For that reason, SynsID should be understood not as a fixed protocol, but as an adaptive framework whose evolution remains inseparable from the evolution of science itself.

Conclusion

The evidence reviewed throughout this paper supports a clear and internally consistent conclusion. Human disposition is substantially heritable at the population level, yet it emerges from a distributed biological architecture composed of hundreds of interacting genetic variants whose expression depends continuously upon environmental and developmental conditions. Contemporary science therefore supports neither genetic determinism nor reliable individual behavioral prediction based on genotype alone.

At the same time, the evidence demonstrates that subjective human judgment remains an insufficient foundation for personnel certification in environments where a single failure may produce irreversible consequences. Neither biology considered in isolation nor intuition considered independently provides an adequate basis for high-consequence decision-making.

The appropriate response is therefore neither to ignore the human factor nor to reduce it to genetics. It is to evaluate the integrated human being.

The **SynsID (Synergistic Identification)** framework proposes that personnel certification should rest upon the expressed phenotype: the observable integration of biology, development, environment, and demonstrated behavior evaluated through objective, longitudinal, continuously verifiable evidence. In doing so, it seeks to replace isolated indicators with a more comprehensive understanding of human reliability.

The broader implication extends beyond personnel certification alone. Increasingly powerful technologies continue to amplify the consequences of individual human decisions. As scientific capability advances, institutional responsibility must advance with it. The challenge is no longer merely technological; it is civilizational. The question is not simply how powerful our technologies become, but whether our methods for entrusting them evolve with equal sophistication.

Ultimately, **SynsID** is not a proposal about genetics. It is a proposal about institutional judgment. Its central premise is that the most consequential decisions should never depend upon isolated pieces of evidence, but upon the careful integration of all scientifically relevant information within transparent, ethical, and continuously adaptive institutions.

The future of high-consequence security will therefore depend less on discovering perfect predictors than on designing better systems of evaluation. In that sense, the principle underlying this framework extends well beyond personnel reliability itself:

The whole is often more informative than any of its individual parts.

It is through that principle of integration—scientific, institutional, and human—that **Synergistic Identification** derives both its name and its purpose.

Disclaimer

This monograph presents a conceptual framework intended to stimulate scholarly discussion on personnel reliability in high-consequence domains. It combines established scientific evidence with forward-looking institutional proposals that should not be interpreted as current operational practice.

Nothing in this monograph advocates the use of genetic information as an independent criterion for personnel certification. On the contrary, one of its central conclusions is that contemporary scientific evidence does not support reliable individual behavioral prediction from genotype alone. The proposed **SynsID** framework explicitly rejects genetic determinism and instead emphasizes objective, longitudinal assessment of the expressed phenotype under rigorous ethical, legal, and scientific safeguards.

References to third-party technologies—including the Cell2Sentence (C2S-Scale) family of models developed by Yale University, Google Research, and Google DeepMind—are limited to their documented scientific capabilities within cellular biology. Any discussion of their potential future relevance to personnel reliability represents the author's conceptual analysis and should not be interpreted as an endorsement by, affiliation with, or representation of those organizations.

The views expressed are solely those of the author and are intended to encourage interdisciplinary dialogue at the intersection of behavioral science, institutional design, artificial intelligence, and strategic security.

Works Cited

1. Zwir I, Arnedo J, Del-Val C, et al. Uncovering the complex genetics of human character. Molecular Psychiatry. 2020;25:2295–2312. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-018-0263-6

2. Zwir I, Arnedo J, Del-Val C, et al. Uncovering the complex genetics of human temperament. Molecular Psychiatry. 2020;25:2275–2294. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-018-0264-5

3. Caspi A, McClay J, Moffitt TE, et al. Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. Science. 2002;297:851–854. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1072290

4. Byrd AL, Manuck SB. MAOA, childhood maltreatment, and antisocial behavior: meta-analysis of a gene-environment interaction. Biological Psychiatry. 2014;75(1):9–17. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.05.004

5. Caspi A, Sugden K, Moffitt TE, et al. Influence of life stress on depression: moderation by a polymorphism in the 5-HTT gene. Science. 2003;301:386–389. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1083968

6. Risch N, Herrell R, Lehner T, et al. Interaction between the serotonin transporter gene (5-HTTLPR), stressful life events, and risk of depression: a meta-analysis. JAMA. 2009;301(23):2462–2471. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.878

7. Lykken D, Tellegen A. Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. Psychological Science. 1996;7(3):186–189. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00355.x

8. Bartels M. Genetics of wellbeing and its components satisfaction with life, happiness, and quality of life: a review and meta-analysis of heritability studies. Behavior Genetics. 2015;45:137–156. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-015-9713-y

9. Bond CF, DePaulo BM. Accuracy of deception judgments. Personality and Social Psychology Review. 2006;10(3):214–234. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_2

10. Lango Allen H, Estrada K, Lettre G, et al. Hundreds of variants clustered in genomic loci and biological pathways affect human height. Nature. 2010;467:832–838. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09410

11. Challenges and Opportunities for Developing More Generalizable Polygenic Risk Scores. PMC, National Institutes of Health. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9828290/

12. The Role of α-Synuclein in the Regulation of the Serotonin System: Physiological and Pathological Features. PMC, National Institutes of Health. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9953742/

13. Cell2Sentence-Scale Gemma 2 27B (C2S-Scale): model card. Yale University, Google Research, and Google DeepMind. Hugging Face. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://huggingface.co/vandijklab/C2S-Scale-Gemma-2-27B

14. Google's Gemma AI Model Helps Discover a New Potential Cancer Therapy Pathway (C2S-Scale 27B). Google. 2025. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://blog.google/innovation-and-ai/products/google-gemma-ai-cancer-therapy-discovery/

15. Genetic Discrimination and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA). National Human Genome Research Institute. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://www.genome.gov/about-genomics/policy-issues/Genetic-Discrimination

16. DoD Instruction 5210.42: DoD Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Assurance. U.S. Department of Defense. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/521042p.pdf

17. Shedding Light on Antisocial Behavior Through Genetically Informed Research. Annual Review of Psychology. 2025. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-psych-021524-043650

18. Feng T, et al. Semi-Autonomous Mathematics Discovery with Gemini: A Case Study on the Erdős Problems. arXiv:2601.22401. 2026. Accessed June 5, 2026. https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.22401