

Research Article

The Lying Cycle: A Neurophysiological Account of Deception and Its Implications for Polygraph Examination

Iyeru Godglory Oluwole

Iyeru Oluwole

Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission, Nigeria

Polygraph Examiner

Email: oluwoleiyeru@gmail.com

Article History:

Received: 15 Sept 2026 | **Accepted:** 20 Sept 2026 | **Published:** 30 Sept 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23061414>

*** Related declarations are provided in the final section of this article.*

Abstract

A lie does not begin at the moment it is spoken. It begins earlier, in the brain, as a plan, and it ends up in the body as measurable psychophysiological changes. This is the premise polygraph examination has always worked from, and this paper tries to spell out the sequence in more detail than is usually offered. This paper proposes a four-stage model of the deceptive act — planning, execution, concealment, and confrontation — and argues that what a polygraph records at each relevant question is best understood as a sympathetic nervous system reaction to specific threat, and may be viewed also as a direct behavioral signature of lying itself, since lying so often functions as the mechanism by which an offense is concealed. The paper works through the supporting literature on cognitive load, brain imaging of deception, and autonomic Psychophysiology, and makes the case that reactivity tracks salience: whatever most threatens an examinee's safety or standing will pull more of that person's attention, psychology and physiology than a comparably phrased but low-stakes question, guilty or not. I also address, deliberately and at some length, the scientific criticism the polygraph has attracted for decades, because a paper that argues for the underlying mechanism without acknowledging the method's documented limits would not be an honest one. The paper closes with what this means in practice: how an examiner might use the

concept of salience and the stages of the Lying Cycle to build better questions, run a more disciplined pre-test interview, and interpret results with appropriate caution.

Keywords: polygraph, deception, autonomic nervous system, cognitive load, comparison question technique, psychophysiology

1. Introduction

Before anyone lies, they plan to. Sometimes the planning takes weeks; sometimes it is compressed into the half-second between doing something wrong and being asked about it. Either way, something has to happen in the brain first — a recognition that the truth is dangerous, a decision about what to say instead, and usually some rehearsal of how to say it convincingly. Everything that follows in this paper rests on that fairly ordinary observation: **the brain runs the operation, and the body carries out the orders.**

Polygraph theory has always assumed something like this (National Research Council [NRC], 2003), even if it is rarely stated in quite these terms. What we want to do here is trace the sequence more carefully — from the moment an offense or a decision to deceive is first conceived, through its planning and execution, its maintenance over time, and finally its confrontation in an interview room or on a polygraph chart. This is therefore tagged or called the Lying Cycle. It is a fairly simple idea, but working through its stages in order turns out to clarify a few things that matter for how a test is built and how its results should be read.

It is critical not to pretend that the polygraph's scientific standing is settled on the part of the critics some of whom believe physiological arousal at a relevant question can come from fear of being wrongly disbelieved just as easily as from guilt (NRC, 2003; Iacono & Ben-Shakhar, 2019), and any paper that explains the mechanism of deception without engaging that problem head-on is skipping the harder half of the argument. This is directly handled in Section 6.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 What the Brain Is Doing Before Anyone Speaks

Brain-imaging studies of deception keep landing on the same general region: the prefrontal cortex. Abe and colleagues, using PET scans, found that fabricating an answer — as opposed to simply staying quiet about the truth — recruited the dorsolateral and anterior prefrontal cortices, areas tied to executive control, working memory, and the suppression of a response that would otherwise come out automatically (Abe et al., 2006, 2007). A later meta-analysis pooling several imaging studies found the same pattern held up across the literature: more

prefrontal and executive activity during lying than during truth-telling (Christ, Van Essen, Watson, Brubaker, & McDermott, 2009).

A number of these studies also picked up amygdala involvement, and this detail matters more than it might first appear. The amygdala is not primarily a lying structure; it is a threat-appraisal structure. Its involvement tends to be strongest when the deception happens in a real social interaction with something at stake, rather than in a low-stakes laboratory task where a participant is simply told to lie about a picture (Abe et al., 2007). A lie told during a card game is not the same event, neurologically, as a lie told to an investigator about a crime that could end in prison. What the amygdala's activity tells us is that the brain has already classified the situation as dangerous — and that appraisal or reaction, not the utterance itself, is what eventually shows up on a polygraph chart.

Put plainly: by the time an examinee is sitting in the chair, the planning is long finished. The prefrontal cortex built the account weeks or years earlier; the amygdala flagged what was risky about the truth around the same time. The nervous system, in other words, has been rehearsing this moment since well before anyone asked the first question.

2.2 Why Lying Is Harder Work Than Telling the Truth

There is a separate, well-established line of research on why deception is cognitively taxing. Cognitive load theorists argue that constructing and holding onto a lie draws on limited mental resources in a way that recalling a true memory simply does not (Vrij, Fisher, Mann, & Leal, 2006; Vrij, 2008). A liar has to suppress the true answer, invent something plausible in its place, keep that invention consistent with whatever the questioner might already know, watch the questioner's face for signs of doubt, and manage their own presentation on top of all of that. Vrij (2008) and Walczyk, Roper, Seemann, and Humphrey (2003) both make roughly this point: truth-telling is retrieval; lying is construction, and construction costs more.

That cost is not limited to the instant the lie is spoken. It runs, at a lower level, through the entire concealment period, and it spikes again whenever the hidden material is approached — which is exactly what a relevant question in a polygraph interview is designed to do. DePaulo and colleagues' large meta-analysis of behavioral deception cues (2003) found liars tend, on average, to appear more tense and less forthcoming than truth-tellers, though no single cue is reliable enough on its own to be diagnostic. The polygraph sidesteps the unreliability of visible behavior by measuring the psychophysiological cost of that same cognitive and emotional load directly, rather than inferring it from how someone looks or sounds.

2.3 From Brain to Body: The Autonomic Nervous System

Somewhere between what the brain decides and what the polygraph records sits the autonomic nervous system (ANS), the part of the peripheral nervous system that runs heart rate, blood pressure, breathing, and sweat gland activity without any conscious input. It has two branches pulling in opposite directions: sympathetic, which drives the acute fight-or-flight response, and parasympathetic, which pulls the body back down afterward (Cannon, 1927; Handler & Honts, 2008).

When the amygdala and prefrontal cortex together decide a question is dangerous, the sympathetic branch fires. Heart rate and blood pressure climb, driven by catecholamine release; breathing changes; sweat gland activity increases, which lowers the skin's electrical resistance and shows up as a change in electrodermal activity (Critchley, 2002; Handler & Honts, 2008). These are, more or less exactly, the channels a standard polygraph examination record. Nothing on the chart originates in the fingertips or the chest — it originates upstream, in a decision the brain already made, and the ANS is simply the messenger carrying that decision to the surface of the body (Handler & Honts, 2008). Even the most skillful pathological liar goes through this phase.

This is really the whole mechanism the rest of the paper leans on: the polygraph does not detect a lie. It detects the sympathetic aftermath of a brain that has just decided something is worth protecting.

3. The Lying Cycle

Putting the pieces above in order gives a rough four-stage sequence. None of the stages are strictly separable in real life — they blur into each other, and their length varies enormously by person and by offense — but treating them separately is useful for thinking about where in the process a given interview technique is actually aimed.

Stage One: Planning

Before most offenses, the prefrontal cortex is already busy: estimating the odds of getting caught, drafting a cover story, guessing at what might get asked later. This is premeditation in something closer to the clinical sense than the purely legal one — a period where the false account gets built before it is ever needed (Abe et al., 2006). Impulsive offenses compress this stage but rarely skip it entirely; even a split-second decision usually carries some flicker of “I need to hide this.”

Stage Two: Execution

This covers the act itself and the first lies told about it — to a witness, a colleague, a first responder, whoever asks first. Cognitive load is already running high here, because the gap between what happened and what the person is willing to admit has to be actively managed from the very first question (Vrij, 2008).

Stage Three: Concealment

Between the offense and any formal confrontation comes the longest stage: keeping the story straight across time, across different people, often for months or years. This is where the lie is at its most stable — rehearsed, routine, sometimes close to automatic for the person telling it. But the stability is partly surface-level. Walczyk et al. (2003) suggest the underlying work of suppressing the true account and staying alert for suspicion continues quietly the entire time, even when nothing about the person's behavior looks unusual. This explains why arousals/reactions to relevant questions cut across all channels (respiration, cardiology, electrodermal) during polygraph testing for a guilty examinee.

Stage Four: Confrontation

This is the stage a polygraph examiner actually works in. When the concealed material is approached directly — in an interview/interrogation, a statement, or a relevant question on a polygraph — the threat-appraisal system fires acutely. The closer a question gets to the specific thing the person has spent the most effort hiding, the sharper the reaction, because that is the thing most threatening to their safety or standing. This is where the psychophysiology described in Section 2.3 stops being theoretical and becomes something an examiner can actually observe on a chart.

It is worth saying plainly that practiced liars, even pathological ones, do not get to skip this stage. What they are generally better at is compressing or automating Stages One through Three, which is part of why they can seem composed under ordinary questioning (Vrij, 2008). What they cannot reliably do is switch off an acute threat response to the exact issue in question once that issue is approached carefully — because, on the evidence available, that appraisal is not something a person consciously controls (Handler & Honts, 2008).

4. Why the Issue in Question Wins

The claim underlying most of this paper is a simple one: people react most strongly to whatever most threatens their wellbeing. That is not a new insight, but it is worth stating directly, because it is the actual logic behind the Comparison Question Technique (CQT), the

format most polygraph examiners use. In a CQT, the examinee's psychophysiological response to a relevant question — one that goes straight at the matter under investigation — is compared against their response to a comparison question, a deliberately broad question about past conduct that has nothing to do with the specific issue (NRC, 2003; Iacono & Ben-Shakhar, 2019). A guilty examinee, the theory goes, finds the relevant question more threatening than the comparison question and reacts accordingly; an innocent examinee, for whom the relevant question carries no real danger, reacts about the same or more to the comparison question instead.

Critics have rightly pointed to the fact that environmental or incidental emotion is a real confound — nervousness about the test itself, general anxiety, prior bad experiences with authority. They may be right in principle, but in field practice this is precisely what the Standard Operating Procedures of the two most widely recognized bodies in the profession, the International Society of Polygraph Examiners (ISOPE) and the American Polygraph Association (APA, 2011), are built to address: incidental anxiety tends to spread evenly across a set of questions rather than concentrating on one, and it does not, by itself, produce the sharp differential reaction the CQT is looking for. A well-built test tries to isolate exactly that differential by pairing the relevant question against something structurally similar but personally much less consequential. Whether that isolation actually works as cleanly in the field as it does on paper is a separate and harder question, and Section 6 takes it up directly.

5. What This Means for Examiners

A few things follow from thinking about testing this way. The pre-test interview is probably the most undervalued part of the process. If reactivity or reaction tracks personal threat rather than deception in some abstract sense, then the interview is where an examiner actually finds out what is genuinely at stake for this examinee, and phrases the relevant question so it lands squarely on that issue rather than something adjacent or ambiguous to it.

Relevant questions themselves need to be built with Stage Four in mind — single-issue, unambiguous, and reviewed with the examinee beforehand, so that whatever psychophysiological reaction follows can't reasonably be chalked up to surprise or confusion instead of the issue itself (NRC, 2003). Comparison questions need to mirror the relevant question in form without mirroring it in stakes; the whole comparison falls apart if the two questions differ in phrasing as much as they differ in content.

Timing matters more than it might seem. The sympathetic response has a refractory period, and questions asked too close together will bleed into one another; spacing needs to be adequate and, ideally, randomized so an examinee can't anticipate the rhythm (Handler & Honts, 2008). And because the whole system runs on cognitive and physiological load, an examinee attempting countermeasures mid-test is really just stacking a second demanding task on top of an already loaded one — which is worth training examiners to notice, since it tends to show up as unusual patterning across the different channels rather than as any single obvious tell.

Underneath all of it, the most important discipline is probably the simplest to state and the hardest to practice consistently: treat reactivity or reaction as evidence of salience and threat, not as proof of a fact. That is what the underlying science actually supports, and “claiming more than that is where the method gets itself into trouble”.

6. Where This Argument Runs into Trouble

Any paper that builds a theoretical case for polygraph practice owes the reader an honest look at how contested the method's scientific standing actually is. The 2003 National Research Council report — still the most thorough independent review of the evidence — concluded that the Comparison Question Technique's scientific basis was weak, that a lot of the supporting field research had real methodological problems, and that the technique's true error rate could not be pinned down from the evidence available, even though it did find the CQT performed better than chance (NRC, 2003). Iacono and Ben-Shakhar's fifteen-year follow-up (2019) largely reached the same conclusion: the core problems the NRC identified had not been resolved, and claims of 90 percent-plus accuracy were not, in their view, well supported. To be fair to the other side of this argument, polygraph professional bodies and some researchers dispute this reading because over the decades, polygraph practice had consistently evolved and gained more recognition because of its SOP which has also evolved to meet the regulations and the laws of most countries practicing it and also training and pointing to newer field studies and arguing that the CQT and other test techniques does meet legal admissibility standards in some jurisdictions (American Polygraph Association, 2011; Honts, 2022). This is a live scientific dispute, mostly settled but not yet a settled one, and readers should treat it that way.

The Lying Cycle model offers one additional piece toward that ongoing conversation, not a resolution of it. What it offers is an explanation for why a psychophysiological reaction

occurs at a relevant question when deception is genuinely present. It does not, however, rule out the possibility that an innocent person might find that same question highly salient — fear of being falsely accused, an unrelated trauma connected to the topic, plain distrust of the whole procedure. These are exactly the alternative explanations critics point to, and exactly the kind of thing peripheral physiological measures alone struggle to rule out (NRC, 2003). In field practice, this risk is addressed in part through the posttest interview, where such alternative explanations can be raised and worked through directly with the examinee, and through the Standard Operating Procedures examiners are trained to follow under bodies such as ISOPE and the APA, which build ethics, legality, and admissibility considerations directly into examiner conduct. These procedural layers do not eliminate the possibility of false positives or false negatives, but in day-to-day practice they are what keeps such outcomes rare.

A recurring criticism of the Comparison Question Test (CQT) concerns its vulnerability to countermeasures. Because the sympathetic response underlying CQT scoring can be partly masked — for instance, by deliberately inflating reactions to comparison questions, or by engaging in a competing mental task during the test — a motivated and informed examinee may be able to distort the very physiological comparison on which the technique depends (NRC, 2003). This remains a genuine limitation rather than a myth: even sophisticated procedural safeguards cannot fully eliminate the underlying physiological vulnerability, since sympathetic arousal, while difficult to suppress entirely, can still be partially manipulated by a trained examinee.

That said, procedural and administrative safeguards substantially reduce the practical impact of this vulnerability. Advances in pretest and posttest chart analysis techniques, combined with examiner skill and competence, structured peer review, and other quality-control procedures, have improved the detection of countermeasure attempts and reduced their success rate. These safeguards do not eliminate the theoretical weakness identified by the NRC (2003), but they meaningfully strengthen the technique's practical resistance to manipulation.

This procedural resilience is distinct from, though complementary to, the physiological basis of the CQT described in Sections 2 and 3: the neurophysiological mechanisms underlying the comparison-question response remain the technique's scientific foundation, while examiner-

level and administrative controls address the practical risk that an examinee will successfully exploit that mechanism.

7. Conclusion

A lie is not really a single spoken moment. It is the last visible piece of a much longer process that starts with planning in the prefrontal cortex, runs through a concealment period that keeps drawing on cognitive resources long after the initial act, and ends in an acute physiological reaction when the hidden issue is finally approached directly. We have called that sequence the Lying Cycle, and the argument of this paper is that a polygraph chart is best read as a record of threat appraisal — strongest wherever the examinee has the most to lose, which is usually, though not always, the very issue the examiner is asking about.

None of this settles the argument over whether the polygraph is accurate enough to rely on, and it was not meant to. What it offers examiners is a clearer sense of what their instrument is actually picking up, and why the pre-test interview, the wording of the relevant question, and restraint in interpreting the result matter just as much as the machine itself. A green leaf covers what is underneath it well enough, for a while. Careful, patient questioning is the heat that eventually tests whether it holds — but what withers under that heat still has to be read with some humility about what the method can, and cannot, actually prove.

Article Publication Details

This article is published in the **International Journal of Multidisciplinary Department**, ISSN 3108-2718 (Online). In Volume 2 (2026), Issue 5 Sept-Oct)

The journal is published and managed by **IJRG**.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank the editors and the reviewers for their valuable suggestions on this paper.

References

1. Abe, N., Suzuki, M., Tsukiura, T., Mori, E., Yamaguchi, K., Itoh, M., & Fujii, T. (2006). Dissociable roles of prefrontal and anterior cingulate cortices in deception. *Cerebral Cortex*, 16(2), 192–199.
2. Abe, N., Suzuki, M., Mori, E., Itoh, M., & Fujii, T. (2007). Deceiving others: Distinct neural responses of the prefrontal cortex and amygdala in simple fabrication and deception with social interactions. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19(2), 287–295.

3. American Polygraph Association. (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques. *Polygraph*, 40(4), 194–305.
4. Cannon, W. B. (1927). The James-Lange theory of emotions: A critical examination and an alternative theory. *American Journal of Psychology*, 39(1/4), 106–124.
5. Christ, S. E., Van Essen, D. C., Watson, J. M., Brubaker, L. E., & McDermott, K. B. (2009). The contributions of prefrontal cortex and executive control to deception: Evidence from activation likelihood estimate meta-analyses. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19(7), 1557–1566.
6. Critchley, H. D. (2002). Electrodermal responses: What happens in the brain. *The Neuroscientist*, 8(2), 132–142.
7. DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. J., Malone, B. E., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., & Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(1), 74–118.
8. Handler, M., & Honts, C. R. (2008). A critical look at the fight or flight response in psychophysiological detection of deception. *European Polygraph*, 2(3–4), 193–204.
9. Honts, C. R. (2022). Current status of forensic lie detection with the comparison question technique: An update of the 2003 National Academy of Sciences report on polygraph testing — A rejoinder. *Forensic Science International: Synergy*, 4, 100214.
10. Iacono, W. G., & Ben-Shakhar, G. (2019). Current status of forensic lie detection with the comparison question technique: An update of the 2003 National Academy of Sciences report on polygraph testing. *Law and Human Behavior*, 43(1), 86–98.
11. National Research Council. (2003). *The polygraph and lie detection*. Committee to Review the Scientific Evidence on the Polygraph, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
12. Vrij, A., Fisher, R., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2006). Detecting deception by manipulating cognitive load. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(4), 141–142.
13. Vrij, A. (2008). A cognitive load approach to lie detection. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 5(1–2), 39–43.
14. Walczyk, J. J., Roper, K. S., Seemann, E., & Humphrey, A. M. (2003). Cognitive mechanisms underlying lying to questions: Response time as a cue to deception. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 17(7), 755–774.

