PS-04 Stress, coping and mental health by sex

The intersection of biological sex, stress physiology, and mental health constitutes one of the most rigorously debated and consequential domains in modern behavioural science. As societies strive to optimize the environments in which men and women live together—whether in intimate dyads, familial units, corporate organizations, or broader societal structures—understanding how the sexes systematically differ, and where they significantly overlap, is paramount. The study of stress is inherently the study of adaptation. When confronted with a disruption to homeostasis, the human organism marshals a complex cascade of neuroendocrine and autonomic responses designed to mobilize energy, mitigate threat, and eventually restore equilibrium. However, the precise architecture of this response, the psychological coping strategies deployed to manage it, and the long-term psychiatric consequences of its dysregulation exhibit profound sex-dependent variations.

This foundational report synthesizes the prevailing scientific literature concerning sex differences in stress reactivity, coping strategies, and mental health outcomes. To provide a rigorous architectural framework, the analysis strictly differentiates between three distinct but interacting layers of human experience. The first layer is physiology, representing the measurable biological substrate, including the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, autonomic nervous system reactivity, and molecular receptor mechanics. The second layer is behaviour, representing statistical distributions of coping strategies, affiliation, and psychiatric symptom presentation. The third layer is culture, representing the variable landscape of societal norms, gender roles, and structural expectations that amplify, suppress, or redirect underlying biological predispositions.

A Methodological Prelude: Distinguishing Averages from Individuals

Before examining the neurobiological and epidemiological literature, it is a mathematical and empirical necessity to clearly distinguish between group averages and individual prediction. The scientific literature on sex differences relies heavily on statistical aggregates, most frequently reported as standardized mean differences (such as Cohen's *d* or Hedges' *g*) or Odds Ratios (OR). These metrics quantify the distance between the means of two groups relative to the variance within those groups.

In her landmark synthesis of 46 meta-analyses, Janet Shibley Hyde (2005, 2014) articulated the "Gender Similarities Hypothesis"[1]. This hypothesis posits that males and females are similar on the vast majority of psychological and cognitive variables, with effect sizes clustering predominantly in the small (d = 0.11 to 0.35) to near-zero (d < 0.10) range[1]. To contextualize this mathematically, when two populations differ by an effect size of d = 0.30—a common and highly significant magnitude for many robust sex differences in stress behaviour and physiology—the distributions of those two populations still overlap by approximately 88%.

Therefore, while establishing distinct physiological baselines and statistical behavioural patterns

is absolutely vital for public health epidemiology, pharmacological development, and sociological modeling, applying these statistical aggregates to predict the behaviour, coping style, or physiological stress response of any single *individual* man or woman is highly prone to error. The findings discussed in the subsequent sections map the differing centers of gravity for men and women as broad populations. They elucidate systemic vulnerabilities and distinct evolutionary adaptations, but they do not represent binary, non-overlapping biological inevitabilities for individuals.

Layer 1: Physiology (The Measurable Substrate)

The physiological layer of the stress response is primarily governed by two major systems: the autonomic nervous system (ANS), which regulates immediate, catecholamine-driven arousal (the sympathetic "fight-or-flight" response), and the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, which manages sustained, glucocorticoid-driven endocrine adaptation. Across both systems, rigorous literature reveals robust, replicable sex differences in baseline functioning, acute stress reactivity, and molecular receptor mechanics.

HPA Axis Reactivity and Cortisol Patterns

The HPA axis coordinates the systemic endocrine response to stress. Upon perceiving a threat, the hypothalamus releases corticotropin-releasing factor (CRF), which stimulates the pituitary gland to release adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH). ACTH travels through the bloodstream to the adrenal cortex, triggering the synthesis and release of glucocorticoids, predominantly cortisol in humans. Cortisol mobilizes glucose, suppresses non-essential functions like digestion and reproduction, and eventually feeds back into the brain to shut down the stress response.

To measure HPA reactivity in controlled settings, researchers frequently utilize the Trier Social Stress Test (TSST), a standardized laboratory paradigm involving public speaking and mental arithmetic performed in front of a non-responsive, stern evaluative panel. The TSST is highly effective, reliably inducing a two- to four-fold increase in salivary free cortisol above baseline levels in 70% to 80% of adult participants[3].

A seminal and widely cited meta-analytic review by Kudielka and Kirschbaum (2005, *Biological Psychology*) established that adult men consistently mount a significantly larger and more robust cortisol response to acute psychosocial stress (such as the TSST) than women[5]. Across dozens of independent studies, mean cortisol responses were observed to be 1.5 to 2 times higher in healthy men compared to healthy women[4]. Subsequent meta-analyses have replicated this finding, confirming that healthy men evidence significantly higher peak cortisol and greater total cortisol output—measured as the Area Under the Curve (AUC)—compared to women facing identical stressors[9]. Furthermore, men often exhibit elevated anticipatory cortisol levels merely in expectation of a psychological stressor, a phenomenon less frequently observed in women[4].

However, this average sex difference is not static; it is heavily modulated by female endocrinology, specifically the menstrual cycle and the use of exogenous hormones. Research by Kirschbaum et al. (1999, *Psychoneuroendocrinology*) demonstrated that women in the luteal phase of their menstrual cycle (characterized by high progesterone) exhibit robust cortisol responses that are often statistically comparable to those of men[12]. Conversely, women in the

follicular phase, or those utilizing oral contraceptives (OC), show heavily blunted cortisol reactivity[14]. This suggests that gonadal steroids are primary biological drivers of these observed physiological differences. Specifically, estrogen generally dampens HPA reactivity by modulating CRF expression, while progesterone may enhance it, creating a shifting physiological landscape for women that men do not experience[17].

The Cortisol Awakening Response (CAR)

In contrast to reactive cortisol during acute stress, baseline diurnal cortisol patterns exhibit a different architecture of sex differences. The Cortisol Awakening Response (CAR) is a highly stable, genetically influenced phenomenon characterized by a rapid 50% to 75% increase in cortisol levels occurring within the first 30 to 45 minutes after waking[20]. The CAR is theorized to be a primary functional process designed to mobilize resources for the anticipated demands of the day, alongside a secondary process that helps the organism counterregulate prior-day emotional experiences[21].

Wüst et al. (2000, *Psychoneuroendocrinology*), in a combined methodology study of 509 adult subjects, found that the initial *magnitude* of the cortisol rise immediately post-awakening does not significantly differ between the sexes[20]. However, the temporal resolution of the response does: women tend to display a significantly delayed decrease in cortisol following the morning peak, meaning their systems remain bathed in waking cortisol for a longer duration than men[20]. Furthermore, CAR appears to be differentially sensitive to chronic stress and psychopathology based on sex. Under conditions of high psychological stress or clinical burnout, the CAR frequently becomes blunted or dysregulated in men, whereas women facing similar examination stress or chronic overload often maintain or even elevate their awakening cortisol response[22].

Autonomic Reactivity: The Heart Rate Variability (HRV) Paradox

The autonomic nervous system, comprising the sympathetic (accelerator) and parasympathetic (brake) branches, demonstrates a fascinating and highly paradoxical sex difference, particularly regarding Heart Rate Variability (HRV). HRV is the measure of the naturally occurring beat-to-beat variations in heart rate. High vagally-mediated HRV at rest—indicating strong parasympathetic control via the vagus nerve—is universally considered a biomarker of cardiovascular health, flexible emotion regulation, and robust stress resilience. Low resting HRV is highly correlated with internalizing psychopathologies, such as depression and anxiety[24].

A comprehensive and definitive meta-analysis by Koenig and Thayer (2016, *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*) analyzed data from 63,612 human participants (31,970 females) across a massive 1,154 effect size estimates[25]. The researchers uncovered a highly replicable biological paradox. Women exhibit significantly higher resting vagal activity—quantified as greater High-Frequency (HF) power in the power spectral density of the HRV—compared to men[25]. Paradoxically, women display this higher vagal tone despite simultaneously possessing higher mean resting heart rates and a lower standard deviation of normal RR intervals (SDNN), a profile that typically contradicts high parasympathetic control in male-normative physiological models[26].

This baseline difference completely shifts during acute stress. In a subsequent meta-analysis, the same research group indicated that during laboratory stress induction, women exhibit a

more significant and precipitous *drop* in HRV compared to men, yielding a moderate effect size (Hedges' $g = 0.29$, $p < 0.0001$)[28].

The prevailing theoretical explanation for this paradox is that the higher resting vagal tone in women acts as a necessary biological compensatory mechanism[24]. Because women possess an underlying biological vulnerability to hyperarousal and negative affectivity, their autonomic nervous system maintains a stronger parasympathetic "brake" during resting states to prevent chronic dysregulation. When a stressor is encountered, this heavy brake is rapidly released, resulting in the dramatic drop in HRV and the swift deployment of sympathetic arousal[24].

Receptor-Level Mechanics: CRF and the Locus Coeruleus

Moving from systemic endocrine outputs to molecular neurobiology, recent research has successfully isolated sex differences at the cellular receptor level that explicitly predispose women to states of chronic hyperarousal. As noted, corticotropin-releasing factor (CRF) orchestrates the HPA axis. However, CRF also acts as a neurotransmitter centrally in the brain, projecting heavily to the locus coeruleus (LC). The LC is the brain's primary arousal center, responsible for synthesizing and releasing norepinephrine (NE) to alert the forebrain to threat.

Bangasser and Valentino (2014) conducted pivotal, highly replicated research on the CRF1 receptor within the locus coeruleus of animal models, discovering two critical structural dimorphisms that leave female brains uniquely vulnerable to stress[29].

First, female CRF1 receptors exhibit significantly enhanced coupling to the GTP-binding protein (Gs), which amplifies the intracellular cyclic AMP-protein kinase A (cAMP-PKA) signaling pathway[30]. This hyper-coupling makes female LC neurons exquisitely sensitive to very low, acute levels of CRF[29]. Consequently, a minor stressor that fails to trigger an arousal response in a male can trigger a robust norepinephrine release in a female.

Second, and perhaps more crucially for long-term mental health, female CRF1 receptors fail to internalize properly during chronic stress. In male biology, when the brain is flooded with high levels of CRF during sustained stress, the CRF1 receptor associates with beta-arrestin2. This association causes the receptor to physically retract from the cell surface into the interior of the cell (internalization), thereby desensitizing the neuron to further CRF stimulation[29]. This is an adaptive mechanism that protects the male brain from chronic, toxic hyperarousal.

In females, this beta-arrestin2 association does not reliably occur[29]. Under conditions of chronic stress, female LC neurons maintain their CRF1 receptors on the cell surface, remaining persistently sensitive to CRF[30]. Because they lack this adaptive desensitization mechanism, female LC neurons remain flooded with signals, leading to sustained norepinephrine release.

This receptor-level divergence provides a highly plausible biological substrate for why women are disproportionately vulnerable to stress-related psychiatric disorders characterized by hyperarousal, insomnia, and agitation, such as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and Major Depressive Disorder (MDD)[29].

Substance Withdrawal and the HPA Axis

Sex differences in the HPA axis also govern the neurobiology of addiction and coping via substance use. Acute alcohol consumption stimulates the HPA axis in both sexes, but men exhibit a higher cortisol increase following intake[18]. However, chronic exposure and withdrawal

reveal a stark reversal. Women exhibit significantly greater HPA axis hyperactivity during withdrawal from alcohol and nicotine, characterized by massively elevated cortisol levels reflecting acute stress sensitivity[18].

This heightened withdrawal stress in women is modulated by gonadal hormones. Estrogen enhances HPA axis reactivity by increasing CRF in the hypothalamus, leading to higher ACTH and cortisol during stress, particularly during the high-estrogen follicular phase[18]. Consequently, women experience more intense stress-induced cravings during withdrawal, leading to faster relapse times compared to men, who tend to relapse more frequently due to the rewarding properties of the substance rather than the stress of withdrawal[18]. Furthermore, pharmacological interventions like naltrexone, a medication used to treat alcohol use disorder, elicit different HPA responses by sex, significantly increasing ACTH and cortisol in women during high-estrogen phases, but lacking this effect in men[18].

Physiological Construct	Male Averages / Tendencies	Female Averages / Tendencies	Key Mechanisms / Sources
Cortisol Reactivity (TSST)	Higher peak and AUC; robust response across lifespan	Lower peak; highly variable based on menstrual phase	Kudielka & Kirschbaum (2005); modulated by estrogen/progesterone[5]
Heart Rate Variability (Rest)	Lower HF power; higher SDNN and lower resting HR	Higher HF power (vagal tone); lower mean RR interval	Koenig & Thayer (2016); female vagal compensation for negative affectivity[25]
CRF Receptor (Locus Coeruleus)	Internalizes under chronic stress (adaptive desensitization via beta-arrestin2)	Fails to internalize; hyper-couples to Gs protein, increasing sensitivity	Bangasser & Valentino (2014); female predisposition to hyperarousal[30]
Substance Withdrawal	Lower cortisol during withdrawal; relapse driven by reward	Hyperactive HPA during withdrawal; relapse driven by stress	Modulated by estrogen enhancing CRF production[18]

Layer 2: Behaviour (Statistical, Overlapping

Distributions)

Physiological differences provide the necessary biological hardware for the stress response, but psychological appraisal and coping behaviours dictate how that stress is managed in real time. Behavioural responses to stress exhibit significant sex differences, though it is critical to reiterate that these are characterized by overlapping statistical distributions rather than strict binary categories.

Coping Strategies and Cognitive Appraisal

When confronted with psychosocial stressors, men and women demonstrate different statistical preferences for specific coping mechanisms. A comprehensive meta-analysis by Tamres, Janicki, and Helgeson (2002, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*) examined dozens of studies on sex differences in coping behaviour[33].

The meta-analysis revealed that women are significantly more likely than men to employ almost *all* forms of coping strategies[33]. However, the strongest effect sizes indicated that women predominantly utilize strategies involving verbal expression, emotional processing, and social integration. Specifically, women are far more likely to seek emotional support, engage in positive self-talk, and, notably, ruminate on their problems[33]. Rumination—the repetitive, passive, and cyclical focus on the causes, meanings, and consequences of distress—is a known maladaptive coping strategy that is heavily linked to the onset, severity, and maintenance of depressive episodes[33].

Conversely, while men generally report using fewer coping strategies overall, they display a relative statistical preference for problem-focused, active coping (taking direct action to solve the stressor) and avoidant coping mechanisms[33]. Avoidant strategies in men frequently include behavioural disengagement, denial, and the use of alcohol or other substances to numb or distract from distress[38].

Furthermore, the type of stressor profoundly dictates the magnitude of the physiological and behavioural response. Stroud, Salovey, and Epel (2002, *Biological Psychiatry*) demonstrated that sex differences in stress reactivity depend heavily on the context of the psychological threat. In their laboratory studies (N=50), men exhibited significantly greater cortisol spikes in response to *achievement* stressors (e.g., highly evaluative mathematical and verbal performance challenges)[40]. In stark contrast, women exhibited significantly greater cortisol spikes in response to *social rejection* stressors (e.g., being excluded from a peer interaction group)[40]. This suggests that men's physiological alarms are evolutionarily and culturally more attuned to threats against competence and hierarchical status, while women's physiological alarms are more attuned to threats against social integration and relationship stability. These specific sensitivities have been replicated in developmental studies, showing that post-pubertal girls demonstrate heightened biological sensitivity to peer rejection compared to boys[42].

Tend-and-Befriend vs. Fight-or-Flight

For decades, the standard paradigm for the biological stress response was "fight-or-flight," a concept largely derived from mid-20th-century research conducted disproportionately on male animals and human men. In a highly influential theoretical paper, Taylor et al. (2000, *Psychological Review*) proposed an alternative, evolutionarily adaptive behavioural stress

response utilized predominantly by females: "tend-and-befriend"[43].
Taylor argued that female behavioural responses to stress are evolutionarily optimized to protect offspring (tending) and to seek out social groups for mutual defense and resource sharing (befriending)[44]. Physiologically, the tend-and-befriend response is hypothesized to be driven by the oxytocin system, which operates in conjunction with endogenous opioids and is enhanced in the presence of estrogen[44]. While both men and women experience rapid sympathetic nervous system arousal during a threat, women's simultaneous release of oxytocin acts to downregulate acute HPA axis reactivity, encouraging affiliative, nurturing behaviour rather than aggression or solitary withdrawal[44].
Critics of the tend-and-befriend model argue that it risks essentializing female behaviour to maternal instincts and ignoring the fact that human males also heavily rely on social affiliation, coalition building, and group defense during stress. However, subsequent empirical validations have demonstrated that, under stress, women do display higher rates of prosocial and affiliative risk-taking, whereas men are more likely to exhibit aggressive, competitive, or isolated risk-taking[48]. For instance, stress reliably increases risk-taking behaviour in adolescent boys (correlated with blunted cortisol responses), while stress tends to decrease risk-taking in adolescent girls[48].

The Internalizing vs. Externalizing Spectrums

The culmination of differing stress physiology, cognitive appraisal, and coping behaviours manifests in distinctly gendered patterns of psychiatric breakdown. Psychiatric epidemiology has long recognized that women suffer from higher rates of depression and anxiety, while men suffer from higher rates of substance abuse, anti-social behaviour, and completed suicide. Eaton et al. (2012, *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*) utilized sweeping data from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC, N = 43,093) to map these clinical disparities onto an invariant dimensional liability model[49]. They found that mental disorders do not exist in isolation but fall along two broad, latent spectrums: *Internalizing* (characterized by turning distress inward, leading to mood, anxiety, and phobic disorders) and *Externalizing* (characterized by projecting distress outward, leading to antisocial personality, intermittent explosive, and substance use disorders)[49].
The researchers found that the structural model itself was gender-invariant, meaning the underlying architecture of mental illness is the same for both sexes. However, women's average standing on the latent internalizing dimension is significantly higher, while men's average standing on the externalizing dimension is significantly higher[49]. This overarching framework seamlessly explains why stressed women ruminate and develop depression and panic disorders, while stressed men are more likely to externalize their distress through alcohol dependency, physical aggression, or extreme risk-taking[39].
This internalizing/externalizing dichotomy is tragically reflected in suicide statistics. Women experience higher rates of suicidal ideation and suicide attempts, aligning with the internalizing loop of severe depression and rumination. Conversely, men die by suicide at rates three to four times higher than women, a reality driven largely by the externalizing traits of impulsivity, substance use disinhibition, and the selection of highly lethal, violent means[39].

The Depression Gap and the "Male Depression" Controversy

The most studied disparity within the internalizing spectrum is Major Depressive Disorder (MDD). Salk, Hyde, and Abramson (2017, *Psychological Bulletin*) conducted an exhaustive, definitive meta-analysis encompassing data from over 3.5 million individuals across 90 nations[53].

They found that women are roughly twice as likely to be diagnosed with major depression as men (Overall Odds Ratio = 1.95; Cohen's *d* = 0.27)[54]. Developmentally, this gender difference does not exist in childhood. It emerges sharply around age 12 (OR = 2.37), peaks dramatically during mid-adolescence (ages 13–15, OR = 3.02), and then declines slightly to remain stable at roughly a 2:1 ratio throughout adulthood[53]. The timing of this divergence strongly implicates the onset of puberty, where the surge in gonadal hormones (altering HPA axis and LC mechanics) interacts with heightening social-evaluative pressures and the onset of rumination[53].

The Controversy: A highly contested counter-hypothesis argues that the 2:1 depression ratio is an artifact of biased, female-centric diagnostic criteria. Proponents of this view argue that the DSM criteria for MDD favor female-typical internalizing symptoms (crying, sadness, feelings of worthlessness, withdrawal) while entirely ignoring male-typical externalizing symptoms.

Martin, Neighbors, and Griffith (2013, *JAMA Psychiatry*) tested this by analyzing a national sample of 5,692 adults using the Masculine Depression Scale (MDS), which evaluates depression using alternative symptoms such as anger attacks, aggression, irritability, substance abuse, and extreme risk-taking[56]. When assessing the population using *only* these externalizing "male-type" symptoms, a higher proportion of men (26.3%) than women (21.9%) met the criteria for depression[57]. When traditional and alternative symptoms were combined into a unified metric, the sex disparity in depression prevalence entirely vanished (30.6% of men vs. 33.3% of women; $p = .57$)[57]. Proponents of the male depression framework argue that men are socialized against displaying stoic vulnerability; thus, their depression "masks" itself as anger and alcohol abuse, leading to chronic underdiagnosis and a failure of the mental health system to intervene prior to suicide[39].

However, this framework faces fierce criticism. Leading critics, such as Dr. Darrel Regier (former Director of Research at the American Psychiatric Association), argue that conflating externalizing behaviours with depression fundamentally damages psychiatric diagnostic clarity[57]. Critics argue there is insufficient etiological evidence to prove that a man exhibiting substance abuse and aggression is suffering from an underlying "depressive" mechanism, rather than suffering from distinct, well-established pathologies like Intermittent Explosive Disorder, Antisocial Personality Disorder, or Substance Use Disorder[57]. They argue that acknowledging that stress causes externalizing in men is accurate, but redefining externalizing as depression is a categorical error that confuses the outcome with the disease.

Layer 3: Culture (The Variable Landscape)

While physiological and statistical behavioural differences are rooted in evolutionary biology, they do not exist in a vacuum. Culture acts as a powerful amplifier or dampener of underlying biological vulnerabilities. Cultural norms dictate which stress responses are socially sanctioned and which are punished. For instance, traditional masculine norms aggressively police male

expressions of sadness or fear, effectively forcing male distress into externalized channels like anger or stoic avoidance, while feminine norms permit emotional disclosure but may foster passive rumination[39].

The Gender-Equity Paradox

Perhaps the most fascinating finding regarding the interplay of culture and biology in mental health is the "Gender-Equity Paradox," heavily observed in the Salk, Hyde, and Abramson (2017) meta-analysis of depression[53].

Standard sociological theory has long posited that women's higher rates of depression are primarily driven by structural oppression, lack of economic opportunity, unequal domestic labor, and patriarchal constraints[64]. If this hypothesis were entirely true, nations with the highest levels of objective gender equity (e.g., Scandinavian and Western European countries) should exhibit the smallest gaps in male-female depression rates.

The epidemiological data revealed the exact opposite: **Nations with greater gender equity show significantly larger gender differences in major depression diagnoses**[54].

Several mechanisms have been proposed to explain this paradox. First, in highly egalitarian societies, women enter male-dominated, highly competitive professional environments, exposing themselves to achievement-related stressors without necessarily possessing the male-typical biological buffering mechanisms, nor relinquishing their heightened biological sensitivity to social-rejection stressors[40]. Second, as societies become more wealthy and equitable, individuals are freer to express their intrinsic biological dispositions, leading to a maximization of underlying trait differences (a phenomenon robustly observed in personality traits and occupational choice)[65]. Third, women in egalitarian nations may increasingly compare themselves to male peers who, due to biological buffering and residual cultural stoicism, do not express depression, leading women to feel disproportionately inadequate[53].

The paradox highlights the danger of reducing sex differences entirely to cultural oppression; as culture equalizes and basic survival needs are met, underlying biological and behavioural distributions often become more, not less, pronounced.

Loneliness and Social Expectations

The cultural landscape also dictates how the sexes experience and process loneliness. Using Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) to collect real-time data and saliva samples during pandemic lockdowns, Ditzen and colleagues (2020) tracked 247 individuals[66]. They found that living alone and lacking a relationship were massive predictors of heightened trait loneliness and elevated diurnal cortisol[66]. However, cultural expectations around stoicism mean that single men often lack the expansive, platonic emotional support networks that single women actively cultivate, making relationship dissolution or widowhood a significantly more severe neuroendocrine and psychological shock for men than for women.

Dyadic Stress Regulation: How Partners Buffer (and Exacerbate) Stress

Because humans are obligate social animals, stress is rarely processed in total isolation. The presence of a romantic partner profoundly alters how the HPA axis and the autonomic nervous

system react to environmental threats. Research into dyadic coping reveals that men and women utilize and benefit from their partners in fundamentally asymmetric ways.

Asymmetric Buffering: Social Evaluation vs. Social Support

Kirschbaum, Klauer, Filipp, and Hellhammer (1995, *Psychosomatic Medicine*) conducted a seminal laboratory experiment exposing men and women to the TSST under three conditions: alone, supported by an opposite-sex stranger, or supported by their romantic partner, who was instructed to provide active verbal emotional and instrumental support[16].

The results demonstrated a striking sex asymmetry. Men who received verbal support from their female romantic partners exhibited a massive attenuation of the cortisol stress response compared to men who were unsupported or supported by a stranger[67]. For men, the verbal support and presence of a mate acts as a profound physiological shield against environmental stress.

Conversely, women who received active verbal support from their male romantic partners showed a *tendency toward increased* cortisol responses compared to being alone or supported by a stranger[67]. Despite women rating their partner's support attempts highly on self-report questionnaires, their HPA axis registered higher stress[67]. Researchers hypothesize that for women, performing a highly stressful, evaluative task in front of their primary attachment figure triggers social-evaluative threat (the fear of looking incompetent or foolish in front of a mate) or empathetic stress (worrying about the partner's worry)[67]. For verbal support, women often experience better physiological buffering from a female friend or a neutral stranger than from a male spouse[67].

The Power of Touch

If verbal support from a male partner fails to buffer a woman's stress, what does work? Ditzen and colleagues (2007, 2011, 2022) resolved this by altering the support modality. In their initial study, 67 women were subjected to the TSST after receiving either verbal support from their partner, no support, or positive physical contact (a standardized 10-minute neck and shoulder massage from their partner)[68].

The results were absolute: women who received physical touch from their partner exhibited significantly lower cortisol and heart rate responses to the stressor[68]. Verbal social support alone, once again, failed to reduce stress responsiveness[68]. Subsequent studies confirmed that even spontaneous intimacy and short embraces (hugging for less than 10 seconds) prior to stress rapidly accelerate cortisol recovery and dampen reactivity in women[69]. Interestingly, in these brief embrace studies, the stress-buffering effect of a quick hug was potent for women, but negligible for men (who seem to require more explicit, verbal, or sustained active support to register a physiological drop)[72].

Oxytocin, Conflict, and Emotion Recognition

The physiological substrate underlying the benefits of touch, affiliation, and the tend-and-befriend response is the neuropeptide oxytocin (OT). To prove causality in couples' interactions, Ditzen, Heinrichs, and colleagues (2009, *Biological Psychiatry*) conducted a double-blind, placebo-controlled study where 47 heterosexual couples (N=94) self-administered intranasal oxytocin or a placebo before engaging in a standardized, video-taped conflict

discussion regarding an area of chronic marital disagreement[74].
Couples administered oxytocin engaged in significantly more positive communication (eye contact, emotional self-disclosure, validation, caring) relative to negative communication (criticism, contempt, stonewalling)[74]. Furthermore, oxytocin significantly reduced post-conflict salivary cortisol levels ($F = 7.14$, $p = 0.011$)[74]. The effects of OT are particularly beneficial for individuals with low a priori dyadic coping skills, rescuing their ability to regulate the HPA axis during an argument[77].
However, oxytocin is not a generic "cuddle hormone"; its autonomic effects interact strongly with sex. In a follow-up analysis of autonomic responses (measured via salivary alpha-amylase, sAA, a marker of sympathetic arousal), Ditzen et al. (2013) found that oxytocin significantly reduced sympathetic arousal during conflict in women, acting as an anxiolytic[76]. Conversely, oxytocin *increased* sympathetic arousal in men[76]. Crucially, this heightened arousal in men was not linked to aggression, but correlated with increased emotional arousal and more positive, engaged conflict behaviour[76].
Furthermore, Domes et al. (2007, *Biological Psychiatry*) demonstrated that intranasal oxytocin significantly improves emotion recognition—specifically the ability to "read the mind in the eyes" and accurately identify subtle positive and negative facial expressions by modulating amygdala reactivity[79]. Given that men generally score slightly lower on baseline tests of facial emotion recognition than women, oxytocin administration shows a particularly pronounced benefit for older men and youth with autism spectrum disorders, elevating their social cognition capabilities to facilitate better dyadic coping and empathy[79].

Dyadic Construct	Male Response	Female Response	Key Sources
Verbal Partner Support	Massive cortisol attenuation (highly buffered)	Cortisol spike (social-evaluative threat)	Kirschbaum et al. (1995)[67]
Physical Touch/Embrace	Negligible buffering from brief touch alone	Massive cortisol attenuation (highly buffered)	Ditzen et al. (2007, 2022)[68]
Oxytocin Administration (Conflict)	Increased sympathetic arousal (engagement); improved emotion recognition	Decreased sympathetic arousal (calming); enhanced positive communication	Ditzen et al. (2009, 2013); Domes (2007)[76]

Summary of Robust Findings

1. Men mount a significantly larger cortisol response to acute psychosocial stress (e.g.,

TSST) than women, though female reactivity can match men's during the luteal menstrual phase.
2. Women possess higher resting vagally-mediated heart rate variability, which paradoxically drops more severely than men's during acute stress.
3. Female CRF1 receptors in the locus coeruleus fail to properly internalize via beta-arrestin2 during chronic stress, leaving women uniquely biologically predisposed to chronic hyperarousal.
4. Women heavily outpace men in utilizing emotion-focused, verbal, and ruminative coping strategies, whereas men statistically lean toward problem-solving and avoidance.
5. Men show peak physiological stress reactivity to achievement/performance challenges, whereas women show peak reactivity to social rejection challenges.
6. The underlying structure of psychopathology diverges by sex: women dominate the internalizing spectrum (depression/anxiety), while men dominate the externalizing spectrum (addiction/anti-social behaviour).
7. The gender gap in major depression emerges universally at age 12, peaks at a 3:1 ratio in adolescence, and settles at a stable 2:1 ratio in adulthood.
8. Paradoxically, nations with higher objective gender equity display larger, not smaller, sex disparities in major depression diagnoses.
9. Men experience profound physiological stress buffering from their partner’s verbal support and presence, whereas women experience stress spikes from a male partner's verbal support.
10. Women experience massive physiological stress buffering from physical intimacy, massages, and brief embraces, an effect that is negligible for men.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The "Male Depression" Construct:** Should externalizing behaviors (anger, extreme risk-taking, substance abuse) be formally classified as a male-specific presentation of Major Depressive Disorder, or does doing so destroy diagnostic clarity by conflating depression with distinct impulse-control and personality disorders?
- **The Gender-Equity Paradox Mechanism:** Is the widening gap in depression diagnoses in highly egalitarian countries a result of women taking on male-typical stressors without male biological buffers, an artifact of reduced stigma, or a natural maximization of intrinsic biological trait differences?
- **Evolutionary Basis of Coping:** Is the "Tend-and-Befriend" model a distinct, oxytocin-driven evolutionary circuit unique to females, or is it merely a culturally socialized variant of general human attachment behavior that males also utilize but express differently?
- **Long-term Oxytocin Efficacy:** While acute intranasal oxytocin improves laboratory conflict communication and emotion recognition, can it be practically and safely utilized as a long-term therapeutic intervention for distressed couples without triggering biological tolerance or receptor down-regulation?

5 to 10 Most Important Sources to Read in Full

1. **Kudielka, B.M., & Kirschbaum, C. (2005).** Sex differences in HPA axis responses to stress: A review. *Biological Psychology*, 69(1), 113-132.[5]
2. **Salk, R.H., Hyde, J.S., & Abramson, L.Y. (2017).** Gender differences in depression in representative national samples: Meta-analyses of diagnoses and symptoms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 143(8), 783-822.[53]
3. **Bangasser, D.A., & Valentino, R.J. (2014).** Sex differences in stress-related receptors: "micro" differences with "macro" implications for mood and anxiety disorders. *Biology of Sex Differences*, 5(1), 1-14.[31]
4. **Tamres, L.K., Janicki, D., & Helgeson, V.S. (2002).** Sex differences in coping behavior: A meta-analytic review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(1), 2-30.[33]
5. **Eaton, N.R., et al. (2012).** An invariant dimensional liability model of gender differences in mental disorder prevalence: evidence from a national sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121(1), 282.[49]
6. **Ditzen, B., et al. (2009).** Intranasal oxytocin increases positive communication and reduces cortisol levels during couple conflict. *Biological Psychiatry*, 65(9), 728-731.[74]
7. **Kirschbaum, C., et al. (1995).** Sex-specific effects of social support on cortisol and subjective responses to acute psychological stress. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 57(1), 23-31.[16]
8. **Koenig, J., & Thayer, J.F. (2016).** Sex differences in healthy human heart rate variability: A meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 64, 288-310.[25]
9. **Taylor, S.E., et al. (2000).** Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological Review*, 107(3), 411.[44]
10. **Martin, L.A., Neighbors, H.W., & Griffith, D.M. (2013).** The experience of symptoms of depression in men vs women: analysis of the National Risk and Vulnerability Survey. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 70(10), 1100-1106.[58]

Implications for Living Together

Translating neuroendocrine and epidemiological data into actionable insights requires strict avoidance of the naturalistic fallacy—the assumption that because a biological sex difference is "natural," it is inherently morally "good," unchangeable, or socially optimal. However, willfully ignoring these biological and statistical realities guarantees profound friction in how men and women live, work, and relate to one another.

For **couples and families**, the asymmetry in stress buffering is perhaps the most critical, immediately actionable takeaway. When a man returns home highly stressed, a woman providing active verbal reassurance and physical presence is highly likely to successfully downregulate his cortisol. Conversely, a man attempting to verbally "fix" a woman's stress, or hovering over her offering verbal advice during a stressful task, may inadvertently spike her cortisol by triggering social-evaluative threat. To buffer a female partner effectively, male partners should prioritize non-evaluative physical intimacy (hugging, touch, massages) over verbal problem-solving. Furthermore, understanding that men's physiological alarms are tripped most severely by achievement threats, while women's are tripped by social rejection, allows

couples to offer targeted grace when their partner seems to overreact to a specific domain.
For **organizations and societies**, the data on mental health manifestations is vital for designing effective support structures. Management and human resources systems must recognize that women experiencing burnout are statistically likely to internalize—manifesting as anxiety, absenteeism, and rumination. Men experiencing the exact same level of burnout are more likely to externalize—manifesting as anger, interpersonal conflict, risk-taking, or alcohol abuse. Corporate and legal disciplinary structures often punish male externalizing as a "character flaw" while treating female internalizing as a "health issue," failing to see both as divergent expressions of identical underlying stress.
Finally, while the validity of the "male depression" diagnostic label remains contested, destigmatizing male vulnerability could dramatically lower male suicide rates by providing an alternative to lethal externalization. Conversely, recognizing women's unique biological vulnerability to chronic hyperarousal—via the failure of CRF1 receptors to internalize—can pave the way for more biologically targeted workplace wellness interventions, acknowledging that women may require longer recovery periods to fully clear stress hormones from their central nervous systems. Ultimately, building a functional society requires designing environments that accommodate and respect the dual physiological realities of both sexes, leveraging their complementary strengths rather than demanding uniformity.

Works cited

1. The gender similarities hypothesis - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16173891/
2. Gender similarities and differences - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23808917/
3. Sex and stress: Men and women show different cortisol responses to, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5120613/
4. Consistent sex differences in cortisol responses to psychological, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/1454958/
5. Sex differences in HPA axis responses to stress: A review, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7992745_Sex_differences_in_HPA_axis_responses_to_stress_A_review
6. Kudielka, B.M. and Kirschbaum, C. (2005) Sex Differences in HPA, https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1518675
7. Sex differences in HPA axis responses to stress: a review - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15740829/
8. Sex differences in salivary cortisol reactivity to the Trier Social Stress, https://d-nb.info/1185980415/34
9. Sex-specific interaction between cortisol and striato-limbic, https://academic.oup.com/scan/article/16/9/972/6271473
10. Sex differences in salivary cortisol reactivity to the Trier Social Stress, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316444610_Sex_differences_in_salivary_cortisol_reactivity_to_the_Trier_Social_Stress_Test_TSST_A_meta-analysis
11. Sex differences in salivary cortisol reactivity to the Trier Social Stress,

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Sex-differences-in-salivary-cortisol-reactivity-to-Liu-Ein/0d8dcfe1523b798d9cd4b922f6f1e684ae1daaaf
12. Premenstrual syndrome is associated with blunted cortisol reactivity, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.3109/10253890.2014.999234
13. (PDF) Premenstrual syndrome is associated with altered cortisol, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332887765_Premenstrual_syndrome_is_associated_with_altered_cortisol_awakening_response
14. Impact of gender, menstrual cycle phase, and oral contraceptives on, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10204967/
15. Consistent sex differences in cortisol responses to psychological, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Consistent-sex-differences-in-cortisol-responses-to-Kirschbaum-W%C3%BCst/927ff8f7af4d765e7d8cb1fe2b69b1643bd45f15
16. Sex-Specific Effects of Social Support on Cortisol and Subjective, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Sex-Specific-Effects-of-Social-Support-on-Cortisol-Kirschbaum-Klauer/ae553dbb857f6202114d15f70174900e60d4b533
17. Sex differences in the HPA axis - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24944032/
18. How Do Sex Differences Play A Role In How The HPA Axis ... - NHSJS, https://nhsjs.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/How-Do-Sex-Differences-Play-A-Role-In-How-The-HPA-Axis-Is-Affected-By-Alcohol-or-Nicotine-Use-2.pdf
19. Psychoneuroendocrine stress responses and mood as related to the, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/4070522/
20. The cortisol awakening response - normal values and confounds, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12689474/
21. The Cortisol Awakening Response - Endocrine Society, https://www.endocrine.org/journals/endocrine-reviews/the-cortisol-awakening-response
22. Sex differences in the cortisol response to awakening in recent, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18640785/
23. The effect of an environmental stressor on gender ... - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18541385/
24. Sex moderates the relationship between resting heart rate variability, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30475032/
25. Sex differences in healthy human heart rate variability - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26964804/
26. Sex differences in healthy human heart rate variability, https://www.isbewonders.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Sex-differences-in-healthy-human-hrv-a-meta-analysis.pdf
27. Sex differences in heart rate and heart rate variability in rats - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/physiology/articles/10.3389/fphys.2023.1170320/pdf
28. Quantitative meta-analysis of heart rate variability finds reduced, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7422617/
29. (PDF) Sex Differences in Corticotropin-Releasing Factor Receptor,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44673449_Sex_Differences_in_Corticotropin-Releasing_Factor_Receptor_Signaling_and_Trafficking_Potential_Role_in_Female_Vulnerability_to_Stress-Related_Psychopathology
30. (PDF) Sex differences in corticotropin-releasing factor signaling and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46158581_Sex_differences_in_corticotropin-releasing_factor_signaling_and_trafficking
31. Sex differences in stress-related receptors - Temple University, https://scholarshare.temple.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/d1af3aa2-298e-4e59-8a29-2c46783f736c/content
32. Sex Differences in the Locus Coeruleus-Norepinephrine System, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4875880/
33. A Meta-Analytic Review and an Examination of Relative Coping, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247759663_Sex_Differences_in_Coping_Behavior_A_Meta-Analytic_Review_and_an_Examination_of_Relative_Coping
34. Sex Differences in Coping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review and an, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Sex-Differences-in-Coping-Behavior%3A-A-Meta-Analytic-Tamres-Janicki/96d7b572a1a6266244b66f8c05106d74da6fd529
35. Meta-Analysis of Sex Differences in Coping Behaviors by Stressor, https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Meta-Analysis-of-Sex-Differences-in-Coping-Behaviors-by-Stressor-Appraisal_tbl3_247759663
36. Sex Differences in Coping Behavior - A Meta Analytic Review and, https://www.scribd.com/document/262740099/Sex-Differences-in-Coping-Behavior-A-Meta-Analytic-Review-and-an-Examination-of-Relative-Coping
37. The Impact of Coping Styles and Gender on Situational Coping, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.913125/full
38. Redalyc.Coping Strategies: Gender Differences and Development, https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/172/17224489021.pdf
39. Male-Type Depression Mediates the Relationship between Avoidant, https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/19/17/10874
40. Sex differences in stress responses: Social rejection versus, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11179617_Sex_differences_in_stress_responses_Social_rejection_versus_achievement_stress
41. Sex differences in stress responses: social rejection ... - PubMed - NIH, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12208639/
42. Sex differences in biological response to peer rejection ... - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27939363/
43. Tend and Befriend Theory - Psychology Fanatic, https://psychologyfanatic.com/tend-and-befriend-theory/
44. Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: tend-and-befriend, not, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10941275/
45. Tend and befriend - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tend_and_befriend
46. Tend and Befriend Theory - UCLA Social Neuroscience Lab, https://taylorlab.psych.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2014/11/2011_Tend-and-Befriend-Theory.pdf

47. (PDF) Social support and oxytocin interact to suppress cortisol and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8958966_Social_support_and_oxytocin_interact_to_suppress_cortisol_and_subjective_responses_to_psychosocial_stress
48. Gender Specific Effect of Psychological Stress and Cortisol ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3681843/
49. An invariant dimensional liability model of gender differences in, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21842958/
50. Study uncovers a reason behind sex differences in mental illness, https://www.apa.org/monitor/2011/11/sex-differences
51. A review of the 257 meta-analyses of the differences between ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12224573/
52. A Hypothesis of Gender Differences in Self-Reporting Symptom of, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.589687/pdf
53. Gender Differences in Depression Appear at Age 12, https://neurosciencenews.com/age-depression-gender-6528/
54. Gender differences in depression in representative national samples, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28447828/
55. Gender Differences in Depression in Representative National, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316529552_Gender_Differences_in_Depression_in_Representative_National_Samples_Meta-Analyses_of_Diagnoses_and_Symptoms
56. Depression Symptoms May Manifest Differently in Men, https://anzmh.asn.au/blog/mental-health/depression-symptoms-may-manifest-differently-in-men
57. Do Men Experience Depression Differently From Women?, https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/10.1176/appi.pn.2013.10a24
58. The experience of symptoms of depression in men vs women, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23986338/
59. Sex Differences in Masculine Depression: Externalizing Symptoms, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282896371_Sex_Differences_in_Masculine_Depression_Externalizing_Symptoms_as_a_Primary_Feature_of_Depression_in_Men
60. Male Depression: The Centre for Male Psychology's Position, https://daffodil-indigo-tk4k.squarespace.com/s/CMP-position-statement-on-male-depression-21-01-26.pdf
61. Men's Depression, Externalizing, and DSM-5-TR: Primary Signs and, https://researchnow.flinders.edu.au/en/publications/mens-depression-externalizing-and-dsm-5-tr-primary-signs-and-symp/
62. depression in males – specificity, aetiology, relationships ... - Termedia, https://www.termedia.pl/Journal/-116/pdf-40467-10?filename=PPIN_1_2020-6-00111-Kielan.pdf
63. Gender differences in competitiveness and fear of failure help, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1131837/full

64. Gender Differences in Depression in Representative National ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5532074/
65. A Systematic Review and New Analyses of the Gender-Equality, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12065958/
66. Partnerschaft und Gesundheit | Request PDF - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336867640_Partnerschaft_und_Gesundheit
67. Sex-specific effects of social support on cortisol and subjective, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7732155/
68. Effects of different kinds of couple interaction on cortisol and heart, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17499441/
69. Romantic partner embraces reduce cortisol release after acute, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?type=printable&id=10.1371/journal.pone.0266887
70. Intimacy as Related to Cortisol Reactivity and Recovery in Couples, https://marriage.psych.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/213/2020/05/Intimacy_as_Related_to_Cortisol_Reactivity_and.4.pdf
71. Intimacy as Related to Cortisol Reactivity and Recovery in Couples, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30134358/
72. Romantic partner embraces reduce cortisol release after acute, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0266887
73. Women who embraced their partner subsequently had lower stress, https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/952368
74. Intranasal Oxytocin Increases Positive Communication and Reduces, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23491014_Intranasal_Oxytocin_Increases_Positive_Communication_and_Reduces_Cortisol_Levels_During_Couple_Conflict
75. Intranasal oxytocin increases positive communication and reduces, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19027101/
76. (PDF) Sex-specific effects of intranasal oxytocin on autonomic, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230582289_Sex-specific_effects_of_intranasal_oxytocin_on_autonomic_nervous_system_and_emotional_responses_to_couple_conflict
77. Dyadic Coping and Its Underlying Neuroendocrine Mechanisms, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02600/full
78. Sex-specific effects of intranasal oxytocin on autonomic nervous, https://academic.oup.com/scan/article/8/8/897/1627051
79. Oxytocin improves emotion recognition for older males - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24856057/
80. Oxytocin improves specific recognition of positive facial expressions, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/41579082_Oxytocin_improves_specific_recognition_of_positive_facial_expressions
81. Effects of Intranasal Oxytocin on the Neural Basis of Face, https://www.psychologie.uni-freiburg.de/abteilungen/psychobio/studium/archiv/ws1

718/Domes13BiologicalPsychiatry.pdf
82. Effects of intranasal oxytocin on emotional face processing in women, https://www.psychologie.uni-freiburg.de/abteilungen/psychobio/studium/archiv/ws1718/Domes10Psychoneuroendocrinology.pdf
83. Intranasal oxytocin improves emotion recognition for youth with, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19897177/
84. New treatment for social problems in autism? Oxytocin improves, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/04/100408105200.htm
85. Intranasal Oxytocin Improves Emotion Recognition for Youth with, https://research.birmingham.ac.uk/en/publications/intranasal-oxytocin-improves-emotion-recognition-for-youth-with-a/