

Research Article

Open Access

The Impact of Personal Safety on the Individual Radicalization Tendency

Shunxin Yao

Queensland University of Technology, Australia

ABSTRACT

Radicalisation works as a global challenge; the interdisciplinary psychological mechanism is normally simplified. This research integrates research about the radicalization process, authoritarian, emotional radicalisation, and political violence, then establishes the three-dimensional framework called cognitive radicalisation, behaviour justification and affective radicalisation. This research is based on the WVS 1981-2022 dataset and the Ologit model to analyse the heterogeneous impact of physical safety, economic security, and trust in families on the three-dimensional radicalisation indexes.

The results show that the three types of sense of safety all have protective effects, but their effect pathways are different. The physical safety mainly releases the hostile emotion (parameter is -0.100). Economic security mainly restricts the cognitive radicalising (parameter is -0.126); trust in family mainly decreases the behaviour of justification (parameter is -0.105). The control variables also have heterogeneous differences among different dimensions. The males are relatively radical in the behavioural level but limited in the level of cognition and emotion, the higher income individuals are milder in the level of cognition and emotion, but the behavioral elastic is higher. Health has a protective impact on all three dimensions, especially on the emotional effect.

This research emphasises that the sense of security has a unique function in the different dimensions of radicalisation, indicating that public policy should not be generalized in different situations and ought to accurately intervene in the community's public safety, economic guarantee and family bonds. In addition, radicalisation may also be triggered by social pathology to some extent; social integration and social equality mechanisms are also important.

*Corresponding author

Shunxin Yao, Queensland University of Technology, Australia.

Received: May 11, 2026; Accepted: May 15, 2026; Published: May 25, 2026

Introduction

Recently, political radicalism has been emerging around the world, which challenges global governance and social integration. The concept of radical thought and measurements has been ambiguous for a long time [1]. The core problem is how different types of sense of unsafety triggers radical tendencies at the psychological level. The intuition may point towards the consistent amplification effect, but the research shows that radicalisation is not a single routine; the cognition can peel with the behaviour, and it has various mechanisms [2].

Three-Dimensional Framework of Radicalization

I integrate the psychological and violence research based on the process orientation, then comes out a three-dimensional conceptual framework called cognitive radicalisation – behavioural justification – affective radicalisation, thus avoiding simply the radicalisation as the ideological movements or the violent participation [3-5]. In this category, ethical peeling is the key psychological threshold of behavioural justification [6]. The emotional dimension and the polarisation in the sentiment, which is a form of hostility among different groups, are linked with each other [7].

Multidimensional Safety Perception

In response to the research above, I divide the safety perception into physical safety, economic security and trust in family, then I

come up with the heterogeneous hypothesis. This prerequisite is physical safety, which mainly affects hostile thought, economic security affects the cognition towards the system and authority, and it restricts the justification of deviant behavior. This setting establishes a foundation for the later large sample size test based on the World Value Survey (WVS) dataset.

Personal Security and Values Change

Find that economic security can significantly affect individual values. Economic security is the individual ability and confidence of avoiding substance scarcity, unemployment and social disorder in personal life. Later, some other scholars expanded the concept of personal security [8]. points out that trust, which is the main part of social capital, affects human values [9]. Trust is the individual tendency to believe that most strangers are reliable, honest, and will obey the social rules. During the pandemic, found that the physical insecurity caused by the virus can also change individual values. Physical safety is that individuals can avoid physical threats from the environment. Based on those works, I got a new concept called personal security, which contains three concepts: physical safety, economic security and trust in family. I will use those factors to be predictors and explore how they can affect human radical values [10].

Contribution of this Research

This research clearly identifies the multi-systematic attributions

and the regenerative mechanisms of radicalisation. In the methodology, I provide a transferable measurement framework. In practice, I have suggestions about accurate intervention on specific social problems. I also have some suggestions about governance in the community, public safety, economic support network, and the bonds of family.

Literature Review

In the recent twenty years, radicalisation moved from the ideological tendency that labelled different groups towards the psychological-behavioural process that regards radicalisation as a cross-environmental state. In the past period, research about radicalisation has had confused definitions of the concepts. There is another dispute in the relationship between cognitive radicalisation and behavioural radicalisation [1]. The research mechanism deeply divides the multiple affecting pathways and emphasises the group threats and the environmental effects (McCauley & Moskalenko, 2008[2,4].

Based on that research, my research adopts the viewpoints of the procedural, creating a three-dimensional radicalisation framework based on a huge sample size survey. The three core concepts in my framework are cognitive radicalisation, behavioural justification, and affective radicalisation. This framework inherits the thought of the systematic review of multi-pathways radicalization [3]. I use the staircase to termism model to describe the psychological evolution from the unsatisfactory towards violence [5]. Then I regard ethical peeling as the key threshold of deviation and ethical justification [6].

In the sentimental dimension, sentimental polarization research shows that the party and group identity will enhance the hate

and discrimination towards the individual outside the group, and its effect on the daily judgment and behavior are more than the policy disputing [7].

In the cognitive dimension, the authoritarian traditions reveal the structural tendency of the obedience – offensive – tradition tendency [11]. And when the motivation of the authoritarian shows the increasing of the social threats and the splitting, the authoritarian will be activated significantly [12].

In the normalisation dimension, the relative sense of deprivation could trigger dissatisfaction, but only when this type of dissatisfaction gets the normative support of violence and the deviation, it may convert into the collective operations and the political violence [13].

In addition, the safety perception is clearly aligned with the three-dimensional radicalisation. Physical safety may repress hostile emotion, the economic security links with the institutional cognition, family and society decrease the deviation justification through the normalization and sentimental support. This is like the mechanism of buffer-restriction from the social capital theory [14].

Data and Methodology

DATA Source

I used the World Value Survey (WVS) historical dataset based on the official document. WVS covers hundreds of countries, using the multilevel and multiphase random sampling method to collect data. It opens to academia freely; this is good for comparative analysis and repetitive tests among different countries and periods [15].

Sample Handling

Table 1: Right Hand Side Variables

Dimension	WVS Code & Item	Construct Captured	Representative Literature & Rationale
Cognitive radicalization	E117 – “Having a democratic political system” (rev.)	Commitment to democratic norms vs. openness to anti-democratic cognition	Lower endorsement of democracy signals cognitive acceptance of non-democratic alternatives, a core element in radicalisation pathways. critiques conceptual ambiguity and emphasises beliefs; synthesises how anti-system cognitions underpin radicalisation stages.
	E114 – “A strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections”	Authoritarian preference	Classic indicator of authoritarian cognition. Altemeyer details authoritarian submission/aggression; shows threat-activated authoritarianism—both map directly to endorsing unconstrained leadership.
	E116 – “Having the army rule”	Support for military rule / suspension of civilian institutions	Preference for military governance indexes readiness to bypass liberal-democratic constraints—an advanced form of authoritarian cognition within radicalisation sequences (e.g., Moghaddam’s “staircase” toward violence; Horgan on routes into extremism).
	E235 – “How important is it to live in a country governed democratically?” (rev.)	Interiorization of democratic values	Lower importance reflects cognitive drift away from democratic legitimacy—consistent with frameworks that link value priorities and system support to radical beliefs [3].

	E233 – “Women have the same rights as men” (rev., as essential to democracy)	Acceptance of universalistic democratic norms (equality)	Rejecting gender equality indicates resistance to core liberal-democratic norms embedded in modern democracies; such normative rejection co-varies with authoritarian cognition [11,12].
	E234 – “Science & technology better or worse for the world” (rev.)	Attitude toward modernity / scientific progress	Anti-modern attitudes correlate with closed, threat-oriented cognitions and receptivity to authoritarian explanations, bridging insecurity and anti-system beliefs on value change under (in) security; broader anti-modernity motifs in radical cognition) [8].
Behavioral justification	F114A – “Claiming government benefits you’re not entitled to”	Moral disengagement re: fraud	Endorsing fraud reflects Bandura’s moral disengagement—ethical “peeling” that normalises deviance; a behavioural gateway in radicalisation sequences [5].
	F114E – “Terrorism as a political/ideological/religious means”	Justification of political violence	The clearest behavioural radicalisation signal—explicit approval of violence as an instrument, a critical threshold in pathways to extremism [4-5].
	F114B – “Stealing property”	Justification of property crime	Acceptance of norm-breaking aligns with weakened internal controls and readiness to transgress—consistent with radicalisation’s behavioural channel [6].
	F114C – “Parents beating children”	Acceptance of interpersonal violence	Tolerance for violence in intimate settings indexes broader moral disengagement and readiness to excuse harm, which co-travels with support for collective violence.
	F114D – “Violence against other people”	Approval of interpersonal violence	Direct readout of ethical boundary erosion is central to behavioural radicalization.
	F115 – “Avoiding a fare on public transport”	Acceptance of low-level deviance	Seemingly minor rule-breaking captures early normalisation of deviance—an on-ramp to broader justification of unlawful acts [6].
Affective radicalization (hostility)	A124_02 – “Would not like as neighbours: people of a different race”	Out-group hostility / exclusion	A prototypical marker of affective polarisation and social distance; animus toward out-groups is a robust emotional substrate of radicalization [17].
	A124_03 – “Would not like as neighbours: heavy drinkers”	Generalized exclusion (non-political out-group)	Captures breadth of exclusionary affect beyond ethnicity, indexing generalised hostility and low tolerance hallmark of affective radicalisation.
	A165 – “Most people can be trusted” (rev.)	Generalized social trust (low)	Low trust comes with fear/hostility and is central to the social capital account of cohesion vs. fragmentation [9, 14], a key emotional substrate of radical narratives.
	E069_11 – Confidence in national government	Institutional trust (low) / alienation	Institutional distrust reflects emotional estrangement from the polity—fertile ground for radical/anti-system affect.
	E069_07 – Confidence in parliament	Institutional trust (low)	Low confidence in representative bodies indicates affective rejection of system legitimacy, often accompanying out-group hostility .
	E069_08 – Confidence in civil service	Institutional trust (low)	Broad distrust across state institutions signals generalised hostile affect toward the social order—a stable emotional correlate of radicalisation [3,1]

Note: Weight on average. All radicalisation indices are constructed by unifying their constituent WVS items onto a 1–10 scale. Items that originally measured in the opposite direction were reversed so that higher scores consistently indicate higher levels of radicalisation. The cognitive index aggregates items related to anti-democratic attitudes and authoritarian preferences; the behavioural justification index combines moral approval of fraud, violence, and deviant acts; and the affective index captures out-group exclusion

and distrust in institutions and society.

The dependent variables are three-dimensional radicalisation indexes. Specifically, there are three radicalisation indices in this framework: a cognitive radicalisation index, a behavioural justification index, and the affective radicalisation index.

Cognitive radicalization is based on research about authoritarianism and anti-democratisation to establish. For instance, this includes the support of the monarchy or military dictator and the suspiciousness of democracy, also including the reversal effect of treatment. This index indicates the institutional cognition of the deviation from the democratic [11-12].

The behavioural justification index is the measure of ethical approval of fraud, stealing, corporal punishment, violence and terrorism [5].

The affective radicalisation index pays attention to social trust, the exclusion of the heterogeneous neighbour, and the distrust of the political organisation. Those originate from the sentimental polarisation mechanism.

Table 2: Left-Hand Side Variables

Variable Type	Variable Code	Meaning / Measurement
Independent Variable	H001	Sense of security in one's neighbourhood
Independent Variable	C006	Satisfaction with the financial situation of the household
Independent Variable	D001_B	Level of trust in one's family
Control Variable	X001	Gender
Control Variable	X003	Age
Control Variable	X047_WVS	Income class
Control Variable	A009	Self-rated health status

The core independent variable is physical safety, which shows the sense of community safety, and economic security, which indicates satisfaction on own economic condition and the trust in family, which reflects the family bond and indicates social trust. Those indices are all from the WVS dataset, and all are unified into the 1 to 10 discrete data.

The control variables are gender, age, income level, and health. Those can be found in the demographical chapter of the WVS and coding in the WVS standard; some of them are reversed and unified in the same nature during the data cleaning.

Model Setting

Because the composite indexes are ordinary discrete datasets and biased distributions, I employ the Ordinary Logit (Ologit) model to estimate the model. In the Ologit model, I project the latent variable and other latent factors into the observatory classes, then use the Maximum Likelihood method to estimate and report the parameters, z values, and the significance. Robustness is rechecked in the substitutive standard and the different groups. This setting is like the logic of the WVS historic trend dataset, good for reusing and rechecking. The models are established using STATA 17.

Common Method Bias

This research uses Harman's single-factor test. The explanatory rate of the first factor that is not spun is about 24%, which is lower than the threshold of 40%. This indicates that the common method bias can be controlled in my research. In the future, I can also combine different resources and multiple indices in various questions to decrease this risk, especially when I use many waves of surveys and the multi-country dataset.

Model Results

Table 3: Regression results

Variables	Model 1: Cognitive Radicalization	Model 2: Behavioural Justification	Model 3: Affective / Group Hostility
	Coefficient (Std. Error)	Coefficient (Std. Error)	Coefficient (Std. Error)
Core Independent Variables			
Physical Security (x1)	-0.038*** (0.002)	-0.028*** (0.003)	-0.100*** (0.002)
Economic Security (x2)	-0.126*** (0.002) **	-0.086*** (0.003)	-0.006*** (0.002)
Family Trust (x3)	-0.062*** (0.003)	-0.105*** (0.004) **	-0.056*** (0.003)
Control Variables			
Gender (c1)	0.041*** (0.009)	-0.208*** (0.012) **	0.041*** (0.009)
Age (c2)	-0.079*** (0.002)	-0.106*** (0.002)	-0.026*** (0.002)
Income Level (c3)	-0.013*** (0.003)	0.017*** (0.003)**	-0.053*** (0.003)
Health Status (c4)	-0.041*** (0.003)	-0.034*** (0.003)	-0.064*** (0.002)**

Model Fit Statistics			
Observations (N)	145,147	84,043	154,366
Likelihood Ratio χ^2	9804.15***	5786.82***	6098.73***
Pseudo R ²	0.0096	0.0113	0.0060

Note: Reported values are log-odds coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses. Dependent variables are measured on a 1–10 scale. The ordered logit (Ologit) model treats them as ordinal categorical variables.

Gender coding: 0 = Male, 1 = Female.

p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001. Bold values indicate the strongest effect within each model.

Cognitive Radicalisation index Ologit Regression Results

The model is totally significant (LR χ^2 is 9804.15; p-value is lower than 0.001). Three core independent variables all have significantly negative impacts on cognitive radicalisation.

The better physical safety, the lower cognitive radicalisation (parameter is -0.038). Economic security has the highest negative effect here (parameter is -0.126); this indicates that economic anxiety is the key recourse of cognitive radicalisation. The trust in family is higher; the cognitive radicalisation is lower (parameter is -0.062); this reveals that family is the essential psychological buffer.

From a view of control variables, the male has a lower probability to emerge cognitive radicalisation under physical unsafety, economic distress and the destruction of trust in family. The age increase significantly lowers the cognitive radicalisation tendency. The higher the income class, the lower the probability of cognitive radicalization. A healthier person has a lower probability of becoming a cognitive radical.

To sum up, no matter the security situation or the demographic trait, nearly all the variables are systematically linked with cognitive radicalisation. Economic security has the highest impact among them in this model. This model reflects that multidimensional unsafety will boost individuals to easily accept radical opinions in cognition.

Behaviour Justification Index Ologit Regression Results

This model is holistically significant, LR χ^2 is 5786.82, and the p-value is lower than 0.001. Three senses of safety all hurt the behavioural justification.

The higher physical safety, the lower probability to support the justification of fraud, violence, and fare evasion (parameter is -0.028). The better economic security, the higher probability of rejecting deviation (parameter is -0.086). The nice trust in family, which indicates a better family relationship, can restrict the ethical loss (highest effect, parameter is -0.034).

The control variables have different structures from the cognitive models. The female significantly tends not to justify the deviation (parameter is -0.208). The elders have a lower probability to justify the deviation (parameter is -0.106). The higher income may trigger the justification for the deviation (parameter is 0.017). better health, more obedience in the social rules (parameter is -0.034).

To wrap up, trust in family becomes the most powerful protective factor at a behavioural level. But the gender and income direction are opposite to the cognitive dimension, which shows the cognitive radicalisation, and the behavioural justification has different psychological mechanisms; I must analyses based on different dimensions.

Affective Radicalisation index Ologit Regression Results

The model is robust (Lr χ^2 is 6098.73; p-value is lower than 0.001). All the safety factors have a significantly negative impact on the affective radicalisation index.

Physical safety has the highest impact (parameter is -0.100), better physical safety, less exclusion, and more trust in society and political organisation. The economic security has a negative impact, but its impact is the weakest in this model (parameter is -0.006). This indicates that the economically anxious are more prone to individual survival pressure, not directly converted into exclusion from the external group. The trust in family significantly decreases the emotional hostility (parameter is -0.056); the family bond is good at social openness and the attitudes of trusting others.

In control variables, the male has a lower probability to become affective radicalization in unsafe situations (parameter is 0.041). Elder are more radical (parameter is -0.026). The higher income level shows less hostility (parameter is -0.053). Health causes the strongest negative impact in this model (parameter is -0.064); the healthier individual tends to believe the external world more and less exclusive.

In conclusion, physical safety is the key to restricting the affective radicalisation; one's own health and social resources can also significantly improve social trust.

Summary of the Model

Three-dimensional results show that the impact of safety perception has significant dimensional heterogeneity.

Physical safety has the strongest impact on the affective radicalisation (-0.100), following cognitive radicalisation (-0.038) and behavioural justification (-0.028). This shows that external safety threats are easier to trigger exclusion among different groups.

Economic security has the highest impact on cognitive radicalisation (-0.126), the weakest impact in the emotional dimension (-0.006). This indicates that economic anxiety mainly changes the value judgment and the thought about different social systems, not directly activating emotional hostility.

Trust in family has the largest effect on behaviour justification (-0.105); this emphasises that family normalisation has a key function to restrict the deviation justification.

The control variables have obviously different traits. The males are more radical in the behavioral level but obey the normalization more in the cognitive and emotional realms. The individuals with higher income levels are milder in cognition and emotion but can easily have deviation justification at the behavioural level. The health dimension has the highest impact; the healthier have more trust and less hostile tendencies.

To sum up, three-dimensional radicalisation has different psychological origins. The physical safety main releases the emotional hostility. Economic security affects the cognitive structure. Trust in family mainly normalizes behavioral rules.

The results testify that it is essential for us to divide radicalisation into cognitive, behavioural, and emotional. Different dimensions have different mechanisms to motivate.

Discussion

This research divides the radicalisation tendency into three different dimensions: cognition, behaviour, and affect. I used the mass cross-country dataset and Ologit to test the impact of multidimensional safety perception. The results show that the three types of personal security all have protective functions, but they have different pathways. Physical safety has the strongest restriction on emotional hostility; this implies that the external threat firstly erodes the social trust and triggers defensive emotions such as we-they, which is like the sentimental polarisation theory. Economic security mainly represses cognitive radicalization, which is like the claim that the relative deprivation theory emphasises that economic anxiety motivates individuals to find authoritarian answers. Trust in the family has the highest bundle. for the behavioural justification, this proofs that from the unsatisfactory to the action need to cross the threshold of the ethical peeling, the intensive primary bond can stop the radicalisation at this point.

In public policy, the decision maker ought to increase public safety in the community to decrease hostility and revive social trust; solidify economic expectations to release cognitive biases; enhance the family's positive relationship and community support to internalise the normalisation.

At the theoretical level, the results support the procedural multi-pathway mechanism. The radicalisation is not a linear push over, but the splitting, evaluation and interaction among cognition, normalisation, and emotion.

In addition, this research takes advantage of three dimensions of personal security, which are physical safety, economic security and trust in family to detect social pathology. The results of this research also support a type of social prospective view; radicalization is not solely originating from the individual moral defects or the cognitive disorder, but a social phenomenon in the specific social structure. Although cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) emphasizes bias in the individual beliefs and the mindset, if we ignore the social inequality, marginalised situations, institutional discrimination, the crisis in identity and some other macro factors, the explanation and intervention effect of the CBT may be limited [17]. From this view, radicalisation is more like the symptoms of social pathology, not a single psychological anomaly. Thus, except for the intervention and interference in the individual psychological level, we need to contain the public policy which affecting the structural innovation about the social integration, opportunity fairness and the social support for the vulnerable groups.

Conclusion

Based on the WVS cross-country large sample and the Ologit model, this research divides the radicalisation into cognitive radicalisation, behavioural justification and affective radicalisation. The research systematically identifies the heterogeneous impacts of multi-dimensional safety perception.

Physical safety mainly buffers emotional and collective hostilities. The unsafety first erodes social trust, then amplifies the defensive psychological state between them and us. This increases the distrust of social organisations and exclusion towards other groups.

Economic security mainly suppresses cognitive radicalization, the economic anxiety is easier to change the value judgment and the attitudes towards different institutions, makes individual accept the authoritarian or the anti-democratic explanation, not directly triggering emotional hostility.

Trust in family mainly restricts behavioural justification. The intensive primary bond increases the internalisation of normalisation and decreases the ethical justification for the violence, fraud, and deviant behaviours.

The control variables deeply prove the multi-dimensions. The males are more sensitive to the behaviours, but more normalised in the cognitive and emotional aspects. The higher income individuals are milder in their cognitive and emotional responses, but more tolerant of the slight deviation. Health is permanently negatively correlated with the three-dimensional radicalisation.

This research has a lot of policy implications. We need to improve public safety in the community to revive the social trust, guarantee economic security to consolidate the democratic cognition, and enhance the family-oriented support network to internalise the social norms. This three-dimensional framework provides clear pathways for the explanation of radicalization and provides the operational empirical evidence fundamental for the intervention.

From the perspective of social pathology, radicalization also should be put in a more generalised social context to comprehend. The individual level of cognition and psychological factors are important, but they cannot independently explain the formation of pathways of radicalisation. The social inequalities, social exclusion, systematic unfairness and other unequal structural conditions may consist of the important background factors of the individual's acceptance from the radical ideology. Thus, the efficient defence and intervention strategy should also be established outside the individual psychological support, deeply combining social integration and the social equality mechanism.

References

1. Neumann PR (2013) The trouble with radicalization *International Affairs* 89: 873-893.
2. McCauley C, Moskalenko S (2008) Mechanisms of political radicalization: Pathways toward terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 20: 415-433.
3. Borum R (2011) Radicalization into violent extremism I: A review of social science theories. *Journal of Strategic Security* 4: 7-36.
4. Horgan J (2008) From profiles to pathways and roots to routes: Perspectives from psychology on radicalization into terrorism. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 618: 80-94.
5. Moghaddam FM (2005) The staircase to terrorism: A psychological exploration. *American Psychologist* 60: 161-169.
6. Bandura A (1999) Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 3: 193-209.
7. Iyengar S, Westwood S J (2015) Fear and loathing across party lines: New evidence on group polarization. *American Journal of Political Science* 59: 690-707.

8. Inglehart R, Abramson PR (1994) Economic security and value change. *American Political Science Review* 88: 336-354.
9. Putnam RD (1995) Bowling alone America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6: 65-78.
10. Akaliyski P, Taniguchi N, Park J, Gehrig S & Tormos R (2024) Values in crisis: Societal value change under existential insecurity. *Social Indicators Research* 171: 1-21.
11. Altemeyer B (1996) *The authoritarian specter* Harvard University Press <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674053052>.
12. Stenner K (2005) *The authoritarian dynamic*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/authoritarian-dynamic/7620B99124ED2DBFC6394444838F455A>.
13. Gurr TR (1970) *Why men rebel* Princeton University Press. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315631073/>.
14. Putnam RD (2000) *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon.
15. Haerpfer C, Inglehart R, Moreno A, Welzel C, Kizilova K, et al. (2022) *World Values Survey: All Rounds – Country-Pooled Datafile (Version 3.0)*. JD Systems Institute & WWSA Secretariat <https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSCContents.jsp?CMSID=Documentation>.
16. Iyengar S, Lelkes Y, Levendusky M, Malhotra N & Westwood SJ (2019) The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science* 22: 129-146.
17. Shafieioun D, Haq H (2023) Radicalization from a societal perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology* 14: 1197282.

Copyright: ©2026 Shunxin Yao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.