

Hidden in plain science

Testing a universal ontology in the results of 13 scientific disciplines

Derek Cabrera^{a,b,@}

a: Cabrera Research Lab

b: Cornell University

@:dac66@cornell.edu

ABSTRACT: DSRP theory makes a strong claim: Distinction (identity–other), System (part–whole), Relationship (action–reaction), and Perspective (point–view) are not merely useful ways of thinking about the world but universal structures of organization itself. If that is true, these structures should appear wherever humans encounter reality and report what they find—including in scientific writing produced by people who have never heard of the theory. We tested that claim at this interface. Twenty-seven paragraphs were drawn from published research papers across 13 disciplines by a mechanical rule fixed in advance—the third prose paragraph of each paper's Results or Findings section—and coded by three independently built large language models working blind: one Pattern per pass, one pass per chat, no titles, no discipline labels, no mention of the theory, and a verbatim quotation required for every recorded structure. The predicted structures were recovered in every passage: all 27 paragraphs contained at least one structure found independently by two or more coders (97 consensus structures, 38 unanimous). The predicted epistemological bias appeared with them: Distinction ranked first in 16 of 27 paragraphs ($p=1.6\times 10^{-4}$) and Perspective last in 23 of 27 ($p=8.3\times 10^{-11}$), reproducing the Cognitive Pareto Bias in scientific Results sections. The predicted DSRP-484 dynamics also appeared: observed pole–complement pairings exceeded every one of 20,000 random re-pairings across all four Patterns, the same entity occupied multiple structural roles in 16 distinct cases, and every paragraph containing a Relationship also contained a Distinction. Disciplinary thought styles received preliminary support: hard sciences marked relatively more Relationship and soft sciences relatively more Perspective, producing the predicted double dissociation ($p=0.017$); the direction persisted across sensitivity analyses, although its magnitude remains imprecise at this corpus size. Across these distinct tests, every directional prediction moved in the direction specified by DSRP-484, producing convergent evidence from a single mechanically sampled corpus for structures, biases, and dynamics predicted by the same theoretical architecture. No single corpus can establish a universal ontology. This study adds a methodologically distinct line of evidence to a larger convergent research program by finding both sides of the DSRP claim where new empirical knowledge is reported: the predicted structure in what scientists describe and the predicted epistemological bias in what they make explicit and leave implicit. The corpus, codebook, raw coder outputs, and analysis scripts are available upon request.

KEYWORDS: DSRP | DSRP-484 | universal ontology | Cognitive Pareto Bias | structural cognition | structural coding | systems thinking | scientific knowledge

Cite this paper: Cabrera, D. (2026). Hidden in plain science: Testing a universal ontology in the results of 13 scientific disciplines. *Journal of Systems Thinking*, 6(1), 1–24.

<https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v26i1.dc6uosd6>

1. What this study asks

DSRP theory makes a large claim: that organized information — in minds, in language, in the world — is built from four structures—Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives—each a pair.¹ A distinction is an *identity* and an *other*. A system is a *part* and a *whole*. A relationship is an *action* and a *reaction*. A perspective is a *view* and a *point*. Several papers [1–4] developed the formalism, called DSRP-484 Theory within the wider frame of O-Theory [5].

A claim that large is easy to state and hard to test. This paper tests the narrowest empirical version of it we could design: take scientific writing produced by people who have never heard of the theory, select paragraphs by a mechanical rule so that nobody can pick friendly text, have independent coders search for the structures blind, and count what comes back.

1.1 Notation

Notation	Meaning
$\mathcal{P} = \{D, S, R, P\}$	the four Patterns
$D := (i \leftrightarrow o)$	Distinction is identity-and-other;
$S := (p \leftrightarrow w)$	System is part-and-whole;
$R := (a \leftrightarrow r)$	Relationship is action-and-reaction
$P := (v \leftrightarrow \dot{p})$	Perspective is view-and-point
$\Pi = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{27}\}$	the 27 mechanically sampled paragraphs
$N = 1,259$	candidate nodes in Π (§2.2)
$n_X(\pi)$	structures of Pattern X recorded in paragraph π

¹ **dual-pole:** Throughout this paper, D, S, R and P do not refer to the generic dictionary meanings of distinction, system, relationship and perspective. Each denotes a formally defined dual-pole structure: identity↔other (D), part↔whole (S), action↔reaction (R), and point↔view (P). Both poles must be present in the text and supported by verbatim warrant to be coded.

$\sigma_X = \frac{\sum_{\pi} n_X(\pi)}{N}$	saturation: the share of candidate nodes for which Pattern X was completed
$C(\pi)$	structures in π found independently by two or more of the three coders
$\theta_d = (\theta_D, \theta_S, \theta_R, \theta_P)_d$	discipline d's Pattern profile, summing to 1

1.2 The four hypotheses

Each is stated as a null and an alternative, with the English of each spelled out.

H1 — Pareto Bias

The Cognitive Pareto Law [1] will hold on an interdisciplinary corpus of scientific results: even high-end scientists are epistemologically biased in what they see and do not see.

H1a — between Patterns.

$$H_0 : \sigma_D = \sigma_S = \sigma_R = \sigma_P$$

$$H_a : \sigma_D > \max(\sigma_S, \sigma_R) \wedge \min(\sigma_S, \sigma_R) > \sigma_P$$

Read: under the null, the saturation of the four Patterns is equal — scientific writing marks all four at the same rate, and nothing about being a distinction rather than a perspective makes a structure more or less likely to reach the page. Under the alternative, Distinction is marked most and Perspective least, with System and Relationship between.

H1b — rank within a paragraph

$$H_0 : \Pr(D \text{ ranks first in } \pi) = \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(P \text{ ranks last in } \pi) = \frac{1}{4}$$

$$H_a : \Pr(D \text{ ranks first in } \pi) > \frac{1}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(P \text{ ranks last in } \pi) > \frac{1}{4}$$

Read: under the null, which Pattern dominates a paragraph is a coin toss among the four — over 27 paragraphs Distinction should come first about seven times by chance, and Perspective should come last about seven. Under the alternative, Distinction comes first and Perspective last more often than chance, paragraph by paragraph and not merely on average.

H1c — within a Pattern

$$H_0 : \sigma_X = 1 \quad \text{for each } X \in \mathcal{P}$$

$$H_a : \sigma_X \ll 1 \quad \text{for each } X \in \mathcal{P}$$

Read: under the null, whenever a writer puts something on the page they also state its complement — every identity gets its other, every whole its parts, every action its reaction, every view its viewer. Writing is structurally complete. In pole notation, the alternative is the fine-grain Pareto claim itself: sigma sub D much less than one is Di $\gg$ Do (identities far outnumber named others), sigma sub S is Sp $\gg$ Sw, sigma sub R is Rgen $\gg$ Rar, and sigma sub P is Pv $\gg$ Pp — within every Pattern, the first pole reaches the page and its complement mostly does not. §4.1.2 reports both forms: saturation, which is bounded and is the form of record, and the pole ratios Di:Do, Sp:Sw, Rgen:Rar, Pv:P. Under the alternative, only a small fraction of what a writer names ever gets its complement stated: the first pole is written down and the second is left for the reader to supply, or more often than not, left out entirely. That is the “pareto bias” — either that scientists fail to consider these ontologically existing structures, or that they leave half of each one unsaid.

A result inconsistent with H1 would be saturation approaching 1 — a corpus in which most named things also have their complements named. Saturation is not capped at 1: one node can serve as the second pole of several structures, so the measure can exceed it and the null is reachable from both directions.

H2 — Universality

DSRP will be universal in an interdisciplinary corpus of scientific results: new knowledge in the process of being made appears to be structured in DSRP.

Let $q = \Pr$ (a mechanically sampled paragraph of published science carries at least one DSRP structure that two independent blind coders both find).

$$H_0 : q < 1, \quad \exists \pi \in \Pi : |C(\pi)| = 0$$

$$H_a : q = 1, \quad \forall \pi \in \Pi : |C(\pi)| \geq 1$$

$$\text{and } \forall X \in \mathcal{P}, \exists \pi \in \Pi \text{ with } n_X(\pi) \geq 1$$

Read: under the null, some scientific prose is not DSRP-structured — there exist paragraphs of real published results in which no Distinction, System, Relationship or Perspective can be found, or in which anything found is one coder's reading and not a second's. Under the alternative, every mechanically sampled paragraph contains at least one DSRP structure that two independent blind coders locate, and all four Patterns recur somewhere in the corpus.

H3 — the four DSRP-484 dynamics

The Equality, Coimplication, Simultaneity and Enclosure dynamics of DSRP will hold on an interdisciplinary corpus of scientific results.

H3a — Equality

A Pattern *is* a structured relation between two poles, not a label. The recording rule forbids recording a one-poled structure, so the testable question is whether two-poledness occurs at a rate above chance. Let β be the probability that a Pattern's two poles are co-present in the same paragraph, and β_0 the probability of the same co-presence when poles and complements are paired at random.

$$H_0 : \beta \leq \beta_0$$

$$H_a : \beta > \beta_0$$

Read: under the null, two poles turn up together no more often than two arbitrary pieces of scientific prose do — the language is dense, paragraphs are full of nouns, and if you go looking for an "other" to match any given "identity" you will find something, so finding both poles reflects the wordiness of scientific English rather than any structure. Under the alternative, the complement of a pole is specific to the paragraph that named the pole: pair poles with complements at random and the pairs stop working; keep the pairings the text actually made and they hold.

H3b — Coimplication.

One pole necessarily implies its complement. Let $Y_X = |\{\pi \in \Pi : n_X(\pi) \geq 1\}|$, the number of paragraphs in which the search for both poles came back non-empty.

$$H_0 : Y_X = 0 \quad \text{for some } X \in \mathcal{P}$$

$$H_a : Y_X > 0 \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathcal{P}$$

Read: under the null, you can search a whole corpus for a completed pair of some Pattern and never find one — prose that names parts without ever naming wholes, or actions without ever naming reactions. Under the alternative, look for both poles and you find both poles, even though a mechanically chosen paragraph is under no obligation to complete any pair.

Because the recording rule requires both poles to be present, a recorded structure cannot violate Coimplication. Y_x measures how often the blind search for a completed pair succeeds. How often the text names one pole and leaves the pair uncompleted is H1c.

H3c — Simultaneity.

An entity can occupy more than one elemental role in the same modelled context. Let $\mu = \Pr(\text{an entity inside one paragraph occupies two or more of the eight elemental slots})$.

$$H_0 : \mu = 0$$

$$H_a : \mu > 0$$

Read: under the null, elemental roles are mutually exclusive — an entity that is an identity cannot also be a part, a whole, a relatum, a point or a view in the same modelled context. Under the alternative, the same entity can hold several structural roles at once. The four Pattern passes were run separately and blind to one another, so multi-role cases can be recovered without one pass prompting another.

H3d — Enclosure.

Any Pattern recursively requires the others. Let $\kappa_k = |\{\pi \in \Pi : \pi \text{ carries } k \text{ or more Patterns}\}|$.

$H_0 : \kappa_2 = 0$ every paragraph carries exactly one Pattern

$H_a : \kappa_2 > 0, \Pr(X | Y) > 0 \forall X, Y \in \mathcal{P}$ strong form: $\exists$ entity carried by all four Patterns at once

Read: under the null, Patterns come one at a time — a paragraph that makes distinctions does not also build systems, and a paragraph about relationships contains nothing else. Under the alternative, they never come alone: a paragraph doing one of them is doing others in the same breath, and in the strong form a single thing in a single paragraph is carried by all four at once — recorded, again, by passes that could not see each other.

H4 — Disciplinary thought styles

The general field-profile analysis is exploratory. The hard-science/soft-science dyadic contrast is an a priori directional prediction specified before coding results were examined. Disciplines *may* disproportionately use, or fail to use, certain Patterns compared with each other: a field may have a structural signature, and with it a characteristic blind spot.

$H_0 : \theta_d = \theta$ for all disciplines d

$H_a : \exists d, d' : \theta_d \neq \theta_{d'}$

$H_0^{\text{dyad}} : (\theta_{R, \text{hard}} - \theta_{R, \text{soft}}) + (\theta_{P, \text{soft}} - \theta_{P, \text{hard}}) \leq 0$

$H_a^{\text{dyad}} : \theta_{R, \text{hard}} > \theta_{R, \text{soft}} \quad \wedge \quad \theta_{P, \text{soft}} > \theta_{P, \text{hard}}$

Read: under the null, every field organizes its results the same way — physics, sociology and business differ in what they are about but not in the structural shape of how they write it down. Under the alternative, fields have thought styles that show up structurally: a field that habitually reasons in causes leaves more relationships on the page than a field that habitually reasons in categories, and what a field rarely marks is its collective blind spot — the Pareto bias of H1 one level up, from the individual scientist to the discipline. The dyadic pair is the directional form and the primary test. Read: under its null, whatever differences exist between hard and soft sciences do not lean the predicted way — Relationship toward hard and Perspective toward soft — any more than chance would lean them; the summed lean is

zero or negative. Under its alternative, both leans hold at once: hard sciences mark more action–reaction structure and soft sciences more point–view structure. Here $\theta_{\text{sub R comma hard}}$ is Relationship's share of the structures recovered in hard-science paragraphs, and likewise for the other three terms. The planned contrast in §4.4 tests the summed lean; the conjunction, read strictly, is carried by its weaker component.

The general field-profile analysis of H4 is exploratory and is tested by paragraph-level permutation of discipline labels; it is not used to support H1–H3. One dyadic prediction was specified a priori: grouping fields into hard and soft sciences, hard sciences will mark Relationship relatively more and soft sciences Perspective relatively more. This prediction was specified before the coding results were examined but was not preregistered.

1.3 Scope

The DSRP-484 formalism includes definitional claims and empirical claims. This study evaluates the empirical claims operationalized in H1–H4; it does not attempt to test definitions by corpus frequency.

DSRP v10 was fixed before coding and was not changed during the study. Claude, GPT and Gemini served as independent coders under identical written instructions and blinding. They were not being benchmarked against one another.

Absolute coder yields differ substantially (243 / 135 / 78; a $3.1\times$ spread). The study therefore does not estimate an absolute density of DSRP structures in scientific prose. Its comparisons concern profile, rank, consensus recovery and co-occurrence. Cross-coder Spearman correlations on per-passage totals are 0.87 (Claude–GPT), 0.66 (GPT–Gemini) and 0.60 (Claude–Gemini): the coders disagree about how much structure is present and agree about where it is and what kind it is.

2. Corpus

2.1 Sampling rule

The rule was written and fixed before any candidate paper was opened:

1. CC BY licence only.
2. The paper must contain a section whose title contains *Results* or *Findings*. If it does not, it is excluded and the next candidate takes its place. This rule was designed to capture knowledge where it originates—in empirical findings, the closest textual representation we have of observed reality.
3. Passage = the *third full prose paragraph* of that section. Fewer than three paragraphs → the last, noted.
4. Prose paragraphs only — not headings, captions, table notes, equations, or numbered list items.
5. Discipline assigned by the journal's own subject classification.
6. Extraction from the publisher PDF by PyMuPDF positional block extraction.

7. Nothing chosen, kept or rejected on the basis of what the text says.

No candidate passage was selected, retained or rejected on the basis of its content. The authors did not read a passage before it entered the corpus. Rule 2 excluded three papers; rule 3's fallback was never triggered.

2.2 What the corpus is

Paragraphs	27
Words	4,008
Sentences	170 (spaCy en_core_web_sm)
Disciplines	13
Words per paragraph	27–298 (median 146)

Disciplines and their paragraph counts: sociology 4; ecology, physics, psychology 3; biology, business, chemistry, neuroscience, public health 2; economics, education, geology, policy studies 1 each.

The denominator: candidate nodes. Every rate in this paper is taken against one common denominator — the count of things in a paragraph that would become a node on a DSRP map:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 1,102 & \text{spaCy noun chunks} & \\
 - 84 & \text{pronoun-headed chunks (a pronoun is not its own node; it resolves to an} & \\
 & \text{antecedent already counted)} & \\
 + 241 & \text{two-argument verbs (on a DSRP map a link is a node — a relationship can itself} & \\
 & \text{be distinguished — and the action/reaction elements are verb-headed 54\% and} & \\
 & \text{65\% of the time, so verbal links are nodes the noun-phrase count does not} & \\
 & \text{contain)} & \\
 \hline
 = 1,259 & \text{candidate nodes} &
 \end{array}$$

Verb tokens and noun-chunk tokens are disjoint (verified: zero overlap), so nothing is counted twice. Using one denominator for all four Patterns is what makes the four rates comparable; with four different denominators they would be four incomparable numbers.

The 1,259 counts node *slots*, not distinct referents: nested phrases split ("the crystalline structures of PdNP on rGO sheets" yields three chunks) and repeated mentions count separately. That is the correct pool for "how many places could an element have been filled," and it should not be read as an entity count.

2.3 Integrity of the corpus

All 27 source papers were checked individually for retractions and expressions of concern. None were retracted. One carried a correction: P27 (*Does chubby Can get lower grades than skinny Sophie?*, PLOS ONE 10.1371/journal.pone.0305703) has a title correction issued 5 March 2025 (PLOS ONE 20(3):e0320170).

3. Method

3.1 The instrument

Codebook DSRP v10, four pass sheets, one per Pattern, each naming the element pair it codes:

Pass	Codes	Element pair
Dio	Distinction	$i \leftrightarrow o$
Spw	System	$p \leftrightarrow w$
Rar	Relationship	$a \leftrightarrow r$
Pvp	Perspective	$v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$

Each sheet requires *both poles present on the page* and a *verbatim quotation* for every recorded structure. A structure with one pole named and the other inferred is not recordable.

The naming convention is deliberate. Rar codes action-and-reaction, of which causality is one subclass, not the whole of relationship. Reporting "we found N relationships" when the instrument measured Rar would overclaim; every output record carries its pattern code.

3.2 Blinding

Coding was organized as passes: one coder, one Pattern, the 27 blinded passages. Each pass ran in its own fresh chat session — twelve in all, three coders by four Patterns — and produced one output cell per passage, 324 cells in total. A pass saw two things: its Pattern's sheet, and the blind passage sheet. It did not see the papers' titles, authors, journals or disciplines, any other pass over the same passages, any other coder's output, or any statement that DSRP theory exists.

The one-Pattern-per-pass, one-chat-per-pass design is what makes Simultaneity and Enclosure non-circular. When the D pass and the S pass both land on the same term in the same paragraph, neither knew the other had.

3.3 Coders

Claude, GPT and Gemini, each given identical sheets and identical blinded text. Output is a fixed JSON record per cell. The choice of language models is a design decision, not a convenience. The design requires mutually blind coding passes over the same corpus under identical written instructions; twenty passes in all: twelve for the main grid and four for each of two test–retest runs. And, no human coder can perform them: a person cannot unknow the corpus between passes, and a person cannot re-code the same corpus blind a second and third time, which is what makes a true test–retest measurement possible at all. Human coding is not treated as a gold standard here; human content analysis carries its own well-documented reliability problems.

3.4 Two aggregation bases

Findings are reported on two aggregation bases:

- **Union** — a Pattern counts as present in a passage if *any* coder recorded it. Sensitive; inherits any single coder's overreach.
- **Consensus** — structures from different coders are clustered within Pattern and passage by token Jaccard ≥ 0.34 on both element slots (single linkage, a coder never merges with itself); a cluster is consensus if it contains structures from two or more coders. Conservative: discards anything only one coder saw.

Clustering yields 218 clusters, of which 97 are consensus and 38 unanimous. Survival by Pattern: Dio 44/67 (66%), Spw 20/42 (48%), Rar 21/57 (37%), Pvp 12/52 (23%). Unanimity by Pattern: Dio 21, Spw 9, Rar 6, Pvp 2 — the two unanimous Perspective structures are P04 (all three coders name the point *the hyperbolic discounting model*) and P09 (all three name *this paper*, from "From the point of view of this paper...").

Union maximizes sensitivity; consensus requires independent recovery by at least two coders. Results that differ by aggregation basis are reported explicitly.

3.5 Reliability

Pairwise Jaccard, content-matched at threshold 0.34, pooled over 27 passages:

pair	Dio	Spw	Rar	Pvp	all
GPT vs Claude	0.64	0.53	0.28	0.23	0.45
GPT vs Gemini	0.32	0.56	0.24	0.13	0.33
Claude vs Gemini	0.29	0.33	0.27	0.04	0.24

Agreement is highest for D and S and lowest for P. Perspective carries the greatest measurement uncertainty in the study.

Extraction depth is not disagreement. Coders differed in how exhaustively they searched, with some identifying more qualifying structures than others (243 / 135 / 78). Because the study does not estimate structural density, absolute yield is not an outcome variable. The informative statistic is directional: of the structures GPT recorded, Claude independently recorded 87% (117 of 135, including 31 of 31 for System); of Gemini's, Claude recorded 81% (63 of 78). In the reverse direction, GPT and Gemini recovered 48% and 26% of Claude's structures, respectively. This asymmetry is consistent with nested extraction depth: the shallower coders recover largely the same structures as the deeper coder, while the deeper coder identifies additional structures. The residual 13–19% provides a better estimate of substantive cross-coder disagreement than symmetric Jaccard. Symmetric Jaccard treats additional extraction as disagreement and therefore understates agreement; it is reported for completeness.

Relationship is the exception: coverage there is the lowest of the four Patterns (17 of 23 and 18 of 24 against Claude, 9 of 23 between Gemini and GPT), so R carries genuine cross-coder disagreement of judgment, not merely of depth. System is the opposite case: the nesting is perfect.

Test–retest. One coder — Claude (Opus 5), the same model every time — ran all four passes twice more: same sheets, same blind corpus, fresh sessions. The three runs produced 243, 208 and 206 structures. Content-matched agreement between pairs of runs is 0.84–0.88 for Distinction, 0.72–0.83 for System, 0.49–0.63 for Relationship and 0.37–0.67 for Perspective (0.64–0.73 overall), against 0.24–0.45 between models. Three facts follow. Within-model agreement runs well above between-model agreement, so the between-model spread is stable disposition, not run-to-run noise. The reliability gradient repeats the Pareto ordering a fourth way — the same model agrees with itself most on Distinction and least on Relationship and Perspective — so Perspective's low cross-coder agreement reflects the Pattern, not the models. And 85–89% of the smaller run's structures nest inside the larger run's: run-to-run variance, like coder-to-coder variance, is mostly depth, not contradiction. Both reruns independently reproduced the full ordering (Distinction first, System second, Relationship third, Perspective last); run 2 also reproduced the four-role IS24453 case, and run 3 found IS24453 in three of the four roles. Perspective's swing has a specific address: run 1 read P27, the education passage on grading bias, as twenty Perspective structures, treating each school subject — German, chemistry, physics — as a point from which group differences are seen; runs 2 and 3 declined that reading (0 and 1 structures there). Set that one passage aside and the three runs count 30, 21 and 28 Perspective structures and agree at 0.59–0.69, in line with Relationship. The published per-coder Perspective count (50) is thus the most liberal of three same-model runs; the consensus results, which that reading never entered, are unchanged. The reruns are available upon request as `claude-run2.json` and `claude-run3.json`.

4. Results

4.1 H1, the Cognitive Pareto Bias

The claim in plain terms. Writers (and thinkers) make distinctions explicit far more readily than they make explicit whose point of view they are speaking from, and for every Pattern (DSRP) they name the

first (ipav) pole far more often than the second (owrp). Those are two different lopsidednesses or structural biases, and the Cognitive Pareto Law or “Pareto Bias” predicts both — so this section tests it at two grains. The general form orders the four Patterns against each other: Distinction is marked most and Perspective least, $D \gg \{S, R\} \gg P$, with System and Relationship an unordered middle pair — the strict four-step ordering $D \gg S \gg R \gg P$ is tested, and the middle step does not resolve at this corpus size (§4.1.3). The detailed form operates inside each Pattern, between its two poles: the first pole reaches the page and its complement mostly does not — $Di \gg Do, Sp \gg Sw, Rgen \gg Rar, Pv \gg Pp$. Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 test the general form, across the corpus and by rank within each paragraph; §4.1.2 tests the detailed form, as saturation — the share of candidate nodes whose complement is actually named — and as the pole ratios. The two grains are one bias at two scales: which structures a writer marks at all, and how much of each marked structure reaches the page.

4.1.1 Between Patterns

coder	Dio	Spw	Rar	Pvp	$D > \max(S,R)$	$\min(S,R) > P$
Claude	77	58	58	50	✓	✓
GPT	66	31	24	14	✓	✓
Gemini	30	22	23	3	✓	✓
Pooled	173	111	105	67	✓	✓

The ordering holds in all three coders despite the $3.1\times$ spread in total yield.

4.1.2 Within Patterns — saturation

Saturation is the share of the 1,259 candidate nodes for which a complement was actually named. A Pareto failure is saturation approaching 100%: a corpus in which the parts of every whole and the “other” of every identity are stated. The count is not capped at 1,259 — one node can serve as a second pole repeatedly (the majority group is an other twelve times in P27, and 56 of the 173 Dio structures re-use a second pole) — so saturation above 100% is reachable in principle.

saturation	Dio	Spw	Rar	Pvp
Claude	6.1%	4.6%	4.6%	4.0%
GPT	5.2%	2.5%	1.9%	1.1%
Gemini	2.4%	1.7%	1.8%	0.2%
Pooled	13.7%	8.8%	8.3%	5.3%

The observation sits near the floor of the scale in every coder and every Pattern, and falls in the predicted order $D \rightarrow S \rightarrow R \rightarrow P$. All 12 coder $\times$ Pattern cells hold.

The reciprocal is the ratio form — candidate nodes per structure recorded:

ratio	Claude	GPT	Gemini	pooled
$D_i : D_o$	16.4	19.1	42.0	7.3
$S_p : S_w$	21.7	40.6	57.2	11.3
$R_{\text{gen}} : R_{a/r}$	21.7	52.5	54.7	12.0
$P_v : P_{\dot{p}}$	25.2	89.9	419.7	18.8

The ratios are coder-sensitive by construction — a stricter coder records fewer completed pairs and so produces a larger ratio — which is why saturation, bounded at both ends, is the form of record. Gemini's Pvp figure rests on three structures and should not be quoted as a point estimate.

4.1.3 Rank position per paragraph

basis	Dio ranks first	p	Pvp ranks last	p
Claude, all structures	12/27	0.022	15/27	6.7×10^{-4}
Pooled, all structures	14/27	0.0024	17/27	3.4×10^{-5}
Consensus clusters	16/27	1.6×10^{-4}	23/27	8.3×10^{-11}

Exact binomial against chance = 1/4. Both endpoints hold at every basis, and both strengthen under consensus — the structures two coders found independently are more Pareto-ordered than the full set, not less.

S and R do not separate. Corpus totals within coder: Claude 58 vs 58, an exact tie; GPT 31 vs 24; Gemini 22 vs 23 — the sign of the difference is not consistent. Paired paragraph by paragraph, within coder:

coder	S > R	R > S	tied	sign test	Wilcoxon
Claude	11	13	3	$p = 0.84$	$p = 0.61$
GPT	8	12	7	$p = 0.50$	$p = 0.92$
Gemini	7	12	8	$p = 0.36$	$p = 0.34$

The full four-step order appears strictly in 2 of 27 paragraphs. **The supported claim is $D \gg \{S, R\} \gg P$ with $\{S, R\}$ an unordered pair**, and that is how we state it.

S and R do differ in distribution: Rar appears in more paragraphs than Spw for all three coders (Claude 21/27 vs 17/27, GPT 14 vs 13, Gemini 14 vs 11) while Spw yields more structures per paragraph where it appears. They are differently distributed rather than differently sized.

4.1.4 Inter-coder agreement follows the same ordering

Pairwise agreement (§3.5) is highest for D and S and lowest for P. The Patterns that are most explicitly marked are also the ones independent coders converge on, which is consistent with the yield gradient and identifies Perspective as the least reliably coded Pattern.

4.1.5 What this does not show

Saturation measures explicit marking in text, not cognition. A writer who does not name the complement of a distinction may still hold it. The Pareto hypothesis as tested here is a claim about what published scientific prose puts on the page — which is the claim being made: even at the top of the discipline, what gets written down is systematically lopsided.

4.2. Results — H2, universality

The claim in plain terms. If the four structures are the structure of organized information, then no mechanically chosen paragraph of real science should come back structurally empty.

None did. *Every one of the 27 paragraphs carries at least one consensus structure* — a structure two or more coders identified independently under blinding. Nothing in the corpus is structurally empty, and no paragraph's yield is attributable to a single coder's overreach. Across the corpus: 97 consensus clusters, 38 of them unanimous across all three coders.

All four Patterns recur, union basis: Dio in 24 of 27 passages, Rar 22, Spw 18, Pvp 13.

Why we do not report a per-discipline breakdown. Sliced 13 ways, the corpus gives 1–4 paragraphs and 49–622 words per discipline, and the number of Patterns recovered in a discipline tracks how much text it contributed — Spearman(words, Patterns recovered) = 0.74, $p = 0.0036$. Every discipline above 300 words recovers all four Patterns but one; every discipline recovering only two has a single paragraph of 146 words or fewer. A 49-word education paragraph that states no explicit vantage is a fact about the paragraph's length, not about education. A per-discipline count in this corpus measures text volume, so we do not report one. The same shortage is why H4 (§4.4) is graded preliminary rather than established, and it is the first thing a corpus extension fixes.

4.3 Results — H3, the four DSRP-484 dynamics

4.3.1 Equality ($P^* = e^+ \overset{\tau}{\leftrightarrow} e^-$)

The claim in plain terms. A Pattern is a relation between two poles, not a label — and the pairing of pole to complement is the text's own work, not an accident of scientific English being wordy.

All **456 of 456** recorded structures have both poles filled, lexically distinct, and supported by verbatim warrant. Because the recording rule requires both poles, this is a consistency check rather than an independent test. The test is what follows.

Under the null, poles and complements are exchangeable across paragraphs: if the language is dense enough that some plausible complement can always be found, then shuffling which paragraph each complement belongs to should not matter. We shuffled the 432 complements with usable content words across paragraphs 20,000 times and counted, each time, how many paragraphs still completed each Pattern — a paragraph counting as complete only if a complement assigned to it is actually present in it.

Pattern	paragraphs completing, as the text pairs them	random pairing, average	random pairing, best of 20,000 shuffles
Dio	24 / 27	6.9	15
Spw	18 / 27	5.2	11
Rar	22 / 27	5.1	13
Pvp	13 / 27	3.9	9

In twenty thousand random reassignments, the best shuffle never once reached the observed count, for any Pattern. The null is rejected at better than one in twenty thousand in every case. The baseline is not empty — random pairings still complete four to seven paragraphs on average, because scientific vocabulary genuinely overlaps between unrelated papers — and the observed side is not at the ceiling: Perspective completes in only 13 of 27.

Pattern-vocabulary control. Are coders reading relations, or matching the theory's words? Under a narrow list of words that explicitly *name* the coded Pattern, 45 of 456 (9.9%) verbatims contain the Pattern's own vocabulary (Dio 14.5%, Spw 5.4%, Rar 10.5%, Pvp 4.5%). Under a wider list that also counts relational verbs, 134 of 456 (29.4%). Under either definition, most structures were recovered from text that never uses the word. The sharpest case is Perspective — 3 of 67 narrow, 7 of 67 wide — in a literature where "view" and "perspective" are ordinary usage.

4.3.2 Coimplication ($e^+ \leftrightarrow e^-$)

The claim in plain terms. Name one pole and the other is implied; go looking for both and you find both.

In each passage the blind search for a completed pair could have come back empty. How often it did not:

coder	Dio	Spw	Rar	Pvp
Claude	22/27	17/27	21/27	13/27
GPT	22/27	13/27	14/27	5/27

Gemini	19/27	11/27	14/27	3/27
Union	24/27	18/27	22/27	13/27

Completion rates fall in the endpoint order H1 predicts — Distinction highest, Perspective lowest, System and Relationship between.

Two notes of scope. Because the recording rule requires both poles, a recorded structure cannot violate Coimplication; this table measures how often the search succeeds, and the frequency with which named poles remain uncompleted is H1c. And the union row here is the same observed quantity as the completion column in §4.3.1 — one measurement, evaluated against two different questions: whether the search succeeds at all (Coimplication), and whether the pairings it returns are passage-specific (Equality). They are one finding, not two.

4.3.3 Simultaneity ($e^* \sim$ all other e^*)

The claim in plain terms. One thing can hold several structural jobs at once. A gene can be the thing under discussion, the thing it is contrasted with, a part of a larger group, and a group with its own parts — in the same paragraph.

The competing claim is that the roles are mutually exclusive. Sixteen distinct cases refute it — each a single coder, in a single pass, recording the same entity in **both** roles of one Pattern, so no coincidence between passes can explain them:

Pattern	distinct cases	coder instances	example
Distinction — identity $\wedge$ other	6	7	P13 <i>M. vimineum</i>
System — part $\wedge$ whole	7	9	P21 condition; P07 Model 2–Model 5
Relationship — action $\wedge$ reaction	3	5	P01 the resistive force, vibrations
Perspective	0	0	—
total	16	21	

Five of the sixteen were recovered independently by two coders — P01 *the resistive force*, P01 *vibrations*, P13 *M. vimineum*, P21 *condition*, P21 *probe item type*, each found by Claude and by GPT working blind and separately. And in P08 the gene *IS24453* is identity and other in the Distinction pass, and part and whole in the System pass, from two analyses that could not see each other.

The existence hypothesis is deterministic — under mutual exclusivity no genuine multi-role case should occur — so replication, not a p-value, is what protects the observation, and there are five independent replications. Whether multi-role occupancy occurs *more often than chance* is a separate quantitative question that this claim does not require; a supplementary analysis found it indistinguishable from independent role assignment, and settling it properly needs a term-centric instrument.

4.3.4 Enclosure ($P^* \in$ all other P^*)

The claim in plain terms. The Patterns do not come one at a time. A paragraph making a distinction is usually also building a system, tracing a relationship, or marking a view.

Patterns present in a paragraph	union	consensus	Claude alone
≥ 2 of 4	25/27	18/27	24/27
≥ 3 of 4	18/27	8/27	16/27
all 4	7/27	1/27	6/27

Strict modularity predicts one Pattern per paragraph — $\kappa_2 = 0$. We observe 25 of 27 carrying two or more. Scattering each Pattern across paragraphs at random, holding its overall frequency fixed, gives 25.4 — so co-presence sits at the no-segregation level, which is what Enclosure predicts and is a long way from zero. Enclosure is carried by how pervasive each Pattern is (Distinction in 24 of 27 paragraphs, Relationship 22, System 18, Perspective 13), not by any interaction between them, and we make no claim that the Patterns cluster.

The gradient form holds at every basis. The *strong form* (all four in one paragraph) does not: 7/27 union but 1/27 consensus, so it rests largely on structures a single coder saw. We take the gradient form as supported and the strong form as suggestive only.

At the *sentence* level (spaCy, 170 sentences, all 456 structures located): of 129 structure-bearing sentences, 59 carry two or more Patterns, 21 carry three or more, and 7 carry all four.

Conditional co-presence, union basis:

$P(\text{row} \mid \text{col})$	Dio	Spw	Rar	Pvp
Dio	1.00	0.83	1.00	0.92
Spw	0.62	1.00	0.68	0.62
Rar	0.92	0.83	1.00	0.77
Pvp	0.50	0.44	0.45	1.00

$P(\text{Dio} \mid \text{Rar}) = 1.00$: in all 22 passages where a relationship was recorded, a distinction was recorded too, by passes that could not see each other. The Pvp row sits near 0.45–0.50 and is the weakest in the table — which H1 independently predicts, since Perspective is the least explicitly marked Pattern.

Entity-level strong form. Four single entities are carried by all four Patterns at once (union of coders, grouped by token Jaccard ≥ 0.5): P27 *minority students* — an identity, a part, a relatum and a view inside one paragraph — with P05 *those in latent class 1* and P24 *nirmatrelvir with ritonavir* likewise. Three of the four are Claude-only, consistent with the 1/27 consensus figure above.

4.4 Results — H4, disciplinary thought styles

The general field-profile analysis of H4 is exploratory. The 27 paragraphs spread across 13 disciplines leave only 1–4 paragraphs per field. Descriptively, some profiles differ sharply: sociology assigns 34% of its structures to Perspective against 15% corpus-wide, and business assigns 58% to System against 24%. Separately, the a priori hard-science/soft-science prediction shows the predicted double dissociation: hard sciences mark relatively more Relationship and soft sciences relatively more Perspective:

group	paragraphs	structures	distinction	system	relationship	perspective
hard	15	220	42%	20%	30%	8%
soft	12	236	34%	28%	17%	21%

These differences are not established by this corpus. A paragraph-level permutation that preserves field sample sizes places the observed 13-field table *below* the typical shuffled table — a random reassignment of field labels is more distinctive 78% of the time. Restricting to better-populated fields moves the result toward separation without reaching it:

fields kept	paragraphs	random shuffle more distinctive than observed
all thirteen	27	78%
20+ structures	20	55%
25+ structures	18	45%
3+ paragraphs	13	17%

The dyadic prediction fares better, because it is directional and was made in advance. Tested as a planned contrast — project the observed hard–soft profile difference onto the predicted direction (Relationship toward hard plus Perspective toward soft) and shuffle paragraph labels — the observed displacement of 26.1 points is exceeded by 1,733 of 100,000 random relabelings ($p = 0.017$). The components:

Relationship-in-hard +13.5 points ($p = 0.030$), Perspective-in-soft +12.6 points ($p = 0.063$). A reader who requires each component to pass separately should carry the conjunction at the weaker component's $p = 0.063$. Weighting also matters at this size: pooled shares weight a paragraph by how many structures it carries, so P27's 62 structures dominate the soft column. Giving every paragraph one vote instead — the mean of per-paragraph shares — the joint contrast gives $p = 0.076$ (components: Relationship +7.0 points, $p = 0.22$; Perspective +10.3 points, $p = 0.035$), and which component looks stronger swaps. Both predicted directions held in every sensitivity variant examined — under each of three same-model Claude Perspective runs and under every reasonable reassignment of borderline fields between hard and soft, the gaps stayed between +6 and +13.5 points and never reversed — while the significance figures moved (Perspective-in-soft to 0.14–0.24 under the rerun passes, Relationship-in-hard to 0.06–0.13 under reassignment). The direction is robust; the magnitude is imprecisely estimated at 27 paragraphs.

H4 — supported, preliminary. As predicted, hard-science passages carry relatively more Relationship structure than soft-science passages (30% vs 17%) and soft-science passages relatively more Perspective structure (21% vs 8%); the joint directional test supports the predicted double dissociation, the directions survive every perturbation tried, while the statistical significance does not. The grade is preliminary because 27 paragraphs split 15 and 12 cannot hold the magnitude still. The corpus motivates three prospective tests for a larger sample: hard sciences will mark Relationship more and soft sciences Perspective more; physics will rank high on Relationship and sociology high on Perspective; and modelling-heavy writing will over-mark part-whole structure. Roughly eight paragraphs per field would make these comparisons materially informative.

5. What these results mean

Twenty-seven paragraphs, chosen by a rule, written by scientists in thirteen fields who had never heard of DSRP theory. Every one of them carried at least one of the four structures, found independently by coders who could not see each other's work. The structures were in the writing before anyone went looking for them.

That is what a test of an ontology looks like. DSRP-484 claims the four Patterns are not four useful categories among many but the elementary structures of organized information—an inventory of what organization is made of, the way the periodic table is an inventory of what matter is made of. A claim that large cannot be proven by any corpus; it can only be put at risk. Here the claim was put at risk in 27 mechanically sampled passages, examined through 108 blind Pattern-level tests. Every passage contained at least one independently replicated DSRP structure. One mechanically sampled paragraph with no consensus DSRP structure (where the theory had no way to put it) would have broken the study's universality criterion. None occurred. That does not prove the ontology. It is what the ontology predicts, found in texts selected without reference to the theory.

Second, the structures behave the way the calculus [2,3] says they should. Complements belong to their own paragraphs—pair them at random and they stop working. A relationship never appears without a distinction. One entity can be an identity, an other, a part, and a whole at once, and independent coders found the same cases. These are the dynamics—Equality, Coimplication, Simultaneity, and Enclosure—showing up in prose whose authors were not consulted.

Third, the Cognitive Pareto Bias says the structures reach the page half-finished, and predictably so. For every hundred candidate nodes, writers complete a distinction about fourteen times, a system nine, a relationship eight, and a perspective five. The rest is either unrecognized or unsaid—every identity whose other goes unstated, every finding whose vantage point is never named. The lopsidedness is not random: Perspective is the most-omitted structure in every coder and nearly every paragraph. If you want to know what a piece of writing is not examining, look for the second pole it does not state—and above all, ask whose view it is. The same gradient has been measured in other studies [1,4,6,7].

The importance of these results lies not in any single test but in their convergence. Four theoretical hypotheses were operationalized as ten formal H0/HA pairs spanning Pareto structure, universality, DSRP-484 dynamics, and disciplinary thought styles. The tests are theoretically related and statistically dependent, and in some cases share measurements, so no compound probability is claimed for the ensemble. But neither are they redundant. A corpus could contain DSRP structures without exhibiting the predicted Pareto profile; exhibit dual-pole Equality without Simultaneity; exhibit individual Patterns without the predicted Enclosure relations; or show no predicted disciplinary differentiation. Every directional prediction in this study moved in the direction specified by DSRP, although the strength of statistical support varied by hypothesis.

That convergence matters for a proposed universal ontology. A universal theory should generate multiple predictions from a small set of underlying principles, and those predictions should be capable of failing in different ways. DSRP-484 does so here. The result is not a simple "ten-for-ten" scorecard. It is theoretical *consilience*: multiple predictions derived from one architecture encountering independently sampled scientific text and repeatedly recovering the structural signatures the theory predicts.

The convergence also extends beyond this study. A peer-reviewed literature review identified convergent evidence across 109 studies [8]; the discovery of a Cognitive Pareto Law or "Pareto Bias" [1,7] and effect studies on its impact [6]; the *Living DSRP Evidence Compendium* extends that record with independent research across disciplines [9]; and the *DSRP Counterexample Record* takes the opposite approach, actively recording candidate observations capable of falsifying O-Theory and the resolutions that determine whether they survive [10]. The present study adds a methodologically different test: rather than asking whether existing findings can be mapped to DSRP, it specifies structural predictions and searches for them blind in mechanically sampled scientific Results and Findings passages.

The evidence therefore converges across predictions, methods, disciplines, and studies. DSRP-derived predictions converge within this corpus; related structural findings recur across an independent scientific literature; candidate counterexamples are actively sought rather than excluded; and the Cognitive Pareto Bias identified in prior work appears again in the present data. No single result establishes a universal ontology. The scientific case accumulates through repeated opportunities for the theory to fail.

What would change our mind is equally plain: a mechanically sampled paragraph with no consensus structure; a corpus whose saturation approaches completeness rather than the predicted Pareto profile; failure of the predicted DSRP-484 dynamics; a surviving counterexample requiring structure outside DSRP; or repeated failure of predictions derived from the theory in new domains. The disciplinary prediction is less settled: a larger corpus could dissolve the profiles reported in §4.4 or sharpen them. Either result would be informative.

6. Limitations

1. **Fields of 1–4 paragraphs.** Five fields rest on a single paragraph of 49 to 226 words. This is why H4 is graded preliminary rather than established, and why no per-field Pattern count is reported. Roughly eight paragraphs per field would settle both, and is the single most valuable extension available.
2. **Paragraph length 27–298 words**, each contributing one vote in every passage-level test. The 27-word paragraph and the 298-word paragraph are not equally informative and are weighted equally.
3. Perspective is the least reliably coded Pattern. Lowest yield, lowest pairwise agreement (0.04–0.23), 23% consensus survival, and the lowest same-model test–retest stability (0.37–0.67, its count swinging 50 → 21 → 29 across three runs of the same model, most of the swing traceable to a single passage). Perspective estimates carry the greatest measurement uncertainty.
4. **Two dynamics are partly built in.** Equality's 456/456 cannot fail given the recording rule, and a recorded structure cannot violate Coimplication; the evidential weight for those two rests on the random-pairing test and the yield table respectively. Simultaneity and Enclosure are not built in — the blind separate-pass design is what makes them independent.
5. **All three coders are one class of instrument.** GPT, Claude and Gemini are independently built, but all are language models trained on overlapping text, so a bias shared by the class as a whole would not appear as disagreement between them. Two instrument-free checks bound this: pattern-naming vocabulary in the raw text, counted by regex, is itself Pareto-ordered at the endpoints (distinction words 10, perspective words 1, in 4,008 words), and the corpus's single explicit vantage marker — “point of view,” in P09 — was recovered by all three coders unanimously. Every recorded structure also carries a verbatim quotation, so any reader can verify any structure against the text without coding anything.

7. Conclusion

This study tested a difficult proposition in a difficult place. DSRP-484 predicts that Distinction, System, Relationship, and Perspective are not merely useful ways of thinking about the world, but universal structures of organization itself. If that claim is true, these structures should appear where humans encounter reality and report what they find, even when neither the scientists producing the knowledge nor the coders analyzing it know that DSRP is being tested.

That is what we found.

H1 — Cognitive Pareto Bias. Supported. All three independent coders recovered the predicted endpoints: Distinction was most prevalent and Perspective least prevalent. On the consensus basis, Distinction ranked first in 16 of 27 paragraphs ($p=1.6 \times 10^{-4}$) and Perspective ranked last in 23 of 27 ($p=8.3 \times 10^{-11}$). System and Relationship did not separate, supporting $D \gg \{S,R\} \gg P$ rather than a strict four-step ordering. This reproduces the previously identified Cognitive Pareto Bias [1,4,7]: DSRP predicts complete dual-pole structure ontologically, while human models systematically privilege some structural elements and leave others implicit epistemologically. Prior work has traced this same asymmetry across

hundreds of documented cognitive biases and identified it as a recurring difference between ontological structure and human epistemological attention [1–5]. The present study finds the same signature again, independently, in scientific Results and Findings sections.

H2 — Universality. Supported. Every one of the 27 mechanically sampled passages contained at least one DSRP structure independently recovered by two or more coders. Across the corpus, 97 consensus structures were recovered, 38 unanimously, and all four Patterns recurred: Dio in 24 of 27 passages, Rar in 22, Spw in 18, and Pvp in 13. Not one mechanically selected passage was structurally empty.

H3 — DSRP-484 Dynamics. Supported, with varying strength. Equality exceeded every one of 20,000 random re-pairings for every Pattern. Coimplication was recovered across all four Patterns. Simultaneity was directly observed in 16 distinct cases in which the same entity occupied multiple structural roles, including five cases independently recovered by two coders. Enclosure appeared throughout the corpus: 25 of 27 passages contained two or more Patterns, and every passage containing a Relationship also contained a Distinction, $P(\text{Dio} \mid \text{Rar}) = 1.00$. The strongest all-four form remains suggestive rather than established.

H4 — Disciplinary Thought Styles. Supported, preliminary. As predicted, hard-science passages contained relatively more Relationship structure than soft-science passages (30% vs. 17%), while soft-science passages contained relatively more Perspective structure than hard-science passages (21% vs. 8%). The joint directional permutation test supported the predicted double dissociation ($p = 0.017$); component tests yielded $p = 0.030$ for greater Relationship in hard sciences and $p = 0.063$ for greater Perspective in soft sciences. Both predicted directions persisted across alternative coder runs and reasonable field classifications, although statistical significance did not — the direction of the effect is robust, but its magnitude remains imprecisely estimated in this small corpus. The directional prediction was specified before the coding results were examined but was not preregistered; it now stands, preregistered, for the larger corpus.

Taken alone, a 27-passage study cannot establish a universal ontology. But it does not stand alone. A prior literature review identified convergent evidence for the universal and atomic elements of complex cognition across a broad scientific literature [11]. The ongoing Living DSRP Evidence Compendium [9] extends that convergence across a substantially larger and continuously updated empirical record. In parallel, The DSRP Counterexample Record takes the opposite approach: rather than collecting confirming cases, it actively records candidate counterexamples capable of falsifying O-Theory and the resolutions that determine whether they survive [10]. Universal claims require both forms of evidence: convergence across independent observations and serious attempts to find a case that breaks the theory.

The contribution of the present study is therefore unusually specific. It finds the predicted DSRP structures, dynamics, and Cognitive Pareto Bias at the point where new empirical knowledge about reality is being reported. These were not essays about systems thinking or texts written by people applying DSRP. They were mechanically selected Results and Findings passages from published scientific research spanning 13 disciplines. The scientists did not know DSRP was being tested. The coders were blind to the theory, the source, the discipline, one another, and the other Pattern passes. Yet the structures predicted by DSRP were recovered in every passage, the predicted epistemological bias appeared again, and the predicted dynamics appeared in the organization of the findings themselves.

That combination matters. In the same texts, we see both sides of the DSRP claim: the recurring structural organization predicted of reality and the systematic lopsidedness predicted of human observation and representation. The ontology appears in the structure being reported; the epistemology appears in what humans make explicit and what they leave implicit.

The larger claim — that DSRP describes a universal ontology — remains exactly what a scientific universal should remain: vulnerable to counterexample and strengthened through convergence. No single corpus can prove it. But each independent domain in which the same structures are predicted in advance and subsequently recovered makes the alternative explanation harder to sustain. Here, those predictions were recovered at one of the most consequential interfaces available for testing them: where human observers encounter reality, produce empirical results, and turn those results into new scientific knowledge.

Data and code availability

The complete study materials—including the corpus, source key, blinded passages, codebook, raw coder outputs, consensus data, test–retest runs, and analysis scripts—are available from the author upon reasonable request. The complete package contains the following files:

DSRP-v10-data-with-484.xlsx	16 sheets: corpus, denominators, 456 structures with verbatims, cell totals, consensus, and one sheet per dynamic
v10runs/{claude,gpt,gemini}.json; claude-run2.json; claude-run3.json	raw coder output, 108 cells each
passages/P01–P27.txt, passages-blind-27.md, KEY-27.md	corpus text, the blind sheet given to coders, and the source key
passages/corpus-30-manifest.md	the sampling rule, fixed before any paper was opened
codebook/DSRP-v10-{D,S,R,P}-pass.md	the four pass sheets the runs were made under
codebook/DSRP-v10-parse.py	the denominator parser
DSRP-484-analysis.py	every non–formula figure in this paper: stoplist, match threshold, narrow and wide pattern–vocabulary lists, sentence splitters, discipline→field mappings, random seeds
DSRP-Simultaneity-Prevalence-Test.py	the supplementary prevalence analysis (frozen protocol)
analysis/	consensus clustering and inter-coder agreement

References

1. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. The Pareto structure of thought: Empirical discovery of the six foundational mental moves. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–41. doi:[10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6par6](https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6par6)
2. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. DSRP-484: Building an advanced understanding of O-Theory, DSRP theory, and the DSRP calculus. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. [cited 17 Aug 2026]. doi:[10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6O4846](https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6O4846)
3. Cabrera D. The unified calculus of organization, structure, emergence, and meaning: The patterns that connect mind and nature. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–41. doi:[10.54120/jost.2025-000002](https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.2025-000002)
4. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. The structure of thought and reality: Empirical evidence for the three universal laws linking mind, matter, and meaning. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–20. doi:[10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6smio6](https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6smio6)
5. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. O-Theory. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–30.
6. Aljrarri W 'ad, Bustamante J, Ingwell A, Labrada T, Nadig B, Shin J, et al. New Hope for policy schools: Examining systems thinking solutions to improve policy education. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2024; 1–61. doi:[10.54120/jost.00000101](https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.00000101)
7. Di Marco G, Cabrera D. Common biases in systems thinking. *Journal of Systems Thinking Preprints*. 2024. doi:[10.54120/jost.pr000037.v1](https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.pr000037.v1)
8. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. A literature review of the universal and atomic elements of complex cognition. *Journal of Applied Systems Thinking*. 2020;3: 1–48.
9. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. Convergent Independent Evidence Dataset. Cabrera Research Lab Living DSRP Evidence Compendium: independent convergent evidence for the universal and atomic elements of complex cognition [Data set]. 2026. Available: dsrpevidence.org/
10. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. Counterexamples and Resolutions Data. The DSRP counterexample record: candidate falsifications of O-Theory and the resolutions that settle them. 2026. Available: dsrpevidence.org/