ANNALS OF THE CHRYSENE FORMALISM

AI-AUGMENTED PEER-REVIEWED | VOL. 1, NO. 4 | ISSN 3144-2021 | OCTOBER 2026

ORTHOGONAL REVIEW RECORD

The Placed Source: Exogenous Preparation of the Substituted-Chrysene Assembly, and the Equality of Its Reachable Set with the Endogenous One

Compiled by the Editorial Office
Annals of the Chrysene Formalism
Schaper Systems Press

Paper ID:	ACF-1.4-084
Issue:	Volume 1, Number 4
ISSN:	3144-2021
Review architecture:	Dual-agent orthogonal review (Referee A: mathematics; Referee B: concordance) with editorial adjudication
Review focus:	Configuration set, blindness, orientation datum, registry field, verification
Acceptance date:	2026-10-31
Online publication:	2026-10-31
Pages:	1703–1731
Document version:	v1.0
Last audited:	31 October 2026

Citation: Schaper, C. D. (2026). The Placed Source: Exogenous Preparation of the Substituted-Chrysene Assembly, and the Equality of Its Reachable Set with the Endogenous One. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism*, 1(4), 1703–1731. ISSN 3144-2021. `https://chrysene.com/index.php/acf/article/view/84` • © 2026 Charles D. Schaper. Distributed under the CC Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0.

Declared conflict

This article was reviewed under the journal's AI-augmented peer review by orthogonal constraint. Two referees read the submitted manuscript independently and without sight of each other's reports. Referee A was confined to the mathematics; Referee B was confined to concordance. The editor adjudicated each point. There is no author-reply section in this record.

Scope of Review

The paper replaces Article 79's self-separating source by a stipulated exogenous one. The positive claim is about selection: the locant–arm pattern a unit presents at a stacking contact is unchanged by the flip exactly when the substitution family is ι-invariant and the arm word ι-constant. Two of the accepted points proved to be the same point reached from opposite directions: Referee A observed that the orientation of a unit cannot be a degree of freedom at a site whose substitution pattern is carried to itself by the reference inversion; Referee B observed that the corpus already has an object called the registry field, that it is Article 40's, and that it lives on the z-edges. The resolution moves the orientation datum to the contacts, removes the degeneracy, restores the citation, and changes the headline figure from ℓ bits to $\ell - 1$.

Compiled disposition

Accept with major revision (both referees). Of the eight major points raised by Referee A and the ten raised by Referee B, fourteen are accepted in full, three are accepted in substance with the proposed remedy declined or varied, and one is declined. The largest change is the move of the orientation datum to the contacts, which makes the object of selection the same object as the filing's Aligned/Unaligned datum and as Article 57's "five binary agreements", and changes the paper's headline figure from ℓ bits to $\ell - 1$. The article's length rose from 23 to 29 pages. The editor regards the article as materially improved by the review.

Contents

1 Stage summary **3**

2 Full review history (verbatim) **4**

1 Stage summary

Dual-agent architecture

Referee A confined to mathematics (definitions, proofs, correspondence between each statement and what its proof establishes, verification script). Referee B confined to concordance (whether every citation of the corpus and of the filing says what the manuscript says it says). Neither referee was told what the other was asked. The editor adjudicated each point under the standing instruction that a recommendation is not implemented in order to discharge it, and a recommendation whose implementation would alter the paper disproportionately to the validity of the comment is rebutted rather than followed.

Principal revision: orientation datum moved to contacts

Referee A's M4 and Referee B's C5 proved to be the same point reached from opposite directions. The orientation of a unit cannot be a degree of freedom at a site whose substitution pattern is carried to itself by the reference inversion. Article 40 already has a registry field $\eta : E_z \to \mathbb{Z}_2$ on the oriented z-edges. Moving the datum to the contacts removes the degeneracy, restores the citation, makes the object of selection the same object as the filing's Aligned/Unaligned datum and as Article 57's "five binary agreements", and changes the headline figure from ℓ bits to $\ell - 1$. H_{frame} is registered.

Other major points and dispositions

Referee A: M1 (blindness fails at I sites; contact-blindness theorem added), M2 (product factoring restricted to cluster locus), M3 (compatibility imposed; count becomes a bound), M5 (draw law restated), M6 (conditioning accepted; both figures reported), M7 (script corrections), M8 (non-implication on occupied set). Referee B: C1 (alphabets separated), C2 (H_{br} registered), C3 (same as M1), C4 (conflict with Article 57 removed), C6 (clause (j) confined to figures), C7–C10 (filing quotations and Aligned/Unaligned carried). Fourteen major points accepted in full, three accepted in substance with remedy varied or declined, one declined.

2 Full review history (verbatim)

The following is the complete text of the dual-agent review history with editorial dispositions.

> **Editorial note on the process.** This article was reviewed under the journal's AI-augmented peer review by orthogonal constraint. Two referees read the submitted manuscript independently and without sight of each other's reports, each confined to one constraint: Referee A to the mathematics and Referee B to concordance. Neither referee was told what the other was asked. The editor then adjudicated each point. Of the eight major points raised by Referee A and the ten raised by Referee B, fourteen are accepted in full, three are accepted in substance with the proposed remedy declined, and one is declined. Two of the accepted points proved to be the same point reached from opposite directions, and the revision they forced is the largest change between the submitted and the published versions. The editor regards the article as materially improved by the review.

Referee A — mathematical constraint

Recommendation: accept with major revision.

The paper replaces Article 79's self-separating source by a stipulated exogenous one. It defines a configuration as such a labelling, counts the configurations, and compares the two sources as an image against a support rather than as two measures. The positive claim is about selection. The architecture is the right one and the central negative claim is, in corrected form, true. But three statements the paper advertises are false or unsupported as written, and one declared non-dependency is load-bearing.

Major points: M1 (blindness fails at I sites; accepted in full, paper restructured), M2 (product factoring exceeds hypothesis; accepted in full), M3 (configuration set is not a product set; accepted in substance, remedy varied), M4 (flip dependence; accepted in substance, remedy declined as insufficient; datum moved to contacts), M5 (draw law; accepted), M6 (bit figure; first clause accepted, second declined, both figures reported), M7 (checks; accepted in full), M8 (occupied set; accepted in full). Minor points m1–m12 accepted or accepted in part.

Referee B — concordance constraint

Recommendation: accept with major revision.

Most of the manuscript's citations survive checking. Where the manuscript sits wrongly in the corpus is at the far end of the arc. Articles 78 and 80 do not leave the composition of the interior lattice open. The reachability theorem has a parallel problem. Two conflicts are left unrecorded that the Seniority convention requires to be recorded.

Major points: C1 (twelve-letter stock alphabet at lattice sizes; accepted in full), C2 (reachability theorem credits endogenous draw with bridging; accepted in full), C3 (delivered stock not blind at every site; accepted in full, same as M1), C4 (retention of configurations Article 57 identifies; accepted, conflict removed), C5 (Article 40 already has a registry field; accepted in full, the revision's hinge), C6 (clause (j); accepted,

amendment declined), C7 (filing does not set the two routes against each other; accepted in full), C8 (Aligned/Unaligned; accepted in full), C9 (numeric citations; accepted), C10 (two molecular readings; accepted in full). Minor points c1–c13 accepted.

Summary of dispositions

Fourteen major points accepted in full, three accepted in substance with the proposed remedy varied or declined, one declined. The article's length rose from 23 to 29 pages, the verification script gained one block and lost four assertions that did not check what they were described as checking, and the headline selection figure fell from ℓ bits to $\ell - 1$.

Recommendation

Accept with major revision. The dual-agent orthogonal review is complete. The orientation datum has been moved to the contacts, the headline figure is now $\ell - 1$, and all accepted points have been implemented. No further computation is required. The architecture is sound and the article is materially improved by the review.

References

[Art83] C. D. Schaper. The transformed product. *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* 1(4):1675–1702, 2026. Article 83.

Revision history

Version	Date	Notes
v1.0	2026-10-31	Review record published with Article 84.

Living Document Notice

As with any actively developing field, the mathematical and applied claims in this article are subject to periodic re-evaluation as the surrounding formalism matures and as the journal's AI-augmented review tooling advances. Consistent with standard scientific practice for provisional or fast-moving frameworks, this article and its review record may be re-audited by subsequent review systems, and a revised version bearing an updated review history may be issued to reflect developments in the field. Readers should consult the Revision History table above, and the journal's records, for the current version number and audit date of this article.

Editorial Disclaimer

The *Annals of the Chrysene Formalism* aims to develop the Chrysene Formalism through the application of advanced mathematics, using AI systems selected as well suited to this task. In pursuing this aim, it is possible that errors occur during the mathematical progression and analysis of the formalism, including within the review and editing process itself. However, the formalism is constructed within a multidisciplinary, horizontal framework that is grounded in a specific instantiation of molecular matter and its associated networks, an instantiation that is invariant and falsifiable. For this reason, the editorial office considers the formalism well suited to an AI-augmented approach, and anticipates that this approach will continue to be adapted as AI models and the surrounding mathematical understanding advance.