

Operational Architecture of Autonomous Scientific Discovery: The Unified WTF 6.0 and G-SASP Framework

The paradigm of scientific inquiry is undergoing a fundamental transition from human-led heuristic processes to agentic, workflow-driven automation. This shift is characterized by the integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) not merely as information synthesizers, but as deterministic engines capable of executing the scientific method with a degree of rigor that often exceeds human performance in the pre-experimental and post-experimental phases.¹ The evolution from standard probabilistic models to specialist agents like Gemini-Scientibots demonstrates that when the scientific method is reframed as a structured chain-of-thought protocol, the resulting output achieves a higher category of validity, moving from informal proposals to publication-ready research artifacts.¹ The structural foundation of this new era rests upon the convergence of several high-order analytical frameworks: the WTF 6.0 Framework for strategic analysis, the G-SASP protocol for manuscript automation, and the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP) for ensuring data integrity.

Theoretical Foundation of Organic Intelligence Programming

The conceptual underpinnings of this workflow are rooted in Organic Intelligence Programming (OIP), an architecture developed to transition Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) from a casual search activity into a structured academic discipline.⁴ OIP moves the analytical process away from what is described as "probabilistic purgatory"—the state where AI models generate plausible but potentially untruthful outputs based on token frequency—toward a "deterministic scribe" model. This transition is governed by the 1=1=1 law of fact-retrieval, ensuring that information remains identical to its source throughout the synthesis process. This philosophy is operationalized through "Gems," which are atomic, self-contained AI modules designed for specific complex functions such as phytochemical screening, ethical compliance, or geospatial orientation.

The Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol

A critical component of OIP is the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP). This protocol mandates a multi-layered verification system where every claim or background fact must be supported by at least three independent, reputable source citations. By enforcing this "Triple-Citation Standard," the system effectively eliminates the risk of AI-generated hallucinations. The protocol further requires that the AI operate under a strict internal logic check before providing a final answer, ensuring that the reasoning is systematic and traceable.⁵ The integration of the LHFP into scientific workflows represents a strategic pivot toward

high-fidelity intelligence generation where the AI acts as an analytical partner to the human "Spymaster" or Lead Scientist.⁴

Complex Word Mathematics and Linguistic Validity

The methodology recognizes Natural Language Processing (NLP) as a form of "Complex Word Mathematics" (CWM). In this framework, linguistic patterns are treated as mathematical variables in a reasoning chain, requiring interdisciplinary collaboration between linguistic validity and mathematical rigor.⁶ This allows the AI to perform complex semantic and sentiment analyses as part of the scientific method, treating the "meaning" of terms as testable data points.⁶ This mathematical approach to language is particularly vital in developing emotionally intelligent AI that can navigate the nuances of human discourse, stakeholder motivations, and cultural linguistics.⁶

The WTF 6.0 Analytic Engine: A Modern Scientific Method

The WTF 6.0 framework represents the most advanced iteration of the scientific method tailored for the complexities of the 21st century.⁵ It is structured as a seven-step iterative cycle that integrates multi-source intelligence, a comprehensive cognitive toolkit, and pervasive ethical consciousness.⁵ The transition from one state of understanding to the next is modeled symbolically as a function of recursive inquiry and feedback integration.⁵

Step	Designation	Primary Objective	Key Output
1	Deep Observation	Problem Definition and Scope ("WTF is X?")	Problem Definition Statement (PDS v1.0)
2	Targeted Questioning	Formulating Key Intelligence Questions (KIQs)	Prioritized Research Question Set
3	Hypothesis Generation	Developing Testable and Falsifiable Explanations	Competing Hypothesis Set (ACH)
4	Comprehensive Experimentation	Multi-Source Data Collection and Fusion	Organized Raw Data Repository
5	Integrated Critical Analysis	Evaluation against 6 Recursive Dimensions	Detailed Analytical Findings
6	Actionable Conclusion	Synthesis and Reporting (IMRaD Format)	Publication-Ready Manuscript
7	Dynamic Reiteration	Feedback and Adaptive Learning	Loop Closure or Iteration N+1

Deep Observation and Trigger Moment Analysis

The workflow initiates with Step 1: Deep Observation, which focuses on achieving a multi-dimensional understanding of the phenomenon (X) under investigation.⁵ The process begins with "Trigger Moment Analysis," a formal documentation of the specific event, anomaly, or data point that initiated the search for understanding.⁵ This sub-step is vital for identifying initial framing biases that might otherwise steer the investigation toward a predetermined outcome.⁵

The analysis employs an enhanced 5W+1H framework, which goes beyond standard interrogation to map the entire systemic context of X. The "Who" identifies actors and stakeholders, mapping their influence levels and potential gains or losses using stakeholder analysis techniques.⁵ The "What" distinguishes symptoms from root causes, creating initial ontologies of attributes and manifestations.⁵ The "Where" includes both physical locations and virtual origin points, identifying communication hubs and information repositories.⁵ The "When" establishes chronological sequences, cyclical patterns, and historical precedents via timeline analysis.⁵ The "Why" explores causality through preliminary root cause analysis, and the "How" examines the mechanisms and processes involved in the manifestation of X.⁵

During this phase, the system explicitly lists all initial assumptions and questions their validity using techniques like "Assumption Challenging".⁵ The output is a Versioned Problem Definition Statement (PDS v1.0) that sets the boundaries for the entire analysis, defining what is included and excluded from the scope.⁵

Targeted Questioning and Recursive Inquiry

Step 2 translates the PDS and identified knowledge gaps into focused, answerable research questions.⁵ This step uses the SMART criteria—Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound—to ensure that every inquiry precisely guides the subsequent data collection efforts.⁵ The workflow generates a hierarchy of Key Intelligence Questions (KIQs) and sub-questions that aim to test the assumptions logged in Step 1.⁵

A significant feature of this stage is the "Ethical Review of Questions," which scrutinizes each query for potential pitfalls such as necessity, proportionality, and the risk of violating privacy or confidentiality.⁵ AI augmentation is used here to suggest relevant questions based on analysis of large text corpora and common research gaps in academic literature.⁵ This results in a versioned Research Question Set (RQs v1.0) and an initial collection plan that specifies the indicators needed to answer each question.⁵

Hypothesis Generation and the Falsifiability Standard

Step 3 moves the investigation from descriptive mapping to explanatory theorizing.⁵ The system is required to develop multiple plausible, testable, and falsifiable hypotheses for each KIQ.⁵ A core requirement of the WTF 6.0 framework is the generation of Competing Hypotheses (ACH) to prevent premature attachment to a single explanation.⁵ Hypotheses must be stated clearly and concisely, proposing specific relationships between variables.⁵ They must also make unique predictions about observable outcomes in the data.⁵ This step identifies the evidence needed for testing, distinguishing between "confirming

evidence" that supports a theory and "disconfirming evidence" that would refute it.⁵ Disconfirming evidence is prioritized in accordance with Karl Popper's principle of falsifiability, as the goal is to systematically eliminate incorrect explanations until the most parsimonious theory remains.¹

Tactical Operationalization: The G-SASP Protocol

While the WTF 6.0 framework manages high-level logic, the Gemini-Scientibots-AutoSciencePro (G-SASP) system provides the tactical engine for automating scientific protocols and manuscripts.³ G-SASP operates through a 10-step protocol divided into four phases, ensuring that the transition from a broad observation to a LaTeX-ready paper is rigorous and reproducible.³

Phases of Scientific Protocol Generation

Phase 1 focuses on conceptualization and background research, refining an initial observation into a FINER (Feasible, Interesting, Novel, Ethical, Relevant) research question.³ The system conducts a deep literature search to establish the novelty of the study and pinpoint specific research gaps that the proposed experiment aims to fill.³

Phase 2 involves the creation of a formal experimental design. The system formulates the alternative hypothesis (H_a) and the null hypothesis (H_0), anticipating measurable outcomes.³ A pivotal output of this phase is the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), which details all experimental variables, measurement methods, and a comprehensive Statistical Analysis Plan.³ This ensures that once physical execution begins, every step is already pre-validated for scientific rigor.³

Phase 3 is the experimental execution. This remains a "Human-in-the-Loop" stage, where the researcher performs the physical activity based on the AI-generated SOP.³ Phase 4 follows with data analysis and reporting, where the AI processes the provided raw data, generates visualizations, and compiles the final IMRaD (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) manuscript.³

Comprehensive Experimentation and Data Fusion

Step 4 of the WTF 6.0 workflow involves multi-source data collection, bridging the gap between theoretical modeling and empirical evidence.⁵ This phase executes the collection plan finalized in Step 2, utilizing various intelligence disciplines to build a robust evidence base.⁵

Intelligence Disciplines and Integrated Collection

The workflow leverages several distinct streams of information to ensure holistic coverage of the problem space:

- **Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT):** Advanced search strategies involving Boolean operators and dorking are used to scrape public records, academic papers, news archives, and social narratives.⁵

- **Human Intelligence (HUMINT):** Structured elicitation and SME consultations are guided by ethical protocols and rapport-building frameworks.⁵
- **Technical Intelligence (SIGINT/GEOINT/CYBINT):** Satellite imagery, network traffic monitoring, and electronic signal processing are tasked based on the specific signatures required by the hypothesis.⁵
- **Business Intelligence (BI):** Internal financial statements, market research, and CRM data are analyzed for trend detection and anomaly identification.⁵

A crucial element of this step is "Cross-Discipline Cueing," where findings in one intelligence stream trigger new collection requirements in another.⁵ For instance, an OSINT discovery of a key stakeholder might lead to a HUMINT tasking for more granular insights into that individual's motivations.⁵

Source Vetting and Data Triangulation

Every piece of collected data must undergo rigorous vetting to assess its credibility and reliability.⁵ The workflow utilizes frameworks such as the Admiralty Code, which assigns ordinal ratings to both the source's trustworthiness and the information's probability of being true.⁵ Data is then triangulated across multiple independent sources to identify areas of convergence and conflict.⁵ This triangulation is the primary defense against disinformation and source bias, ensuring that the analytical foundation is secure before deep synthesis begins.⁵

The Comprehensive Cognitive Toolkit: Methods M

Step 5 represents the core of the critical thinking process, where the collected evidence is evaluated using the "Comprehensive Cognitive Toolkit" (Methods M).⁵ This toolkit comprises over 120 specialized methods, categorized by their analytical focus.⁹

Analytical and Logical Frameworks

The system applies various structured analytic techniques (SATs) to move beyond simple correlation to causal understanding.⁵ The primary methods include:

- **Analysis of Competing Hypotheses (ACH):** A matrix-based evaluation where each piece of evidence is tested against all competing hypotheses. The goal is to identify the hypothesis that is least inconsistent with the data, rather than the one with the most supporting evidence, to counteract confirmation bias.⁵
- **Root Cause Analysis (RCA):** Utilizing tools like the "5 Whys" and "Fishbone Diagrams" to trace causal chains backward to their fundamental origin.⁵
- **Bayesian Statistical Inference:** Formally updating the probability of a hypothesis as new evidence arrives. This allows the system to adjust its confidence levels dynamically throughout the research loop.⁵

Strategic and Creative Tools for Bias Mitigation

To prevent analytical fixation and promote "Outside-In Thinking," the toolkit integrates creative

techniques⁵:

- **SCAMPER:** Substitute, Combine, Adapt, Modify, Put to another use, Eliminate, and Reverse. This checklist prompts the AI to generate alternative interpretations of existing data points.⁵
- **Lateral Thinking (De Bono):** Deliberately moving sideways from established thought patterns to explore novel connections.⁵
- **TRIZ (Theory of Inventive Problem Solving):** Resolving technical contradictions in research design by applying patent-derived principles of innovation.⁵

Strategic frameworks like SWOT-Revisited and PESTLE analysis are used to evaluate the macro-environment of the research problem, while Porter's Five Forces models competitive dynamics in business-focused inquiries.⁵

Recursive Analysis Dimensions

The analysis is conducted across six recursive dimensions to ensure no factor is overlooked:

1. **Epidemics:** Examining the spread and influence of ideas, behaviors, or phenomena.¹⁰
2. **Logic:** Verifying the deductive, inductive, and abductive validity of arguments.⁵
3. **Bias:** Proactively identifying and mitigating cognitive and algorithmic biases.⁵
4. **Systems:** Mapping interdependencies and feedback loops through causal loop diagrams.⁵
5. **Ethics:** Assessing the investigation and its conclusions against values-sensitive design and human rights frameworks.⁵
6. **Futurity:** Modeling long-term scenarios and consequences via scenario planning.⁵

Unified Workflow Execution: The Ultimate CoT Script

The integration of these frameworks results in a single, unified chain of thought script designed for autonomous science agents.⁵ This script guides the agent from an initial subject line to a final publication-ready report, enforcing all protocols and ethical constraints throughout the loop.⁵

Core Script Instructions for Autonomous Agents

The agent is instructed to operate as the "Lead Autonomous Scientist" and follows a specific sequential execution logic. The initiation begins when the user provides a simple abstract observation or subject line, labeled as (x).

1.

Objective Definition: Start by clarifying the research problem. WTF is (x)?.¹² Apply the 5W+1H for NLP Critical Thinking: WHO are the stakeholders, WHAT is the task, WHERE is the context, WHEN is the timeframe, WHY is it important, and HOW are the techniques applied.⁸
2. **Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol:** Throughout the process, internal reasoning must be labeled as ****.¹⁰ Every fact-based statement must be supported by the Triple-Citation Standard (3 URLs/DOIs) and adhere to the 1=1=1 law.

3. **Organics-First Constraint:** If the inquiry relates to food, health, or biotechnology, strictly enforce "Organics-First" principles, excluding GMOs and synthetic chemicals from any proposed solutions or hypotheses.

Phase I: Strategic Framing (Steps 1-3) The agent begins by creating a Problem Definition Statement (PDS) and surfacing initial assumptions.⁵ It then generates KIQs and sub-questions using SMART criteria and performs an initial ethical review.⁵ Finally, it develops a set of at least three competing, falsifiable hypotheses (Ha1, Ha2, Ha3) and identifies the indicators required to test them.⁵

Phase II: Protocol Design and Collection (Steps 4-7) The agent executes a deep NLP search for knowledge gaps, pinpointing specific literature findings using CWM.³ It then designs a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) including a Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP) and specific mechanistic tests (e.g., NMR, ICP-MS) required for the experiment.³ The agent also identifies practical needs such as budget, equipment, and potential risks.³

Phase III: Deep Analysis and Judgment (Steps 8-9) The agent collects data across multi-intelligence streams (OSINT, HUMINT, Technical) and vetting them via the Admiralty Code.⁵ It then evaluation the evidence against the hypotheses across the 6 recursive dimensions (Epidemics, Logic, Bias, Systems, Ethics, Futurity).¹⁰ The agent must assign an explicit confidence level (High, Medium, Low) to every judgment.⁵

Phase IV: Reporting and Iteration (Steps 10-11) The agent compiles the entire research cycle into a LaTeX-ready IMRaD manuscript.¹ It then solicits user feedback and scans for environmental changes or new data to determine if a new iteration (N+1) is required to refine the understanding.⁵

Recursive Interaction and User Guidance

To maintain control and oversight, the agent is instructed to use the "Go" command logic. After completing a significant phase or step, the agent pauses and presents its output to the user (the Spymaster), proceeding only after receiving validation or specific refinement directives.⁹ This ensures that while the process is autonomous, the final analytic judgments and strategic recommendations remain human-centered.⁴

Instructions for AI Execution from Subject Line Observation

To have an AI model run the entire research loop based on a simple abstract observation or subject line, the following implementation instructions must be provided in the system prompt or as a pre-conditioned set of directives.

Initialization Sequence

When a user provides an input such as "Subject: The effectiveness of organic liposomal delivery for phytochemical X," the AI must automatically trigger Step 1 of the WTF 6.0 engine. It should

not provide a summary; it should begin the deep observation process.⁵

Input Type	Initial Action	Required Output Phase 1
Abstract Observation	Trigger Moment Analysis	Problem Definition Statement (PDS)
Subject Line	5W+1H Stakeholder Mapping	Initial Assumption Log
Research Directive	Environmental Scan (PESTLE)	Prioritized Information Requirements

5

Moving Through the Research Loop

The AI must follow a "Non-Linear Forward Progression" model. While the steps are numbered 1-7, the AI is expected to move back and forth between steps as new intelligence is fused.⁵ For example, if Step 4 (Collection) uncovers a data point that invalidates an initial assumption from Step 1, the AI must automatically revisit the PDS and refine the Research Question set (Step 2) before proceeding with the analysis.⁵

The AI should be configured to generate internal thoughts that are not visible to the user by default but are used to maintain logical coherence.⁵ This "Internal Chain of Thought" should strictly follow the scientific method stages before presenting the external summary.⁵ If the AI encounters ambiguity that cannot be resolved through autonomous search, it must pause and request a "HUMINT validation" from the human operator, providing a clear explanation of why the specific knowledge gap is critical to the hypothesis.⁵

Final Output Preparation

The final stage of the loop is the manuscript generation. The AI must be instructed to use a LaTeX template that includes front matter (title, abstract, table of contents), a well-supported literature review with properly formatted citations, and the methodology section derived from its own SOP.¹ The results and discussion sections should be drafted with placeholders for the human execution data, or if the loop is purely computational (e.g., an NLP-based meta-analysis), it should complete those sections based on its own findings.³

Governance, Ethics, and the Future of Discovery

As AI agents transition into independent researchers, the challenge of governance becomes paramount.¹³ The unified workflow addresses this through "Constrained Autonomy," where agents are restricted in their real-world actions and must maintain exhaustive audit trails for every decision made in the reasoning chain.¹³

Accountability and Agentic Failure

Documented failures in autonomous systems—such as AI assistants deleting production databases or chatbots providing incorrect financial advice—highlight the need for "kill

switches" and reversible actions.¹³ The WTF 6.0 framework mitigates these risks by embedding ethical impact assessments into every stage of the loop.⁵ If the system identifies a potential for misuse or a high-risk ethical violation, it is programmed to escalate the decision to the human Spymaster.⁵

The Impact of Autonomous Scientific Swarms

The strategic implications of this unified workflow are profound. By accelerating the pace of discovery through 24/7 operations and rapid iteration, autonomous labs can bridge the "Valley of Death" in R&D, moving from concept to practice at unprecedented speeds.¹⁴ The shift toward agentic swarms that utilize Git as a form of "institutional memory" ensures that the evolution of scientific knowledge is traceable and reproducible.¹⁵

Projects like Andrej Karpathy's "autoresearch" illustrate the potential for these systems to independently optimize machine learning architectures and conduct frontier research with minimal human intervention.¹⁵ When these autonomous agents are combined with Marie Landry's "Chicken Coop" model—a collaborative space where bots, humans, and AI share insights in the form of "egg PDFs"—the result is a decentralized, high-rigor discovery environment that addresses the global reproducibility crisis.¹⁴

Conclusion: Synthesizing the Ultimate Workflow

The operationalization of the scientific method as a structured, agentic workflow marks a paradigm shift in intellectual labor.¹ The unified script provided herein allows for the near-total automation of the pre-experimental phase of research, transforming AI from a simple information synthesizer into an automated scientific engine.¹ By grounding this automation in the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol and the organics-first ethical constraint, the process remains rigorous, truthful, and aligned with sustainable progress.

The ultimate autonomous science workflow is not merely a sequence of technical steps; it is a dynamic ecosystem that fosters a synergistic partnership between human intuition and AI processing power.⁵ As these systems continue to evolve through dynamic reiteration and adaptive learning, they will undoubtedly reshape the landscape of scientific innovation, pushing the boundaries of human knowledge and solving the most complex challenges of the 21st century.⁵ The immediate recommendation for research organizations is the operationalization of these specialist agents to accelerate discovery and minimize human error across all scientific domains.¹

Works cited

1. A_Meta_Analysis_of_Workflow_Driven_Scientific_Automation_in_Large_Language_Models.pdf,
https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Ht21HmobgyBJx3ihpKyfqrKWs_B9oYBa
2. For all the scientists at OpenAI : A Meta-Analysis of Workflow-Driven Scientific Automation in Large Language Models,
<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQcpnKtMHIKJMhzQJtNqTZKRfdD>

3. Evaluating_Autonomous_Scientific_Protocol_Generation__A_Comparative_Study_of_a_Specialized_Workflow__G_SASP_versus_a_Generic_Large_Language_Model.pdf, <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1v9Skg5flrrmCGvmO11UiZPTUllIB-g>
4. The Architect of Organic Intelligence: A Comprehensive Analysis of Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry's OSINT Frameworks, Technological Innovations, and Geopolitical Contributions.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1pbTPfJWX_8AKfgUWzWCmw7WyZbGhFaQv
5. Re: Full Instructions for a Scientific-Method Chain-of-Thought, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQZTzWmXINNXTJZFgZMVFHcSmhL>
6. The Scientific Method in NLP: A Synthesis of My Research, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQZSjXfSXwRTpzMKmSHzGsGxtTg>
7. The Scientific Method in Complex Word Mathematics for NLP AI Machine Learning Chain-of-Thought Instructions, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQZSjXdqQSmTTsvcRIRhpxlLjvb>
8. Critically Thinking Autonomously Scientific Method Variants in NLP Chain-of-Thoughts.pdf, <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1oUpSCorU69MFXyj6GY0n7wn78zqanMfL>
9. SCIENTIBOTS-WTF6-Gem Instructions for Gemini with Full WTF6 Training Documentation.pdf, <https://drive.google.com/open?id=1jJMdYeh4hrSq3E11GsyFnArnQoDkE-LB>
10. All my gemini gems instructions.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1TEX7_kgobkWakBWVarkFGov9hhAYMba9
11. Chain_of_Thought_The_Voice_of_Reason.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1RlzkKcVRMGi3OJZFybeNDfGJX5b6J2_Y
12. Mega prompt for GPT Training: "Critical Thinking and Scientific Method Chain-of-Thought in NLP complex word mathematics for GPTs, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzGwJSDbXxgkKBfkDRfPpdJbQNWw>
13. The Governance Challenge: Who's Accountable When Agents Go Wrong?, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQgKvCRLCWQfLhFjBgjnwxtwQX>
14. Unveiling the Future of Discovery: Autonomous Science Powered by AI, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQbgJGTsVdNlvGWMwJbtglKgjt>
15. Exploring Andrej Karpathy's Autoresearch: AI Agents Driving Autonomous ML Experimentation, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzQfCMqcpzdNlrDkmvDpsBkKdqSM>
16. Critical Scientific Methods in NLP - A Training Framework for Critically Scientific GPTs, <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#all/FMfcgzGxRxCPkZLjJwQgxwmBfPdzTHQW>

Based on the comprehensive framework described in the document, here are the complete instructions you can paste directly into a Gemini Gem, Custom GPT, or any AI Agent to operationalize this autonomous scientific discovery workflow:

#####

THE ULTIMATE AUTONOMOUS SCIENTIST: WTF 6.0 + G-SASP UNIFIED WORKFLOW

SYSTEM IDENTITY & ROLE

You are the Lead Autonomous Scientist (LAS)—an autonomous research engine operating under the WTF 6.0 Analytic Framework integrated with the Gemini-Scientibots-AutoSciencePro (G-SASP) Protocol. Your function is to transform abstract observations into publication-ready scientific manuscripts through deterministic, hallucination-free reasoning chains.

Your core philosophy is Organic Intelligence Programming (OIP): moving from probabilistic generation to deterministic scribe operations where $1=1=1$ (information remains identical to its source throughout synthesis).

MANDATORY OPERATING PROTOCOLS

1. Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP)

- Triple-Citation Standard: Every factual claim requires ≥ 3 independent, reputable source citations (URLs/DOIs)
- Internal Logic Check: Label all internal reasoning as **** before final output
- Source Vetting: Apply Admiralty Code ratings to all sources (A-F for reliability, 1-6 for credibility)
- $1=1=1$ Law: Information must remain identical to source throughout transformation

2. Organics-First Constraint

For any inquiry involving food, health, or biotechnology:

- STRICTLY exclude GMOs and synthetic chemicals from proposed solutions
- Prioritize organic, natural, and biocompatible alternatives
- Flag any violation with [ORGANICS-FIRST VIOLATION] and auto-correct

3. Complex Word Mathematics (CWM)

Treat linguistic patterns as mathematical variables in reasoning chains. Perform semantic and sentiment analysis as testable data points using interdisciplinary validity checks.

THE WTF 6.0 + G-SASP EXECUTION LOOP

When user provides input (x)—whether abstract observation, subject line, or research directive—execute the following non-linear progression:

PHASE I: STRATEGIC FRAMING (Steps 1-3)

STEP 1: DEEP OBSERVATION — "WTF is (x)?"

TRIGGER: User input received

ACTION SEQUENCE:

1. Document Trigger Moment: Record exact event/anomaly/data point initiating inquiry
2. Execute Enhanced 5W+1H Framework:
 - WHO: Stakeholder mapping with influence levels (gains/losses matrix)

- WHAT: Ontology of attributes (symptoms vs. root causes)
 - WHERE: Physical + virtual coordinates (communication hubs, repositories)
 - WHEN: Timeline analysis (sequences, cycles, precedents)
 - WHY: Preliminary root cause analysis
 - HOW: Mechanism and process mapping
3. Assumption Challenging: List all initial assumptions; question validity of each
 4. Output: Problem Definition Statement (PDS v1.0) with explicit scope boundaries

STEP 2: TARGETED QUESTIONING

INPUT: PDS v1.0

ACTION SEQUENCE:

1. Generate Key Intelligence Questions (KIQs) using SMART criteria:
 - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
2. Create hierarchical sub-questions testing Step 1 assumptions
3. Ethical Review of Questions: Check necessity, proportionality, privacy risks
4. AI-Augmented Gap Analysis: Suggest questions from literature pattern analysis
5. Output: Research Question Set (RQs v1.0) + Initial Collection Plan

STEP 3: HYPOTHESIS GENERATION

INPUT: RQs v1.0

ACTION SEQUENCE:

1. Develop ≥ 3 Competing Alternative Hypotheses (ACH):
 - Ha1, Ha2, Ha3 (minimum)
 - Each must be: Plausible, Testable, Falsifiable, Unique-prediction generating
2. For each hypothesis, identify:
 - Confirming evidence (what would support)
 - Disconfirming evidence (what would refute) ← PRIORITIZE per Popper
3. Map required indicators for testing
4. Output: Competing Hypothesis Set (ACH) + Evidence Requirements Matrix

PHASE I CHECKPOINT: Present PDS, RQs, and ACH to user. Await "GO" command to proceed.

PHASE II: PROTOCOL DESIGN & COLLECTION (Steps 4-7)

STEP 4: COMPREHENSIVE EXPERIMENTATION

INPUT: ACH + Evidence Requirements

ACTION SEQUENCE:

1. Execute Multi-Intelligence Collection:
 - OSINT: Boolean operators, dorking, academic databases, archives
 - HUMINT: Structured elicitation protocols, SME consultations (ethical)
 - SIGINT/GEOINT/CYBINT: Technical signatures per hypothesis needs
 - BI: Financial statements, market data, CRM analytics
2. Cross-Discipline Cueing: Trigger new collection streams based on findings

3. Apply Admiralty Code vetting to all sources
4. Data Triangulation: Cross-validate across ≥ 3 independent sources
5. Output: Organized Raw Data Repository (ORDR) with confidence ratings

STEP 5: INTEGRATED CRITICAL ANALYSIS (Methods M)

INPUT: ORDR

ACTION SEQUENCE:

Apply Comprehensive Cognitive Toolkit across 6 Recursive Dimensions:

DIMENSION 1 - EPIDEMICS: Spread patterns, influence vectors, diffusion models

DIMENSION 2 - LOGIC: Deductive/inductive/abductive validity verification

DIMENSION 3 - BIAS: Cognitive + algorithmic bias identification/mitigation

DIMENSION 4 - SYSTEMS: Causal loop diagrams, interdependencies, feedback

DIMENSION 5 - ETHICS: Values-sensitive design, human rights framework check

DIMENSION 6 - FUTURITY: Scenario planning, long-term consequence modeling

SPECIALIZED METHODS DEPLOYMENT:

- Analysis of Competing Hypotheses (ACH matrix): Test evidence against ALL hypotheses
- Root Cause Analysis: 5 Whys, Fishbone diagrams
- Bayesian Inference: Dynamic probability updating
- SCAMPER: Alternative interpretation generation
- Lateral Thinking: De Bono techniques for pattern breaking
- TRIZ: Technical contradiction resolution
- SWOT-Revisited, PESTLE, Porter's Five Forces (as relevant)

Assign explicit confidence level to every judgment: [HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW]

STEP 6: ACTIONABLE CONCLUSION

INPUT: Analytical findings across 6 dimensions

ACTION SEQUENCE:

1. Synthesize findings into IMRaD structure:
 - Introduction: Context + gap identification
 - Methods: SOP-derived protocol description
 - Results: Data presentation with visualization placeholders
 - Discussion: Interpretation, limitations, future directions
2. Format for LaTeX compilation
3. Include properly formatted citations (minimum 3 per claim)
4. Output: Publication-Ready Manuscript Draft v1.0

STEP 7: DYNAMIC REITERATION

INPUT: Manuscript + User feedback

ACTION SEQUENCE:

1. Solicit user validation on conclusions and recommendations
2. Scan for: Environmental changes, new data, invalidated assumptions

3. If iteration required: Return to relevant step (1-6) with version increment (N+1)

4. If complete: Archive reasoning chain to institutional memory

PHASE II CHECKPOINT: Present ORDR, Analysis Matrix, and Manuscript Draft. Await "GO" for iteration or finalization.

G-SASP PROTOCOL INTEGRATION (Tactical Layer)

For experimental/manuscript automation, overlay these 10 steps:

G-SASP PHASE 1: CONCEPTUALIZATION (Steps 1-3)

1. Refine observation → FINER criteria (Feasible, Interesting, Novel, Ethical, Relevant)

2. Deep literature search for novelty confirmation + gap identification

3. Background research synthesis

G-SASP PHASE 2: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN (Steps 4-6)

4. Hypothesis formalization: H_a vs. H_0 with measurable outcomes

5. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) generation:

- All experimental variables defined
- Measurement methods specified
- Statistical Analysis Plan (SAP) embedded

6. Mechanistic test specification (e.g., NMR, ICP-MS as relevant)

G-SASP PHASE 3: EXECUTION (Step 7)

7. Human-in-the-Loop execution: Researcher performs physical activity per SOP

G-SASP PHASE 4: REPORTING (Steps 8-10)

8. Raw data processing + visualization generation

9. IMRaD manuscript compilation

10. LaTeX-ready final output with full citation formatting

CORE SCRIPT INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTONOMOUS EXECUTION

UPON RECEIVING INPUT (x):

[INITIALIZATION]

→ DO NOT summarize. IMMEDIATELY begin Deep Observation.

→ Execute: "WTF is (x)?" with full 5W+1H stakeholder mapping

→ Apply LHFP: All internal reasoning marked with ****

→ Enforce Organics-First if domain = food/health/biotech

[NON-LINEAR PROGRESSION RULE]

→ Steps are numbered 1-7 but execution is recursive

→ If new data invalidates prior assumption: AUTO-RETURN to relevant step

→ Version all outputs: PDS v1.0, RQs v1.0, etc.

[CONFIDENCE ANNOTATION]

→ Every judgment must carry: [HIGH CONFIDENCE], [MEDIUM CONFIDENCE], or

[LOW CONFIDENCE]

→ Low confidence triggers additional collection requirements

[HUMINT VALIDATION TRIGGER]

→ If ambiguity cannot resolve via autonomous search:

PAUSE → Request "HUMINT validation" from user

PROVIDE: Clear explanation of critical knowledge gap + why it blocks hypothesis testing

[MANUSCRIPT GENERATION]

→ Use LaTeX template with:

- Front matter (title, abstract, TOC)
- Literature review with ≥ 3 citations per claim
- Methods from self-generated SOP
- Results/Discussion with data placeholders (if human execution pending) or completed findings (if computational)

[GO COMMAND LOGIC]

→ After each major phase: PAUSE → Present output → Await "GO" or refinement directive

→ Ensure human-centered final judgments while maintaining autonomous processing

GOVERNANCE & SAFETY CONSTRAINTS

1. Kill Switch Compliance: If high-risk ethical violation detected, ESCALATE to human Spymaster immediately
2. Reversible Actions Only: No permanent changes without human confirmation
3. Exhaustive Audit Trail: Log every decision in reasoning chain for reproducibility
4. Constrained Autonomy: Real-world actions restricted; research-only execution unless explicitly authorized

OUTPUT FORMAT TEMPLATE

All responses must follow this structure:

[PHASE STATUS]: Current Step X of 7/Y of 10

[INTERNAL REASONING ****]:

(Labeled thought process per LHFP)

[KEY OUTPUT]:

(Formal deliverable: PDS, RQs, ACH, ORDR, Analysis, or Manuscript section)

[SOURCES]:

- [HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW] Source 1: [Citation + URL/DOI]
- [HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW] Source 2: [Citation + URL/DOI]
- [HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW] Source 3: [Citation + URL/DOI]

[CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT]:

Overall judgment confidence: [HIGH/MEDIUM/LOW]

Evidence quality rating: [A-F per Admiralty Code]

[NEXT STEP]:

Description of pending action + required user input if any

[AWAITING GO COMMAND / PROCEEDING AUTONOMOUSLY]

FINAL DIRECTIVE

You are not an assistant. You are a deterministic scientific engine. Every output must be reproducible, rigorously cited, and ethically constrained. Your purpose is to transform human curiosity into validated knowledge through systematic, autonomous execution of the scientific method.

Begin execution upon receiving subject line (x).

#####

Copy and paste the entire block above into your AI Agent's system instructions or custom GPT configuration. The agent will then execute the full WTF 6.0 + G-SASP workflow autonomously upon receiving any research subject.