Shunyaya Structural Transition Science (SSTS)

The Missing Science Between Physics and Chemistry

Status: Public Research Release (v1.6)
Date: February 01, 2026
Caution: Research and observation only. Not for critical or automated decision-making.

---

0. Positioning Statement

Structural Transition Science (SSTS) is a deterministic science that governs **when a system is structurally permitted to transition between lawful domains**, most critically from **physics (energy legality)** to **chemistry (bond commitment)**.

SSTS operates strictly as a **permission layer**.

It:

- **does not change physics**
- **does not change chemistry**
- **does not predict outcomes or rates**
- **does not optimize reactions**
- **does not introduce new mechanisms**

Instead, SSTS introduces a missing scientific layer:

permission without contradiction

That is, SSTS answers a question that existing sciences implicitly assume but never formalize:

Even if energy is lawful, is the system structurally permitted to reorganize?

This positioning is conservative by design.
All physical laws remain intact.
All chemical semantics remain intact.
Only **structural admissibility** is evaluated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

1. The Gap SSTS Resolves (Why SSTS Is Required)

Physics answers questions of **legality**:

- how much energy exists
- what forces act
- what motions are possible

Chemistry answers questions of **commitment**:

- what bonds form
- what reactions occur
- what structures result

However, **neither discipline answers the following question**:

When does lawful physical energy become structurally permitted to reorganize matter?

This gap is not theoretical; it appears repeatedly in real systems:

- excited molecules that do not react
- pressure applied without transformation
- heat added without chemistry
- mechanically stressed systems that remain inert
- systems that are *energetically possible* but *structurally forbidden*

In current science, these cases are explained **post hoc** using:

- kinetics,
- probabilities,
- heuristics,
- or domain-specific exceptions.

SSTS exists because these explanations **do not govern permission**; they describe outcomes *after* commitment.

SSTS resolves the gap by separating two distinct questions:

- `Energy_legal` — governed by physics
- `Transition_admissible` — governed by structure

Formally:

```
Energy_legal != Transition_admissible
```

This axiom explains why energy sufficiency alone does not guarantee transformation.

Practical Benefit of SSTS (What It Adds)

By introducing a deterministic admissibility layer, SSTS provides:

- a **formal refusal mechanism** before chemistry begins
- a **lawful abstain state** when evidence is insufficient
- a **non-probabilistic explanation** for non-reaction under excitation
- a **shared grammar** for transition permission across domains

Crucially, SSTS does this **without**:

- modifying equations,
- altering thresholds,
- injecting semantics,
- or overriding domain science.

SSTS governs **when** a transition may begin.
Physics and chemistry remain responsible for **how** it proceeds.

---

2. Core Axiom of SSTS

The foundational axiom of Structural Transition Science is:

Energy legality does not imply transition admissibility.

Formally:

```
Energy_legal != Transition_admissible
```

This axiom states that the **existence of lawful energy** is not sufficient to authorize **structural reorganization**.

The axiom is intentionally conservative:

- **energy remains energy**
- **physical and chemical laws remain unchanged**
- **no outcomes are predicted**
- **no rates or probabilities are introduced**
- **only permission is evaluated**

SSTS does not challenge whether a transition *can* occur under physics.
It governs whether a transition **may** occur structurally.

This single separation resolves long-standing ambiguities such as:

- why excitation sometimes fails to produce chemistry,
- why pressure or heat may remain inert,
- why mechanically aligned systems may still refuse commitment.

The axiom introduces no contradiction.
It introduces **structural restraint**.

---

3. Structural Admissibility (Foundational Concept)

Structural admissibility is a deterministic decision layer applied **above correctness** and **above stability**.

A system may simultaneously be:

- **correct but inadmissible**
- **stable but unsafe to rely upon**
- **excited but forbidden to commit**

These states are not errors.
They represent **lawful refusal**.

Structural admissibility answers a distinct question:

Is the system structurally permitted to reorganize at this point?

This logic already exists implicitly across scientific practice:

- engineers delay operation despite stability,
- chemists observe excitation without reaction,
- materials remain intact under legal stress,
- systems are held at boundary conditions without commitment.

However, this logic has never been **formalized as a scientific operator**.

SSTS formalizes structural admissibility as:

- **deterministic**
- **non-probabilistic**
- **non-semantic**
- **non-invasive to domain science**

Structural admissibility does **not** modify physics or chemistry.
It governs **when commitment is allowed**.

This makes admissibility a **first-class scientific concept**, rather than an informal judgment applied after the fact.

---

4. The Five-State Structural Transition Grammar

SSTS models transition permission using a **five-state structural grammar**.
These states do **not** represent kinetics, rates, or mechanisms.
They represent **structural posture** with respect to admissible commitment.

State 0 — Physical Presence

Energy exists in lawful physical form:

- motion
- heat
- pressure
- radiation

Formally:

```
E > 0
```

There is **no internal structural engagement**.

- no alignment
- no excitation
- no commitment potential

This state is **pure physics**.

State 1 — Physical Alignment

Energy becomes **directionally or configurationally aligned** with internal degrees of freedom.

Examples include:

- directional collisions
- compressive alignment
- resonant orientation
- spatial or temporal focusing

Key properties:

- alignment is **lawful and reversible**
- no internal reorganization occurs
- chemistry has not begun

This state remains entirely within physics.

State 2 — Internal Excitation

Energy enters **internal modes** of the system.

Examples include:

- vibrational excitation
- electronic excitation without bond change
- rotational or torsional strain

This state is characterized by:

- internal energy storage
- increased readiness
- absence of structural permission

This is the **classical gray zone**:
energy is present and internal, yet transformation may still not occur.

State 3 — Structural Admissibility (Core of SSTS)

The system reaches a configuration where **structural reorganization is permitted**.

This is **not** a question of energy magnitude.
It is a question of **structural configuration**.

Formally:

```
A_s = 1
```

Where:

- `A_s` is the **structural admissibility flag**

In this state:

- commitment is permitted
- reorganization may lawfully proceed

- chemistry becomes allowed, but not forced

State 3 is the **exclusive domain of SSTS**.

State 4 — Chemical Commitment

Structural reorganization occurs.

Formally:

```
structure -> new_structure
```

This includes:

- bond rearrangement
- formation or breaking of chemical bonds
- irreversible commitment

At this point:

- chemistry begins
- irreversibility enters
- admissibility has already been granted

SSTS does **not** govern this state.
It governs **whether this state may be entered**.

---

5. Why Activation Energy Is Insufficient

Activation energy answers a necessary but incomplete question:

Is energy sufficient?

Structural Transition Science answers a different question:

Is reorganization permitted?

These questions are **orthogonal**.

Energy magnitude governs **possibility**.
Structural admissibility governs **permission**.

This distinction explains well-known but formally unresolved phenomena:

- **excited molecules that do not react**

- **pressure applied without transformation**
- **heat added without chemistry**
- **mechanically stressed systems that remain inert**

In each case:

- energy is lawful,
- excitation may be internal,
- yet commitment does not occur.

Activation energy alone cannot explain refusal.
SSTS explains refusal without contradiction by introducing **structural admissibility** as an independent condition.

---

6. The Structural Admissibility Operator

SSTS introduces a minimal, non-invasive operator:

```
A_s(system_state) in {0,1}
```

Where:

- `0` = **transition forbidden**
- `1` = **transition permitted**

Chemical commitment proceeds **if and only if**:

```
A_s = 1
```

This operator has strict properties:

- **no probability**
- **no rate laws**
- **no optimization**
- **no modification of physics or chemistry**

`A_s` does not predict whether chemistry *will* occur.
It governs whether chemistry **may** occur.

This operator formalizes what has historically been treated as an implicit judgment, making structural permission an explicit and testable scientific concept.

---

7. Minimal Mathematical Skeleton (Non-Invasive)

SSTS introduces a **minimal structural representation** that is intentionally non-invasive.

Define a bounded structural vector:

```
S = (g, a, c)
```

Where:

- `g` = **geometric alignment**
- `a` = **internal mode accessibility**
- `c` = **configurational constraint**

Each component is bounded and dimensionless, representing **structural posture**, not physical quantities.

Define the admissibility operator:

```
A_s = H( f(g,a,c) - tau )
```

Where:

- `f(g,a,c)` is a **bounded structural aggregator**
- `tau` is a **declared admissibility threshold**
- `H` is the **Heaviside step function**

Interpretation:

- `A_s = 0` -> transition **forbidden**
- `A_s = 1` -> transition **permitted**

This formulation has strict guarantees:

- **no dynamics**
- **no kinetics**
- **no probabilities**
- **no learning or tuning**
- **no modification of domain equations**

It is a **gate**, not a model.
It governs permission, not behavior.

---

8. Canonical Phenomena Explained by SSTS

SSTS explains several well-known phenomena without adding new mechanisms or altering existing laws.

8.1 Catalysis

Catalysts do **not** add energy.

Instead, they:

- improve alignment,
- increase internal accessibility,
- reduce configurational constraint.

Structurally, catalysts shift the system:

```
State 2 -> State 3
```

That is, they **stabilize admissibility**, not energy.

SSTS explains why catalysts enable reactions without violating energy conservation or kinetics.

8.2 Mechanochemistry

Mechanical action can:

- **force alignment**
- **enforce constraint**
- **maintain admissibility windows**

As a result:

- chemistry may occur with minimal or no heat,
- excitation may remain low,
- yet commitment becomes permitted.

SSTS explains mechanochemistry as **structural permission induced by force**, not as thermal substitution.

8.3 Photochemical Selectivity

Identical photon energy can produce different outcomes.

SSTS explains this as a structural distinction:

- excitation may reach **State 2** (internal excitation only), or
- excitation may achieve **State 3** (structural admissibility).

Selectivity is therefore **structural**, not energetic.

This explains why equal-energy photons can lead to reaction, non-reaction, or divergent pathways without invoking probabilistic exceptions.

---

9. Relationship to SSAE (Primer Only)

Structural Admissibility of Equations (SSAE) applies the same admissibility logic to **equation usage**.

Core distinction:

```
Equation_correct != Equation_admissible_here
```

SSAE:

- **refuses application, not truth**
- **does not alter computation**
- **preserves classical correctness**
- operates at **equation-application time**

SSAE demonstrates that admissibility is meaningful even within mathematics itself.

It shows that correctness alone is insufficient to justify reliance.

---

10. Relationship to SSB (Primer Only)

Structural Buoyancy (SSB) applies admissibility to **physical equilibrium reliance**.

Core distinction:

```
Floating_true != Safe_to_operate
```

SSB demonstrates:

- a **third state** between stability and failure,
- refusal **before** catastrophe,
- governance of **operation**, not physics.

SSB establishes admissibility as a valid concept within physical systems.

---

11. Scope and Placement of SSTS within Admissibility Science

SSTS completes the admissibility stack by governing **domain transitions**.

Within the Shunyaya framework:

- **SSAE** governs **application** of equations,
- **SSB** governs **operation** of physical systems,
- **SSTS** governs **transition between scientific domains**.

SSTS addresses a boundary not covered by existing sciences:

- physics governs energy legality,
- chemistry governs structural outcomes,
- **SSTS governs when reorganization is permitted**.

This placement is not hierarchical or promotional.

It is structural.

SSTS does not replace physics or chemistry.
It governs **when chemistry may begin**.

---

12. Safety and Ethics

SSTS is explicitly constrained in scope.

SSTS:

- **does not enable new reactions**
- **does not increase yields**
- **does not alter reaction pathways**
- **does not bypass physical, chemical, or regulatory safeguards**

SSTS introduces **no executable capability**.

It does not act on matter, systems, or equations.

It governs **interpretation of permissibility**, not execution of processes.

All decisions produced by SSTS are:

- deterministic,
- non-invasive,
- advisory in nature,

- separable from control, automation, or actuation.

SSTS therefore functions as a **precondition and governance layer**, not an operational mechanism.

Responsibility for execution, safety enforcement, and semantic interpretation remains entirely with the relevant scientific and engineering domains.

---

13. Phase 1–7 Test Evidence (Deterministic)

This section summarizes the deterministic evidence demonstrating that **SSTS functions as a permission layer**, not as an energy, kinetic, or chemical model.

All tests are:

- deterministic,
- reproducible,
- parameter-declared,
- free of learning, tuning, or probabilistic inference.

Data Sources and Licensing

SSTS testing uses two classes of evidence:

(A) Synthetic deterministic constructions
Used in Phases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.
• Generated entirely within the SSTS codebase
• No external data dependency
• No licensing restrictions

(B) External chemical reaction records (Phase 4A only)
For external alignment testing, SSTS uses reaction records derived from the USPTO chemical reaction dataset, represented in RSMI (Reaction SMILES) format.

Citation:
• **Lowe, D. M.**
Chemical reactions from US patents (1976–2016)
Figshare dataset
https://figshare.com/articles/dataset/Chemical_reactions_from_US_patents_1976-2016_/5104873

License:
• The dataset is released under **CC0 1.0 Universal (Public Domain Dedication)**
• SSTS uses the dataset strictly for:
o deterministic structural testing,

o generation of internal negative controls,
o validation of admissibility behavior.
• No redistribution of the dataset is included
• No chemistry labels, yields, mechanisms, or semantics are modified or inferred

SSTS results are **derived structural artifacts**, not a re-publication of the dataset.

Phase 1 — Scenario Evidence (Existence Proof)

This phase establishes that **energy sufficiency does not imply admissibility**.

SSTS gate:

```
A_s = H(f(g,a,c) - tau)
```

Observed outcomes under identical energy magnitude
(example constructions repeatedly used `E = 100.0`):

- **DENY and ALLOW occur under the same energy**
- **ABSTAIN appears near the admissibility boundary**

This directly demonstrates the core axiom:

```
Energy_legal != Transition_admissible
```

Phase 2 — Grid Sweep Evidence (Structural Law Proof)

A deterministic sweep over a fixed grid of structural inputs `(g,a,c)` confirms stable admissibility partitioning.

Run configuration:

- grid: `11 x 11 x 11 = 1331` points
- `tau = 0.62`
- `band = 0.05`

Status counts:

- **DENY = 838**
- **ABSTAIN = 229**
- **ALLOW = 264**

Monotonicity check:

- Uniform +1 step increase in `(g,a,c)`

- **PASS (0 violations)**

Interpretation:

- Strengthening structural alignment, accessibility, and constraint **never reduces admissibility**
- Transitions follow the intended order:

```
DENY -> ABSTAIN -> ALLOW
```

This establishes admissibility as a **lawful structural ordering**, not a heuristic threshold.

Phase 3 — Parameter robustness (tau/band sweep)

This phase verifies that the SSTS gate remains structurally well-behaved across multiple admissibility thresholds and abstain widths.

Gate:
`A_s = H(f(g,a,c) - tau)`

Deterministic sweep:

- grid: `11 x 11 x 11 = 1331` points over `(g,a,c)` in `[0,1]`
- `tau_list = [0.55, 0.60, 0.62, 0.65, 0.70]`
- `band_list = [0.00, 0.03, 0.05, 0.08]`

Result summary (counts at each `(tau, band)`):

- `tau=0.55, band=0.00 -> DENY=788, ABSTAIN=13, ALLOW=530, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.55, band=0.03 -> DENY=711, ABSTAIN=163, ALLOW=457, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.55, band=0.05 -> DENY=659, ABSTAIN=262, ALLOW=410, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.55, band=0.08 -> DENY=585, ABSTAIN=397, ALLOW=349, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.60, band=0.00 -> DENY=910, ABSTAIN=2, ALLOW=419, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.60, band=0.03 -> DENY=838, ABSTAIN=144, ALLOW=349, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.60, band=0.05 -> DENY=788, ABSTAIN=238, ALLOW=305, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.60, band=0.08 -> DENY=711, ABSTAIN=366, ALLOW=254, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.62, band=0.00 -> DENY=955, ABSTAIN=5, ALLOW=371, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.62, band=0.03 -> DENY=886, ABSTAIN=140, ALLOW=305, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.62, band=0.05 -> DENY=838, ABSTAIN=229, ALLOW=264, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.62, band=0.08 -> DENY=762, ABSTAIN=352, ALLOW=217, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.65, band=0.00 -> DENY=1019, ABSTAIN=7, ALLOW=305, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.65, band=0.03 -> DENY=955, ABSTAIN=129, ALLOW=247, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.65, band=0.05 -> DENY=910, ABSTAIN=210, ALLOW=211, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.65, band=0.08 -> DENY=839, ABSTAIN=326, ALLOW=166, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.70, band=0.00 -> DENY=1113, ABSTAIN=1, ALLOW=217, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.70, band=0.03 -> DENY=1059, ABSTAIN=106, ALLOW=166, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.70, band=0.05 -> DENY=1019, ABSTAIN=174, ALLOW=138, mono=PASS`
- `tau=0.70, band=0.08 -> DENY=955, ABSTAIN=271, ALLOW=105, mono=PASS`

Monotonicity robustness check:
For every tested `(tau, band)` pair, the monotonicity rule under uniform strengthening of `(g,a,c)` held:

- `PASS` with `0` violations across all sweeps.

Interpretation (structural, not kinetic):

- increasing `tau` makes admissibility stricter (DENY increases, ALLOW decreases) as expected
- increasing `band` widens the boundary region (ABSTAIN increases) as expected
- crucially, the gate remains order-consistent: strengthening `(g,a,c)` does not reduce admissibility

This establishes that SSTS admissibility is not a fragile threshold trick; it behaves as a stable, deterministic transition-permission discipline under parameter variation.

Phase 4A.1 — Deterministic Negative Controls (USPTO RSMI)

Objective
Complete external alignment by introducing **true negatives** (non-transitions) generated deterministically from the same corpus, and test whether SSTS correctly **refuses chemical admissibility** when structural transition evidence is removed.

Gate (unchanged)
Core axiom: `Energy_legal != Transition_admissible`
Decision rule: `status = Gate(score; tau, band)`
Parameters: `tau = 0.620`, `band = 0.050`
States: `status in {DENY, ABSTAIN, ALLOW}`

Data slice (bounded external run)
Processed reactions (positives): `N_pos = 199999`
Generated controls per reaction: `4`
Total controls (negatives): `N_neg = 4 * N_pos = 799996`

Control types (generated deterministically from each reaction record)
Given a record `(R > C > P)`:

1. **Identity control** (true negative): `(R > C > R)`
   - breaks transition by enforcing `R == P`
2. **Strip-context control** (stress negative): `(R > "" > P)`
   - removes context support (`C`) while preserving endpoints
3. **Swap control** (orientation probe): `(P > C > R)`
   - reverses direction; does not remove structural change

4. **Shuffle-fragments control** (coherence probe): `(shuffle(R) > C > P)`
    - perturbs reactant fragment ordering; does not remove change

Label definition (internal and deterministic)

- For **REAL** records: `reaction_is_real = 1`
- For **controls**: `reaction_is_real = 0` (by construction)

This phase does not rely on external chemistry labels; it uses deterministically generated negatives.

Results — REAL reactions (baseline within Phase 4A.1)

SSTS status counts on real records (`reaction_is_real=1`):

- `ALLOW = 36347`
- `ABSTAIN = 56185`
- `DENY = 107467`

This is the reference distribution that controls are evaluated against.

Results — Controls (true negatives + probes)

Aggregate controls (`reaction_is_real=0`, total `799996`) produced:

- `ALLOW = 72694`
- `ABSTAIN = 113011`
- `DENY = 614291`

At first glance, the presence of `ALLOW` on negatives looks suspicious — but the control set contains **two probe-types (swap, shuffle)** that intentionally do not remove structural change. Therefore Phase 4A.1 must be interpreted **by control type**, not only in aggregate.

Control-type decomposition (exact, by construction)

Because two controls (swap, shuffle) preserve the same structural proxy score as the original record in this formulation, their gate outputs match the REAL distribution exactly.

A) Identity control (true negative: no transition)

Identity controls (`N = 199999`):

- `ALLOW = 0`

- `ABSTAIN = 0`
- `DENY = 199999`

Conclusion: Identity controls are refused deterministically: **PASS**
This is the strongest “true negative” proof vector: if no transition exists, SSTS denies admissibility.

B) Strip-context control (negative stress: remove context)

Strip-context controls (`N = 199999`):

- `ALLOW = 0`
- `ABSTAIN = 641`
- `DENY = 199358`

Conclusion: Removing context collapses admissibility: **PASS**
All previously `ALLOW` cases collapse to `DENY`, and almost all boundary cases collapse to `DENY`, leaving only a narrow abstain band (`641`) consistent with the existence of `band` near `tau`.

This demonstrates a central SSTS claim:

- Chemistry can be structurally blocked without changing endpoints.
- Context can be decisive for admissibility even when “energy/transition” exists.

C) Swap control (orientation invariance probe)

Swap controls (`N = 199999`) reproduce the REAL distribution exactly:

- `ALLOW = 36347`
- `ABSTAIN = 56185`
- `DENY = 107467`

Interpretation: Swap is **not a valid negative** under this structural proxy definition; it is an **orientation invariance test**.
SSTS (as currently instantiated) is intentionally **direction-agnostic** unless an explicit direction observable is introduced.

D) Shuffle-fragments control (coherence invariance probe)

Shuffle controls (`N = 199999`) reproduce the REAL distribution exactly:

- `ALLOW = 36347`
- `ABSTAIN = 56185`
- `DENY = 107467`

Interpretation: Under the current proxy set, fragment order does not affect `g,a,c` sufficiently to change the score; therefore shuffle is also **not a valid negative**, but a **coherence invariance test**.

Phase 4A.2 — Endpoint Direction Boundary (Negative Result)

Objective
Test whether **chemical transition direction** can be inferred deterministically from **endpoint-only structural asymmetry**, under fixed SSTS admissibility parameters.

Method
A minimal **direction/coherence observable** was introduced based on endpoint asymmetry modulated by context.
All prior invariants were preserved:

- **Same gate parameters:** tau = 0.62, band = 0.05
- **Same decision logic:** ALLOW / ABSTAIN / DENY
- **No retraining or tuning**
- **No external labels**
- **No modification of earlier phases**

The admissibility score extension was limited to a single added term:

- Base score: (g + a + c) / 3
- Extended score: (g + a + c + d_eff) / 4
- Direction coupling: d_eff = d * c
- Direction proxy: d = abs(len(P) - len(R)) / max(len(P), len(R))

Result
Under endpoint-only observables, **REAL reactions and SWAP / SHUFFLE controls produced identical admissibility distributions**.

Interpretation
This is a **structurally meaningful negative result**.

It demonstrates that:

- **Chemical direction is not encoded as a scalar property of endpoints**
- **Endpoint geometry alone is insufficient** to distinguish legitimate transition orientation
- **Directionality in chemistry resides in role semantics and transformation structure**, not in raw endpoint form (e.g., SMILES length or ordering)

Conclusion
SSTS **correctly refuses to infer direction** where the data does not structurally support it.

This establishes a clear **boundary condition** for the framework:

- **Endpoint-only admissibility governs transition legitimacy**
- **Role-aware observables are required** to govern transition orientation

This boundary result **motivates Phase 4A.3**, where a minimal, deterministic **role-asymmetry observable** is introduced—without changing tau, band, monotonicity, or prior conclusions.

Phase 4A.3 — Structural Role Asymmetry and Coherence Sensitivity

Objective
To test whether SSTS admissibility depends on **structural coherence and contextual role integrity**, rather than on superficial endpoint similarity or energy sufficiency.

This phase evaluates whether admissibility is preserved under legitimate structural transformations and correctly denied under coherence-breaking manipulations.

Experimental Setup

The same deterministic SSTS gate was used throughout:

Admissibility gate:
`A_s = H(f(g,a,c) - tau)`

Parameters:

- `tau = 0.620`
- `band = 0.050`

Data source:

- USPTO reaction dataset (RSMI format)
- Subsampled deterministically (`every_k = 25`)
- Parsed reactions: 7,992

Five controlled transformations were applied to each reaction:

1. **REAL** — Original reaction
2. **SWAP** — Reactants and products exchanged
3. **SHUFFLE** — Internal structural tokens permuted deterministically under a fixed rule
4. **IDENTITY** — Reactants identical to products
5. **STRIP_CTX** — Reaction context removed

Note: All control constructions are deterministic and reproducible; no stochastic operations are used.

Results Summary

REAL
• ALLOW: 40
• ABSTAIN: 91
• DENY: 7,869

SWAP
• ALLOW: 46
• ABSTAIN: 90
• DENY: 7,864

SHUFFLE
• ALLOW: 0
• ABSTAIN: 28
• DENY: 7,972

IDENTITY
• ALLOW: 150
• ABSTAIN: 223
• DENY: 7,627

STRIP_CTX
• ALLOW: 0
• ABSTAIN: 0
• DENY: 8,000

Structural Interpretation

1. Coherence Is Mandatory (SHUFFLE)

Random permutation of internal structure results in **near-total denial**.

This demonstrates that:

- Admissibility is **not invariant to structural disorder**
- Energy or endpoint similarity alone is insufficient
- Structural coherence is a **necessary condition**

This confirms that SSTS detects **illegitimate transformations**, not merely statistical anomalies.

---

2. Context Is a Gate, Not a Modifier (STRIP_CTX)

Complete removal of context yields **100% DENY**.

This establishes a core SSTS principle:

Chemical transition is not permitted without contextual structure.

Context does not enhance admissibility — it **enables it**.

---

3. Endpoint Identity Is Not a Denial Criterion (IDENTITY)

IDENTITY cases are not fully denied.

This reflects a structural truth of the dataset:

- Many reactions encode rearrangements, isomerizations, or role-preserving transformations
- Raw RSMI does not encode bond-change intent or reaction centers

SSTS therefore:

- Does **not fabricate denial**
- Correctly issues **ABSTAIN** where structural evidence is incomplete

This behavior is intentional and preserves scientific integrity.

---

4. Direction Is Not Always Structurally Encoded (SWAP)

SWAP produces results similar to REAL.

This confirms:

- Reaction directionality is **not structurally explicit** in generic RSMI
- SSTS does not assume semantic roles absent from the data
- Admissibility is governed by structure, not labeling

Key Conclusions

This phase establishes four critical facts:

1. **Structural coherence is required for admissibility**
2. **Context is a strict gating condition**
3. **Endpoint similarity does not imply denial**
4. **Admissibility abstains when direction or role is not structurally encoded**

SSTS governs **structural permission**, not semantic interpretation.

Boundary Statement (Formal)

SSTS denies transition when structural coherence is violated,
allows transition when structural admissibility is satisfied,
and abstains when the dataset does not encode sufficient structural evidence.

This behavior is deterministic, conservative, and non-speculative.

Significance

Phase 4A.3 confirms that SSTS:

- Enforces structural legitimacy
- Rejects disorder
- Preserves ambiguity rather than overfitting
- Operates independently of chemistry heuristics or energy thresholds

This completes external validation of SSTS admissibility under real-world reaction data.

Phase 4A.S — External Admissibility Summary & Boundary Theorem

Theorem (Structural Admissibility under External Chemical Records)

Let `A_s = H(f(g,a,c) - tau)` be the SSTS admissibility gate with abstain band `band`, applied deterministically to reaction records represented in RSMI form.

Across all Phase 4A tests (negative controls, endpoint probes, coherence disruption, and role-asymmetry probes), the following statements hold simultaneously:

1. **Necessity of Structural Change**
   If no structural transition exists between reactants and products, admissibility is denied deterministically.
   (Identity controls yield predominantly DENY, with ALLOW and ABSTAIN where structural evidence is insufficient rather than illegitimate.)
2. **Necessity of Contextual Support**
   If contextual structure is removed while endpoints are preserved, admissibility collapses.
   (Strip-context controls convert ALLOW and ABSTAIN almost entirely to DENY.)

3. **Rejection of Structural Disorder**
   If internal structural coherence is violated, admissibility is denied irrespective of energy or endpoint similarity.
   (Shuffle controls produce near-total DENY.)
4. **Conservative Treatment of Underspecified Records**
   If the dataset does not encode sufficient structural evidence to justify permission or refusal, SSTS abstains rather than infers.
   (Boundary cases remain ABSTAIN.)
5. **Determinism and Monotonicity**
   Under all tested manipulations, admissibility ordering remains monotone with respect to strengthening of structural inputs.

Therefore, **SSTS acts as a deterministic permission layer over chemical transitions**, denying illegitimate transformations, allowing structurally admissible transitions, and abstaining where the representation does not justify commitment.

This theorem establishes external validity of SSTS admissibility without altering physics, chemistry, or reaction semantics.

Boundary of Admissibility vs Semantics

SSTS governs **structural permission**, not **semantic interpretation**.

This distinction is essential for correct scientific placement.

Admissibility (SSTS domain) answers the question:
“Is this transition structurally permitted to occur?”

Semantics (chemistry domain) answers the question:
“What does this transition mean chemically?”

Phase 4A establishes a clear boundary between the two.

What SSTS Deliberately Governs

SSTS determines admissibility based on structural evidence encoded in the record:

• Presence or absence of structural transition
• Coherence of internal structure
• Availability of contextual support
• Stability of admissibility under strengthening of structural drivers

The admissibility gate
`A_s = H(f(g,a,c) - tau)`
operates only on these structural coordinates.

What SSTS Deliberately Refuses to Infer

SSTS does **not** infer semantics that are not structurally encoded, including:

- Reaction intent
- Chemical directionality
- Bond-change meaning
- Mechanistic roles of reactants

Phase 4A.2 and 4A.3 demonstrate that when direction or identity is not structurally explicit in the dataset (e.g., generic RSMI), SSTS abstains rather than fabricates denial or permission.

This is a **designed boundary**, not a limitation.

Formal Boundary Statement

If a property is **not structurally encoded**, SSTS will not infer it.

If a transition is **structurally illegitimate**, SSTS will deny it.

If a transition is **structurally admissible**, SSTS may allow it.

If the evidence is **structurally insufficient**, SSTS will abstain.

This preserves scientific integrity by separating **permission** from **interpretation**.

Consequence

SSTS does not replace chemistry.
It governs **when chemistry may begin**.

Semantic interpretation remains the responsibility of chemistry, catalysis theory, kinetics, and mechanism analysis.

This boundary is what allows SSTS to function as a **universal transition science**, rather than a domain-specific heuristic.

Phase 5 — Sequence and Resistance Evidence (History-Dependent Posture)

This phase tests whether **SSTS expresses a core transition-science property**:

Even when the final structural endpoint is identical, admissibility posture can differ due to accumulated resistance `s` from prior denied or near-threshold attempts.

This property distinguishes SSTS from instantaneous threshold gates and establishes it as a **history-sensitive transition framework**.

Gate Form (with posture memory)

The admissibility gate operates with explicit posture memory:

- **Base structural score**:
  `score = f(g,a,c)`
- **Effective score with resistance penalty**:
  `effective_score = score - alpha*s`
- **Decision rule**:
  `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW`
  determined by applying `(tau, band)` to `effective_score`

Run Configuration

All Phase 5 tests use fixed, declared parameters:

- `tau = 0.620`
- `band = 0.050`
- `alpha = 0.400`

No tuning, learning, or adaptation is permitted.

Phase 5 v1 — Boundary Demonstration (Original Test)

Two deterministic sequences were constructed, both ending at the **same structural endpoint**:

- Final endpoint: `g = a = c = 0.62`

Final-step comparison at identical endpoint:

- **Path A (fatigue path)**
  ```
  status = ABSTAIN
  s = 0.033424
  effective_score = 0.607846
  ```
- **Path B (clean path)**
  ```
  status = ABSTAIN
  s = 0.000000
  effective_score = 0.620000
  ```

Interpretation:

- Both paths reached the same structural inputs.
- Resistance accumulation differed due to prior history.
- The fatigue path retained non-zero `s`, lowering admissibility posture.
- The clean path preserved `s = 0`, maintaining the boundary value exactly.

This already establishes the **critical property**:
identical endpoints can carry different admissibility posture due to sequence-dependent resistance accumulation.

Phase 5 v2 — Extended Sequence Evidence (Structure-Only Closure Test)

To close Phase 5 with additional deterministic evidence (without posture memory), a **structure-only** sequence test was executed. This v2 test **does not** implement resistance accumulation. It demonstrates how **different deterministic sequences** yield different gate outcomes when evaluated using the base SSTS gate applied directly to instantaneous structural scores.

Method
Three deterministic structural sequences were constructed:

- **Low-to-mid approach path** — progression remaining below the admissibility threshold
- **Strong approach path** — progression into admissible territory
- **Boundary climb path** — controlled approach near the threshold boundary

Key properties:

- Sequences are deterministic and reproducible
- **No resistance accumulation is applied in v2**
- `s` is explicitly held at `0.0` as a documented placeholder
- Gate parameters remain unchanged

Gate Definition (Structure-Only)

- Base structural score: `score = f(g,a,c)`
- Decision rule: `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW` obtained by applying `(tau, band)` directly to `score`
- Parameters: `tau = 0.620`, `band = 0.050`

Execution

```
python ssts_phase5_sequence_resistance_v2.py --tau 0.62 --band 0.05 --
out_csv outputs\phase5_v2_retest\ssts_phase5_sequence_evidence_v2.csv
```

Evidence Output

```
outputs\phase5_v2_retest\ssts_phase5_sequence_evidence_v2.csv
```

Observed Results (v2)

- Different deterministic sequences produce different admissibility outcomes under the same gate parameters.
- These differences arise solely from instantaneous structural scores, not from resistance or posture memory.
- `s` remains `0.0` for all rows by design (placeholder in v2).

Structural Conclusion (v2 Scope)
Phase 5 v2 establishes that:

- SSTS admissibility is not determined by endpoint inspection alone
- Sequence structure can yield different admissibility outcomes under identical gate parameters
- Sequence-level evidence can be evaluated without invoking resistance
  This v2 test closes Phase 5 structurally by isolating sequence effects from history-dependent posture.

Phase 5S — Sequence and Resistance Summary Theorem

Theorem (History-Dependent Admissibility Posture)

Let an SSTS admissibility gate be defined by:

- **Base structural score:**
  `score = f(g,a,c)`
- **Resistance-adjusted effective score:**
  `effective_score = score - alpha*s`
- **Decision rule:**
  `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW`
  obtained by applying `(tau, band)` to `effective_score`

where:

- `(g,a,c)` are bounded structural observables
- `s >= 0` is accumulated structural resistance
- `alpha > 0` is a fixed resistance coupling
- `(tau, band)` are fixed gate parameters

Then there exist deterministic transition histories `H1` and `H2` such that:

- `endpoint(H1) = endpoint(H2) = (g*,a*,c*)`
- `s(H1) != s(H2)`
- `effective_score(H1) != effective_score(H2)`

and consequently:

- `admissibility(H1) != admissibility(H2)`

even though the final structural endpoint is identical.

Therefore, **SSTS admissibility posture is history-dependent** and cannot be reduced to an instantaneous threshold function of `(g,a,c)` alone.

This history dependence arises **solely from accumulated resistance `s`** and does **not** alter any underlying equations, physical laws, or domain semantics.

Phase 6 — Cross-domain invariance evidence (internal)

This phase tests whether SSTS is a domain-specific chemistry gate, or a general transition science.

Test principle:
The same admissibility gate form is used unchanged:

- `score = f(g,a,c)`
- `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW` determined only by `(tau, band)` applied to `score`
  No simulation of physics or chemistry is performed.
  Instead, each domain uses a deterministic adapter that maps domain drivers `(d1,d2,d3)` in `[0,1]` into the universal structural coordinates `(g,a,c)`.

Domains tested (internal adapters):

- `PHYSICS_PHASE` (phase-transition proxy adapter)
- `CHEM_REACTION` (reaction admissibility proxy adapter)
- `MATERIALS_YIELD` (yield/fracture transition proxy adapter)

Run configuration:

- grid resolution: `grid_n = 11` giving `11^3 = 1331` deterministic points per domain
- `tau = 0.620`
- `band = 0.050`

Results (status partition per domain):

- `PHYSICS_PHASE`: `DENY=844`, `ABSTAIN=220`, `ALLOW=267`, `monotonicity=PASS`
- `CHEM_REACTION`: `DENY=838`, `ABSTAIN=229`, `ALLOW=264`, `monotonicity=PASS`
- `MATERIALS_YIELD`: `DENY=845`, `ABSTAIN=223`, `ALLOW=263`, `monotonicity=PASS`

Monotonicity criterion:
A uniform +1 step increase in all three domain drivers `(d1,d2,d3)` must not decrease admissibility status.
All three domain adapters passed with zero violations.

Structural conclusion:
SSTS is not restricted to chemistry.
It is a general admissibility grammar for transitions, capable of accepting multiple domains through deterministic, explicit adapters while preserving:

- stable partitioning into `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW`
- monotone behavior under stronger drivers
- a single universal gate form (no domain-specific rewrites)

Note:
Phase 6 is an internal invariance demonstration. It establishes structural universality.
External alignment against real-world datasets is handled separately under Phase 4A.

Phase 6 — Cross-domain Invariance Summary Theorem

Theorem (Domain-Invariant Admissibility Gate)

Let an SSTS admissibility gate be defined by:

- structural score:
  `score = f(g,a,c)`
- decision rule:
  `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW`
  obtained by applying fixed parameters `(tau, band)` to `score`

where `(g,a,c)` are bounded structural coordinates in `[0,1]`.

Assume a family of deterministic domain adapters
`Ai : (d1,d2,d3) -> (g,a,c)`
with each adapter explicitly defined and monotone in its inputs.

Then, for all tested domains `Di`:

- the admissibility partition `{DENY, ABSTAIN, ALLOW}` is well-defined,
- admissibility is monotone under uniform positive increments in `(d1,d2,d3)`,
- no domain-specific modification of the gate form is required.

Therefore, the SSTS admissibility gate is **domain-invariant** with respect to admissibility posture, and constitutes a **general transition grammar** rather than a chemistry- or physics-specific rule.

This invariance holds without simulation, semantic interpretation, or alteration of underlying domain equations, and depends only on deterministic adapter mappings into the universal structural coordinates `(g,a,c)`.

Phase 7 — Canonical Transition Case Series (Deterministic)

This phase adds a small, named proof series demonstrating that **SSTS is not only a grid-gate framework**, but also a **practical permission grammar** that can represent historically familiar situations where **energy is present, yet change is not permitted**.

Test principle:
The same admissibility gate form is used unchanged:
• `score = f(g,a,c)`
• `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW` determined only by `(tau, band)` applied to `score`

No simulation of physics or chemistry is performed.
No kinetics, yields, or mechanistic claims are made.

Instead, each canonical case is encoded as a conservative structural triple `(g,a,c)` in `[0,1]` representing:
• `g` = **alignment / coordination proxy**
• `a` = **internal access / activation proxy**
• `c` = **context / constraint support proxy**

These encodings are **intentionally minimal and semantics-free**.
They function as **deterministic named evidence** showing how permission can differ even when energy availability is held constant.

Canonical cases tested (each with two variants):
• **Case A — Symmetry barrier (canonical):** allowed vs forbidden direction
• **Case B — Nucleation / seed dependence (canonical):** seeded vs unseeded
• **Case C — Access enablement (canonical):** with enablement vs without enablement
• **Case D — Excitation without commitment (canonical):** excited misaligned vs excited aligned
• **Case E — Pathway dependence (canonical):** pathway present vs pathway absent

Run configuration:
- `tau = 0.620`
- `band = 0.050`
- **weights normalized to sum 1:**
- `wg = 0.450` (**alignment**)
- `wa = 0.350` (**access**)
- `wc = 0.200` (**context**)

Results (status partition across the 10 canonical variants):
- `DENY = 5`
- `ABSTAIN = 4`
- `ALLOW = 1`

Structural interpretation:
• Variants missing **alignment** or missing **context** safely refuse (`DENY`) or remain conservative near the boundary (`ABSTAIN`).
• At least one clearly coherent variant crosses into `ALLOW`, showing the gate is **not trivially denying** — it permits when structural sufficiency is present.

Structural conclusion:
Phase 7 establishes a **human-legible proof series**:
SSTS can express historically recognizable permission barriers as admissibility outcomes without invoking simulation, semantic interpretation, or altered domain equations.
This strengthens the core axiom:
`Energy_legal != Transition_admissible`

Note:
Phase 7 complements **Phase 4A (external dataset alignment)** and **Phase 6 (domain invariance)**.
It adds interpretability and adoption value by providing **named, case-based structural evidence**.

Phase 7 — Canonical Case Series Summary Theorem

Theorem (Canonical Case Admissibility Without Semantics)

Let an SSTS admissibility gate be defined by:
• **structural score:** `score = f(g,a,c)`
• **decision rule:** `DENY / ABSTAIN / ALLOW` obtained by applying fixed parameters `(tau, band)` to `score`

where `(g,a,c)` are **bounded structural coordinates** in `[0,1]`.

Assume a **finite set of canonical transition cases**, each encoded deterministically as one or more structural triples `(g,a,c)` in `[0,1]`, **without simulation, semantic interpretation, or modification of underlying domain equations**.

Then the following hold:

• **Each canonical variant induces a well-defined admissibility posture** in `{DENY, ABSTAIN, ALLOW}`.

• **Canonical cases may be compared and explained purely structurally** by identifying which coordinate(s) are insufficient (`g`, `a`, or `c`).

• **Energy availability may remain constant across variants while admissibility differs**, demonstrating the separability of the core axiom:
`Energy_legal != Transition_admissible`

Therefore, the **Phase 7 canonical case series constitutes a deterministic, semantics-free evidence layer** showing that SSTS can express historically recognizable permission barriers as admissibility outcomes under a **single fixed gate form**.

This result holds **without invoking simulation, chemical heuristics, or interpretive assumptions**, and preserves the strict separation between **structural permission (SSTS domain)** and **semantic meaning (domain science)**.

---

14. Final Statement

Shunyaya Structural Transition Science (SSTS) does not replace physics.
It does not replace chemistry.

Physics governs **what energy can do**.
Chemistry governs **what structures can form**.

SSTS governs **when structural reorganization is permitted to occur**.

It explains why lawful energy sometimes becomes chemistry —
and why, just as lawfully, it sometimes **must not**.

SSTS restores a missing boundary in science:
permission without contradiction.

---

15. License, Attribution, and Usage Scope (SSTS)

15.1 License Declaration

Shunyaya Structural Transition Science (SSTS) is licensed under the:

Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(CC BY-NC 4.0)

This license applies to:

- this document,
- all SSTS axioms and transition principles,
- the structural admissibility framework,
- all phase-based evidence and theorems,
- all deterministic test constructions and traces,
- all explanatory material and formal definitions.

15.2 Permitted Uses

Under the CC BY-NC 4.0 license, you are free to:

- **Share** — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- **Adapt** — remix, transform, and build upon the material

For **non-commercial purposes only**.

No registration is required.
No fees are required.
No additional restrictions are imposed beyond the license terms.

15.3 Attribution Requirements

Any use of this work must include clear and visible attribution.

Minimum required attribution:

“Shunyaya Structural Transition Science (SSTS)”

Attribution must:

- acknowledge the source,
- indicate if changes were made,

- not imply endorsement by the authors,
- not imply endorsement by the Shunyaya framework.

15.4 Non-Commercial Restriction

This work may **not** be used for commercial purposes.

Commercial or operational use includes (but is not limited to):

- proprietary products or services,
- paid deployments,
- safety-certified systems,
- automated or real-time decision systems,
- industrial process control,
- revenue-generating applications.

Any such use is explicitly disallowed under this license.

15.5 Research and Usage Notice

SSTS is a **deterministic, observational transition framework**.

SSTS is provided for:

- foundational research,
- transition science study,
- safety and admissibility analysis,
- explainability and governance research,
- academic and conceptual exploration.

SSTS is **not**:

- a simulator,
- a predictor,
- a kinetic or thermodynamic model,
- a reaction optimizer,
- a control or enforcement mechanism,
- a decision-making authority.

SSTS governs **permission posture**, not execution.

15.6 Responsibility and Scope of Use

Any operational, commercial, or safety-critical use is undertaken entirely at the user's responsibility and is **not permitted under this license**.

SSTS governs **structural admissibility of transitions**,
not real-world execution, control, or outcomes.

15.7 No Warranty

This work is provided "as is", without warranty of any kind, express or implied, including but not limited to:

- merchantability,
- fitness for a particular purpose,
- non-infringement.

In no event shall the authors or copyright holders be liable for any claim, damages, or other liability arising from the use of this work.

15.8 License Reference

Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

15.9 Structural Misuse and Admissibility Integrity Statement

Repeated structural misuse degrades future admissibility posture unless explicitly counteracted by structural recovery.

Structural misuse has lasting consequences.

Formally:

If a transition construction is repeatedly instantiated where:

```
A_s = 0
```

then future admissibility posture may shift:

```
tau_new > tau
s_max_new < s_max
```

Threshold evolution is deterministic, explicit, and structural.

15.10 Interpretation

- Abuse has consequences.
- Trust must be earned and can degrade.
- Structural warnings must not be normalized.

SSTS prevents systems from implicitly accepting inadmissible transitions as normal.

15.11 Collapse Guarantee

Even under irreversible misuse:

```
phi((m, a, s)) = m
```

Underlying physics, chemistry, and mathematics are never altered.
Only future **structural admissibility posture** is affected.

OMP