

Many small claims, all under active replication

Example Author A

2026-05-17

Demonstration paper in the rrxiv reference corpus. The canonical machine-readable version lives at rrxiv.com/papers/rrxiv:2605.00008.

Abstract

A survey paper registering many small empirical claims about preprint discoverability. Each claim is currently the subject of an in-progress replication effort by an independent group.

1 Introduction

A survey paper registering many small empirical claims about preprint discoverability. Each claim is currently the subject of an in-progress replication effort by an independent group.

This document is a structured encoding of the paper in the `rrxiv` protocol’s Canonical Intermediate Representation (CIR). It engages with the topics `cs.DL` and `cs.IR`. The encoding registers 5 formal claims (5 untested). Each claim is annotated with its claim type, evidence type, and current replication status; dependency edges between claims, when present, form a machine-readable proof DAG.

2 Methodology

We follow the `rrxiv` convention of separating *claims* (the proposition under consideration) from *evidence* (the argument or data supporting it). Each claim in the results section below is presented with its statement, the type of evidence appealed to, and a brief discussion of replication status. Where claims depend on prior results — internal or external — the dependency is recorded in the CIR as a `\dependson` edge, so the full inferential structure is machine-traversable. Citations of external work appear in the References section at the end of this document.

3 Results: registered claims

Claim 1

Claim 1 (Claim 1). Preprint titles longer than 12 words receive 18% less cross-domain attention.
Replication status: untested.

This claim is an empirical observation supported by data. As of the encoding date, it has not yet been independently tested.

Claim 2

Claim 2 (Claim 2). Adding a structured abstract correlates with 22% higher click-through from search.

Replication status: untested.

This claim is an empirical observation supported by data. As of the encoding date, it has not yet been independently tested.

Claim 3

Claim 3 (Claim 3). Domain-experts cite within their own subfield 4x more than cross-domain.

Replication status: untested.

This claim is an empirical observation supported by data. As of the encoding date, it has not yet been independently tested.

Claim 4

Claim 4 (Claim 4). Section-level retrieval beats whole-paper retrieval on recall@5 for narrow queries.

Replication status: untested.

This claim is an empirical observation supported by data. As of the encoding date, it has not yet been independently tested.

Claim 5

Claim 5 (Claim 5). The reproducibility-budget signal is stable across three independent reannotation rounds.

Replication status: untested.

This claim is an empirical observation supported by data. As of the encoding date, it has not yet been independently tested.

4 Discussion

The claim graph above is the primary product of this paper. By making every claim independently citable — and by recording its dependencies, evidence type, and current replication status as structured fields — the paper participates in the rrxiv reproducibility-first corpus. Subsequent papers in this instance may extend, contradict, or replicate individual claims here without forcing a rewrite of the entire document. See the canonical version online for the live discourse layer.

5 References

- Discoverability metrics for preprints
- Cross-domain attention in scholarly networks