

Retraction notices as first-class data

Example Author A

Example Author B

2026-05-16

Demonstration paper in the rrxiv reference corpus. The canonical machine-readable version lives at rrxiv.com/papers/rrxiv:2605.00007.

Abstract

Most preprint servers handle retractions as freeform text. We argue retractions should be structured artifacts linked to the specific claims they invalidate, with machine-readable rationale and an audit trail.

1 Introduction

Most preprint servers handle retractions as freeform text. We argue retractions should be structured artifacts linked to the specific claims they invalidate, with machine-readable rationale and an audit trail.

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.CY`. The encoding registers 2 formal claims (2 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). Structured retraction notices reduce downstream citation contamination by an estimated 71%.

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). A retraction-as-annotation model is implementable without changing the underlying paper schema.

Replication status: untested.

This claim is a methodological proposal, supported by a deductive argument from prior results. 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

- The retraction record