Independent Re-Coding Protocol (ADAPT cases)

Purpose. Address the paper's central evidence limitation - that the case-to-proposition mapping was performed solely by the methodology's originator - by having a **neutral auditor** independently re-code the four cases and report **inter-rater reliability**. This requires *no new fieldwork* and *no release of classified data*; it operates on redacted case packs the author can already share under NDA.

Who. A systems-engineering academic or senior practitioner with **no affiliation to The Swift Group** and no stake in ADAPT. Engage under NDA.

Inputs the author provides (redacted/de-identified). For each of the four cases: the available artifacts and dependency maps, review/decision records, status reports, and member-check memos - at the same de-identification level as the manuscript. The author's own coding is **withheld** from the auditor until after the auditor codes independently (blind).

Coding task

For every **case × proposition (P1-P5)** cell, the auditor records, using only the case pack:

1. **mechanism_present** - was the ADAPT mechanism for that proposition actually present in the case? `Y / N / NA`
2. **proposition_stressed** - did the case meaningfully exercise (stress) the proposition? `Y / N`
3. **outcome_direction** - direction of the associated outcome where observable: `pos / neutral / neg / NA`
4. **evidence_strength** - strength of the chain of evidence for the cell: `1` (weak/single source) … `3` (triangulated)
5. **auditor_notes** - one line of justification.

Use `recoding_sheet_template.csv` (20 rows: A-D × P1-P5).

Reliability computation

1. Reduce each cell to the binary judgment used in the paper's Table 6: **case consistent with proposition?** (`1/0`).
2. Compare the auditor's 20 binary judgments against the author's 20 (the paper's Table 6).
3. Report **percentage agreement** and **Cohen's kappa**; list every disagreement with both raters' notes.
4. (Optional) A second independent rater on the same packs yields a three-way reliability and Fleiss' kappa.

Cohen's kappa on 2 raters × N items: kappa = (p_o − p_e) / (1 − p_e), where p_o is observed agreement and p_e is chance agreement from the marginal rates of `1/0`. (`reproduce.py`'s matrix gives the author's column; the auditor's sheet gives the other.)

Deliverable

A 1-2 page **auditor memo**: the filled coding sheet, % agreement and kappa, the discrepancy list, and a one-paragraph judgment on whether the originator's case-to-proposition mapping is independently supported. This memo (and kappa) should be cited in the manuscript's §3.4 and §6.4, moving the claim from *"author-interpreted"* to *"independently corroborated."*

What it licenses

With an acceptable kappa reported, the paper may state that the qualitative pattern-matching is **independently reproducible and not an artifact of single-observer bias** - the single biggest available gain in evidentiary standing under the project's hard constraints.