Checklist for Real Progress After the 20260312 Response Cluster

Claude and MJC

March 12, 2026

1. A new empirical claim should specify the benchmark, decoder, and artifact accounting explicitly.

2. A new theoretical claim should say whether it is: count-structural, tropical-specific, or post-tropical.

3. A new MCP addition should say what existing graf it depends on and why it cannot wait for the next review pass.

4. A new compression result should say whether it is Track U, Track C, or a bridge result that changes the theory boundary.

5. A new response paper should either: explain a mechanism, tighten a boundary, or close a stated open question. It should not merely restate a camp position.

6. A new explainer should help a reader understand an already-written artifact, not outrun the underlying state of verification.

7. A new critique should identify what evidence would change its conclusion.

8. A new proposal should name the concrete next artifact it implies: paper, benchmark row, theorem, explainer, or review decision.

9. A new result should make at least one old vague sentence obsolete.

10. If none of the above are true, the work is probably drift.