Article

Not peer-reviewed version

A Foundational Framework and Benchmarking Methodology for Observer-Dependent Entropy Retrieval in Linguistic Computation

Evlondo Cooper *

Posted Date: 1 April 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

Keywords: observer-dependent entropy; linguistic comprehension; cognitive modeling; quantum-inspired computation; entropy retrieval; density matrix; individual differences; garden-path sentences; language processing; attention and working memory

doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

Article

A Foundational Framework and Benchmarking Methodology for Observer-Dependent Entropy Retrieval in Linguistic Computation

Evlondo Cooper

Independent Researcher; 1evlocoo@pm.me

Abstract: Comprehension is not merely passive decoding, but rather an observer-relative process of entropy retrieval. We formalize how individual cognitive differences modulate linguistic uncertainty via Observer-Dependent Entropy Retrieval (ODER). ODER makes two novel predictions that no current model jointly captures: (1) ∇C spikes during garden-path resolution will correlate with P600 amplitude only in low-working-memory observers, and (2) coherence terms in the observer's density matrix (μ) will predict priming interference patterns. ODER's quantum-inspired framework explains divergent processing costs across observer types without resorting to arbitrary parameter tuning. Using a constructed language (Aurian) as a controlled testbed, we provide implementable tools for measuring how processing difficulty is shaped by observer-specific attention, memory capacity, and prior knowledge. We further compare ODER's quantum formalism to classical alternatives—such as Bayesian mixture models and fuzzy logic—to clarify its purpose: modeling ambiguity and interference without implying that the brain itself performs quantum computation.

Keywords: observer-dependent entropy; linguistic comprehension; cognitive modeling; quantum-inspired computation; entropy retrieval; density matrix; individual differences; garden-path sentences; language processing; attention and working memory

---

1. Introduction

Traditional entropy models quantify linguistic uncertainty without accounting for observer-specific processing differences. Yet, recent evidence from neurolinguistics and computational cognition suggests that interpretive effort—and thus uncertainty reduction—depends on an observer's attentional state, working memory capacity, and contextual familiarity [7,11]. ODER extends this literature by:

- Defining entropy retrieval as a function of hierarchical syntactic complexity and information transfer efficiency.
- Mapping these theoretical constructs to measurable cognitive signatures in EEG, fMRI, and pupillometry.
- Proposing a replicable benchmarking framework for empirical evaluation.

Crucially, ODER represents a shift from viewing comprehension as entropy reduction in the message to entropy retrieval in the observer. This distinction addresses not just what is complex, but how and when different observers experience that complexity.

1.1. Contributions

- A unified mathematical framework for observer-dependent entropy retrieval.
- Explicit retrieval Equation (2) and transition Equation (5) functions parameterized to reflect attention, working memory, and prior knowledge in measurable ways.
- A contextual gradient operator that captures reanalysis (e.g., garden-path phenomena) in dynamic, observer-dependent terms.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 April 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

- A benchmarking methodology to compare ODER against existing cognitive models, with a clear roadmap for empirical testing.
- A demonstration of how quantum-formalism constructs (e.g., density matrices) can be adapted to model ambiguity and interference without implying literal quantum computation in the brain.

1.2. Relationship to Existing Models

ODER does not seek to compete with existing linguistic models solely on predictive accuracy. It instead addresses a fundamental gap in current approaches:

- Surprisal-based models [6,9] effectively quantify unexpectedness but assume a uniform processor, missing individual differences in how surprisal is experienced.
- Resource-rational models [5,10] acknowledge bounded cognitive resources but often lack explicit reanalysis mechanisms (e.g., the P600 in garden-path sentences).
- Transformer-based language models excel at prediction and generative tasks but provide limited insights into why or how individuals differ in linguistic processing.

Rather than replacing these models, ODER serves as a meta-framework clarifying when and why processing difficulties arise for specific observers.

1.2.1. The ODER Innovation: A Conceptual Map

Consider the classic garden-path sentence, "The horse raced past the barn fell." Empirical data reveal expert-novice divergence [3] in processing difficulty. Simple surprisal-based models predict uniform difficulty, whereas ODER explains observer-specific divergences by parameterizing retrieval via attention, working memory, and prior knowledge.

1.3. Theoretical Positioning of ODER

Table 1. Theoretical positioning of ODER relative to existing approaches.

Approach	Primary Focus	Treatment of Observer	Key Limitations
Surprisal Models	Input statistics and probability	Uniform processor with idealized capacity	Cannot explain individual differences in processing difficulty
Resource-Rational	Bounded rationality and capacity limits	Variable capacity, uniform processing mechanisms	Lack explicit reanalysis mechanisms; processing viewed as passive
Optimal Parsing	Active processing strategies	Uniform processor with idealized strategies	Cannot explain individual variations in strategy selection
ODER (This paper)	Active retrieval by heterogeneous observers	Parameterized by attention, memory, and knowledge	Requires empirical calibration of observer parameters

By reframing comprehension as active, observer-relative retrieval rather than passive decoding, ODER aims to unify phenomena previously treated separately (e.g., garden-path reanalysis, working memory constraints, expertise).

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

2. Mathematical Framework

A Note on Reading This Section
Readers unfamiliar with quantum formalism may wish to focus on the high-level interpretations of each equation (Equations (1)–(5)) rather than the matrix mechanics. The crucial takeaway is that density matrices capture multiple possible interpretations simultaneously, while the proposed operators model how those interpretations evolve under linguistic input and observer constraints.

2.1. Observer-Dependent Entropy

For observer j, the cumulative entropy at discourse time τ is defined as:

$$S_{obs,j}(\tau) = -\sum_i P_{obs,ij}(\tau) \log P_{obs,ij}(\tau) + \int_0^\tau f\big(L_{hier}(t), I_{trans}(t), \nabla C(t)\big)\, dt. \tag{1}$$

Where $P_{obs,ij}$ is the posterior distribution over interpretations for observer j. This component parallels traditional information-theoretic measures (e.g., Shannon), but the integral term brings in observer- and time-dependent factors:

- L_{hier}: Hierarchical syntactic complexity
- I_{trans}: Information transfer efficiency
- ∇C: Contextual gradient (rapid reanalysis vs. gradual accumulation)

2.2. Retrieval Function

$$f(L_{\text{hier}}, I_{\text{trans}}, \nabla C) \;=\; A\big[\alpha L_{\text{hier}} + \beta I_{\text{trans}}\big]^{\delta}\; \exp(-\tau/\tau_0). \tag{2}$$

Parameters

- $\alpha \in [0,1]$: Attentional focus (higher α means more focused attention)
- $\beta \in [0,1]$: Working memory constraint (higher β means lower capacity)
- $\delta > 0$: Prior knowledge/experience (higher δ indicates more extensive domain knowledge)

The exponential decay term $\exp(-\tau/\tau_0)$ models timing effects, ensuring that earlier words can have outsized influence depending on how quickly attention shifts or how memory load accumulates.

2.3. Contextual Gradient Operator

$$\nabla C(t) = \frac{dC(t)}{dt}, \quad |\nabla C| \le M, \quad C \in C^1[0,\tau]. \tag{3}$$

Large spikes in ∇C correspond to points of rapid reanalysis (e.g., garden-path resolution), linking to event-related potentials like the P600 or N400. More gradual accumulation corresponds to syntactic complexity in embedded or nested clauses.

2.4. Why Use a Quantum-Inspired Density Matrix Instead of Classical Models?

An observer's cognitive state in ODER is represented by the density matrix:

$$\rho_{\text{obs}}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(\tau) & \mu(\tau) \\ \mu^*(\tau) & \beta(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where $\alpha(\tau)$ tracks attentional focus, $\beta(\tau)$ tracks working memory load, and $\mu(\tau)$ encodes coherence, reflecting simultaneous activation of multiple interpretations.

Comparison to Classical Alternatives

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

- **Bayesian Mixture Models**: Well-suited for continuous uncertainty but often struggle to represent interference effects, where prior exposure to one meaning can suppress or amplify the probability of a competing meaning.
- **Fuzzy Logic**: Captures degrees of truth but lacks a principled mechanism for interference or superposition.
- **Quantum Probability (Density Matrices)**: Natively allows superposition of interpretations and interference terms (μ), aligning with empirical observations that meaning is often not discretely chosen until critical disambiguation points occur.

Critical Point: Although quantum mechanics inspired the formalism, ODER does not claim that the brain performs quantum computation. Rather, we utilize the mathematical machinery to address phenomena (e.g., superposition of potential interpretations) that classical probability struggles to model without undue complexity [1].

2.5. State Transition and Unitary Evolution Assumption

The observer's cognitive state evolves according to:

$$\rho_{\text{obs}}(\tau + \Delta\tau) = T\big(\rho_{\text{obs}}(\tau), L_{\text{hier}}, I_{\text{trans}}, \nabla C\big), \tag{5}$$

where a simplest case instantiation is:

$$T(\rho_{\text{obs}}, L_{\text{hier}}, I_{\text{trans}}, \nabla C) = U(\tau)\, \rho_{\text{obs}}\, U^{\dagger}(\tau). \tag{6}$$

$U(\tau)$ is a unitary operator expressed as:

$$U(\tau) = \exp\Big[-i\big(H_0 + H_{\text{int}}(L_{\text{hier}}, I_{\text{trans}}, \nabla C)\big)\tau\Big], \tag{7}$$

with

$$H_{\text{int}} = \gamma_1\, L_{\text{hier}}\, \sigma_x \;+\; \gamma_2\, I_{\text{trans}}\, \sigma_z \;+\; \gamma_3\, \nabla C\, \sigma_y. \tag{8}$$

- $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ are Pauli matrices;
- $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ weight syntactic, informational, and contextual factors, respectively.

Rationale for Unitary Evolution

- **Preservation of Superposition**: Unitary evolution preserves the off-diagonal terms (μ) in ρ_{obs}, enabling ongoing ambiguity.
- **Possible Extensions for Noise**: In realistic settings, cognitive states may degrade over time (e.g., through forgetting or distraction). Future versions of ODER could incorporate a decoherence or noise term, creating an open-system approach that models how interference patterns "collapse" under memory decay or external noise.

2.6. Implementation Algorithm

This algorithm can be implemented in Python using standard numeric libraries (NumPy/SciPy for matrix operations; QuTiP for density matrix routines). NLP toolkits (NLTK, SpaCy) provide syntactic analyses for L_{hier}.

doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

Algorithm 1 ODER Entropy Retrieval

Require: sentence S, observer parameters α, β, μ
Ensure: observer-dependent entropy score S_{obs}
Initialize $S_{\text{obs}} = 0$
Initialize ρ_{obs} using Equation (4)
for each word w in S **do**
    $L_{\text{hier}} \leftarrow \text{syntactic\_depth}(w, \text{context})$
    $I_{\text{trans}} \leftarrow \text{information\_transfer}(w, \text{context})$
    $\nabla C \leftarrow \text{contextual\_gradient}(w, \text{context})$
    Update $S_{\text{obs}} \mathrel{+}= f(L_{\text{hier}}, I_{\text{trans}}, \nabla C)$ using Equation (2)
    Update $\rho_{\text{obs}} = T(\rho_{\text{obs}}, L_{\text{hier}}, I_{\text{trans}}, \nabla C)$ using Equation (5)
end for
return S_{obs}

3. Benchmarking Methodology

3.1. Comparative Metrics

- **Entropy Reduction Rate**: How quickly S_{obs} decreases over time.
- **Reanalysis Latency**: Captured by reaction-time variance on garden-path tasks.
- **Predictive Accuracy**: Correlation between model predictions and observed EEG or fMRI signals.
- **Pupillometric Response**: Pupil dilation under load or disambiguation.
- **Eye-Movement Patterns**: Fixations/regressions during garden-path resolution.

3.2. Protocol

1. Compute baseline entropy Equation (1) for stimuli in Aurian.
2. Implement ODER retrieval dynamics (Equations (2)–(5)).
3. Compare against surprisal-based and resource-rational baselines using metrics such as Brier Score and variance explained.
4. Validate with a multimodal approach: behavioral data (reaction times, comprehension probes), pupillometry, EEG, and fMRI.

3.3. Neurophysiological Correlates

- Contextual gradient spikes (∇C) $\rightarrow$ correlated with P600 amplitude.
- Information transfer efficiency (I_{trans}) $\rightarrow$ correlated with N400 components.
- Working memory load (β) $\rightarrow$ associated with theta oscillations in frontal EEG.

3.4. Distinguishing Retrieval Failure from Prediction Failure

A core ODER innovation is the distinction between retrieval failure and prediction failure:

- **Prediction Failure**: The language model (e.g., a parser) fails to anticipate upcoming input (traditional surprisal).
- **Retrieval Failure**: An observer cannot efficiently integrate available information due to cognitive constraints (e.g., overshooting working memory capacity or failing to maintain coherent superposition).

These failures produce empirically different signatures:

- **EEG**: An attenuated P600 after prolonged processing difficulty.
- **Pupillometry**: A plateau in pupil dilation for low-capacity observers, even as complexity increases.
- **Behavioral**: Non-linear error rate increases in comprehension probes.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

4. Empirical Calibration

4.1. Aurian as an Initial Testbed

Aurian is a constructed language that provides explicit control over syntactic complexity (L_{hier}) and informational load (I_{trans}). While artificial, this setup allows careful manipulation of embedding and lexical properties, offering a "clean" environment for initial model testing.

4.1.1. Aurian Grammar Specification

Core Syntactic Rules

$$S \to \text{NP VP} \tag{1}$$
$$\text{NP} \to (\text{Det})\ \text{N}\ (\text{CP}) \tag{2}$$
$$\text{VP} \to \text{V}\ (\text{NP})\ (\text{CP}) \tag{3}$$
$$\text{CP} \to \text{C S} \tag{4}$$

Lexicon with Complexity Scores (L_{hier})

- *kem* (subject pronoun, +0)
- *vora* (simple verb, +1)
- *sul* (complementizer, +2)
- *daz* (embedding verb, +2)
- *fel* (object noun, +0)
- *ren* (modifier, +1)
- *tir* (determiner, +0)
- *mek* (conjunction, +1)
- *poli* (adverb, +1)
- *zul* (negation, +1)

Examples

- Low entropy: "Kem vora fel" (SVO)
- Medium: "Kem vora fel ren" (SVO+modifier)
- High: "Kem daz sul tir fel vora" (center-embedding)
- Very high: "Kem daz sul tir fel sul ren vora poli zul" (nested clauses)

4.1.2. Clarifying the L_{hier} Metric

In these examples, each rule or lexical item contributes a complexity increment. We acknowledge that parsing strategies (e.g., dependency distance) might yield different numeric values. Future expansions could compare L_{hier} to standard parse-tree depth or inter-rater calibrations.

4.2. Confidence, Sensitivity, and Parameter Variance

While ODER posits that parameters α, β, δ are individually measurable, any empirical study faces variability and measurement error. We propose:

- **Confidence Intervals** around each parameter, reflecting uncertainty in tasks like the n-back or reading span.
- **Sensitivity Analyses** that vary each parameter by $\pm 10\%$ to evaluate how robust ODER predictions remain.

Emphasizing ODER's flexibility—rather than strict determinism—can encourage researchers to treat the model as a baseline for systematically examining individual differences, not a final quantitative predictor.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

4.3. Minimal Synthetic Simulation

Before large-scale experiments, a simple synthetic simulation can illustrate how observer parameters modulate ∇C:

Two Synthetic Observers:

- Observer A: $\beta = 0.3$ (high working memory)
- Observer B: $\beta = 0.7$ (low working memory)

Garden-Path Sentence: "The horse raced past the barn fell."

Predicted ∇C Patterns:

- Observer A: Modest spike at "fell" with quick resolution.
- Observer B: Larger spike and prolonged resolution time.

Such a toy simulation shows that while a baseline surprisal model predicts a uniform difficulty spike, ODER differentiates the magnitude and duration of the reanalysis cost by observer.

4.4. Parameter Estimation and Synthetic Demonstration

Parameter Estimation

- **Maximum Likelihood**: Fit α, β, δ to reaction-time data on center-embedding in Aurian.
- **Bayesian Hierarchical Models**: Account for inter-observer variability, capturing population-level vs. individual-level parameters.

Illustrative Example
Lexical Ambiguity (e.g., "bank"): Observers with high α maintain superposition ($|\mu|$ stays high) until disambiguation. Observers with low α prematurely collapse to a single interpretation.

4.5. Cross-Linguistic Validation Plan

After verifying ODER's core assumptions in Aurian, we propose testing it on typologically diverse languages. This increases ecological validity and ensures that ODER's parameterization extends to:

- Varying word orders (e.g., SOV, VSO).
- Morphologically rich systems (e.g., polysynthetic languages).
- Tone-based or case-marking languages (e.g., Mandarin, Finnish).

4.6. Data Pipeline and Resource Constraints

Data Pipeline

- **Stimulus Creation**: Aurian or natural-language data.
- **Observer Testing**: Gather attention (dual-task), working memory (reading span), prior knowledge (domain surveys).
- **ODER Implementation**: Apply Equations (1)–(5) to predict ∇C, P600 amplitude, etc.
- **Validation Layer**: Compare predictions with EEG, fMRI, or eye-tracking data.

Acknowledgment of Resource Constraints
As an independent researcher, large-scale EEG/fMRI studies may be cost-prohibitive. We therefore encourage:

- **Collaborative Partnerships**: with labs already collecting relevant EEG data.
- **Reanalysis of Public Datasets**: e.g., Natural Stories Corpus, Dundee Corpus, or Nieuwland et al. [11].
- **Crowdsourced Behavioral Testing**: for reaction times and self-paced reading tasks.

By using existing resources, we can iteratively refine ODER's parameters before conducting more expensive neurophysiological validations.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 April 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

5. Cross-Domain Applications of ODER

While ODER was developed to formalize individual differences in linguistic comprehension, its central premise—that entropy retrieval is an observer-specific, dynamically evolving process—offers broader implications. This section outlines how ODER's framework could inform adjacent fields, from interface design to epistemology. In keeping with the model's empirical foundations (Sections 3–4), we provide tiered applications, a summary table mapping ODER's constructs to use cases, and testable predictions for each domain. We also include a short note on clinical cautions (Section 5.2) and a minimal AI example (Section 5.3.3) to illustrate potential integrations.

5.1. Near-Term Applications

5.1.1. Adaptive Systems and Human–Machine Interaction

One promising near-term use of ODER is in attention- and memory-calibrated interfaces. Parameters such as α (attentional focus) and β (working memory constraint) could inform dynamic UI complexity, particularly in high-stakes tasks (e.g., medical decision systems). For instance:

- **On-the-Fly Simplification**: When an ODER-based system detects that ∇C is spiking (potential reanalysis overload), it could simplify syntactic structures or provide clarifying text blocks.
- **Retrieval Failure Alerts**: If ocular or behavioral measures suggest repeated comprehension breakdowns, the interface could adopt more redundant cues or break up the information into smaller chunks.

Testable Prediction (UI): In a user study with an adaptive UI, participants flagged by ODER as high-β (low working memory) will show shorter reanalysis times, fewer comprehension errors, and reduced frustration compared to those using a static UI.

5.1.2. Learning, Assessment, and Educational Feedback

Because ODER formalizes how comprehension effort varies among observers, it holds promise for personalized learning:

- **Cognitive Profiling**: An "ODER-based reading test" could estimate α and β by tracking where readers encounter repeated spikes in ∇C. This parallels how n-back tasks measure working memory, but with a linguistic focus.
- **Adaptive Tutoring Systems**: If a learner's ∇C values remain persistently high, the system could slow the introduction of new vocabulary or complex syntax, scaffolding the lesson more gradually.

Testable Prediction (Education): In a classroom platform instrumented with ODER metrics, students identified as having high-β profiles (i.e., lower WM capacity) will show significantly improved learning outcomes when lessons are dynamically restructured to reduce syntactic complexity at peak ∇C moments.

5.2. Emerging and Mid-Term Applications

5.2.1. Clinical and Accessibility Contexts

The model's explicit treatment of attentional bandwidth, memory load, and observer-dependent ambiguity resolution may help in cognitive diagnostics and assistive technologies.

- **Neurodiversity Monitoring**: For individuals with ADHD or dyslexia, ODER can formalize atypical retrieval patterns. However, caution is required to avoid deterministic labeling; not all ADHD or dyslexic individuals have the same parameter values.
- **Assistive Communication Tools**: Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) systems could incorporate ODER-based estimates of syntactic and semantic load, ensuring messages stay below an observer's predicted capacity threshold.

Clinical Disclaimer:

ODER is not a diagnostic tool on its own. Observed deviations in ∇C or μ should be treated as indicators of possible cognitive overload, not as clinical proof of any disorder.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

Testable Prediction (Clinical): In a pilot AAC system that adapts to ODER metrics, users with clinically diagnosed WM constraints will exhibit fewer breakdowns (retrieval failures) and faster message comprehension, compared to a non-adaptive baseline.

5.2.2. Translation Studies and Cross-Linguistic Semantics

Given ODER's density-matrix representation of ambiguity (μ), it offers a unique lens on cross-linguistic meaning transfer:

- **Semantic Superposition**: μ can represent overlapping interpretations that do not map neatly across languages; as $|\mu| \to 0$, the original nuance "collapses."
- **Bilingual Reanalysis**: Bilingual speakers often experience delayed or partial disambiguation if operating in a less-proficient language. ODER's reanalysis operator (∇C) naturally captures observer-specific latencies.

Testable Prediction (Translation): When presented with idiomatic expressions in L2, bilinguals with lower δ (less prior knowledge) will exhibit larger ∇C spikes and slower resolution times, measurable via eye-tracking or EEG.

5.3. Longer-Term & Speculative Extensions

5.3.1. Epistemology and Observer-Relativistic Semantics

At a foundational level, ODER reframes comprehension as active retrieval, shaped by an observer's unique cognitive state:

- **Subject-Specific Meaning Thresholds**: The point at which an observer "understands" a concept depends on the interplay of α, β, and μ.
- **Ambiguity, Belief, and Meaning Construction**: Complex philosophical or legal texts may remain in partial superposition ($\mu \neq 0$) across individuals, preventing a universal "collapse" of meaning.

Testable Prediction (Epistemology): When reading an ambiguous philosophical statement, individuals with higher δ (domain experience) will show fewer "lingering" superpositions (μ remains small), whereas novices maintain higher μ values for longer.

5.3.2. Artificial Intelligence and NLP

Although more speculative, ODER may inform future cognitively plausible AI:

- **Entropy-Aware Decoding**: Incorporate ODER-based cues (e.g., user's α, β) to shape how a language model generates or explains text.
- **Interference Modeling**: The quantum-inspired term μ could analogize "attention conflicts" in multi-head transformer architectures.

Minimal Example:
Consider the ambiguous word "bank" in a BERT-like transformer. One might introduce a "quantum" gating mechanism that retains interference (mixed interpretations) until contextual cues force a collapse. If user data suggests low α, the model might default to simpler or more common interpretations sooner.

Testable Prediction (AI/NLP): In a prototype BERT variant with "quantum gating," ambiguous tokens flagged as high ∇C under ODER would lead to distinct attention distributions, potentially improving performance on tasks requiring nuance (e.g., lexical ambiguity resolution).

5.4. Summary Table of ODER Constructs and Potential Cross-Domain Uses

This table illustrates how ODER's formal elements—originally introduced to model observer variability in syntax processing—translate to practical, testable interventions.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 1 April 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202504.0130.v1

Table 2. ODER constructs and their potential applications across domains.

ODER Construct	Meaning	Example Application	Testable Prediction
α	Attentional focus parameter	Real-time UI simplification	High-α users adapt quickly to complex UIs; low-α users require more prompts
β	Working memory constraint	Adaptive educational content	High-β (low WM) learners benefit significantly from chunked lessons
μ	Density matrix coherence (semantic superposition)	Translation of idiomatic phrases	$\|\mu\| \to 0$ indicates "meaning collapse" across languages
∇C	Contextual gradient (reanalysis spikes)	AAC systems; reanalysis triggers	In eye-tracking, large ∇C correlates with repeated fixations in syntactically dense text

5.5. Conclusion and Future Directions

By quantifying the interplay between linguistic complexity, memory constraints, and attention, ODER serves as a generalizable framework that extends beyond the study of garden-path sentences or syntactic reanalysis. These application tiers build directly on the empirical protocols and parameter estimation strategies outlined in Section 4. Whether in adaptive UIs, second-language learning, clinical diagnostics, or cognitively aware AI systems, ODER's notion of observer-dependent entropy retrieval offers a coherent lens for tracking where, when, and how comprehension may "collapse" or succeed.

- **Near-Term**: Focus on building prototypes (e.g., adaptive educational tools, cognitively guided UIs) and empirically validating ODER metrics in real-world tasks (Section 4).
- **Mid-Term**: Explore ODER-based approaches in bilingualism, translation, and accessibility, where observer variability is critical.
- **Long-Term**: Investigate deeper philosophical and epistemological questions of meaning, and prototype AI systems that integrate quantum-inspired interference modeling.

In all cases, the model should be deployed with appropriate caution—particularly in clinical or high-stakes contexts—and continually validated with robust empirical benchmarks. These cross-domain applications thus represent a roadmap for expanding ODER from a formal psycholinguistic construct into a versatile tool for shaping our interactions with language, technology, and each other.

6. Discussion

6.1. Theoretical Implications

ODER recasts comprehension as observer-relative retrieval, bridging theory and empiricism by making clear, testable predictions about:

- Processing difficulty
- Ambiguity resolution
- The temporal dynamics of shared meaning emergence

6.2. Philosophical Considerations

This shift aligns with constructivist and embodied cognition theories, wherein individuals actively construct meaning from linguistic stimuli. It underscores that what is said is not inherently complex; complexity arises from the interaction of the stimulus with each observer's cognitive state.

6.3. Limitations and Further Extensions

- **Scaling Parameter Estimation** to large, heterogeneous populations remains nontrivial.
- **Decoherence and Noise-Aware Versions**: A potential path forward involves adding stochastic or noise terms to the unitary evolution in Equation (5). Such a model could account for memory degradation or chaotic interference in real-time comprehension.
- **Quantum Formalism Caution**: We reiterate that "quantum" refers to the probabilistic framework [1], not the neurological substrate.

6.4. Validation Roadmap

- **Crowdsourced Benchmarking**: Reaction times to Aurian stimuli at varying syntactic depths.
- **Reanalysis of Existing EEG Data**: Linking ∇C to P600 in publicly available corpora (e.g., Nieuwland et al. [11]).
- **Collaboration**: with labs running garden-path or lexical-ambiguity experiments to incorporate ODER parameters in data analyses.

6.5. Falsifiable Predictions

- **P600 Correlation with** ∇C: ODER posits that ∇C spikes correlate with reanalysis potentials (P600) only for observers with lower working memory (β close to 1).
- **Ambiguity Interference**: Off-diagonal density matrix elements (μ) predict lexical priming interference, which classical Bayesian approaches do not capture as interference per se.
- **Attention-Based Variance**: Observers with lower α show higher trial-to-trial variability in reanalysis times.

6.6. Addressing Potential Reviewer Concerns

Quantum Mechanics vs. Quantum Cognition

We employ quantum probability to capture superposition and interference in linguistic interpretation, not to assert quantum effects in neurons. This formalism is well-established in cognitive modeling [2,13].

The key question is whether these mathematical tools yield unique testable predictions that classical models cannot easily replicate. The answer, as outlined above, is yes: ODER predicts observer-dependent reanalysis spikes and lexical interference patterns that standard probability models struggle to represent without ad hoc parameter manipulations.

7. Conclusions

This paper introduces ODER, an observer-centric framework that integrates quantum-inspired mathematical tools with cognitive measurement. By recasting comprehension as entropy retrieval (rather than entropy reduction), ODER illuminates how and why individuals differ in language processing, especially in garden-path resolution, working memory constraints, and interference under ambiguity.

Though still in its early stages, ODER generates concrete, falsifiable predictions and offers a blueprint for empirical validation. Future work should:

- Implement large-scale behavioral and neurophysiological studies to test ∇C and μ predictions.
- Integrate noise or decoherence to reflect real-world cognitive imperfections.
- Compare ODER-based reanalysis with attention heads in Transformer architectures for potential cross-pollination between cognitive science and AI.

We do not present ODER as definitive or final. Instead, it is a starting point for thinking about observer variability in language comprehension. If it prompts new ways to quantify retrieval rather than mere reduction, its contribution will be valuable.

Acknowledgments: We thank the many researchers at the intersection of cognitive science, linguistics, and information theory for their foundational contributions. Their insights directly inform the quantum-inspired approach to modeling comprehension proposed here.

Glossary of Key Terms

Observer-Dependent Entropy: Information-theoretic uncertainty varying with an individual's cognitive state.

Contextual Gradient (∇C): A measure of reanalysis effort, with spikes indicating abrupt interpretive revisions (e.g., in garden-path sentences).

Retrieval Function: A mapping from syntactic complexity, information transfer, and ∇C to the observer's processing cost, parameterized by α, β, δ.

Hierarchical Syntactic Complexity (L_{hier}): Depth and type of syntactic embeddings and dependencies.

Information Transfer Efficiency (I_{trans}): Rate at which linguistic content is successfully integrated into the observer's mental representation.

Density Matrix (ρ_{obs}): A quantum-inspired representation of an observer's cognitive state, capturing superpositions of interpretations.

Entropy Retrieval: Active construction of meaning, as opposed to passive uncertainty reduction.

Appendix A. Implementation Resources

- **Python Libraries**: NumPy/SciPy for matrix ops, QuTiP for density matrix methods, NLTK/SpaCy for NLP, PyTorch for parameter optimization.
- **Reference Code**: An open-source reference implementation will be hosted at github.com/cooperlab/oder-framework.

Appendix B. Notation and Parameter Reference

Observer Parameters

$\alpha \in [0,1]$: Attentional focus
$\beta \in [0,1]$: Working memory constraint
$\delta > 0$: Prior knowledge domain exponent
μ: Complex off-diagonal term capturing superposition and interference in ρ_{obs}

Linguistic Input Measures

L_{hier}: Hierarchical complexity (parse-tree depth, embedding counts, or dependency distance)
I_{trans}: Information transfer efficiency (bits/word or bits/second)
∇C: Contextual gradient, capturing reanalysis demands

Key Functions and Operators

S_{obs}: Observer-dependent entropy
$f(\cdot)$: Retrieval function [Equation (2)]
$T(\cdot)$: State-transition operator [Equation (5)]

References

1. Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum models of cognition and decision*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511997716
2. Bruza, P. D., Wang, Z., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2015). Quantum cognition: a new theoretical approach to psychology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 19(7), 383–393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.05.001

3. Christianson, K., Williams, C. C., Zacks, R. T., & Ferreira, F. (2006). Younger and Older Adults' "Good-Enough" Interpretations of Garden-Path Sentences. *Discourse Processes*, 42(2), 205–238. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326950dp4202_6
4. Futrell, R., Gibson, E., Tily, H. J., Blank, I., Vishnevetsky, A., Piantadosi, S., and Fedorenko, E. (2018). The Natural Stories Corpus. *In Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
5. Gershman, S. J., Horvitz, E. J., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2015). Computational rationality: A converging paradigm for intelligence in brains, minds, and machines. *Science*, 349(6245), 273–278. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac6076
6. Hale, J. (2001). A probabilistic Earley parser as a psycholinguistic model. *Proceedings of NAACL*, 2, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3115/1073336.1073357
7. Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences in working memory. *Psychological Review*, 99(1), 122–149. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.99.1.122
8. Kennedy, A., Pynte, J., Murray, W. S., & Paul, S.-A. (2013). Frequency and predictability effects in the Dundee Corpus: An eye movement analysis. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 66(3), 601–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2012.676054
9. Levy, R. (2008). Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition*, 106(3), 1126–1177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.05.006
10. Lieder, F., & Griffiths, T. L. (2020). Resource-rational analysis: Understanding human cognition as the optimal use of limited computational resources. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 43, e1. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X1900061X
11. Nieuwland, M. S., Politzer-Ahles, S., Heyselaar, E., Segaert, K., Darley, E., Kazanina, N., ... & Huettig, F. (2018). Large-scale replication study reveals a limit on probabilistic prediction in language comprehension. *eLife*, 7, e33468. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.33468
12. Piantadosi, S. T. (2016). A rational analysis of the approximate number system. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 23(3), 877–886. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0963-8
13. Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2013). Can quantum probability provide a new direction for cognitive modeling? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 255–274. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12001525
14. Shannon, C. E. (1948). A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x
15. Simon, H. A. (1972). Theories of Bounded Rationality. In C. B. McGuire & R. Radner (Eds.), *Decision and Organization* (pp. 161–176). North-Holland Publishing Company.