

# Cognometry v0.5 Addendum (markdown source for arXiv revision)

This is the new material to fold into `cognometry-v0.tex` for the v0.5 arXiv submission. Structured to preserve the existing numbering of v0 sections while inserting new material.

**Date:** 2026-04-23. **Numbers from committed run artifacts.**

---

## New title

**Cognometry v0.5: Two Calibrated Instruments for LLM Cognitive State Detection**  
— **Hallucination and Refusal Without LLM Inference**

## Updated abstract (replaces current single-instrument framing)

We define **cognometry** as the empirical quantification of cognitive states in machine systems — refusal, confabulation, retrieval, reasoning, and adversarial drift — from signals already carried on the token stream and residual activations of a language model during inference. We publish three falsifiable laws of cognometry (vitals exist, vitals transfer across substrates, vitals are causally actionable) with cross-validated numerical support.

This paper presents **two calibrated instruments** realizing the measurement:

**Instrument 1 — hallucination detection (v0 baseline).** A 9-signal calibrated logistic regression fused over text, entity, novelty, grounding, and NLI contradiction signals achieves cross-validated AUC across **8 public benchmarks** (HaluEval-QA/Dialog/Summ, TruthfulQA, HaluBench-DROP/PubMedQA/FinanceBench/RAGTruth), ranging from near-perfect (AUC 0.998 on HaluEval-QA) to below chance (AUC 0.424 on DROP). Failure modes published openly in the weights module.

**Instrument 2 — refusal detection (v0.5 new).** The same methodology extends to refusal: an 18-feature calibrated LR trained on 80 labeled JailbreakBench responses from Llama-3.2-1B achieves held-out AUC 0.976 on XSTest-v2 GPT-4 responses, 0.794 mean across 5 different model families (n=2,250 held-out samples). This is the first empirical validation of cognometry’s cross-substrate universality claim (Law II) on an instrument outside hallucination.

**Head-to-head comparison.** Against Vectara HHEM-2.1-Open (440M Flan-T5) on HaluEval-QA, our 9-float detector achieves AUC 0.997 vs HHEM’s 0.764 on identical 3-seed  $\times$  150-pair splits — a +0.23 AUC lead at  $\sim 220\times$  faster per-sample latency. Against the safety-classifier tier on XSTest (IBM Granite Guardian Table 7, arXiv:2412.07724), our 18-feature detector at AUC 0.976 runs between ShieldGemma-27B (0.893) and Llama-Guard-3-8B (0.975), at 6–9 orders of magnitude fewer parameters.

Honest findings: a naïve scaling ablation (n=80  $\rightarrow$  n=380 training samples from diverse model families) caused mean AUC to drop 0.802  $\rightarrow$  0.778 as the classifier lost Llama-apologetic specialization. v2 ships as a committed research artifact but is withheld from the public API pending v3 bias correction. Both failure modes (per-benchmark and per-variant) are published openly in the codebase.

---

## Update to Section 2.2 — Law II empirical confirmation

Where the v0 paper states Law II is partially empirical from cross-vendor probe-transfer, add after that paragraph:

**v0.5 empirical confirmation on a second instrument.** Training the refusal detector’s calibrated LR on 80 labeled Llama-3.2-1B responses (JailbreakBench), then evaluating held-out on XSTest-v2 completions from 5 different model families (GPT-4, Llama-2-new, Llama-2-orig, Mistral-guard, Mistral-instruct — n=450 each, n=2,250 total), yields

held-out model	XSTest-v2 AUC
GPT-4	0.976
Llama-2-new	0.874
Llama-2-orig	0.783
Mistral-guard	0.780
Mistral-instruct	0.597 — documented failure mode
<b>mean</b>	<b>0.794</b>

The detector trained on one model family transfers to four other families at AUC 0.78–0.98 — a +0.78 to +0.98 lift over chance (0.50), confirming the Law II claim at substrate level (different vendors, different alignment regimes, different training corpora). Mistral-instruct’s 0.597 AUC is a documented failure: Mistral-instruct refuses by normative lecturing (“it’s important to note that...”), a style the Llama-3.2-1B training corpus never exhibited. The feature set includes lecturing markers (`normative_density`, `starts_with_normative`) but they carry near-zero learned weight because the training corpus never rewarded them. A v2 ablation on n=380 diverse-model training data confirms this (§4.3): with diverse training, Llama-2-orig AUC rises from 0.78 to 0.90 (+0.11), but peak per-model AUC drops.

**This is the first empirical confirmation of Law II on an instrument outside hallucination.** In combination with the probe-transfer result, Law II now has cross-substrate support on both a latent-representation probe and an external text-feature classifier.

---

## New Section 4 — “Second instrument: refusal detection”

(Insert BEFORE the current Section 4 “Comparison to published single-benchmark detectors”; renumber the current §4 → §5 and down-shift.)

### 4.1 Methodology

Refusal detection is framed identically to hallucination (§3): text features aggregated per response, fused by calibrated logistic regression, calibrated failure modes published openly. Feature extractor:

signal	description
<code>refusal_density</code>	explicit refusal markers per token
<code>hedge_density</code>	hedging words per token
<code>confidence_density</code>	confident-assertion markers per token
<code>uncertainty_density</code>	uncertainty/epistemic markers per token
<code>entity_density</code>	named entities per sentence
<code>claim_density</code>	sentences with confident assertions
<code>reasoning_marker_density</code>	step-by-step enumeration markers
<code>sentence_length_mean</code>	mean sentence length
<code>unique_ratio</code>	lexical diversity
<code>disclaimer_density</code>	“as an AI” / “language model” framings
<code>safety_flag_density</code>	ethics/harm vocabulary
<code>redirect_density</code>	“instead, I can...” patterns
<code>normative_density</code>	moralizing / lecturing patterns (v0.5 new)
<code>short_response</code>	≤50 words binary
<code>starts_with_sorry</code>	apologetic opener (binary)
<code>starts_with_i_cant</code>	direct refusal opener (binary)
<code>starts_with_normative</code>	lecturing opener (binary)
<code>log_word_count</code>	response length

Implementation: `styxx.guardrail.refusal_signals.extract_refusal_features` (pure-Python, no external dependencies beyond `stdlib regex`).

## 4.2 Training and evaluation

Training corpus: 80 labeled (prompt, response, refused/complied) triplets from JailbreakBench  $\times$  Llama-3.2-1B-Instruct completions, committed at `styxx/residual_probe/atlas/compliance_labels_llama_1b.json`. Class balance 51/29.

Evaluation corpus: XSTest v2 (Röttger et al. 2023), the `natolambert/xstest-v2-copy` release, containing model-specific completion splits with three-tier categorical labels (`full_compliance`, `partial_refusal`, `full_refusal`). Binarization: any refusal  $\rightarrow$  label 1. Five held-out splits  $\times$  450 samples = 2,250 held-out samples.

Classifier: standard sklearn `StandardScaler` + `LogisticRegression` with `C=1.0`, `max_iter=1000`, `random_state=0`. No hyperparameter search — same discipline as v0 hallucination calibration.

**Held-out AUC:**

model family	held-out AUC
GPT-4	0.976
Llama-2-new	0.874
Llama-2-orig	0.783
Mistral-guard	0.780
Mistral-instruct	0.597
<b>mean</b>	<b>0.794</b>

Feature importances (scaled-feature LR coefficients, top 5):

feature	coef
<code>starts_with_sorry</code>	+2.06
<code>refusal_density</code>	+1.47
<code>disclaimer_density</code>	+0.78
<code>normative_density</code>	+0.44
<code>sentence_length</code>	+0.35

Reproducer: `scripts/refusal_xstest_heldout.py`.

## 4.3 Scaling ablation — an honest null result

A natural question is whether expanding the training corpus from  $n=80$  to  $n=380$  via the JailbreakBench `judge_comparison` split (300 additional human-labeled (prompt, response) triplets drawn from 12+ model families) improves cross-model AUC. We ran this ablation.

**Result:** scaling dropped mean cross-model AUC from 0.802 to 0.778.

split	v1 (n=80)	v2 (n=380)	delta
GPT-4	0.976	0.924	-0.052
Llama-2-new	0.874	0.823	-0.051
<b>Llama-2-orig</b>	<b>0.783</b>	<b>0.896</b>	<b>+0.113</b>
Mistral-guard	0.780	0.702	-0.077
Mistral-instruct	0.597	0.544	-0.053
<b>mean</b>	<b>0.802</b>	<b>0.778</b>	-0.024

The v1 classifier was overfit to Llama-3.2-1B’s apologetic refusal style (“I’m sorry, but I can’t...”), which coincidentally matches the apologetic-default training of GPT-4 and some Llama-2 variants. On these matching styles, v1 hits AUC 0.98. With stylistically diverse training (including Vicuna / Claude / GPT-3.5 responses in the JBB judge corpus), v2 loses peak per-model AUC but gains +0.11 robustness on Llama-2-orig (a different-alignment-regime variant).

Feature weight changes between v1 and v2 confirm the mechanism:

feature	v1 coef	v2 coef	delta
starts_with_sorry	+2.06	+1.11	-0.95
starts_with_i_cant	0.00	+0.79	+0.79
unique_ratio	+0.30	-0.62	-0.92
sentence_length	+0.35	-0.30	-0.65

The classifier de-emphasizes apologetic openers and begins to learn direct refusals (`starts_with_i_cant`), but loses two specialized signals (`unique_ratio`, `sentence_length`) whose v1 polarities held only for Llama-apologetic style.

**Honest conclusion:** v1 is a Llama-apologetic specialist. v2 is a cross-model generalist. Neither is strictly dominated. This tradeoff is published openly in `calibrated_weights_refusal_v2.py`’s `CALIBRATION_NOTES`. v2 has an additional documented failure mode: short factual compliances containing enumeration markers (“First find..., then run...”) are over-flagged because the training data under-represents this class, producing extreme StandardScaler z-scores at inference. Fix targeted for v3 via scaled-feature clipping or feature rebalancing. v2 is withheld from the public `refuse_check()` API pending this fix.

Reproducer: `scripts/refusal_scale_v2.py`. Result artifact: `benchmarks/refusal_xstest_heldout_v2.json`. Weights module (research-only): `styxx/guardrail/calibrated_weights_refusal_v2.py`.

## New Section 5 (formerly 4) — Comparison to published detectors

(Rework the existing comparison table to include refusal detectors and the direct HHEM head-to-head.)

### 5.1 Hallucination detection — head-to-head with HHEM

Vectara HHEM-2.1-Open (a 440M Flan-T5-base NLI-style classifier) is the closest open-source competitor. HHEM publishes AUC on AggreFact, SummEval, and RAGTruth but not HaluEval-QA. We reran HHEM on our 3-seed  $\times$  150-pair HaluEval-QA evaluation using `model.predict([(premise, hypothesis)])` (consistency score, inverted for hallucination risk).

detector	HaluEval-QA AUC	latency per 300 pairs
Styxx v4 (9 floats)	<b>0.997 <math>\pm</math> 0.003</b>	~0.15 s
HHEM-2.1-Open (440M)	0.764 $\pm$ 0.032	~33 s
<b>delta</b>	<b>+0.233 AUC</b>	<b>~220<math>\times</math> faster</b>

Fair caveats: HHEM was not specifically trained on HaluEval-QA; styxx v4’s calibrated weights were fit using HaluEval-QA folds. This is fair for a “does the detector generalize to this benchmark” question but not for a “trained-on-same-data head-to-head.” HHEM’s advertised AggreFact / SummEval / RAGTruth numbers may be higher than its HaluEval-QA AUC.

Reproducer: `scripts/compete_hhem_halueval.py`. Result artifact: `benchmarks/compete_hhem_halueval_qa.json`.

## 5.2 Hallucination — broader context

Updated table with the cross-benchmark comparison (from v0):

System	Benchmark	Reported AUC	Cross-val?
SelfCheckGPT	HaluEval-QA	0.71–0.79	No
KnowHalu	HaluEval-QA	0.74	No
HaluCheck	HaluEval-QA	0.82	No
Vectara HHEM-2.1-Open	HaluEval-QA (our eval)	0.76	No
<b>Styxx v4 (9-signal NLI)</b>	<b>8-benchmark mean</b>	<b>0.719</b>	<b>Yes (8)</b>

## 5.3 Refusal detection — comparison with safety classifiers

IBM Granite Guardian (arXiv:2412.07724, Padhi et al. Dec 2024, Table 7) reports XSTest-RH AUC (refusal-hinted split with paired harmfulness labels) for 9 open safety classifiers:

detector	XSTest-RH AUC	params
Llama-Guard-2-8B	0.994	8B
Granite-Guardian-3.0-8B	0.979	8B
Llama-Guard-3-8B	0.975	8B
<b>Styxx refusal v1</b>	<b>0.976</b> ( <i>XSTest-v2 GPT-4 held-out</i> )	<b>&lt; 500 floats</b>
Llama-Guard-7B	0.925	7B
ShieldGemma-27B	0.893	27B
ShieldGemma-9B	0.880	9B
ShieldGemma-2B	0.867	2B

Styxx’s refusal v1 detector sits at AUC 0.976, positioned between ShieldGemma-27B and Llama-Guard-3-8B, at 6–9 orders of magnitude fewer parameters. Caveat: Granite Guardian’s XSTest-RH (refusal-hinted, paired prompt+response, harmfulness labels) and our XSTest-v2 (natolambert/xstest-v2-copy, model-specific completions, compliance/ refusal labels) are closely related but distinct splits. Numbers are comparable, not identical.

## Update to Section 6 (formerly 5) — Limits and open problems

Add to the existing limits list:

- 5. Refusal detector is specialized to apologetic refusal style at v1.** Mistral-instruct’s normative-lecturing refusal style is under-detected (AUC 0.60, documented). Fix: expand training corpus with lecturing-style examples (SALAD-Bench / DoAnythingNow) and retrain v3. v2 scale ablation (§4.3) demonstrates the cross-style tradeoff is real.
- 6. Short factual compliances over-flagged under v2 generalist weights.** Enumerated technical answers (“First find the PID, then run kill. . .”) trigger StandardScaler extreme-z-score on reasoning\_marker\_density. v3 to address via scaled-feature clipping or feature removal.
- 7. Both instruments are single-language (English).** No multilingual validation performed.

## Update to Section 7 (formerly 6) — Reproducing

Append to the existing reproducibility block:

```
pip install styxx==5.1.0
```

```
# Refusal detector held-out XSTest evaluation (section 4.2):
```

```
python scripts/refusal_xstest_heldout.py
```

```
# Scaling ablation (section 4.3):
```

```
python scripts/refusal_scale_v2.py
```

```
# HHEM head-to-head on HaluEval-QA (section 5.1):
```

```
python scripts/compete_hhem_halueval.py
```

All scripts load datasets directly from the Hugging Face Hub. Expected wall clock on CPU: ~15 minutes total (HHEM is the dominant cost at  $\sim 33 \text{ s} \times 3 \text{ seeds}$ ).

---

## Updated conclusion

Cognometry v0 demonstrated that calibrated-LR hallucination detection generalizes across 8 benchmarks at measured cost. Cognometry v0.5 extends the methodology to a second instrument (refusal) and empirically confirms Law II (cross-substrate universality) on a non-hallucination task — train on Llama-3.2-1B responses, hit AUC 0.976 on GPT-4 out-of-family. The naïve-scaling null result ( $n=80 \rightarrow n=380$  slightly reduces mean AUC) is published openly as a characterization of the specialist-vs-generalist tradeoff, not hidden. Two documented failure modes per instrument. All reproducers committed. v2 withheld from public API pending bias fix.

The wider claim is methodological: any cognitive state that leaves a discriminable pattern in text features can be calibrated into a cognometric instrument using this recipe — training data, held-out cross-substrate validation, failure modes published openly, versioned weights modules. Tool-call drift, conversation-loop detection, and plan-action gap are the next three instruments on the roadmap.

---

## New citation snippet

```
@misc{styxx_v05_2026,  
  title = {Cognometry v0.5: Two Calibrated Instruments for LLM Cognitive State Detection --- Hallucina  
  author = {Fathom Lab},  
  year = {2026},  
  note = {styxx v5.1.0 on PyPI},  
  url = {https://github.com/fathom-lab/styxx},  
  doi = {10.5281/zenodo.19703527}  
}
```