Re: Formal Complaint – Case of Chirimuuta (2026). New Development: Unilateral and Unfounded Closure by Editor-in-Chief During Pending Publisher Investigation
Agustin Ostachuk <aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
Mon, 14 Sep 2026 4:47:56 PM -0300Sent
"Ethics Reporting"<Ethics.reporting@springernature.com>

Dear Springer Nature Research Integrity Group,

I am writing to supplement my formal complaint of 4 September 2026 and to report a development that bears directly on the integrity of the investigation your office has opened.

On 14 September 2026, Kevin Lala, Editor-in-Chief of *Biological Theory*, sent me a letter declaring the matter closed. This letter was sent **ten days after your office confirmed that it had opened an investigation** and had contacted the publishing editor to obtain information. Kevin Lala's letter makes no reference to your investigation, to the COPE guidelines I cited, or to the procedural concerns I raised. It closes the case unilaterally.

This development raises two distinct issues: (1) the conduct of the Editor-in-Chief during a pending publisher investigation; and (2) the substantive deficiencies of the arguments on which he relies. I address both below.

## 1. Procedural Issue: Unilateral Closure During a Pending Publisher Investigation

The timeline is documented:

- **10 August 2026**: I submitted a formal complaint to *Biological Theory*.
- **12 August, 18 August, 3 September 2026**: Kevin Lala responded without referring the matter to your office, without providing procedural criteria and without a timeline. He stated that the journal would decide "in our own time".
- **4 September 2026**: I filed a formal complaint with Springer Nature Research Integrity. Your office confirmed receipt the same day and stated that it had contacted the publishing editor and would begin the investigation upon receiving the necessary information.
- **14 September 2026**: Kevin Lala declared the matter closed.

The Editor-in-Chief closed the case **while your investigation was pending**. This is not a question of interpretation; it is a documented sequence of events. Under COPE Core Practices and Springer Nature's Research Integrity policies, once a publisher's integrity team has opened a case, the journal editor should not unilaterally resolve the matter. Doing so precludes the outcome of an investigation he does not control and interferes with the process your office has initiated.

I note, in addition, that the process Kevin Lala describes was entirely internal: an "in-house investigation" conducted "with colleagues"; an unidentified staff member with "expertise on the topic" whose analysis is not published, not signed and not available for

scrutiny; and a final decision taken without consulting me, without offering an appeal mechanism and without referring the matter to your office. This is precisely the procedural deficiency I raised in my complaint of 4 September.

The letter of 14 September states: *"I now consider the matter closed"*. It does not state that your office was consulted, that your investigation was concluded or that the matter was resolved through any procedure external to the journal. It closes a case that your office had opened.

## 2. Substantive Deficiencies of the Arguments in the 14 September Letter

The letter presents three substantive arguments. None of them addresses the claim I submitted.

### (i) "Some of the core features of Ingressing Minds are already independently present in Levin's work before the Ostachuk 2020 publication"

This is partially true and I do not contest it. Levin's work on bioelectricity, basal cognition and collective intelligence predates 2020. But this is not the claim in dispute.

The claim in dispute concerns a specific theoretical shift: the postulation of a **non-physical, structured and stratified domain of forms** from which patterns "ingress" into the material world, with **teleological agency operating at the level of form**. That framework does not appear in Levin's pre-2020 work. His pre-2020 work is materialist and experimental. The framework of "Platonic Space" appears in 2025, four years after he was directly notified of the Evolutio Unfolding Theory and acknowledged receipt of my materials.

The Levin of 2021, when I contacted him, was an experimental biologist. His work concerned bioelectricity and regeneration. He did not publish theoretical or philosophical frameworks. The Levin of 2025 publishes a framework that postulates a non-physical domain of forms with teleological agency. This shift is documented and unexplained by the hypothesis of independent development. It occurs after the 2021 contact and after the newsletters of 2024–2025, which he opened.

The question is not whether Levin had prior ideas. It is whether the specific architecture of "Platonic Space" reproduces the specific architecture of the EUT. It does.

### (ii) "There are conceptual precursors from other scholars that predate the ideas shared in Levin's and Ostachuk's publications"

This is correct but irrelevant. Plato, Aristotle, Whitehead, Bergson, Driesch and Sheldrake are all precursors of both frameworks. Every idea has ancestors. But the existence of ancestors does not address whether Levin had access to the EUT and reproduced its architecture. The documented contact of February 2021 establishes

access. The structural analysis establishes reproduction. The existence of precursors establishes neither.

### (iii) "There are conceptual differences between the two publications"

This is the weakest of the three arguments, and it is important to explain why. The differences are **the mechanism of the appropriation**, not a refutation of it. As I have documented in "Epistemic Chameleonism" (Ostachuk, 2026, EJ15308831), the strategy consists precisely in preserving the underlying conceptual architecture while changing the terminology:

- "Ideological matrix" → "Platonic space"
- "Actualization" → "Ingression"
- "Teleological formal agents" → "High-agency patterns"
- "Consciousness as portal" → "Physical embodiments as portals"

The existence of terminological differences does not weaken the claim. It confirms it. If the two texts were identical word for word, the case would be textual plagiarism. They are identical in architecture and different in vocabulary. That is what the analysis demonstrates.

## 3. The Objective Standard: The CLEO Verification Protocol

To avoid the appearance that this is a matter of interpretation, I have published a formal, binary and reproducible protocol for the determination of structural appropriation: the **CLEO Verification Protocol v1.0** (Ostachuk, 2026, EJ44455471).

The protocol defines the "conceptual signatures" of the EUT — the constitutive elements that make it unique and without which the architecture would be fundamentally different. It then tests whether a later framework reproduces those signatures.

The protocol defines four signatures:

- **CS1**: A virtual, non-spatiotemporal domain that is internally stratified.
- **CS2**: A process of sequential manifestation from that domain into the actual world.
- **CS3**: The rejection of *de novo* generation of complexity from simplicity.
- **CS4**: Consciousness as both the means of access to the virtual and the agent of actualization.

The protocol specifies that the satisfaction of **three of the four signatures** constitutes structural derivation. The "Platonic Space" framework satisfies **all four**. The determination is "Derivative Framework (High Fidelity)".

This is not an opinion. It is a binary test applied to a published text. The protocol is offered as a permanent standard, not as a personal argument. Its application to "Platonic Space" is documented in the paper cited above.

## 4. Request

I request that Springer Nature Research Integrity:

1. Confirm the status of the investigation opened on 4 September 2026.
2. Incorporate into that investigation the conduct of Kevin Lala as Editor-in-Chief of *Biological Theory*, specifically the unilateral closure of the case on 14 September 2026, while your investigation was pending.
3. Confirm whether the conduct described is consistent with Springer Nature's Research Integrity policies and COPE Core Practices.
4. Assign a case reference number.

I am attaching all the correspondence with Kevin Lala below, including his today's closing letter. I am also attaching all the relevant and mentioned papers (the Levin 2021 correspondence is included in the section "EVIDENCE"). I am available to provide any further documentation.

Sincerely,

**Dr. Agustín Ostachuk**
Transdisciplinary Scientific Researcher
Director
EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development
https://www.evolutio.ar

From: Ethics Reporting <Ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
To: "Agustin Ostachuk"<aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
Date: Fri, 04 Sep 2026 11:05:24 -0300
Subject: RE: Formal Complaint: Procedural Blockage and Structural Conflict of Interest by the Editor-in-Chief of Biological Theory – Case of Chirimuuta (2026)

Dear author,

We have contacted the respective publishing editor who will provide more information about this to us .

We will start the investigation as soon as we get the information . We appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard.

Best Regards,

Research Integrity Group

Springer Nature

**From:** Agustin Ostachuk <aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
**Sent:** Friday, September 4, 2026 3:01 AM
**To:** Ethics Reporting <ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
**Subject:** Formal Complaint: Procedural Blockage and Structural Conflict of Interest by the Editor-in-Chief of Biological Theory – Case of Chirimuuta (2026)

Dear Springer Nature Research Integrity – Resolutions Team,

I am writing to file a formal complaint regarding the handling of a research integrity concern by Kevin Lala, Editor-in-Chief of *Biological Theory*.

On August 10, 2026, I submitted a formal complaint to *Biological Theory* concerning the article by Chirimuuta (2026), which cites an unreviewed preprint by Michael Levin ("Ingressing minds: causal patterns beyond genetics and environment in natural, synthetic, and hybrid embodiments", 2025, psyarxiv/5g2xj). That preprint presents a framework—"Platonic Space"—that reproduces the same conceptual architecture as my Evolutio Unfolding Theory, published in 2020 in *Cosmos and History*. This is a documented case of structural conceptual appropriation, not a matter of missing citation. The Research Integrity Group has received copies of all previous correspondence with Kevin Lala; the core evidence is provided in a comparative article [https://philpapers.org/rec/OSTECA] and a forensic article [https://philpapers.org/rec/OSTEUT-2].

Kevin Lala has responded on August 12, August 18, and September 3, 2026. In each reply, he has failed to refer the matter to the Research Integrity Group, has provided no timeline, no procedural criteria, and no acknowledgment of the structural conflict of interest. His responses have been consistently evasive, essentially repeating that he and his "colleagues" are conducting an investigation and that the journal will make a decision "in our own time".

I note three specific concerns:

1) **Procedural blockage.** Despite repeated requests, no COPE-compliant process has been initiated. The EIC has repeatedly declined to provide transparent criteria or any tentative timeline, stating on August 18 and September 3, 2026, that the journal will decide "in our own time". Under COPE Core Practices, keeping an integrity investigation open indefinitely without procedural transparency or estimated milestones constitutes an unacceptable procedural delay.

2) **Conflict of interest.** The Editor-in-Chief and a substantial part of the editorial board share institutional ties with the Konrad Lorenz Institute. The EIC explicitly stated on August 12, 2026, that he is handling this matter via informal discussions with his "colleagues". In a highly interconnected niche network such as Evo-Devo, a peer-led review restricted to this specific academic circle guarantees a protective and self-reinforcing bias.

3) **Prior awareness at the highest editorial level.** The previous Editor-in-Chief, Stuart Newman, personally recommended in 2021 that I contact Michael Levin to collaborate on my Evolutio Unfolding Theory. This establishes documented prior knowledge of my work within the journal's editorial lineage.

Although the Research Integrity Group has been copied on previous exchanges, no formal case has been opened. I now request that the Resolutions Team formally take carriage of this matter, assess both the underlying claim and the conduct of the Editor-in-Chief, and assign an independent case manager.

I look forward to a case reference number.

Sincerely,

**Dr. Agustín Ostachuk**
Transdisciplinary Scientific Researcher
Director
EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development
https://www.evolutio.ar

========== Forwarded message ==========

From: Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>

To: "Agustin Ostachuk"<aostachuk@evolutio.ar>

Date: Mon, 14 Sep 2026 13:07:31 -0300

Subject: Allegation of plagiarism

========== Forwarded message ==========

Dear Dr Ostachuck

I am writing in my role as Editor-in-Chief of Biological Theory to let you know that we have now completed our in-house investigation into the allegations that you have made against Michael Levin concerning plagiarism, and its impact on our recent publications.

I would like to reassure you that these allegations were taken very seriously by the editorial team at the journal, and that we have taken time to study the relevant materials and consult with relevant parties. Below I detail our conclusions.

You requested that Biological Theory issue an editorial note of concern about a recently published article by Mazviita Chirimuuta, which cites a Levin preprint *Ingressing Mind* that you claim plagiarises your work. We have decided against doing so, for a number of reasons: (i) Dr. Chirimuuta has every right to cite a preprint, and doing so is currently common practice at most academic journals; (ii) Dr. Chirimuuta assures me that she was unaware of any dispute surrounding your preprint at the time of publication; (iii) the editors of academic journals cannot realistically be expected to check whether all cited sources in the articles they publish are subject to disputes. Hence, until such a time as any allegations of plagiarism are proven, I see no reason for the journal to issue an editorial note of concern in this matter.

We were also mindful that we have just published online two (*Mind Everywhere*) articles by Levin, ostensibly on a related topic to the *Ingressing Mind* article that concerns you. While you seemingly were less concerned about these works, we nonetheless conducted a further investigation to ascertain to what extent these articles build on the disputed material. Had they done so, then that might have been grounds for an editorial note of concern. However, our investigation, conducted independently by two editorial staff, is that *Mind Everywhere* does not build meaningfully on *Ingressing Mind*.

Finally, while any dispute between you and Dr. Levin is none of our business, and in my judgment it is not our place to attempt to evaluate it, nonetheless one of our staff who has expertise on the topic sought to evaluate whether there is evidence to support your accusation that *Ingressing Minds* is a plagiarism of your *A theory of evolution as a process of unfolding*. They noted that (i) some of the core features of *Ingressing Minds* are already independently present in Levin's work before the Ostachuk 2020 publication. They (ii) point to conceptual precursors from other scholars that predate the ideas shared in Levin's and Ostachuk's publications, concluding "to my mind, it is absolutely possible that Levin could have developed his theory independently from Ostachuk's publication by drawing on existing intellectual traditions." Finally, (iii) they point to conceptual differences between the two publications, including "a substantial difference in the conceptualization of possible evolutionary trajectories" and the absence in Ostachuk of anything equivalent to Levin's specific pointer/interface concept. In this individual's judgement it is highly plausible that Levin could have arrived in a similar conceptual space to you quite independently.

In conclusion, an investigation conducted by editorial staff at Biological Theory does not leave us with cause for concern that Chirimuuta's article was wrong to refer to Levin's *Ingressing Minds* work, that Biological Theory were wrong to publish Levin's *Mind Everywhere* articles, or that

Levin's *Ingressing Minds* article may have plagiarised your work. Thank you for your patience in awaiting the outcome of our investigation. I now consider the matter closed.

Kevin

Prof. Kevin N Lala, PhD, FRSB, FRSE (he/him or they/them) Pronounce
(Formerly Laland)
Editor-in-Chief, Biological Theory
EDI Faculty Lead Science & Medicine
Centre for Biological Diversity
School of Biology
University of St Andrews
Sir Harold Mitchell Building
St Andrews
Fife, UK, KY16 9TF
tel: 01334 463568
e-mail: knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk
https://lalandlab.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/
http://evolutionevolving.org
https://thescienceofraceandracism.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/.
Follow me on Bluesky or LinkedIn
See http://evolutionevolving.org
Before you reply

I work flexibly and sometimes send emails outside of standard working hours, but I try to maintain a reasonable work-life balance. Please don't feel under pressure to respond to this email immediately, particularly if it would mean working outside your regular hours. Do something fun instead!

---

The University of St Andrews is a charity registered in Scotland : No SC013532

========== Forwarded message ==========

From: Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>
To: "Agustin Ostachuk"<aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
Cc: "ethicsreporting"<ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
Date: Thu, 03 Sep 2026 05:51:23 -0300
Subject: Re: Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Structural Conceptual Appropriation of Prior Art and Scholarly Record
========== Forwarded message ==========

Agustin. As I said previously, at Biological Theory we are undertaking a full investigation and will make a decision in our own time. Our research is still ongoing. Rest assured that I will let you know when a decision has been made. Kevin

Prof. Kevin N Lala, PhD, FRSB, FRSE (he/him or they/them) Pronounce
(Formerly Laland)
Editor-in-Chief, Biological Theory
EDI Faculty Lead Science & Medicine
Centre for Biological Diversity
School of Biology
University of St Andrews
Sir Harold Mitchell Building
St Andrews
Fife, UK, KY16 9TF
tel: 01334 463568
e-mail: knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk
https://lalandlab.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/
http://evolutionevolving.org
https://thescienceofraceandracism.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/.
Follow me on Bluesky or LinkedIn
See http://evolutionevolving.org

Before you reply

I work flexibly and sometimes send emails outside of standard working hours, but I try to maintain a reasonable work-life balance. Please don't feel under pressure to respond to this email immediately, particularly if it would mean working outside your regular hours. Do something fun instead!

---

The University of St Andrews is a charity registered in Scotland : No SC013532

**From:** Agustin Ostachuk <aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
**Date:** Wednesday, 2 September 2026 at 18:14
**To:** Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>
**Cc:** ethicsreporting <ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
**Subject:** Re: Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Structural Conceptual Appropriation of Prior Art and Scholarly Record

Dear Kevin Lala,

I am writing to follow up on my communications of August 10, 12, and 19, 2026, concerning the article by Chirimuuta (2026) in *Biological Theory*.

I would appreciate a brief update on the status of the review process and any next steps that have been determined.

As you know, my concern is specific: the article cites an unreviewed preprint that is the subject of a documented structural conceptual appropriation claim. Under COPE guidelines and Springer Nature's policies, this warrants referral to the Springer Nature Research Integrity Group for independent evaluation.

I remain available to provide any further documentation.

Sincerely,

Agustín Ostachuk

**Dr. Agustín Ostachuk**
Transdisciplinary Scientific Researcher
Director
EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development
https://www.evolutio.ar

From: Agustin Ostachuk <aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
To: "Kevin Lala"<knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>
Cc: "ethicsreporting"<ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
Date: Wed, 19 Aug 2026 16:30:44 -0300
Subject: Re: Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Prior Art and Scholarly Record

Dear Kevin Lala,

Thank you for your response and for giving me the opportunity to comment on Levin & Resnik's two-part article.

I've taken a look at them. These articles don't use the concepts outlined in "Platonic Space" (2025, psyarxiv/5g2xj), the framework that consists of a Structural Conceptual Appropriation of my EUT theory (2020) through the mechanism of "Epistemic Chameleonism" (same conceptual architecture, different terminology). However, their existence is not irrelevant: they illustrate a broader, more general pattern that I'm documenting in my research project on "Epistemic Pathologies".

These articles essentially reproduce the historical intellectual trajectory of my own work: the revival of teleology and agency in biology through a re-engagement with Aristotle and Driesch, the critique of mechanistic biology, and the framing of living systems as goal-directed agents.

This is something I have already done more than 10 years ago (see, for example, *The Principle of Life: from Aristotelian Psyche to Drieschian Entelechy* published in *Ludus Vitalis* in 2016). I have called this "Intellectual Life Trajectory Appropriation": the appropriation not of a single concept or theory, but of the entire intellectual trajectory of a pioneering researcher, erasing the author of this original trajectory from the attempt to rewrite the narrative of the history of science.

While this broader pattern is part of my ongoing research, my formal concern to *Biological Theory* remains specific: the article by Chirimuuta (2026) cites the unreviewed preprint "Platonic Space" (2025) as authoritative, without acknowledging the documented case of structural conceptual appropriation of my Evolutio Unfolding Theory (Ostachuk, 2020).

I therefore reiterate my request that *Biological Theory* initiate the appropriate COPE-compliant assessment of the Chirimuuta article, ideally with referral to the Springer Nature Research Integrity Group for independent evaluation.

Given your own well-documented commitment to equity and inclusion in science, I trust that the case of a researcher from the Global South alleging the appropriation of his work by a renowned figure from the Global North, with all the power asymmetries that this entails (age, career stage, funding, mutually protective and self-reinforcing academic networks, etc.), will be treated with the seriousness it deserves.

I look forward to your confirmation that the formal process has been initiated.

Sincerely,

Agustín Ostachuk

**Dr. Agustín Ostachuk**
Transdisciplinary Scientific Researcher
Director
EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development
https://www.evolutio.ar

From: Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>
To: "Agustin Ostachuk"<aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
Cc: "Elisabeth Zimmermann"<elisabeth.zimmermann@kli.ac.at>
Date: Tue, 18 Aug 2026 13:32:16 -0300

Subject: Re: Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Prior Art and Scholarly Record

Agustin. Rest assured, we at Biological Theory will decide if an editorial note of concern is appropriate in our own time, after a full investigation of the issues.

In the meantime, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we recently published online two articles by Mike Levin (https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13752-025-00523-6, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13752-025-00524-5), and give you the opportunity to comment on whether these publications draw on the disputed material.

Thank you, Kevin

Prof. Kevin N Lala, PhD, FRSB, FRSE (he/him or they/them) Pronounce
(Formerly Laland)
Editor-in-Chief, Biological Theory
EDI Faculty Lead Science & Medicine
Centre for Biological Diversity
School of Biology
University of St Andrews
Sir Harold Mitchell Building
St Andrews
Fife, UK, KY16 9TF
tel: 01334 463568
e-mail: knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk
https://lalandlab.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/
http://evolutionevolving.org
https://thescienceofraceandracism.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/.
Follow me on Bluesky or LinkedIn
See http://evolutionevolving.org
Before you reply

I work flexibly and sometimes send emails outside of standard working hours, but I try to maintain a reasonable work-life balance. Please don't feel under pressure to respond to this email immediately, particularly if it would mean working outside your regular hours. Do something fun instead!

---

The University of St Andrews is a charity registered in Scotland : No SC013532

**From:** Agustin Ostachuk <aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
**Date:** Wednesday, 12 August 2026 at 15:51
**To:** Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>
**Cc:** stuart_newman <stuart_newman@nymc.edu>; isabellasarto-jackson <isabella.sarto-jackson@kli.ac.at>; ethicsreporting <ethics.reporting@springernature.com>

**Subject:** Re: Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Prior Art and Scholarly Record

> You don't often get email from aostachuk@evolutio.ar. Learn why this is important

Dear Kevin Lala,

Thank you for acknowledging receipt of my communication of August 10, 2026. I appreciate your prompt response.

However, I note that your reply does not indicate whether the formal editorial procedures established by COPE and Springer Nature for handling allegations of research misconduct have been initiated. As you are aware, COPE Core Practices and Springer Nature's Research Integrity Policy prescribe that concerns of this nature should be referred to the publisher's integrity team for independent assessment (Springer Nature Research Integrity Group, in copy), rather than being handled through informal consultation with colleagues.

By way of reference, a parallel communication I sent to *Physics of Life Reviews* (Elsevier) regarding the same disputed preprint was promptly forwarded to the journal's executive publishing editor for formal review, in accordance with COPE guidelines. I respectfully invite you to take the same course of action by referring this matter to Springer Nature's Research Integrity Group for an independent evaluation.

I trust that under your editorship, *Biological Theory* will adhere to the same standards of editorial diligence that the academic community expects from a COPE member journal.

I look forward to your confirmation that the formal review process has been initiated.

Sincerely,

Agustín Ostachuk

**Dr. Agustín Ostachuk**
Transdisciplinary Scientific Researcher
Director
EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development
https://www.evolutio.ar

From: Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>
To: "Agustin Ostachuk"<aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
Cc: "stuart_newman"<stuart_newman@nymc.edu>, "newman"<newman@nymc.edu>, "isabellasarto-jackson"<isabella.sarto-jackson@kli.ac.at>, "ethicsreporting"<ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
Date: Wed, 12 Aug 2026 07:02:53 -0300
Subject: Re: Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Prior Art and Scholarly Record

Agustin. Thank you for your email and for drawing my attention to this issue. I will look into this matter and discuss it with my colleagues before getting back to you. Kevin

Prof. Kevin N Lala, PhD, FRSB, FRSE (he/him or they/them) Pronounce
(Formerly Laland)
EDI Faculty Lead Science & Medicine
Centre for Biological Diversity
School of Biology
University of St Andrews
Sir Harold Mitchell Building
St Andrews
Fife, UK, KY16 9TF
tel: 01334 463568
e-mail: knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk
https://lalandlab.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/
http://evolutionevolving.org
https://thescienceofraceandracism.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/.
Follow me on Bluesky or LinkedIn
See http://evolutionevolving.org

Before you reply

I work flexibly and sometimes send emails outside of standard working hours, but I try to maintain a reasonable work-life balance. Please don't feel under pressure to respond to this email immediately, particularly if it would mean working outside your regular hours. Do something fun instead!

---

The University of St Andrews is a charity registered in Scotland : No SC013532

**From:** Agustin Ostachuk <aostachuk@evolutio.ar>
**Date:** Monday, 10 August 2026 at 20:23
**To:** Kevin Lala <knl1@st-andrews.ac.uk>

**Cc:** stuart_newman <stuart_newman@nymc.edu>; newman <newman@nymc.edu>; isabellasarto-jackson <isabella.sarto-jackson@kli.ac.at>; ethicsreporting <ethics.reporting@springernature.com>
**Subject:** Concerns Regarding Preprint Citation in Chirimuuta (2026) – Prior Art and Scholarly Record

You don't often get email from aostachuk@evolutio.ar. Learn why this is important

Dear Kevin Lala,

I am writing as Director of the EVOLUTIO Research Center and author of the Evolutio Unfolding Theory (EUT, 2020) to express a formal concern regarding the scholarly record in a recently published article in *Biological Theory*.

The article is Chirimuuta (2026), "A Mark of the Noncognitive", which cites as an authoritative, established framework the unreviewed preprint by Michael Levin, "Platonic Space" (psyarxiv/5g2xj), without referencing the prior art from which it is structurally derived. My concern is not with the author's thesis, but with the journal's validation of a source that is the subject of a documented lineage dispute, contravening COPE and Springer Nature editorial guidelines.

This concern is based on three specific, documented points:

**1. Structural Identity and Prior Art**

The "Platonic Space" preprint (Levin, 2025) is not an independent discovery. It is a systematic, structural restatement of the **Evolutio Unfolding Theory (EUT)** , which I formally published in 2020 in *Cosmos and History*. This is not a case of superficial similarity; it is a documented instance of wholesale conceptual appropriation where the original theoretical architecture has been preserved and its terminology rebranded.

A published comparative conceptual analysis formally demonstrates that the two frameworks share an identical explanatory core, with the original EUT concepts being substituted through a strategy of terminological camouflage:

- My original construct, the **Ideological Matrix**—a virtual, stratified domain of pre-existing forms—is systematically relabeled as **Platonic Space**.

- The process of sequential **Unfolding** and **Actualization** of virtual forms into the material world is relabeled as **Ingression**.

- The central driving role of **Teleological Formal Agents** is relabeled as **High-Agency Patterns**.

This documented pattern of renaming an entire conceptual architecture is presented in my open-access article, which I invite you to review:

- Ostachuk, A. (2026). *Epistemic Chameleonism: A Structural and Conceptual Comparative Analysis of the Evolutio Unfolding Theory (2020) and the "Platonic Space" Framework (2025)*. Evolutio Journal. 2026: EJ15308831. [https://philpapers.org/rec/OSTECA]

The citation of this preprint as an authoritative source in a peer-reviewed journal is a matter of significant concern. It violates the basic academic standards of intellectual property protection as defined under Springer Nature's Plagiarism Policy and runs counter to COPE's guidelines on maintaining the integrity of the scholarly record, which depend on the reliability of the sources being cited.

**2. Prior Knowledge Within the Editorial Ecosystem**

The author of the preprint, Michael Levin, was made aware of the EUT in 2021. I contacted him directly, at the recommendation of **Stuart Newman**, to propose a collaboration based on my theory. Levin acknowledged receipt of these materials. Furthermore, Newman and other members of the *Biological Theory* board have received institutional newsletters detailing this dispute, indicating a line of prior awareness of the EUT's priority within the journal's own editorial ecosystem.

**3. Inappropriate Citation Practice**

As per COPE guidelines, preprints should not be presented as validated, peer-reviewed science. Chirimuuta (2026) cites the preprint as the de facto reference for the framework, actively directing the scientific community toward a source under dispute for conceptual appropriation, instead of the 2020 foundational baseline. This perpetuates a potential violation of intellectual property, regardless of the author's intent.

**Formal Request**

Per COPE Core Practices on post-publication corrections and Springer Nature's Research Integrity Policies, I formally request that *Biological Theory* consider this matter and, at minimum, issue an **Editorial Note of Concern** for the Chirimuuta (2026) article. This note would inform readers that the cited preprint is not an independent framework but is the subject of a documented prior art claim, allowing the community to evaluate the evidence critically.

I trust that under your editorship, *Biological Theory* will take the necessary steps to uphold the integrity of the scientific record. I am at your disposal to provide any further documentation.

Sincerely,

Agustín Ostachuk

**Dr. Agustín Ostachuk**
Transdisciplinary Scientific Researcher
Director
EVOLUTIO: A Research Center for Evolution and Development
https://www.evolutio.ar