

QUANTITATIVE SYNCHRONICITY DATA

QSD 1, 2 and 3: Flagship Paper Introduction

Mark Grant, January 2026
quantitativesynchronicity.com

QSD-123: A “Flagship” Paper

This *essay* will introduce [our flagship “QSD” paper](#) which was first published at SSRN under the name *Global Synchronicity: The Scientific Method and Three Datasets That Classical Science Cannot Explain* in August of 2025.

In this paper which we call “QSD-123” we examined three datasets - two from the National Football League, the other from the English Premier League - looking for evidence a possible non-random effect that reflects the traditional definition of synchronicity. The main significance of our QSD-123 paper is that multiple A.I. systems consistently conclude its three featured datasets are demonstrably non-random according to one of the Scientific Method’s main tools: the null hypothesis test.

If A.I. are correct, this is evidence of a breakdown of classical science.

What is Quantitative Synchronicity Data?

QSD, or Quantitative Synchronicity Data, refers to verifiable and quantifiable datasets that reflect the traditional definition of synchronicity, where improbable and “meaningful” patterns are said to appear in an “acausal” or otherwise non-explainable fashion. This interpretation can only be determined scientifically if data are testable, which they rarely are in predominantly anecdotal or personal discussions of synchronicity. QSD remedies this situation by pivoting toward public settings. There, in some cases, the likelihood of various outcomes can be statistically determined. This enables us to test - and effectively prosecute - the belief that chance is always a plausible, if not always correct, governing factor.

Science's 1 in 20 (etc) vs. QSD's Millions and Trillions Etc.

In each of the first three QSD cases, A.I. concludes that chance wilts under cross-examination. It's easy to see why, when one understands that rationality in this discussion requires knowing the meaning of $p \leq 0.05$. Simply put, others must be able to repeat your data at least 1 in 20 times. If they can't, your data is now looking non-random by official scientific consensus. This interpretation becomes increasingly rational as the number 20 rises. Our first three QSD examples start at 1 in 10 million, and as we show in each case, we are being overly conservative in order to favor chance.

QUANTITATIVE SYNCHRONICITY DATA			
FLAGSHIP CASE STUDIES : QSD 1, 2 AND 3:			
Descriptor	QSD-1	QSD-2	QSD-3
	NFL Denver– Pittsburgh 2012	Super Bowl 48 (2014) – 12 Cluster	Liverpool 2025 Premier League Title
Target	316	12	Fibonacci
Data Points	Nine independent 316s	Thirteen vetted “12s”	Clear, season-defining Fibonacci set
Rarity	$p < 1$ in 8 trillion	$p < 1$ in 10 trillion	$p < 1$ in 10 million
Objective Meaning	Direct link to <i>John 3:16</i>	“12” = Seahawks fan identity	Fibonacci = renewal / natural order

→ The vast majority of scientific studies require Probability 'p' thresholds of 1 in 20 to 1 in 1,000.

Prosecuting Chance AND Classical Science

Any cursory consideration of the odds or “Rarity” in the table above will show that this pivot to public and quantifiable synchronicity represents a serious challenge to a presumption that has greatly favored skeptics for decades. Chance's credibility is rarely tested when it comes to discussions of so-called “meaningful” patterns because since synchronistic evidence is usually of the personal and non-quantifiable variety. It is entirely understandable that such skepticism exists because believers in synchronicity have failed as a group *in general* to provide science what legitimate skepticism requires.

However, here we turn the tables and ask the skeptic to walk their talk with replication, starting with National Football League data taken from nearly a century of chronicled outcomes. This pivot enables us to test chance's actual credibility as far as statistical science is concerned.

WHY YOU MIGHT WANT TO READ THE QSD-123 PAPER:

Let me be the first to say that this author's opinions mean nothing. What's truly interesting is that multiple A.I. systems independently conclude that chance fails miserably in all three of our featured cases - and does so contrary to the strong, if not visceral, opinion of the prevailing academic zeitgeist. Also falling like a deck of cards, as a direct consequence, are a host of interpretative theories that rely on chance having credibility. Each has true relevance in some situations—just not here. When it comes to QSD, they are all irrelevant according to A.I..

Obviously, classical science and chance work extremely well in general. Their underlying assumptions work so well that some may be surprised to learn that classical science has been scientifically exposed as incomplete by major multiple discoveries in the 20th century. According to multiple A.I. systems, QSD belongs in that general category of reality paradigm disruption. ([More information here.](#))

Beyond this, all I will say that one year in nobody has offered a truly fatal flaw and I began that campaign here starting around last March. As always, if anybody finds one I will post it here. In the meantime, assume that my putting out more QSD case studies means this is yet to occur.

[Here's another link to our flagship paper.](#) Don't let the size of the paper fool you as there are many seen grabs of URLs for posterity's sake. The main body is not that long.

