

COPE LABS MEDICINE
END-TO-END REFERENCE SPEC (ROUGH DRAFT V0.1)

Status: Rough draft for inspection and alignment.
Last updated: 2026-04-12

PURPOSE

This document shows one full example of:

1. What a client submits at project start.
2. What Cope Labs returns at delivery.

PART A - EXAMPLE CLIENT SUBMITTAL

1) Intake Summary

- * Project code: EX-TB-001
- * Team type: Small biotech preclinical team
- * Primary objective: Identify a short list of TB compounds for review.
- * Requested timeline: 7 calendar days

2) Required Fields

- * Target identifier (example: InhA_mtb)
- * Desired output type (screening only, or screening + FTO, etc.)
- * Hard constraints (budget, compute cap, jurisdiction, safety filters)
- * Review deadline and primary decision date
- * Preferred communication channel for clarifications

3) Input Materials Submitted

- * Target note (1-2 pages)
- * Known compounds or seed list (CSV)
- * Optional structure references (PDB IDs, if available)
- * Internal constraints note (allowed chemotypes, excluded classes)

4) Scope Lock Checklist

- Deliverable name agreed
- Delivery date agreed
- Inclusion/exclusion constraints documented
- Optional add-on lanes confirmed (FTO, clinical evidence)

5) Example Submittal Payload (Plain Text)

Project: EX-TB-001

Target: InhA_mtb

Deliverable Requested: Contract Screening Deliverable + Optional FTO Rapid Risk Report

Decision Date: 2026-04-20

Constraints:

- * Keep MW under 500 where possible
- * Flag known high-risk patent zones in US/EU
- * Include caveats explicitly

PART B - EXAMPLE RETURN PACKAGE

1) Delivery Summary (What Client Gets)

- * One packaged folder with versioned outputs
- * One short executive summary for non-technical reviewers
- * One detailed artifact manifest for technical review

2) Example Package Layout

run_id: 20260412_cope_example_tb_inha

files:

- * executive_summary.md
purpose: Plain-language summary of what was run and what to do next.
- * ranked_candidates_top50.csv
purpose: Main ranked output table for decision review.
- * findings_brief.md
purpose: Key observations, likely signals, and practical caveats.
- * run_config_snapshot.yaml
purpose: Frozen settings used for reproducibility.
- * provenance_manifest.json
purpose: Source references, timestamps, and ownership metadata.
- * optional_fto_risk_report.md
purpose: Preliminary patent-risk view with cited records.

3) Example Return Summary (Client-Facing)

- * Shortlist generated: 50 compounds
- * Recommended immediate review set: Top 10
- * Optional FTO layer: Included
- * Main caveat: Computational ranking is decision support; wet-lab confirmation still required.

4) Review Questions Included In Return

- * Which top candidates match current assay feasibility?
- * Which candidates are blocked by internal exclusions?
- * Which candidates require legal review due to patent-risk flags?

PART C - INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

1) Minimum Acceptance Checks

- * Every output file is present and named in the manifest.
- * Run settings are frozen and attached.

- * Caveats are explicit and easy to find.
- * Output can be reviewed by both technical and non-technical stakeholders.

2) Pass / Fail Standard

Pass:

- * Package is understandable, traceable, and decision-ready.

Fail:

- * Missing files, hidden assumptions, or no clear reproducibility path.

3) Known Limits

- * This package does not replace legal, medical, or regulatory sign-off.
- * This package is a prioritization tool, not a final clinical claim.

REVISION NOTE

This is a rough draft reference specimen intended to make the process inspectable.
Final commercial templates can be tightened after review feedback.