

BCI Structural Blind-spot Backtesting Protocol



Protocol No.: BCI-MOD-2026-005

Purpose and Scope

This Protocol establishes a structured historical backtesting framework to anchor abstract structural variables in verifiable business histories, thereby reducing semantic inflation and providing interpretable, contestable, and reviewable cognitive reference points for complex system analysis.

01 | Governance Logic: Asymmetry of Evidence

Institutional authority does not arise solely from model sophistication, but from the consistency with which a model can explain known historical structural failures.

Accordingly, BCI retrospectively couples each core structural variable (including, but not limited to, TS^n , ES^{-1} , and MT) with observed business evolution paths to test whether such variables can identify established patterns of structural deviation.

This Protocol does not predict specific events or timing, nor does it constitute any judgment regarding the future performance of any entity. It is solely intended to identify structural isomorphisms and risk indication patterns.

BCI does not engage in narrative trend forecasting. It examines only the stable or unstable trajectories that systems may exhibit under defined structural conditions.

All "risk indications," "mirror cases," and "structural isomorphisms" herein describe variable relationships and historical structural similarities only.

They do not constitute probability statements, outcome forecasts, ratings, recommendations, or allocations of responsibility, nor do they establish any form of

benchmark, ranking, or comparative assessment.

02 | Cognitive Anchoring of Core Variables

The following historical isomorphism cases are used as structural reference points for audit and analytical discussion:

Anchor A: TSⁿ (Temporal Structure Index) — Long-term Dilution Resistance in Hermès

Blind Spot:

Many brands exchange long-term dilution resistance for short-term growth by increasing PL (perceptual legibility).

Structural Backtest:

Between the 1920s and 2020s, while peers pursued capital loading through licensing and scale expansion, Hermès constrained PL through capacity limits, craftsmanship constraints, and allocation mechanisms, thereby maintaining TS stability.

Structural Indication:

TSⁿ may be interpreted as an indicator of a system's resistance to temporal dilution. This case illustrates that, under certain conditions, constraining PL supports TS stability, without constituting a prescriptive strategy.

Anchor B: ES⁻¹ (Inverse Energy Efficiency) — Subsidy-Driven Expansion in the Sharing Economy

Blind Spot:

Capital expansion often misinterprets subsidy-driven growth as asset formation.

Structural Backtest:

Certain sharing platforms exhibited sustained increases in ES⁻¹ during expansion, indicating dependence on external capital and participant risk transfer rather than endogenous stability formation.

Structural Indication:

ES⁻¹ functions as a risk indicator of energy source sustainability; persistently high values imply structural dependence on external inputs.

Anchor C: MT (Meaning Tension) — Evolution of Brand Symbolic Gravity

Blind Spot:

The transition from symbolic pricing authority to functional competition often precedes financial metric changes.

Structural Backtest:

In several technology brand histories, MT shifted from vision-centered narratives toward functional legibility, accompanied by rising PL weights.

Structural Indication:

MT reflects the symbolic gravitational strength of a system and may signal long-term pricing power shifts, without implying normative valuation.

03 | Anti-Inflation Principle

BCI reports prohibit the use of descriptive or promotional language not anchored to structural variables.

All evaluative statements must reference explicit variables, observation windows, and isomorphic benchmarks.

All metaphorical expressions are solely for explanatory assistance and do not constitute analytical definitions or formal terminology.

04 | Evidence Presentation Standard

In Category C reports, each structural risk indication must be accompanied by at least one "Mirror Case" illustrating the variable mapping between the current structure and a historical case.

Illustrative format:

"The current TS deviation curve exhibits high structural isomorphism with the risk accumulation phase of a major financial institution in the 1990s. The key failure mechanism in that case involved simultaneous capital overloading and MT dilution. This indication describes structural similarity only and does not constitute outcome prediction or responsibility attribution."

05 | Review, Challenge, and Revision

All backtesting cases and structural mappings may, within reasonable bounds, be subject to methodological challenge, third-party discussion, and academic review.

If material sample bias, mapping distortion, or methodological defects are identified, BCI will, where reasonably practicable, revise the relevant methodological assumptions and document the revisions.

Backtesting and cognitive anchoring do not participate in model parameter adjustment and serve solely for interpretation, audit communication, and methodological validation.

Review and validation refer to the discussability of methodological logic, variable definitions, and mapping mechanisms, and do not imply any obligation to disclose underlying raw datasets, proprietary sources, or commercially sensitive information.