

HCL-STD-001 · STANDARD

Research Standard

Version 1.1

How research at H Capital is conducted, documented, reviewed, published, corrected and maintained.

AUTHOR AND APPROVAL	Tommy H
STATUS	Published
REVIEW	AI-assisted adversarial review and author self-review
EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW	Not conducted
PUBLISHED	29 September 2026 · Supersedes v1.0 (1 August 2026)

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Document control

Field	Value
Document ID	HCL-STD-001
Title	H Capital Research Standard
Version	1.1
Status	Published
Document class	Standard
Research domain	Research governance
Author	Tommy H
Approval authority	Tommy H
Contributors	Tommy H, with AI-assisted drafting and review
Review classification	AI-assisted adversarial review and author self-review
Independent external peer review	Not conducted
Confidence classification	High
Reproducibility classification	Not applicable
Publication date	29 September 2026
Supersedes	HCL-STD-001 v1.0 (1 August 2026)
Public URL	hcapitalassetmanagement.com/research/research-standard/
Permanent file name	HCL-STD-001_Research_Standard_v1.1.pdf
Annual review due	1 August 2027

Normative language

The words **must**, **shall**, **required** and **prohibited** indicate mandatory controls. **Should** indicates a strong recommendation. **May** indicates an optional practice.

ABOUT THIS VERSION

Version 1.1 names the author, aligns the standard with the public H Capital website and library, adds rules for tool pages and Quant Notes, and corrects metadata and formatting defects found in v1.0. The full list is in Appendix E.

CONTENTS

Contents

01	Purpose and scope
02	Foundational principles
03	Document classes and identifiers
04	Research rigor tiers
05	Required metadata, status and versioning
06	Research lifecycle and stage gates
07	Research questions, hypotheses and analysis classification
08	Claims, evidence, sources and citations
09	AI-assisted research and review
10	Confidence and reproducibility
11	Review, adversarial challenge and independence
12	Weighted frameworks and sensitivity analysis
13	Publication, legal risk and research-marketing separation
14	Corrections, withdrawal, dependencies and archival control
15	Failure-report safeguards
16	Website and library publication model
17	Tools and product pages
18	Governance, annual review and effectiveness
A–E	Appendices: Research Paper template, Research Note template, Experiment and Failure Report template, Pre-publication checklist, Revision history

SECTION 1

Purpose and scope

HCL-STD-001 defines how H Capital conducts, documents, evaluates, reviews, publishes, corrects and maintains research. Its purpose is to make research traceable, evidence-based, proportionate to uncertainty, reproducible where reasonably possible, and clearly separated from promotion.

The standard applies to research papers, frameworks, methodologies, experiments, datasets, research notes (published on the website as Quant Notes), failure reports, reviews, decision records, tool pages, and any public claim materially presented as the result of H Capital research.

A reader should be able to determine:

- 1 What question was studied and why it mattered.
- 2 What evidence was used and how it was evaluated.
- 3 How the evidence was analyzed.
- 4 Which conclusions are supported and which remain conditional.
- 5 What remains unknown or disputed.
- 6 How the work could be challenged, audited or reproduced.
- 7 Whether the document is current, corrected, superseded, withdrawn or archived.

SECTION 2

Foundational principles

2.1 Truth before ego

Evidence may invalidate a preferred conclusion. Negative results do not represent failed research; concealing or distorting them does.

2.2 Evidence before opinion

The strength of evidence must be proportional to the importance and consequence of the claim.

2.3 Transparency before certainty

Assumptions, conflicts, limitations, missing data, methodological choices and unresolved uncertainty must be disclosed.

2.4 Reproducibility before authority

Readers should not be expected to accept a conclusion merely because H Capital published it.

2.5 Revision before defensiveness

Published work remains open to correction when stronger evidence or valid criticism emerges.

2.6 Research before promotion

Marketing, tool pages and social posts may summarize research but may not overstate, cherry-pick or conceal material limitations.

2.7 Proportional governance

The burden of documentation and review must match the consequence and maturity of the research.

SECTION 3

Document classes and identifiers

Every controlled document receives a permanent identifier in the form **HCL-[CLASS]-[NUMBER]**. Numbers are sequential within each class, starting at 001. The identifier never changes across revisions; the version number does. The same identifier must be used on the website, in the library and in the file name.

Code	Document class	Primary purpose	Website category
HCL-STD	Standard	Defines mandatory rules	Models & Systems
HCL-FWK	Framework	Defines a reusable decision or analytical system	Models & Systems
HCL-MTH	Methodology	Defines a repeatable research method	Models & Systems
HCL-RP	Research Paper	Presents a complete study and formal conclusion	Research Papers or Strategy Studies
HCL-RN	Research Note	Presents scoped, preliminary or time-sensitive findings	Quant Notes
HCL-EXP	Experiment Report	Documents a controlled test and its outcome	Experiments or Replications
HCL-DS	Dataset Record	Documents provenance, structure, use and limitations of a dataset	Models & Systems
HCL-FR	Failure Report	Preserves knowledge from a failed or abandoned approach	Category of the original study
HCL-REV	Review	Evaluates existing evidence or research	Research Papers
HCL-DEC	Decision Record	Documents a consequential decision	Internal by default

IDENTIFIER RULE

New document classes must not be created merely for convenience. Each class must represent a genuinely distinct purpose and be added through a controlled revision of this standard. Website categories are presentation only; the class and identifier are authoritative.

SECTION 4

Research rigor tiers

Governance is tiered to prevent both under-documentation and unnecessary bureaucracy.

Tier	Use	Minimum control	Public status
Tier 1: Research Log	Daily observations, early hypotheses, source notes, questions, discovery	Date, author, question or observation, evidence or source, interpretation, uncertainty, next action	Internal by default
Tier 2: Research Note or Experiment	Preliminary findings, scoped tests, early validation, Quant Notes	Identifier, question, method, evidence, result, limitations, confidence, next test, references, AI disclosure where material	May be published with a clear preliminary label
Tier 3: Full Research Paper	Material public conclusions, strategic recommendations, research supporting consequential or commercial claims	The complete HCL-STD-001 process, including review, confidence, reproducibility, conflicts, legal-risk assessment and checklist	Official publication

SECTION 5

Required metadata, status and versioning

5.1 Mandatory document metadata

- Document ID and title
- Document class
- Version and status
- Publication date and last-updated date
- Author, contributors, reviewer and approval authority
- Research domain and keywords
- Confidence classification

- Reproducibility classification
- Supersedes and superseded-by fields
- Public URL and permanent file name

5.2 Status system

Statuses marked *public* are the ones shown in the website library. The others are working states that stay internal.

Status	Meaning	Visibility
Concept	The question exists, but formal work has not begun	Internal
Proposed	Scope, question and hypothesis are written and published as a plan. No results yet	Public
In progress	Research or drafting is active	Public
Internal review	Complete enough for structured review	Internal
Published	Publicly available as an official version, with a verdict where one applies	Public
Live test	A strategy passed its backtest gates and is running forward on real data	Public
Rejected	The hypothesis was tested and not supported. The work stays published	Public
Under revision	A published document is being materially updated	Public
Corrected	A published error has been formally corrected	Public
Superseded	Replaced by a newer document or version	Public
Withdrawn	Removed from active use because of a serious defect	Public
Archived	Kept for historical reference but no longer active	Public

5.3 Verdicts

Where a study tests a hypothesis, it carries a verdict separate from its status: **Supported**, **Not supported**, **Inconclusive** or **Requires forward testing**. A proposed study has no verdict.

5.4 Versioning

H Capital uses Major.Minor versioning. Versions below 1.0 are developmental. Version 1.0 is the first public release. Minor versions cover clarifications or non-transformative additions. Major versions are required when the method, evidence, interpretation or conclusion changes materially.

PROHIBITION

Silent replacement of a published file is prohibited. A revised public document must carry a new version number and an updated revision history, and the previous version must remain available, marked as superseded.

SECTION 6

Research lifecycle and stage gates

The lifecycle runs:

Question → tier selection → scope → hypothesis → pre-analysis challenge → research plan → confirmatory evidence collection → exploratory analysis where appropriate → analysis change log → results → post-analysis adversarial review → confidence and reproducibility assessment → legal-risk assessment → approval → publication → dependency registration → monitoring → correction, revision or closure.

6.1 Stage gates

Gate 1: Question approved

- Specific
- Relevant
- Answerable
- Worth the cost of investigation

Gate 2: Research plan approved

- Hypothesis and falsification condition defined
- Variables, evidence requirements, methods, exclusions and stopping rules recorded
- Known risks and commercial incentives disclosed

Gate 3: Analysis complete

- Measurements separated from interpretations
- Confirmatory and exploratory analyses labeled
- Material changes logged
- Alternative explanations considered

Gate 4: Publication approved

Methodology, facts, citations, limitations, claims, confidence, reproducibility, conflicts, legal risk and accessibility reviewed

A study may be published at Gate 2 with the status **Proposed**. Everything after Gate 2 must not be implied until it has happened.

SECTION 7

Research questions, hypotheses and analysis classification

7.1 Primary research question

Each project must define one primary research question identifying the subject, outcome, relevant conditions and timeframe where applicable. Secondary questions may support but may not silently replace the primary question.

7.2 Hypothesis standard

Testable and falsifiable

Specific

Written before the primary analysis

Includes a stated falsification condition

Preserved unchanged in the final document, even when rejected

7.3 Confirmatory and exploratory analysis

Confirmatory analysis is defined before examining the relevant result. Exploratory analysis is created or modified after observing data or preliminary results. Both are valid, but they must be labeled accurately.

Every material change to the analysis is recorded in an analysis change log with these fields:

Change	Date	Reason	Results before and after	Effect on conclusion
What changed	When	Why it changed	Key metrics under both versions	None, weakened, strengthened or reversed

7.4 Variant register

For strategy research, every parameter set and variant tested is logged in an append-only register before its results are viewed. A register reconstructed after the fact must be labeled *reconstructed* and does not count as confirmatory evidence.

SECTION 8

Claims, evidence, sources and citations

8.1 Claim classification

Classification	Meaning
Fact	Directly supported by reliable external evidence
Measurement	Produced by an H Capital measurement, citing the measured file
Observation	Pattern directly observed in evidence
Interpretation	Explanation of an observation
Inference	Reasoned conclusion not directly measured
Hypothesis	Testable proposition awaiting sufficient evidence
Assumption	Input accepted for analytical purposes
Estimate	Approximate quantified judgment
Speculation	Plausible but weakly supported possibility
Recommendation	Proposed action derived from evidence and judgment

8.2 Evidence hierarchy

Evidence quality depends on the claim. A source may be primary for one claim and weak for another.

Level	Typical examples	Use
A	Original datasets, official records, direct experiments, direct measurements, source code and logs, peer-reviewed primary research	Primary support where directly relevant
B	Systematic reviews, recognized institutional reports, official technical documentation, transparent high-quality datasets	Strong secondary support
C	Expert commentary, professional surveys, reputable journalism, documented case studies, market listings	Supporting evidence
D	Anonymous claims, anecdotes, promotional material, unverifiable testimonials, informal discussion	Lead generation only; insufficient alone for major conclusions

8.3 Source evaluation

1 Authority

- 2 Proximity to original evidence
- 3 Method transparency
- 4 Recency
- 5 Independence and conflicts
- 6 Consistency with other credible evidence
- 7 Suitability for the specific claim

8.4 Citation rules

- bullet Cite original sources rather than summaries where practical.
- bullet Do not cite search-results pages or AI-generated text as factual authority.
- bullet Identify sources for tables, data and adapted figures.
- bullet State the date or period of any cited statistic. If it is not known, say so.
- bullet Disclose commercial or affiliate relationships.
- bullet Use permanent HCL identifiers for internal references.
- bullet Include author or institution, title, publisher, date, version, URL or DOI, and access date where applicable.

SECTION 9

AI-assisted research and review

AI may assist with literature discovery, summarization, coding, data transformation, hypothesis generation, drafting, editing, contradiction detection and scenario exploration. AI output is provisional and is not evidence merely because it is coherent.

- bullet Material contributions must be disclosed.
- bullet The AI system and the role it performed must be recorded.
- bullet Material factual outputs must be independently verified.
- bullet Numbers computed by an AI in conversation are not measurements. A deciding number must come from a measured file.
- bullet Responsibility for final methodology, claims and conclusions remains with the author.
- bullet AI-assisted adversarial review must preserve the prompt, issues identified, responses, changes made, unresolved objections and source-verification status.

STANDARD DISCLOSURE

Artificial intelligence was used to assist with research organization, source discovery, analytical design, drafting and review. AI-generated outputs were treated as provisional and verified by the author. Responsibility for the final methodology, claims and conclusions remains with Tommy H.

SECTION 10

Confidence and reproducibility

10.1 Confidence rubric

Dimension	Score
Evidence quality	1–5
Evidence consistency	1–5
Method validity	1–5
Reproducibility	1–5
Sensitivity to assumptions	1–5
Independent confirmation	1–5

Total	Classification
6–11	Very low
12–17	Low
18–23	Moderate
24–27	High
28–30	Very high

The rubric creates an audit trail, not a probability. Critical weaknesses cap the final classification regardless of total score:

- Serious unresolved methodological defect: maximum Low
- Material dependence on one unverified source: maximum Moderate
- No independent confirmation: normally maximum High
- Non-reproducible results: cannot receive Very high without exceptional documented justification

10.2 Reproducibility classification

Status	Meaning
Full	Data, method, parameters and materials are available
Substantial	Most materials are available; minor elements are restricted
Partial	Method is documented, but some data or systems are unavailable
Conceptual	Logic can be evaluated, but results cannot be independently reproduced
Not reproducible	Material constraints prevent reproduction
Not applicable	Reproduction does not meaningfully apply

10.3 Analytical transparency and withheld material

A study may be analytically transparent without releasing every proprietary artifact, such as the source code of a commercial tool. When material is withheld, the publication must state what is withheld, why, the effect on reproducibility, and the minimum evaluation material provided.

SECTION 11

Review, adversarial challenge and independence

11.1 Reviewer-independence classification

Classification	Meaning
Independent external review	Reviewer had no authorship or other role in the work
Internal independent review	Reviewer is part of H Capital but did not author the work
AI-assisted adversarial review	AI was used to challenge claims, evidence and methodology
Author self-review	The author performed a structured review
Not formally reviewed	No formal review completed

INDEPENDENCE RULE

H Capital is currently run by one person, who is both author and approval authority. That limitation must be disclosed on every Tier 3 publication, alongside the review classifications actually used. No person or AI system may be presented as independent when they were not.

11.2 Two-stage adversarial review

Pre-analysis challenge

- bullet Is the question neutrally framed?
- bullet Is the hypothesis falsifiable?
- bullet Could the method structurally favor a desired result?
- bullet Were criteria selected after choosing a preferred outcome?
- bullet Are success and failure conditions explicit?
- bullet Could commercial incentives influence the design?

Post-analysis challenge

- bullet Are conclusions stronger than the evidence?
- bullet Was contradictory evidence omitted?
- bullet Were methods changed after results were observed?
- bullet Could alternative explanations account for the result?
- bullet Is correlation being treated as causation?
- bullet Would the same method be accepted if it produced the opposite conclusion?

SECTION 12

Weighted frameworks and sensitivity analysis

Any framework using numerical scores or weights must disclose why each criterion exists, how scores are defined, why weights were selected, whether they were chosen before results, which assumptions dominate, and whether alternate weights change the ranking. At minimum, test:

- 1 Original weights
- 2 Equal weights
- 3 Immediate-needs weighting
- 4 Long-term strategic weighting
- 5 Reasonable optimistic assumptions
- 6 Reasonable conservative assumptions

Classification	Meaning
Robust	Winner remains stable under reasonable alternatives
Moderately stable	Winner changes only under material assumption changes
Fragile	Small changes alter the ranking
Indeterminate	Evidence does not support a reliable ranking

SECTION 13

Publication, legal risk and research-marketing separation

13.1 Publication requirements

- bullet Permanent identifier assigned
- bullet Metadata complete, with no placeholders
- bullet Citations checked
- bullet Status and version correct
- bullet Limitations disclosed
- bullet Confidence and reproducibility assessed
- bullet Conflicts disclosed
- bullet Public file matches the approved version
- bullet Website record, file name and PDF metadata match
- bullet Revision history present
- bullet Links and supporting files tested
- bullet Accessibility reviewed

13.2 Legal and compliance triggers

Legal or compliance review must be considered before publication when research or promotion includes:

- bullet Expected returns or performance claims
- bullet Recommendations concerning securities or financial instruments
- bullet Client or personal data
- bullet Paid testimonials or affiliate relationships
- bullet Regulated activities
- bullet Personalized financial guidance
- bullet Third-party proprietary datasets
- bullet Claims about legal rights or obligations
- bullet Product comparisons creating material commercial liability
- bullet Claims likely to be read as solicitation or financial promotion

Until qualified review is available, H Capital must use conservative language, avoid guarantees, distinguish research from advice, preserve supporting evidence and avoid implying regulatory approval.

13.3 Separation of research and marketing

Marketing, tool pages and social posts may summarize research but may not omit material limitations, convert correlation into causation, imply guaranteed outcomes, cherry-pick favorable results, use backtests as proof of future returns, present preliminary work as validated fact, alter confidence classifications, or conceal conflicts of interest.

SECTION 14

Corrections, withdrawal, dependencies and archival control

14.1 Correction severity

Severity	Examples	Required action
Minor	Spelling, formatting, broken link, citation formatting	Correct in the next minor version and record it in the revision history
Material	Incorrect figure, data-processing mistake, unsupported claim, meaningful omission	Mark as corrected, publish a correction notice, explain the change, reassess conclusions
Critical	Fabricated evidence, invalid core methodology, materially reversed conclusions, serious ethical or legal breach	Withdraw, preserve the archival record, publish the reason, replace only after full review

NO SILENT DISAPPEARANCE

Published research must not disappear without explanation. Withdrawn, rejected or superseded work keeps an archival record and a status notice. Removing an entry from the library requires a recorded reason.

14.2 Publication dependency register

Each published document records its dependent artifacts: the web page, PDF, X posts, Quant Notes, tool pages, charts, marketing copy, datasets, source repositories and external articles. A material correction requires a review of every dependency.

SECTION 15

Failure-report safeguards

Failure Reports preserve what was learned. They evaluate systems, hypotheses, assumptions, processes, decisions and evidence, not personal worth.

- bullet Avoid emotional or humiliating language.
- bullet Avoid blame unsupported by evidence.
- bullet Avoid presenting hindsight as certainty.
- bullet Do not assume every unsuccessful experiment was preventable.
- bullet Identify salvageable code, data, methods, documentation and lessons.

SECTION 16

Website and library publication model

The website library is the public record of H Capital research. The library index shows, for each entry: identifier, website category, title, one-line summary, status and date. Only categories that contain entries are shown. Placeholder entries are prohibited.

Each entry's own page should contain:

- bullet Document ID and title
- bullet Abstract
- bullet Document class and research domain
- bullet Author, contributors and review classification
- bullet Publication date, last updated, version, status and verdict where applicable
- bullet Confidence and reproducibility classifications
- bullet Keywords
- bullet Read-online and PDF links
- bullet Supporting materials and related documents, including related tools
- bullet Revision history
- bullet Recommended citation

16.1 Quant Notes

Quant Notes are Tier 2 Research Notes (HCL-RN) on prop-firm rules and market mechanics, often adapted from H Capital posts on X. Each note carries an identifier and date, cites its sources with their dates, uses proportionate language, and follows Section 13.3. A note must not contain performance claims about H Capital

tools.

The website record, PDF metadata, file name and revision history must agree.

SECTION 17

Tools and product pages

H Capital publishes trading tools for cTrader. Tool pages are commercial pages, not research, and are governed by the following rules.

- bullet A tool page describes what the tool does, who it is for, its settings, platforms, version and price. It must not state win rates, returns or other performance claims.
- bullet A tool that is not a trading strategy must say so plainly.
- bullet If a tool is derived from H Capital research, the page links to that research and states its status honestly, including when it is preliminary.
- bullet Backtest results must never be presented on a tool page as evidence of future performance.
- bullet Trials, pricing and affiliate relationships are stated plainly.
- bullet A tool or version is listed only once it is actually available. Planned tools are not advertised as if they exist.
- bullet Tool pages are registered as dependencies of any research they cite (Section 14.2).

SECTION 18

Governance, annual review and effectiveness

18.1 Annual review

HCL-STD-001 must be reviewed at least once every twelve months. The review examines which controls improved quality, which created friction, which failures were not prevented, which fields were misunderstood, which new risks emerged, and what should be strengthened or simplified.

18.2 Definition of success

The standard succeeds if it leads H Capital to make fewer unsupported claims, expose uncertainty clearly, preserve research history, correct errors visibly, produce work others can evaluate, separate research from promotion, and improve its methods over time.

FAILURE CONDITION

It fails if it becomes ceremonial paperwork that does not influence real decisions.

APPENDIX A

Research Paper template

HCL-TPL-001

- 1 Document metadata
- 2 Executive summary
- 3 Primary research question and secondary questions
- 4 Background and significance
- 5 Original hypothesis and falsification condition
- 6 Scope, exclusions and time horizon
- 7 Definitions
- 8 Methodology
- 9 Data and sources
- 10 Analysis
- 11 Results
- 12 Alternative explanations
- 13 Adversarial review
- 14 Limitations
- 15 Conclusion and verdict
- 16 Recommendations and reversal conditions
- 17 What we know, believe and do not know
- 18 Confidence assessment
- 19 Reproducibility statement
- 20 AI-assistance disclosure
- 21 Conflicts of interest
- 22 Future work
- 23 References
- 24 Appendices
- 25 Revision history

TEMPLATE RULE

The original hypothesis must remain visible in the final paper even when rejected. Recommendations must state evidence, conditions, main risk, reversal condition and review date.

APPENDIX B

Research Note template

HCL-TPL-002 · USED FOR QUANT NOTES

- 1 Document control
- 2 Question
- 3 Why a Research Note is appropriate
- 4 Current evidence
- 5 Preliminary analysis
- 6 Preliminary finding
- 7 Limitations
- 8 Confidence
- 9 Next test
- 10 AI disclosure
- 11 References
- 12 Revision history

Research Notes use proportionate language such as *suggests*, *is consistent with*, *provides preliminary support* or *does not yet establish*.

APPENDIX C

Experiment and Failure Report template

HCL-TPL-003

C.1 Experiment Report

- 1 Document control and experiment ID
- 2 Objective
- 3 Experimental hypothesis
- 4 Success criteria

- 5 Failure criteria
- 6 Experimental design
- 7 Results
- 8 Interpretation
- 9 Decision
- 10 Lessons
- 11 Reproducibility and supporting files
- 12 Revision history

C.2 Failure Report

- 1 Original objective
- 2 Original reasoning
- 3 Resources committed
- 4 Failure definition
- 5 Evidence of failure
- 6 Root-cause analysis
- 7 What should have been noticed earlier
- 8 Salvageable assets
- 9 Decision and closure
- 10 Preventive changes
- 11 Lessons for future projects
- 12 Related documents
- 13 Revision history

APPENDIX D

Pre-publication checklist

HCL-CHK-001

Identity and control

- ☐ Permanent ID assigned
- ☐ Correct class, version and status
- ☐ Publication date set
- ☐ Author, contributors, reviewer and approval authority identified
- ☐ Permanent file name and website metadata match

Research question and scope

- ☐ Primary question explicit and answerable
- ☐ Scope and exclusions documented
- ☐ Key terms defined
- ☐ Original hypothesis preserved
- ☐ Falsification condition stated

Methodology

- ☐ Method sufficiently documented
- ☐ Variables, criteria, weights, assumptions and rules disclosed
- ☐ Deviations recorded
- ☐ Variant register kept, and marked reconstructed where applicable
- ☐ Sensitivity and robustness considered

Evidence and data

- ☐ Material claims supported
- ☐ Original sources preferred
- ☐ Source conflicts and provenance documented
- ☐ Dates of cited statistics stated
- ☐ Missing data and transformations disclosed
- ☐ Exclusions logged
- ☐ Licensing respected

Analysis and reasoning

- ☐ Measurements separated from interpretation
- ☐ Correlation not presented as causation
- ☐ Alternative and contradictory evidence considered
- ☐ Selection bias, leakage and overfitting assessed where relevant
- ☐ Conclusions do not exceed evidence

Adversarial review

- ☐ Strongest counterargument documented
- ☐ Hidden assumptions sought
- ☐ Material criticism addressed
- ☐ Unresolved criticism remains visible
- ☐ Commercial incentives evaluated

Transparency

- ☐ Limitations complete
- ☐ Confidence and reproducibility justified
- ☐ AI assistance and verification disclosed
- ☐ Conflicts and affiliate relationships disclosed
- ☐ Single-author limitation disclosed where applicable

Publication quality

- ☐ Summary matches paper
- ☐ Tables and figures labeled
- ☐ Citations and quotations checked
- ☐ Links and files work
- ☐ PDF and web versions match
- ☐ Accessibility reviewed
- ☐ No placeholders remain
- ☐ Legal and privacy review completed where required

Knowledge boundary

- ☐ What we know is evidence-supported
- ☐ What we believe is clearly interpretive
- ☐ What we do not know identifies material unknowns
- ☐ Future work follows genuine gaps

APPENDIX E

Revision history

Version	Date	Status	Change	Approved by
0.1	2026-08-01	Draft	Initial structured draft	H Capital Labs
0.2	2026-08-01	Draft	Added operational templates and review checklist	H Capital Labs

Version	Date	Status	Change	Approved by
0.3	2026-08-01	Publication candidate	Integrated adversarial-review amendments, tiers, review classifications, confidence rubric, legal triggers and dependency register	H Capital Labs
1.0	2026-08-01	Published	First consolidated public standard	H Capital Labs
1.1	2026-09-29	Published	Named Tommy H as author and approval authority and renamed H Capital Labs to H Capital. Aligned statuses, verdicts and document classes with the public library (5.2, 5.3, 3). Added the variant register (7.4), the single-author independence rule (11.1), Quant Notes (16.1) and tool pages (17). Filled the public URL and corrected the permanent file name. Fixed contents numbering, list numbering and the analysis change log table from v1.0.	Tommy H

Versions 0.1 to 1.0 are recorded as originally approved, under the name H Capital Labs.