

THE QUAD METHODOLOGY - SELF-SCORING TOOL

QUAD Self-Audit: Score Your Own Deck Before an Investor Does

The same five-criteria citation standard and three-position adversarial challenge a named ThriveFinity verifier runs on every Pre-Launch Verification claim -- turned into a scoring sheet you can apply yourself, lens by lens, in about fifteen minutes.

5

Citation criteria

3

Adversarial positions

4

Intelligence pillars

Named Verifier: Pranav Unni - ThriveFinity - thrivefinity.uk

This self-audit reflects ThriveFinity's own published QUAD methodology (thrivefinity.uk/methodology).

It is a self-scoring tool, not a substitute for an independently verified, named-human-signed verdict.

WHAT THIS IS

A self-scoring tool, not a claims list

This is different from a list of "claims investors check" (that tool already exists -- see ThriveFinity's Series A Claim-Verification Checklist). This document scores **how well-evidenced** a claim already is, using the exact standard a named ThriveFinity verifier applies during a real Pre-Launch Verification engagement: five mandatory citation criteria, plus a three-position adversarial challenge. Use this first to find your weak spots. Use the claims checklist to know which claims to check in the first place. The two are companions, not substitutes.

HOW TO USE IT

Pick your five to eight highest-stakes quantified claims -- usually market size, a retention or engagement metric, a competitive differentiation statement, unit economics, a growth projection, and any team or credential claim. For each claim, work through the six lenses on the following pages and score 0 (fails), 1 (partial), or 2 (passes) against each. A claim scoring below 8 out of 12 should be treated as a live risk before you pitch, not a settled fact.

<p>0 - Fails No evidence, or evidence doesn't meet the criterion</p>	<p>1 - Partial Evidence exists but is incomplete or unclear</p>	<p>2 - Passes Fully meets the criterion, traceable and citable</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The Five Citation Criteria

A source is only "cited" -- not just referenced -- if it passes all five. Score each claim against every lens below.

01 **Named & Traceable** Score: 0 1 2
Can I name the exact source, and could someone else find it themselves?

No anonymous or uncited sources pass at any confidence level. A vague "industry reports show..." scores 0. "IBISWorld, Feb 2025" scores 2. Named source, document title, and where possible a specific section -- that's the bar.

02 **Under 24 Months Old** Score: 0 1 2
Is the underlying data current, or am I citing something stale as if it were still true?

A 2022 figure cited in a 2026 deck about a fast-moving market should be treated as needing re-verification, not as settled fact. Static facts (e.g. a regulatory registration number) are exempt from the recency test -- genuinely time-sensitive figures are not.

03 **Methodology Disclosed** Score: 0 1 2
Do I know -- and can I explain -- how this number was actually derived?

"We're taking 1% of a \$4B market" scores 0 -- there's no method behind the percentage. A bottom-up model (segment x conversion x ARPU) with the assumptions stated scores 2.

04 Sample Size Stated Score:
[]0 []1 []2
Have I written down the actual n= behind this metric, not just the headline number?

An NPS of 72 with no stated sample size scores 0 -- it could be n=12 or n=1,200, and those are different claims wearing the same number. Stating "n=12, early cohort" honestly scores 2 even though the sample is small -- the honesty is what earns the score, not the size.

05 Confidence Assigned Score:
[]0 []1 []2
Have I honestly rated how sure I am -- High, Medium, or Low -- rather than presenting everything with equal certainty?

Presenting every number in the deck with the same false precision scores 0. Explicitly flagging "Medium confidence -- early data, resurveying at scale before Series A" scores 2. Uncertainty stated plainly is more credible than confidence you can't back up.

06 Survives Adversarial Challenge Score:
[]0 []1 []2
Does this claim hold up against three separate hostile readings, not just the one objection I expected?

Test it against all three positions on the next page -- investor, regulatory, and factual alternative. A claim that survives only the objection you anticipated, and collapses under either of the other two, scores 0 or 1, not 2.

The Three-Position Adversarial Challenge

For every claim scoring 2 on the five citation criteria, run it through all three positions below before you consider it pitch-ready.

Investor Objection	"By what specific metric? Compared to what named baseline? Is this benchmarked against a consenting, named competitor?" Vague superlatives -- "industry-leading", "3x faster" -- without a stated metric fail here immediately.
Regulatory Challenge	"Is this comparison making a claim about a real, named company without their consent? Does this claim require a licence, approval, or disclosure I haven't accounted for?" Applies hardest to fintech, health, and any regulated claim.
Factual Alternative	"Is there a more mundane, equally plausible explanation for this number that I haven't ruled out?" n=4 isn't a statistically significant sample. A growth rate built on zero-churn assumptions isn't a forecast, it's a best case dressed as a base case.

Scoring Sheet - Apply This to Your Deck

Photocopy or recreate this table for each of your five to eight highest-stakes claims.

Write out each claim in plain language exactly as it appears in your deck. Score it 0/1/2 against each of the six lenses. A total below 8/12 means the claim needs work before it reaches an investor.

Claim (as written in deck)	01	02	03	04	05	06	/12

Lens key: 01 Named & Traceable . 02 Under 24 Months . 03 Methodology Disclosed . 04 Sample Size Stated . 05 Confidence Assigned . 06 Survives Adversarial Challenge

What a low score actually means. A claim scoring below 8/12 isn't necessarily false -- it means the evidence behind it isn't yet in a shape that survives scrutiny. The fix is usually rewriting the claim with a named source and an honest confidence rating, not abandoning the underlying point. That rewrite is exactly what a Pre-Launch Verification Audit delivers for every claim in a full deck, signed by a named human verifier.

The Four Intelligences - A Wider Check

Once individual claims score well, step back and check the deck as a whole against all four pillars the QUAD methodology runs independently.

Market	TAM/SAM/SOM, growth rate, and regulatory signal -- traced to named registries and market data. <i>Self-check: does your TAM use a bottom-up model, or a top-down percentage with no stated method?</i>
Audience	Buyer archetypes, demand signals, and channel fit -- evidence of who actually buys. <i>Self-check: is your ICP backed by any real signal, or is it an assumption dressed as a persona?</i>
Competitive	Competitor map, positioning gaps, and displacement risk. <i>Self-check: does your deck name real competitors and explain the specific moat, or does it claim "no direct competitors"?</i>
Trend	Whether demand is structural or cyclical -- is the tide moving with your claim or against it. <i>Self-check: can you name one external, dated signal that supports your "why now" slide?</i>

Next Step

This self-audit tells you where your own deck is likely to fall short -- it is not a substitute for an independently verified score. A free Pre-Launch Verification Pulse runs the actual process against one real claim from your deck: retrieval against named sources, the full three-position challenge, and a verdict from a named human verifier -- typically within an hour, at no cost.

Start a free Pulse: thrivefinity.uk/pre-launch-verification

Read the full methodology: thrivefinity.uk/methodology

Named Verifier: Pranav Unni . om@thrivefinity.uk

Sources referenced in this methodology: ThriveFinity QUAD Verification Standard (thrivefinity.uk/methodology). This self-audit is a companion to, not a replacement for, the Series A Claim-Verification Checklist (thrivefinity.uk/resources/series-a-claim-checklist), which lists which claims investors stress-test first.