INTRICATELOGY SCALING

“Where real intelligence meets real analysis.”

“Complexity is the measure, logic is the foundation.”

“Complexity isn't confusion, it’s mastery in motion.”

“Logic is the language of intelligence, complexity is its poetry.”

“Where every feat is dissected, every layer is revealed.”

“Where intelligence is scaled, not assumed.”

“Intelligence isn't a statement, it’s a step-by-step demonstration.”

“In the realm of Intelligence, complexity is the crown, and logic is the scepter.”

- Made by: Aki, Teyfik & Tokho

Introduction to Intricatelogy:

Intricatelogy Scaling is a system designed to evaluate and rank the intelligence of the characters by deeply analyzing their intellectual capacities. Unlike conventional intelligence scaling methods that often rely on general knowledge, statements, or success alone, Intricatelogy Scaling prioritizes two key components: **logic** and **complexity**. This approach ensures that intelligence is assessed based on the depth, intricacy, and logical coherence of a character's reasoning, problem-solving, and strategic maneuvering.

Core Principles:

Logic-Based Evaluation: Intelligence in this system is determined by how logically sound and well-reasoned a character's actions and decisions are. Characters who operate with clear, structured, and logically consistent thinking will rank higher.

Complexity as a Benchmark: The more complex and layered a character's reasoning, thought process, or strategic feats are, the higher they will scale. This means that intelligence is not just about solving problems, but about doing so in ways that demonstrate a deep and intricate understanding of variables, consequences, and advanced thought patterns.

Feats as the Basis for Scaling: Actions, decisions, and problem-solving instances, referred to as "feats" are the primary basis for evaluation. The more sophisticated and logically sound a feat is, the better it will rank within the system.

On-Screen vs. Off-Screen feats: While off-screen feats can be considered, they are given a lower ranking due to the lack of visible complexity. An action that is explicitly shown, explained or broken down step by step, will carry more weight than a merely stated off-screen feat.

Layered Countering: In the Intricatelogy Scaling System, complexity isn't just a measure of intelligence, it directly correlates with how difficult a character is to counter. The deeper and more layered the intellectual feat, the less likely it is that someone with lower intellectual complexity can successfully challenge it.

Later on, we are gonna teach you how you can identify logical feats, how to unravel complexity, why Layered countering is important etc.

Why complexity matters when it comes to measuring intelligence?

In Intricatelogy, complexity is a critical factor in evaluating intelligence and outsmarting abilities because it reflects the depth, sophistication, and logical coherence of a character's reasoning. By focusing on complexity, the system provides a more objective and nuanced way to rank characters, ensuring that intelligence is assessed based on demonstrated feats rather than statements or narrative hype. This approach not only enhances the accuracy of

scaling but also encourages deeper analysis and appreciation of a character's intellectual capabilities.

Demonstrates depth of thought:

- Complexity reflects a character's ability to think deeply and consider multiple layers of a problem. It shows that the character can go beyond surface-level solutions and address underlying variables, consequences, and interdependencies.

Highlights advance problem-solving:

- Complex feats often involve creative solutions, and the ability to navigate ambiguous or chaotic situations. This indicates a higher level of intellectual flexibility and adaptability.

Reflects mastery:

- Complexity requires a character to manage and manipulate multiple variables simultaneously. This includes understanding how different factors interact and predicting outcomes based on these interactions.

Indicates superior strategic planning:

- Complex strategies often involve long-term planning, deception, and the ability to anticipate opponents' moves. This shows a character's ability to think several steps ahead and adapt to changing circumstances.

Shows logical coherence and consistency:

- Complexity is not just about being convoluted; it requires logical coherence. A character's actions and decisions must be internally consistent and follow a clear, rational thought process.

Determines countering potential:

- In the Intricatelogy system, complexity directly correlates with how difficult a character is to counter. The more intricate and layered a character's reasoning or thinking, the harder it is for an opponent to predict, disrupt, or outmaneuver their plans.

Reflects superior adaptability:

- Complex outsmarting feats often involve adapting to unforeseen challenges and turning setbacks into advantages. This shows a character's ability to think on their feet and adjust their strategies in real-time.

Highlights tactical depth:

- Complexity in outsmarting often involves manipulation, information control, deception, strategic methods, and the ability to exploit opponents' weaknesses. This

requires a deep understanding of human behavior and strategic thinking. When facing highly complex scenarios such as rule restricted, the ability to find loopholes and exploit them in order to win affirms this concept of depth.

Why does logic matter while scaling intelligence?

In Intricatelogy Scaling, intelligence is not just about knowledge or quick thinking, it's about how logically structured a character's thoughts, plans, and decisions are. Logic serves as the core foundation that determines the depth, consistency, and effectiveness of intelligence-based feats. Here's why logic is essential when scaling intelligence:

Intelligence without logic is just random brilliance

A character may display moments of high intelligence, but if their reasoning lacks a logical structure, it cannot be classified as true intelligence. Logical thinking ensures that a character's intelligence is consistent, replicable, and applicable across different situations.

Example: Someone guessing the right answer on a test doesn't mean they are intelligent, it means they got lucky. A true logical thinker understands why the answer is correct and can explain their reasoning.

Complexity without logic is just confusion

Some characters appear to have intricate plans, but if those plans lack internal consistency, they are not a true measure of intelligence. Logical reasoning ensures that complexity is structured, meaning the character's intelligence is deliberate rather than coincidental.

Example: A plan that relies purely on luck or convenient circumstances is not a true measure of intelligence. A real strategist controls variables, adjusts to uncertainty, and ensures their plan remains sound.

Logical feats can be measured, intuitive feats cannot

When scaling intelligence, measurability matters. Logic provides a structured way to evaluate intelligence, ensuring that intelligence is not based on subjective impressions but on demonstrable feats of reasoning.

Example:

- Saying "Character A is smart because they 'felt' the right decision" is scalable lower.
- Saying "Character B is smart because they built a multi-layered deception that left no counterplay" is scalable above.

The one who thinks in more logical layers is usually smarter

Characters who can process higher layers of reasoning, deception, and risk control are naturally superior in intelligence. Logical thinking allows for deeper layers of manipulation, which makes a character's intelligence more dominant.

Example:

- **Basic Logic:** "If A happens, then B happens."
- **High-Deduction Logic:** "If A happens, I make it look like B happened while secretly setting up C."
- **Mastermind Logic:** "If A happens, I make the opponent believe they forced B, while in reality, I have preconditioned C to ensure I control D."

The more logical layers a character applies, the smarter they are.

Logic ensures intelligence is structured, not just random intuition, logical complexity determines how resistant a plan is to counterplay, a character with more logical layers naturally outsmarts those with simpler reasoning, logical feats are measurable and can be scaled fairly. In short: Logic is the ultimate test of intelligence.

How some "Illogical" feats still relies on logic:

Illogical feats are naturally and often out of the box due the insane Unpredictability they carry with, however there are feats that are insufficient in logic but still are considered logical.

One example of this is Baku's Kaiser plan, which incorporated an "illogical" element: losing a finger. The reason why this still counts as a logical feat is because this illogical aspect (yes, cutting your own finger lacks logic) works within a logical framework, since it assured Lalo will never see the calendar trap coming by the idea Usogui was desperate enough to lose his own finger just to become the king, so no way his intention was to be defeated by him.

This last example is what we call: Calculated Irrationality, here is how you can identify calculated irrationality feats:

- The action appears reckless or illogical at first glance.
- The character has an underlying reason for making this move.
- It forces the opponent into a false assumption or disrupts logical patterns.
- It leads to a long-term advantage despite the short-term cost.
- It creates an outcome that average logicians wouldn't anticipate.

If an irrational action lacks these elements, it is totally Illogical and in Intricatelogy, illogical feats hold no value to scale.

How to identify and scale complexity and logical feats:

Logic:

Internal Consistency & Rational Thinking

- Does the character use logic to support their decisions, or do they act impulsively?
- Do their conclusions follow from the premises, or do they rely on luck/plot armor?
- Is their thought process deductive (facts to conclusions) or inductive (patterns to general rules)?

Example:

- Weak Logic: “I knew the answer because I had a feeling… intuition”
- Strong Logic: “I deduced the answer by breaking down the clues step by step.”

Problem-Solving and Deduction

- Does the character solve complex problems in a structured way?
- Can they analyze cause and effect accurately?
- Do they apply scientific reasoning, pattern recognition, or deductive reasoning?

Example:

- Basic Deduction: “The door was locked, so I left.”
- Advanced Deduction: “The door was locked, which means someone locked it recently. Given the dust pattern, it must have been within the last hour.”

Complexity:

Depth of Strategic Thinking

- Does the character predict multiple possibilities and prepare for them?
- Do they think several steps ahead instead of just reacting?
- Are their plans adaptive, meaning they adjust as new variables arise?

Example:

- **Shallow Thinking:** Reacting to an attack after it happens.
- **Deep Thinking:** Setting up conditions so the opponent falls into a trap before they even attack.

Contingency Planning & Adaptability

- How well-prepared is the character for different scenarios?

- Can they adapt when their original plan fails?
- Does their thinking show a long-term vision?

Example:

- **Low Complexity:** A character wins a fight by overpowering an opponent directly.
- **High Complexity:** A character makes their opponent think they're winning, only to reveal a hidden strategy that flips the situation completely.

Scaling Complexity and Logic

To rank intelligence feat**s** and characters we have created a tier system:

Logical Thinkers:

🔹 Instinctive Thinker Feat:

- Reacts to situations based on intuition and pattern recognition.
- Uses trial and error rather than structured logic.
- Struggles to anticipate consequences beyond immediate actions.

🔹 Situational Problem Solver Feat:

- Can solve immediate problems using deductive reasoning.
- Able to recognize contradictions but may struggle with deception.
- Thinks one or two steps ahead, but lacks deep contingency planning.

🔹 Strategic Thinker Feat:

- Uses logical paradoxes, risk manipulation, and uncertainty to break opponents.
- Reframes entire situations to alter decision-making dynamics.
- Uses structured logic to deconstruct complex problems, identify patterns, and create multi-layered strategies. Their plans are built on a foundation of logical coherence, ensuring that each step follows rationally from the previous one.
- Creates traps where every choice the opponent makes benefits them.
- Demonstrates high foresight, predicting multiple reactions before they happen, all logic based.
- Leverages observed patterns and layered logic to predict future outcomes. This enables them to anticipate multiple reactions and plan contingencies for each possible scenario.
- Their logic management allows them to predict and control the flow of events, often several steps ahead of their opponents.

Complex Thinkers:

- Basic Thinker Feat:
  - Uses single-layer reasoning.
  - Relies on simple cause-and-effect thinking.
  - No adaptability, if their first plan fails, they're lost.
  - Wins by brute force, luck, or plot convenience.
- Advanced Thinker Feat:
  - Uses multi-layered reasoning.
  - Anticipates opponent moves, but lacks deep contingency plans.
  - Adapts when things go wrong, but might struggle against hyper-layered thinkers.
  - Logical, but still misses deeper implications.
- Mastermind Thinker Feat:
  - Uses hyper-layered reasoning.
  - Thinks several moves ahead and controls multiple variables.
  - Adapts instantly and creates new solutions when plans fail.
  - Their thought process is so advanced that less intelligent characters can't even comprehend nor replicate their methods.

Example of scaling intelligence feats:

- **Basic Thinker Feat:** Outsmarting a single opponent in a direct battle.
- **Advanced Thinker Feat:** Outsmarting an entire group by using deception and strategic misdirection.
- **Mastermind Thinker Feat:** Creating a situation where the opponent unknowingly defeats themselves, while believing they were in control the whole time. This while at the same time using intricate methods to achieve their victory.

Now, we would like to introduce a new method, with this method you can break feats into layered, step by step and categories variables, which will determine how complex is the feat

We are gonna Decompose one of the best manipulation feats of all time: Yokoyas "First Come, First Serve"

Feat Description: "After Akiyama successfully prevented players from joining Yokoya, the game was inevitably in a dead state, so Akiyama came up with the Ushirisuki Circuit

Strategy. With this he was able to deceive everyone and put the game in his favor. Unfortunately for Akiyama, Yokoya acted. Yokoya went and said Akiyama was lying, he's not willing to save all players, he's just letting Akagi dying (Akagi is an infected, and Akiayama refused to have contact with him for now, this part of his strategy to identify the las infected). Obviously Nao refuted this, which Yokoya said: “if that's the case then have contact with Akagi, turn him from infected to normal” Nao proceeds to have contact with Akagi, Yokoya forced this for later confusing players about Nao's and Akagi's current state. After this Yokoya says Akagi can now have contact with the other people, leaving Muscles, Greasy, Akagi and Akiyama as Normal +4 and Nao as Normal +2. Yokoya says Akiyama told other lies, such as the SwingBall, because it cant react to the signals of the transmission devices. He proceeds to test it with Muscles, his state is Normal +4, therefore the ball with long strings shall move based on what Akiyama said. Muscles overreacts, saying he is for real Normal, Yokoya tries it again and now the long string ball moves, proving the balls doesn't react to any signals. It's just a trick where the ball moves at the will of the holder. Although the balls look static, it's actually slightly moving. and the swinging periods for a ball with a long string and a ball with a short string are definitely different. As long as you can find the swinging period of the ball you want to move, you can twist the stick at the same frequency to produce large magnitudes of movement on that ball. Muscles is surprised that Akiyama guessed correctly who was Normal. Yokoya proceeds to debunk it by asking why they agreed to take the swinging ball test, they say Akiyama asked: “Who wants to take the swinging ball test?” So they both offered. Yokoya asks if Nao and Akagi volunteered too, in fact they didn't. They explain how Akiyama first tested it with his own watch, then he grabbed Akagi's hand and told him to take the test, finally he unexpectedly chose Nao to take the test. Yokoya says that's Akiyama's final lie. He reveals Nao, Akagi and Akiyama have been working together even before the game started, that's how they know each other's status. Akiyama acted indifferent towards Akagi, and then asked who wants to take the test, this way the infected player won't show up, because of the fear of being abandoned like Akagi.

Yokoya says in the end Akiyama made a secret alliance and lied to everyone else, that's how he criticized him earlier, but his actions are not more different from his. He finally asks Muscles and Grease what they're gonna do, they run away , saying they will no longer have contact with anyone else, this way, Yokoya made Akiyama's group two important members to produce vaccines. Yokoya asks the remaining 4 players what they are gonna do, Nao says theyll obviously team up with her and win. But Yokoya is curious about if it will work. Yokoya raises up his voice, asking players to think about the facts: He, Bangs and Fatty are Normal +2. Second fact: they need allies in order to win. Third fact, Muscles and Grease are Normal +4, that's why they retired, therefore, if those two are Normal +4, Akiyama and Akagi are as well Normal +4. Therefore Yokoya says he doubts Akiyama and Akagi wont take any risk in helping the other players, since as the other +4 players, they would rather simply stay away from danger. Nao says that's not true, they'll definitely help them because she's still Normal +2, so they need more allies. Yokoya quickly uses his trap, and says “Nao is Normal +2, do we know this for sure as a fact?”. Since the swinging ball test was a Hoax,

Despite Akagi being identified as infected during the swinging ball test, he could actually be “Normal” this is similar to the trick he revealed earlier. The key to Akiyama's plan is to be indifferent towards the "infected" Akagi, so the remaining "infected" player will not volunteer if that's the case, it really doesn't matter whether Akagi is the "infected" or not he just needs to convince others that he is "infected". A player claims this is contradictory, but Yokoya proves it's not: When Nao and Akagi had contact the first time, if Akagi was infected, Nao would've become Infected +2.

But, if Akagi was Normal, then she would've become Normal +4 Afterwards, Nao clicked the vaccine button on her watch to cure herself. If Akagi was Infected +2, she would've become Normal +1, if she was Normal +4, no changes would occur. Then Nao contacted with Akagi again, if Akagi was originally infected, then this would create vaccines and Nao would've become Normal +2, but if Akagi was originally Normal, since they've already contacted previously, nothing will occur. With this reasoning, Yokoya convinces the players there's the chance Nao is Normal +4, Nao tries to deny this, but Yokoya says she has no way of proving what she claims. Yokoya concludes there's something even worse, if Nao is currently Normal +4, Akagi was Normal since the beginning, that means two of the four remaining players are Infected. Yokoya finally says: “Please calmly think about it. for three "normal+4" players to ally themselves with four players while two of which may be "infected". accepting a huge risk just so everyone can win… Can this really be a fact?” Finally, he gives 10 seconds to the players to choose their side, convincing 3 out of 4 players to join his side.”

Layered Decomposition: Now that we know the feat, let's decompose it. To decompose a feat we are gonna use vertical thinking, it does not matters if the character used this or any other sort of thinking, we as readers and scalers are gonna break it do using vertical thinking, which means: “a way of analyzing, processing, and using information in a logical way, step by step, organized way.” So we break down each step the character took (in chronological order) to execute his feat. By breaking down the feat into a vertical method, we can also analyze how many tactics the character used to pull off this feat, such as reasoning, deception, strategy, etc.

Take in consideration this process must be executed using the character's point of view, since often readers have more information of different aspects or scenarios going through, by doing this we can guarantee impartiality and proper scaling by accounting their point of view and mental state while breaking down their feat step by step.

The more layers of thought, planning, or execution a feat involves, the more complex it is.

- Feat Ranking:
- Single-Layer feat: A simple, direct approach with no deeper reasoning.
- Multi-Layer feat: Incorporates multiple steps, requires thinking, reasoning, contingencies, and hidden elements.

- Hyper-Layered feat: Uses many layers of thinking, reasoning, deep foresight, multiple strategies stacked on top of each other, manipulates the environment or people in unexpected ways, deceives by using unpredictable methods.

Example of Layered Decomposition:

Recognizing Disadvantage & Reversing the Game Flow

At first, Yokoya is severely outnumbered, so his group lacks enough members to secure victory. Instead of trying to recruit players directly, he reframes the game's dynamics, he observes Akiyama is currently using a method that apparently can identify the current state of the players, but thanks to his fluid intelligence, he realizes something is odd and can use this win.

- **Step 1: Identifying Akiyama's Lie**
  - Yokoya analyzes the Ushirisuki Circuit Strategy and realizes Akiyama manipulated the players' choices to make the infected hide away.
  - He sees through the deception-based alliance Akiyama built, which relies on creating the illusion of self-sacrifice.
  - Understanding this, he knows he cannot win conventionally, so he must force the players to break apart from Akiyama.
- **Step 2: Turning Akiyama's Strategy Against Him**
  - Instead of trying to convince players logically, he fabricates a new truth that makes trusting Akiyama a risky gamble.
  - His goal isn't to prove Akiyama wrong, it's to make Akiyama prove himself right, which is impossible under the uncertainty Yokoya creates.

Key Complexity Layer: Instead of finding a direct solution, he engineers a scenario where the enemy's own plan works against them.

Step-by-Step Deception Tactic: the trap that turns the game

- **Step 3: Setting Up the Misdirection Trap (Nao's forced contact with Akagi)**
  - Yokoya needs to inject confusion into the group dynamic, so he sets a perfect trap:
  - He calls out Akiyama's supposed lie, saying Akiyama only cares about saving normal players, not all.
  - Nao, being emotionally driven, immediately denies this accusation, a movement Yokoya anticipated
  - Yokoya, right in front of Akiyama, pressures her into proving it by forcing contact with Akagi, something he was totally aware would happen, judging Nao's personality

Why this trap works:

- Akiyama is caught in a paradox Yokoya created, if he tells Nao not to touch Akagi, he looks like he is abandoning him.
- If Nao touches Akagi, the entire game state becomes uncertain, making Akiyama's past reasoning useless.
- This destroys the credibility of the Ushirisuki Circuit Strategy in an instant.

Key Complexity Layer: Instead of disproving Akiyama, he **forces Akiyama's team to disprove themselves** through their own actions.

🔹 **Step 4: Exploiting the Doubt He Created**

- Later on, Yokoya exploits the situation he created by saying:
  "Do we know Nao's status for sure?"
- He redefines the game's logic, because the Swinging Ball Test was a hoax, no one actually knows if Nao is Normal +2 or Normal +4.
- This creates a logical gap that Akiyama cannot patch, causing his entire strategy to unravel.

Key Complexity Layer: He manipulates perception rather than facts. The truth doesn't matter, what matters is that doubt now exists.

🔹 **Step 5: Destroying Akiyama's alliance from within**

- With players questioning Nao's status, Yokoya pressures them into making a decision.
- He forces them to confront a brutal logical dilemma:
  Would three Normal +4 players willingly risk helping a group that might have two infected players?
- The rational answer is no, meaning Akiyama's allies suddenly become hesitant.
- Players abandon Akiyama because the risk outweighs the reward, leaving him vulnerable.

Key Complexity Layer: Yokoya doesn't force players to switch sides, he makes it seem like the only logical choice.

🔹 **Step 6: The 10-Second Pressure Play:**

- Yokoya doesn't let players think things through, since he already presented them the evidence, he gives them 10 seconds to decide.
- This forces a split-second decision, ensuring that fear and doubt dictate their choices, not logic.
- 3 out of 4 players switch sides, securing his victory.

Key Complexity Layer: He manipulates time pressure to ensure Akiyama has no chance of coming up with something to counter him.

Categories required for this feat:

[VCI, FRI, Mass manipulation, Direct manipulation, Indirect manipulation, Logical manipulation, Individual manipulation, Misdirection,Emotional Understanding, Emotional Perception, Leadership, SQ, Inductive Reasoning, Analogical Reasoning, Abductive Reasoning, Counterfactual Reasoning, Logical Reasoning, Critical Thinking, Convergent Thinking, Lateral Thinking, Linear Thinking, Associative Thinking, Analysis, Persuasion, Foresight, Setting Traps]

This way, if different people decompose a feat from the same source, the final result will be almost identical, ensuring more objectivity and general understanding of it. Using Intricatelogy, we can determine how layered and logically structured Yokoya's feat is:

- Logical Tier: Strategic Thinker

This because:

Uses logical paradoxes and risk manipulation to break alliances.
Reframes the game state to make trust impossible.
Counters by adding layers of uncertainty rather than direct arguments.

- Complexity Tier: Mastermind Level

This because:

Multi-layered deception with pre-planned steps.
Forces his opponent's own strategy to collapse under uncertainty.
Breaks his enemy's alliance without ever proving anything himself.
Ensures that his plan is impossible to counter in real-time.

- Situation Analysis (Where this feat was executed and against who)
  - **Situation Vire:** High-Stakes game, where losers will be at one game of being disqualified of the Liar Game and owning a massive debt, however, Yokoya at this point achieved a huge amount of money, so his situation vire is less "dangerous" compared with others, because of this reason the SV is a: 8/10
  - **Situation Complexity:** This game was executed in a high fixed-situation game filled with rules and specific win conditions: 9/10
  - **Resource Management:** Yokoya was in huge disadvantage after his virus outbreak strategy, Akiyama successfully spreaded mistrust among the players against him for his methods, so at that time he most likely would have lost the game. 9
  - **Adversary Force:** This feat was executed against Akiyama, a top tier character and someone who possess a Mastermind Intelligence: 10/10
  - **Feat Complexity:** No need to explain again why this feat is super intricate hands down a: 10/10 manipulation feat.

🔹 Why this feat is hard to counter:

- It manipulates emotions and forces snap decisions.
- It introduces a level of uncertainty that cannot be erased.
- It creates a scenario where every action Akiyama's team takes makes them look more suspicious.
- Akiyama can't prove his innocence, he can only try to disprove Yokoya, which is much harder given the layered reasoning he just presented. Yokoya is able to layer enough this tactic that he guarantees Akiyama is not able to counter it immediately, because Yokoya added well structured layers of reasoning, thanks to this, he achieved his goal.

Feat Ranking:

Now, in Intricatelogy, although complexity is the most important thing, a feat cannot be a 10/10 if it wasn't effective, with this in mind, Yokoya's feat presented an impressive layered structure where he rationalized, predicts, set traps, creates deception and manipulates everyone. This feat was a total success and achieved his main goal, which was to get members to his side, presented an insane adversary, in a very intellectual game with vire within, executed in a moment of total disadvantage that ultimately turned the game flow into his favor by executing a well rounded in logic and intricate method, this is why this feat in intricatelogy scaling is a **10/10.**

How to Scale the Consistency of a Feat:

Here's a breakdown of key considerations on how to accurately scale a consistency of a given feat:

- Reliability/Dependability: Can the character routinely and predictably execute the feat? Or is it subject to stochastic elements or circumstantial dependencies? In Liar Game, Akiyama's strategies often hinged on his ability to reliably predict his opponents' actions, but even his plans could be thwarted by unforeseen variables due the Game's nature.

- Efficacy: How efficiently and effectively does the character perform the feat? Does it require maximal exertion, or can it be accomplished with relative ease? A feat performed with minimal effort suggests a greater mastery and, consequently, higher scaling.

- Repercussions/Drawbacks: Are there any deleterious consequences associated with performing the feat? Does it induce debilitation, vulnerability, or other impairments? For instance, in Death Note, Light Yagami's use of the Death Note came with the perpetual risk of incrimination and the erosion of his own psyche. A feat with negligible drawbacks would suggest a higher degree of control and integration into the character's abilities.

- Frequency: How often can the character perform the feat within a given timeframe? Is it a singular occurrence, or can it be reiterated as needed? A character who can repeatedly execute a powerful feat demonstrates greater potency than one who can only do so once.

- Control: Does the character exhibit precise control over the feat's parameters? Can they modulate its intensity, range, or duration? In Usogui, Baku's gambling prowess stemmed from his meticulous control over every facet of the game, allowing him to manipulate outcomes with astounding accuracy

- Adaptability and Versatility: Contextual Applicability: Is the feat only effective in highly specific circumstances, or can it be adapted and applied across a broad spectrum of scenarios? A feat with limited applicability is inherently less scalable than one that offers manifold possibilities.

- Granularity of Control: To what extent can the character modulate the intensity, duration, or area of effect of the feat? The ability to fine-tune a feat's parameters allows for more efficient resource management and minimizes the risk of collateral damage, thereby enhancing its scalability. A lack of control can render a feat unwieldy and ultimately less effective.

- Robustness: How well does the character maintain the ability to perform the feat when subjected to external pressures,(e.g., being in a debt, taking a battle in a fs situation while having to save oneself and others) or adversarial interference (e.g., being in an straight out disadvantageous situation and having to pull off a great strategy or plan to get oneself out,) A character that collapses under pressure is inherently less scalable than one that remains steadfast.

- Resilience: Can the character consistently execute the feat even when suffering from internal impediments like setbacks, low resources, or psychological stress, A character's ability to persevere and execute complex maneuvers even when compromised is paramount.

In essence, the consistency of feat execution serves as a critical metric for gauging a character's true capabilities. A feat that can be performed reliably, efficiently, and without significant drawbacks is a testament to a character's prowess and warrants a higher scaling assessment.

Categories Used in Intricatelogy:

similar to stop’s scaling with the only difference is allowing inferences regarding knowledge even if it isn’t shown being studied on-screen if the character applies and explains said knowledge on-screen
It allows minimal inferences for feats, but just like Stop’s Scaling, all statements are invalid, even if they’re absolutely logical or just impossible to deny.
FRI, Strategy, Reasoning and Foresight are highly valued and upscale the character scaling accordingly.

FRI - Fluid Reasoning Index:

It is the ability to apply logic and reasoning to problem-solving and novel situations. A novel situation is a scenario that's unique and unexpected. If there's an event that you either don't recognize or haven't anticipated, then it is a novel situation. It measures one’s ability to detect the underlying conceptual relationship among visual objects and use reasoning to identify and apply rules. Identification and application of conceptual relationships requires inductive and quantitative reasoning, broad visual intelligence, simultaneous processing and abstract thinking.

A few examples:

- Playing a new game or solving a new puzzle such as the Rubik’s cube.

- Solving a math or science question using a new procedure.

- Traveling to a new city or town where you have to find your way around the streets.

- Getting lost in an unfamiliar place.
When you’re faced with a problem you’ve never come across before (like any one of the fluid reasoning examples listed), it is the innate ability to solve it.

-Interpreting Graphs, Quickly understanding and extracting information from graphs, including complex 3D visualizations, demonstrates fluid intelligence. It involves processing visual information and translating it into verbal understanding.

-Abstract Reasoning, Understanding hypothetical concepts and considering different possibilities and perspectives showcases fluid reasoning.

-Perceptual Reasoning, Solving problems that contain visual information and images by organizing and mentally manipulating them.

-Thinking Outside the Box, Generating novel solutions to existing problems by thinking abstractly and breaking free from conventional perspectives. This involves creativity, divergent thinking, and the ability to reframe problems.

-Critical Thinking, Fluid reasoning is essential for critical thinking, enabling individuals to assess the validity of arguments, weigh evidence, and arrive at well-reasoned conclusions.

-Pattern Recognition, Spotting patterns or gaps in information to make predictions. For example, a data analyst identifies trends in sales data to predict future customer demands.

-Adapting to new communication styles, Effectively understanding and responding to complex ideas and viewpoints to communicate effectively.

FRI for the scaling of fictional characters ignores the actual main subtests and instead uses different categories that all encompass FRI overall:

1. Cognitive Proficiency Index (CPI) which measures an individual's efficiency and proficiency in processing cognitive information and is measured through the individual's WMI and PSI with WMI being more dominant in the FRI component.

2. Learning Ability, which is measured through the speed and quality of said learning. This includes learning practical skills like riding a bike and academic knowledge like the theory of relativity and in both cases being able to apply said knowledge.

3. Abstract Thinking, which is the ability to go beyond concrete experiences and think about ideas, concepts, and theories that don't have a physical form. It's like having a mind that can build castles in the air, imagine different possibilities, and solve problems in creative ways.

4. Logical Reasoning, which involves analyzing information, identifying its relationships, and drawing valid conclusions based on evidence and sound rules of inference. It requires the ability to distinguish facts from opinions, identify flaws in reasoning, and avoid logical fallacies.

5. Adaptability, which is one’s ability to change their behavioral and/or cognitive acts depending on what the situation requires.

6. Novel Complex Problem-Solving; might overlap with some or all the previous categories and is the most prevalent part of FRI as it is the very ability to deconstruct and solve problems in newly-found situations/scenarios with no to minimal usage of past information.

These categories are not universally obligatory within the scaling system. Each category will be color-coded to signify whether it is essential or optional

Intellectual Categories:

- FSIQ: FRI + VSI + VCI + WMI + PSI + GAI + CPI
- FSEQ: EP +EU + EM + EE + EF + ER
- Fluid Intelligence: Logical Reasoning + Adaptability + Learning Ability + Problem-Solving + CPI (WMI>PSI)
- FSSQ: Influence Building + Social Engineering + Social Cognition + Leadership + Charisma
- FSAQ: Stress Tolerance, Mental Fortitude, Composure + Cognitive Discipline
- General Intelligence: Crystallized Intelligence + Fluid Intelligence
- Gardner Intelligence: Musical + Bodily-Kinesthetic + Interpersonal + Verbal + Mathematical + Naturalistic + Intrapersonal
- Reasoning: Inductive Reasoning, Deductive Reasoning, Abductive Reasoning + Numerical Reasoning + Analogical Reasoning + Causal Reasoning + Counterfactual Reasoning + Abstract Reasoning + Systematic Reasoning + Illogical Reasoning
- Thinking: Abstract Thinking + Divergent Thinking + Convergent Thinking + Lateral thinking + Vertical Thinking + Creative Thinking + Holistic Thinking + Analytical + Systematic Thinking + Associative Thinking + Reflective Thinking + Conceptual Thinking + Non-Linear Thinking
- Overall Memory: Long-Term Memory + Short-Term Memory + SRI
- Planning: Short-Term Planning+ Long-Term Planning + Planning Contingency + Planning Versatility + Planning Resilience + Planning Complexity + Planning Coverage + Planning Process + Planning Aim + Planning Formulation Speed
- Strategy: Strategy Complexity + Strategy Depth + Strategy Building + Strategy Lenght + Strategy Resource Management + Strategy Success-rate + Strategy Countering difficulty + More Limitations + Decision Making
- Deception: Information Control + Acting Skills + Misdirection + Fabrication + Bluffing + Concealment + Disguise + Verbal + Fabrication + Strategical
- Manipulation: Direct + Indirect + Emotional + Logical + Mass + Individual + Blackmail + Financial
- Foresight: Prediction + Anticipation + Trap Evasion + Setting Traps + Decision Making + Risk Assessment
- Countering: Layered Countering > Improvising + Trap Evasion + Tactical Responsiveness + Filed Navigation
- Miscellaneous: Cold Reading + Hot Reading + Methods + Psychology + Info Gathering + Info control + Tactics

Introducing New Categories to Intricatelogy:

We've included novel elements that contribute into underlying the very basis that we're building our method on, these elements are highly valued and affect where the characters scale, these categories can be used in case of comparing character A with character B, since it will objectively show who is smarter (example: when comparing two feats after layered decompose them, these new categories will be also used since it will take in consideration the environment where the feat was executed as well the adversity force and other stuff):

Resources Management:

If a character “A” has disadvantages and low resources, yet they manage to pull off a great strategy or plan, the higher they scale in intricatelogy, the feat has to be both complex and logical to be scaled high of course. Taking Akiyama for instance, in Musical Chairs, he had to go up against four adversities,

1. Harimoto and Yokoya alliance

2. Saving himself, and generate a global economic profit so the majority of players can be saved, while they are not willing to cooperate and instead they fight against each other.

3. Gaya alliance constantly asking for more medals

4. Baldly threatening to betray the group and snitch to Yokoya about the chairs' numbers.

While being at a notably disadvantageous position, with little to no resources, Akiyama pulled off crazy feats amidst the chaos that made him come on top.

This means; the less advantages a character have, yet they are still able to pull off great feats, puts the character higher and gives a big plus, while, if a character had quite the resources needed to pass an adversity yet they pulled a shitty or mid feat, that downgrades their position in the scaling.

Complexity of the Situation:

Assesses the intricacy of the character's predicament, taking into account the extent to which they are constrained by regulations or external factors. The more severely the character is restricted by these rules or circumstances, while still managing to achieve success, the higher they rank within this category.

Adversary Force:

This examines the intellectual capabilities of the adversaries confronted by the character. The more formidable and astute the enemies encountered, the higher the character will rank in this category.

Situation Hostility:

This assessment gauges the mental strain imposed by the circumstances the character encountered. Scenarios involving significant stress, such as games that can result in financial crises or life and death situations, will be rated highly due to the considerable mental resilience and stress tolerance required to overcome them effectively.

Feat Complexity:

This analysis considers the intricacy of the character's accomplishments. Clearly, those who undertake more elaborate and multifaceted feats will be rated higher in this category.

Layered Countering:

In the Intricatelogy Scaling System, complexity isn't just a measure of intelligence, it directly correlates with how difficult a character is to counter. The deeper and more layered the intellectual feat, the less likely it is that someone with lower intellectual complexity can successfully challenge it.

A character with high complexity demonstrates the ability to think in hyper-layered, non-linear, and sophisticated ways. Their strategies and solutions are not straightforward; they account for multiple variables, contingencies, and potential outcomes, that means the deeper and more intricate a character’s reasoning, the harder it is for an opponent to predict, disrupt, or counter their plans. This makes them inherently more difficult to outsmart.

Highly complex feats often involve deception, misdirection, and psychological manipulation, which create uncertainty for opponents. An opponent with lower intellectual complexity may struggle to understand the full scope of the strategy, let alone counter it. Which means if an opponent cannot fully grasp the layers or underlying logic of a plan, they are unlikely to

devise an effective countermeasure. This gives the more complex thinker a significant advantage.

Characters with high complexity are often adaptable and can adjust their strategies in real-time based on changing circumstances. This adaptability makes it difficult for opponents to pin them down or exploit weaknesses. An opponent with lower complexity may rely on static or predictable strategies, which are easier to counter. In contrast, a complex thinker can reframe situations, manipulate risk, and create traps that evolve as the scenario unfolds.

Highly complex thinkers often demonstrate foresight, anticipating multiple steps ahead and preparing for various outcomes. This makes it difficult for opponents to catch them off guard or force them into unfavorable positions. A rival with lower foresight or simpler reasoning is unlikely to anticipate the complex thinker's moves, leaving them vulnerable to being outmaneuvered.

Complex thinkers often exploit the intellectual limitations of their opponents. They design strategies that take advantage of their opponent's predictability, emotional vulnerabilities, or lack of foresight.

Highly complex strategies are resistant to simplistic countermeasures. An opponent with lower intellectual complexity may attempt to counter a complex plan with a basic or linear approach, which is unlikely to succeed.

Fixed-Countering:

Revolves around how well a character can counter and outmaneuver an adversity or opponent in a fixed-situation, whether it's about evading a trap, or setting one, improvising and with an acute ability to see through a strategy or deception, being resilient with a plan and overall having resistance towards manipulation and deception, this scales how hard is to counter a character in a fixed situation.

Non-Fixed Countering:

Pretty much the same here, just the difference is that we're in a non-fixed situation here, while keeping in mind the necessity of complexity and logic to be presented

Cat & Mouse Countering:

Applying more of a thorough resourceful ways and intricate meticulous strategies into either finding the mouse as a cat, or evading the cat as a mouse, while being logical and intricate.

Real Life Situation Countering:

Pretty much the same as NFS countering with only difference, is influence is presented and flexible through the comparison

Overall Situation Countering:

the overall countering points implemented by a character, for instance a character whose main point is FS, would have the upper hand against a character whose main point is NFS, because it's generally harder to perform and adapt in FS, if these characters faced more rule-free scenarios they would most likely dominate. So the final assessment would be as it follows: **FS > C&M > NFS ≥ RLS**

Feat Comparison process:

While comparing the feats of two or more characters either for a video or debate, the process to determine which is superior, after decomposing the feats and determining who takes each category, the process must be as follows.

1. Determine Overall Logical tier (e.g. Situational Problem solver)
2. Determine Overall Complexity tier (e.g. Mastermind Thinker)
3. Resource Management (who overcome total disadvantageous situation just with low resources)
4. Situation Hostility (who faced the most dangerous situations)
5. Situation Complexity (who faced more complex/restricted situations)
6. Adversary Force (who faced the sharpests rivals)
7. Feat Complexity (who has the overall most complex feats)
8. Feat Consistency (who has the overall most consistent feats)
9. Layered Countering (who is hardest to counter in layered countering)

By doing this process, the best feat is guaranteed to come on top, obviously the feat or characters that takes the most categories will take the win.

Addressing Doubts:

Why should I use Intricatelogy instead of other methods?

You can use the scaling system you want, we respect all these systems, the creators of these and those who use them, however there are undeniable flaws in them:

The flaw in Narrative Scaling is self-explanatory, it relies heavily on statements, which are not reliable for evaluating something as complex as intelligence. For example, let's say Character A is considered the smartest in their verse. However, a statement claims that Character B is even smarter. According to Narrative Scaling, Character B would be ranked higher, even if there is no actual evidence of their intelligence. This lack of proof makes no sense. An even bigger issue is that Character B cannot be scaled against anyone outside their verse. If there is no concrete evidence of their strategic abilities, how can we assess their skill in strategy or planning? While we know that Character B is smarter than Character A, we have no way of determining if they are actually better at strategy, planning, or other aspects of intelligence.

How Intricatelogy solves it:

Intricatelogy prioritizes on-screen feats and visible complexity, ensuring that intelligence is assessed based on demonstrated abilities rather than statements or narrative implications.
Example: Instead of accepting that "Character B is smarter than Character A" based on a statement,
Intricatelogy requires logical proof and complex reasoning from Character B's feats to validate their intelligence.

The flaw in normal scaling is that it takes everything in consideration, but doesnt gives priority to real intelligence, complexity, logic, just all can be used and everything holds the same weight, which might sound good on paper, but when it comes to intelligence and outsmarting as we have explained above, logic and complexity are more viable indicators of someone's intelligence, normal scaling it nearly has the same issues as narrative scaling so not much to talk about

How Intricatelogy solves it:

Intricatelogy explicitly prioritizes logic and complexity as the primary metrics for intelligence. This ensures that characters are evaluated based on the depth and sophistication of their reasoning, rather than superficial or unrelated factors.
Example: A character who solves a complex, multi-layered problem with logical consistency will rank higher than one who relies on brute force or luck, even if both achieve the same outcome.

The flaw in Stop Scaling is that it dismisses all off-screen feats, as well as the context of situation, it does not even ensures the feat is logic, it just matters it was executed on-screen dismissing how strong is the realism of the logic applied on it

How Intricatelogy solves it:

In Intricatelogy, off-screen feats are totally valid, and even thought onscreen feats are naturally scaled higher just for the fact of being os-screen, layered offscreen feats can still rank high as long they are build in logic and distribute in layers. We also take in extreme importance the context of the situation, such as the adversary's strength, the complexity and vire.

The flaw in Proven Ability is that despite its emphasis on empirical evidence and logical proof, PA still relies heavily on interpretation of feats, statements, and narrative implications. Different users may interpret the same feat or statement in vastly different ways, leading to inconsistent scaling results. The concept of countering based on character types (e.g., Aggressive Planner vs. Passive Detective) is inherently subjective. There is no objective metric to determine which type counters another, leading to potential bias or inconsistency in arguments.

How Intricatelogy solves it:

Intricatelogy provides a structured framework for evaluating feats based on logical coherence and complexity, reducing the room for subjective interpretation. It avoids the subjectivity of countering by focusing on the intricacy of a character's reasoning and how difficult it is to counter, rather than relying on vague character types, Intricatelogy uses Layered Countering, which demonstrates that the deeper and more layered a character’s logic and complexity are, the less likely it is for someone with lower intellectual intricacy or logical depth to successfully outsmart them.

The flaw of complexity scaling is that it mainly focus in which feat is harder to execute, leading to inconsistent intellectual analysis

How Intricatelogy solves it:

Intricatelogy evaluates complexity not just in terms of difficulty but also in terms of logical coherence and depth of reasoning. This ensures that feats are assessed holistically, considering both the intricacy of the solution and the logical soundness of the thought process.

Example: A character who devises a simple but highly logical and effective solution will still rank well, even if the feat is not the most complex.

The flaw of logical scaling is mainly that it is hard to scale basic in logic, and it never provided a clear explanation of logic and the logical tiers that can determine which logic is superior

How Intricatelogy solves it:

Intricatelogy provides a clear hierarchy of logic by evaluating feats based on their logical depth and sophistication. It distinguishes between instinctive logic (e.g., reacting to situations based on intuition and pattern recognition) and Strategic logic (e.g., Using structured logic to deconstruct complex problems, identify patterns, and create multi-layered strategies. Their plans are built on a foundation of logical coherence, ensuring that each step follows rationally from the previous one).

Why is Intricatelogy better?

While all scaling systems have their strengths and weaknesses, the analytical process is often left entirely to the scaler, with little to no guidance on how to properly evaluate intelligence. This lack of structure leads to inconsistent scaling, where different scalers can interpret the same media and feats in vastly different ways, even when using the same system. Such inconsistencies undermine the reliability and objectivity of intelligence scaling.

Intricatelogy Scaling solves this problem by establishing a methodical and analytical framework for evaluating intelligence. Unlike other systems, Intricatelogy provides clear parameters and guidelines, ensuring that scalers can approach feats and comparisons in a consistent and logical manner. At its core, Intricatelogy prioritizes logic and complexity as the primary metrics for intelligence, ensuring that characters are assessed based on demonstrated feats rather than narrative hype or subjective interpretations. By focusing on these factors, the system emphasizes the depth, sophistication, and logical coherence of a character's reasoning, problem-solving, and strategic abilities.

One of Intricatelogy's greatest strengths is its ability to minimize subjectivity through a structured framework and a strong reliance on on-screen feats. This approach reduces the influence of vague statements or assumptions, ensuring that scaling is grounded in empirical evidence and logical analysis.

The system also encourages detailed analysis of feats, requiring scalers to break down the thought process, variables, and logical steps involved. This level of scrutiny ensures that scaling is accurate, consistent, and reflective of the character's true intellectual capabilities. To further support this process, Intricatelogy introduces specific tools and parameters, such as Logical Tiers, Complexity Tiers, Layered Decomposition, and Layered Countering. These tools guide scalers through the evaluation process, ensuring fairness and objectivity while maintaining a high standard of analysis.

By combining all these elements, Intricatelogy not only prioritizes the most important factors in intelligence, but also provides a thoughtful and methodical process for scaling. This ensures that characters are evaluated fairly and consistently, regardless of the scaler's personal biases or interpretations. In doing so, Intricatelogy sets a new standard for intelligence scaling, offering a reliable and objective system that stands above the rest.

Should I scale a character based on their best feat, or should all their feats be analyzed?

In intricatelogy scaling, analyzing a character's overall feats is more reliable than relying solely on their overall best feat. We recommend having in consideration all the characters' feats, since some of them might be better in categories such as deception and strategy, while others might be better in manipulation and planning. So yes, you can scale a character with their strongest feat, but their strongest feat in different categories, not just the overall strongest feat.

Which is better: one 10/10 feat or four 8/10 feats?

The key categories in intricatelogy scaling are effectiveness, adaptability, and complexity, with their importance ranked as follows: Complexity ≥= Effectiveness ≥ Adaptability Let's compare two characters: Character A, who has one 10/10 feat, and Character B, who has four 8/10 feats. Character A demonstrates exceptional effectiveness and complexity but lacks adaptability due to having only one major feat. On the other hand, Character B shows strong adaptability by achieving multiple great feats, but they may fall short in either complexity, logic or effectiveness. Overall, Character A ≥ Character B in intricatelogy.

Is Effectiveness important in complexity?

Yes it is, in fact, even if a feat is hyper-layered in complexity and uses strategic logic, if it doesn't achieve its goal, will never be a 10/10 feat, it is rather either a 9/10 or 9.5/10. Intelligence is about complexity and logic, but if a feat doesn't achieve the main goal it was designed for, means it wasn't that well constructed.

Are theories accepted in Intricatelogy?

In Intricatelogy Scaling, we ensure that every feat has a clear explanation and is fully understandable. When it comes to theories, they may seem acceptable because there is nothing directly contradicting them, and they appear logical. However, they lack definitive confirmation. Therefore, while theories are accepted in Intricatelogy Scaling, they are nerfed to account for the uncertainty. For example, if a theoretical feat is rated 10/10, it would be downgraded to 9/10. A case in point is Hal's 2SD, which is considered valid in Intricatelogy Scaling, but its rating is slightly reduced.

Do feats need to be well explained to scale higher?

Absolutely no, in Intricatelogy we take the job of vertically decompose the feat to unravel how good it is, ultimately, a character who has very good explained feats compared to another who barely does will have the same equality in this scaling, however by doing the

Feat Decomposition and afterwards scale it with our criteria, the true strength of the feat will reveal.

How did this scaling method idea come out?

We were discussing various scaling methods, such as Normal, Proven Ability, Stop, and Complexity. From our perspective, each of these methods had flaws. To create a clearer and more effective approach, we developed Intricatelogy Scaling as a refined and improved scaling method.

Intricatelogy Tier:

Now as the creators of Intricatelogy, we wanna share a short tier list of characters that are ranked as top, high, medium and low in intricatelogy.

Top tier **(Strategic Thinker in Logic and Mastermind Thinker in complexity**, characters who can execute complex thoughtful feats with robustness and adaptability that's unmatched, have very logical and layered feats, making their countering almost impossible, these characters faced sharp adversary force, as well as very complex situations that pushed their intellect to overcome situations where they were in total disadvantage)

Examples: Akiyama, Akagi, Baku, Michael Scofield, Sherlock Holmes

High tier (**Strategic Thinker in logic and Advanced Thinker in complexity**. Characters that shine in logic but lack hyper-layered feats in some categories, these characters can execute great feats and come up with innovative brilliant tactics amidst the chaos, these characters faced great adversary strength, difficult challenges, but their resource management is slightly below compared with top tier characters)

Examples: Tokuchi Toua, Zero, Hal, CTW L, Kanade, Yokoya

Mid tier (**Situational Problem Solver in logic, while either Advanced or Basic thinker in Complexity**. Characters who can still implement decent feats but neither their complexity, logic nor effectiveness compare to higher characters, these characters have some pretty much known offscreen feats that are unexplained and sometimes their feats are up to luck or outsider effects, meaning they cant control their plans 100% there is always a place for a setback, these characters can often get detached from their surroundings and can come up with good ideas and plans but not to the level of the other masterminds, some of them faced great opposite force, but not a situation as complex as high tier character)

Examples: L, Ayanokoji, Red John, Vincent Lalo, Lelouch, Light, Nagito, Mahone

Low tier: (**Instinctive thinker in Logic while Basic thinker in Complexity** characters whose feats are mostly very easy to counter if faced with a greater adversary with more use of logic and layers, these characters can come up with plans but take time and almost get duped fairly easily, these characters hardly ever face any adversity that's challenging or life threatening which makes their plans or strategies flimsy, their feats are basic in logic and single layered)

Examples: Yuuichi, Chishiya, Takuya, Yuuichi, BB, Suteguma.

With all being said, we hope you find this Intricatelogy introduction and guide helpful.

Our social media:

Teyfik: Tik Tok YouTube, Aki: TikTok Tokho: Tik Tok YouTube