What is Derived Scaling?

What is Derived Scaling? Derived Scaling, in short, is a new form of scaling characters in SCD which mainly involves the context of which statements and off-screen feats are based off of, depending mainly on scalability and explanation. The main aim of this scaling is to clear misconceptions in how people scale characters in outsmarting battles/debates. For example; take those who use powerscaling as a factor to scale intelligence. If a character is omniscient, they automatically slam in every Scaling. Right? The short answer is no. To expand on this, if the character has little to no feats and statements in certain areas of outsmarting, these areas being the categories used in these comparisons. This applies in all scalings excluding Narrative (to my knowledge). The same would be said for Derived Scaling. The main difference, however, is that the statements and off-screen feats have to be explained. It does not matter if categories can be scaled through them, as without context, it will deem it as invalid and unusable to scale the character. Another thing I would like to mention is that this scaling is Subjective. It is not tied to its creator's opinions, and instead, anybody can make their own opinion and argue and debate on it. A reason for its subjectivity is the fact that statements can be interpreted and assumptions can be made. Overall, this scaling is not objective at all, and anybody can have their own takes.

Now, if we want to look into this system more, we will have to look into how both statements and off-screen feats will be treated in Derived Scaling. Off-Screen Feats, unlike what some of the community may interpret them as, are worth exactly as much as On-Screen Feats are. But in this scaling, they will be treated the same way as statements are treated, although they will still maintain their full worth. However, this is *only* if they are or can be explained correctly. In short, the same process of validation will have to be followed for both Statements and Off-Screen Feats, regardless of what they are worth or how
good they are/can be. It will not matter at all how good or impressive the feat is if it can not be explained correctly. And another thing that will have to be followed in the procedure of validating feats and statements is that the statement and/or the off-screen feat has to be able to be sorted into categories, at least to some degree or extent. If this is not the case, it will not be deemed as valid and will not count as a valid feat/statement, even if the feat is explained thoroughly.

There are some things I would like to address about this scaling, such as its stance on certain topics which normally impact most scaling systems in SCD. One of these things is Narrative. It is used a lot to scale characters in both Powerscaling and SCD (For example, one character is stated to be the embodiment of knowledge). There are many types of Narrative which are used in different scaling, such as unspoken, direct, etc. But Derived Scaling holds a different stance on Narrative. This being not to include it at all. The reason for this is that Narrative is implied through statements, most of them with no context. This automatically makes Narrative invalid, this includes every type of Narrative.

Another thing is Hax, Gadgets and Utility. This is also used in many scalings, especially normal scaling. Some examples of this include Shiro's future seeing abilities, Nagito with his luck, Fang

Yuan with Gu (Wisdom, Heavenly Secret, etc). In Derived Scaling, Hax *are* accepted, but on three conditions.

- It must not enhance the character's own ability to think, although you may use hax which can negatively affect them or hax which have negative side effects to them although they can be positive(Like Perfect Mode for Hal), as this will pose a bigger challenge for the character themselves. It's something like 'cheating' in a way. Take for example a man having to pass through a maze. Would it be fair if he could just break the walls and pass straight through easily? No. This is why hax, which enhances the character's ability to think, can't be used.

- For any Hax which can be used on others, their usage of their Hax is to implement their plans, strategy, tactics, etc. instead of enhancing their own thinking due to the first condition I mentioned.

- The feats and statements used, even with Hax, must follow the same validation process as it would without Hax.

Now that all this is sorted out, I would like to state some differences between certain scalings which are similar to this one, the most similar ones being Methodology and Proven Ability. This is only due to the fact that there may be multiple misconceptions on Derived Scaling.

Methodology:

Both Methodological Scaling and Derived Scaling have their strong points, each being useful for their different purposes. Derived Scaling being used to differentiate between the context of the feats/statements, and Methodological being used to measure the process of the feats/statements.They both have multiple similarities with each other. There are some major differences that set them apart, however.

So far, from what I myself know and from general knowledge of the topic of Methodological Scaling, the biggest difference I can highlight between Methodological and Derived Scaling, is the main basis and usage of both scalings. Methodological Scaling is mainly based off of the main process of the feat as well as the main point of the scaling, Methodology. Derived Scaling, however, broadens this topic. To expand on this a bit more, any sort of logical argument can be used in Derived Scaling. There is a condition however, and that is as I have explained before, the context of the statements and feats, more specifically, Off-Screen Feats, that can be accurately scaled and measured through categorical and well-explained context.

To explain further, I will be taking the points I have just mentioned and explaining them further. Methodological Scaling is mainly based on the process of the feat and the Methodology which it contains, or the system of methods used in the particular areas. In Derived Scaling, the process itself will never really matter by itself. In this scaling, the process of the feat/statement will depend on if it has a sturdy backbone to it, meaning it has to have explained context which can

be scaled. The system of methods too will need to be discarded if it doesn't meet the conditions which it is required to meet in this scaling.

However, both can effectively be used in Derived Scaling, but it is only if they can meet the necessary criteria and match with both contexts, essentially making them valid. But unlike Methodology, other logical means of determining the placement of a feat/statement, even if it is unrealistic, will be validated. Again, this is only if it can match both conditions of the contexts stated above. The context and conditions themselves are the main basis for Derived Scaling, which is the main factor to be looked into to effectively validate statements in this scaling.

To state some similarities, let us start with the stance of both on statements and off-screen feats. Both are highly similar to each other, sharing the same views, these views being that although the validation for these is different from each other in the respective scalings, the stance they take will remain the same, due to the fact that in both scalings, both Off-Screen Feats and Statements strictly cannot be validated without explanation and no context feats, regardless of achievement(It depends on if you include Narrative in Derived, then the stance on it is different).

Another similarity can also be their Subjectivity. The reason for this is that nothing, and absolutely nothing, is based on any objectivity in any sort. Both have different reasons for this however, with the main reason for Derived Scaling being Subjective is the vast amount of interpretation and assumptions being overlooked in validating statements to look towards the main explanation and its scalability. This removes any possibility of the Scaling being tied to its creator's opinions. Anybody is free to argue about, debate and/or peacefully discuss about the thoughts and opinions which differ among them, or which are similar with one another. Both scalings are subjective and no opinion is forced upon those who use them. This is something both of these scalings can agree on.

Proven Ability:

Derived Scaling is extremely similar to many scalings used in the community, but the one that strikes the most resemblance to it is easily Proven Ability. Proven Ability Scaling, is by far, the most used as well as the most popular scaling in the community other than Normal Scaling and Narrative Scaling (possibly). Both Derived Scaling and Proven Ability Scaling are alike to the point where some people confuse Derived Scaling with Proven Ability even after explaining thoroughly (I am looking at you, WanderLust.). This is the main reason why both scalings have to be differentiated, to avoid confusion from others and to clear doubts about Derived Scaling. They have a few major and minor differences that set both apart, which will be explained in this specific section.

One major misconception made by people (who I've given a chance to review the scaling) is that Proven Ability also uses the same system to validate statements and off-screen feats. This is actually false, although half-true. It uses this type of system for scaling Off-Screen Feats, and it doesn't treat Statements the same way. Instead, how they treat Statements in Proven Ability is

a lot more different than what people may think it is. In Proven Ability, statements can only be considered valid and usable if they are spoken by a character with a trustworthy narration or if they are stated directly by an inverse narration. In Derived Scaling, Statements have the same process of validation for Off-Screen Feats, meaning it has to be explained enough that the reader can directly make a logical assumption for it/if the reader can comprehend the feat done by the character in a way that the statements are explained, and if the statement can be scaled category-wise (FSIQ, Overall EQ, Strategy, Manipulation, etc). Notice how I put and instead of or. This is because both contexts are needed to validate Off-Screen Feats and Statements, and that even without one of the two contexts, it will automatically be invalid. This is the MAIN difference between Proven Ability and Derived Scaling.

Another difference which I would like to highlight is the stance of Hax and Narrative in both scalings. Both of these things are normally valid in a lot of scalings, excluding Stop Scaling, but because the scaling has been changed to Methodology Scaling, this has been sorted out. Anyway, back to the main topic. The stance of Narrative in Derived Scaling is simple. It's not included at all, regardless of the type of Narrative being used. The reasons for this is that they fall under statements, being both stated by the character and the narration itself. Both have to follow the process of validation for Statements, which will not really work for them due to the fact that Narrative goes unexplained and can't exactly be sorted into an essential category/subcategories. The stance of Narrative, specifically Unspoken Narrative, in Proven Ability is as follows (quoting the Proven Ability Document); “This sort of narrative is gradually understood by consuming the series and (usually) never outright stated directly, it’s the implications that keep the characteristics of any given character consistent with how the author wrote them. An example would be certain characters being more “cunning” than “intelligent”, to which they’ll naturally have little to no IQ feats or narrative but be a lot more focused on manipulation and deception. Or characters that use certain functionalities like Riku and Lelouch respectively being better planners than strategists in retrospect, to which it makes sense that their feats consistently prove that. This also extends to characters being implied to be superior to other characters in GAI or CPI due to “intelligence” statements that can be assessed to be describing a character’s GAI, though just like with anything else in this system, a strong case should be made to make it logical and consistent to believe.”. This falls under Proven Ability's classification for characters, which are known as “character kits”, which is used in the scaling to destroy the A>B>C system most scalings follow.

The stance of Hax is a complicated thing to explain. Hax is normally used in Powerscaling, but some Scaling Systems in SCD use Hax to scale characters, such as Normal Scaling and Narrative Scaling. But these two scalings; Proven Ability and Derived Scaling; hold different stances towards Hax. In Derived Scaling, Hax is permissible to use under a few conditions. These being that if they do not enhance the character's thinking, as it would be more of a “cheat” to do so(is explained in the first section of the document), if they can be used on others, they have to be used to implement their thinking or strategy instead of enhancing their own thinking quality due to what I mentioned beforehand, and lastly, if the feats which use hax can be validated using the same process which they'd have to follow anyway without hax. In Proven Ability, the character can be separated from the character with their Hax implemented if they can

be considered a part of the character themselves. Both the thought process and the way they use them is factored into the base abilities of the character, which is a similarity between both. The character's inferences also wouldn't scale off the gadget itself, which is yet again a similarity between both scalings. The main difference in the scalings from how they use Hax is that Derived Scaling used a certain process to validate Hax, and doesn't separate the Hax from the character themselves, while in Proven Ability, it doesn't follow this process, but it does separate the character with and without the hax is they can be considered a part of the character themselves.

Derived Scaling Subset: HNI(Hax Narrative Included) Derived Scaling/HNI Derived (Couldn't think of a good name)

I'm only doing this so yall don't complain ong

HNI Derived Scaling; HNI Derived, or Hax-Narrative-Included Derived, is a subset of Derived Scaling which includes Hax and Narrative, whilst following the same system which the original Derived Scaling follows. The difference is that both Hax and Narrative are allowed. Narrative Statements here can be separated from other Statements. This also means in same-verse or equalized verse matchups regarding Outsmarting, the Outcome may be unfair towards one side. But you may exclude some aspects of Narrative to be even. If you include Hax, separating the characters with and without Hax is the best route to go for, as it is done in Proven Ability. A difference however, is that in Proven Ability, this is only done if the Hax is directly tied to the character themselves, whilst in HNI, this is not the case, as any Hax may be used if they are related to Outsmarting. The reason for this change is to make this subset of Derived Scaling more diverse in feel and in usage. The same system for the original Derived Scaling is followed; Off-Screen Feats and Statements, this time excluding Narrative Statements, are only valid IF they are explained in a way that is comprehensible and if can be separated into categories. You may use this subset in place of the Original Derived if you wish.

Final words?

I would like to thank those who have taken their time to read this doc. I appreciate every minute of time you have taken to read this effort at making a new scaling system. Derived Scaling is a new scaling, and will have many changes implemented in it from time to time. Thank you for reading, and Takuya solos.

Credits to:

- WhatAmI
- Liminal
- ~~Bonosfear~~ ChronosFear
- WanderLustAdventurer

- PatchiooX
- Shindo Hiraina