Proven Ability Scaling

2025 - April Update

Introduction

Proven Ability has many misunderstood concepts about it and this document will hopefully clear up those misconceptions and explain in full what the rules of this scaling system are and how they get applied when scaling characters from both different shows and characters of the same shows all varying in the types of feats they display.

Before moving further I should put forth that I by no means am I forcing this type of scaling on anyone, interpretations of fictional works are purely subjective, and this scaling is simply another subjective method to compare characters from different fictional works; anyone is free to disagree with it, after all, the intention behind scaling is mainly having fun, so everyone should scale in the way they enjoy the most.

How it works

PA (Proven Ability) Scaling moves from the proven to the provable when evaluating feats, it operates under the idea of Empirical Evidence and Logical Proof, which is contradictory to Stop's scaling for example, which only emphasizes Empirical Evidence and dismisses all logical evidence, even if the product of the scaling is non-holistic.

I'll disclose shortly how to evaluate PA depending on the type of feat/statement presented, but first, I should elaborate on the fact that while scaling PA allows and heavily encourages interpretation and analysis, it does NOT support baseless assumptions like in Assumed Ability Scaling, known as Narrative or Normal Scaling otherwise; characters can never be scaled beyond what can be proven they can perform.

Any given character can be comfortably scaled to where their feats are, and more so, they can be scaled slightly higher in certain categories if it's provable without assumptions or vague interpretations that such scaling would be logically possible.

On-screen and off-screen feats hold the same degree of importance, though it's obviously easier to argue with on-screen feats, the only measurement of superiority between them is the quality of the feat itself.

When determining the winner in an outsmarting scenario, PA scaling only measures the outcome for any scenario given by the user, it's not an end-all be-all type of scaling where there's one type of scenario everyone must stick with, scaling NFS and FS and RLS and MB in this scaling are all valid

General Outsmarting in this system is scaled not by a scenario, but by comparing the characters' ability directly and how they would fare against each other.

Characters that emphasize mainly long-term strategies could be countered by characters that specialize in breaking down huge strategies by short-term tactics, and so on.

This makes it so that a huge variety of takes can be argued, as long as you know both of the characters you're comparing well.

So as explained, PA scaling doesn't concern feat-to-feat comparison, but rather comparing the thought process and outsmarting style of characters.

Comparing scenarios in PA scaling stems from the same idea, except scenarios like FS and NFS do NOT determine General Outsmarting, but anyone CAN scale them as their own scenarios whilst still using the rules of PA scaling.

Scenarios commonly used in scaling:

Liar Game (FS)
Tomodachi Game (FS)
RLS: Scratch/Influene (NFS)
Cat-Mouse Situation (NFS)
Manipulation Battle (NFS)

With the mechanics of the scaling out of the way, we can move to the evaluation of feats, statements, and narrative.

On-screen feats

Feats fall under “on-screen” criteria if they are performed at least 50% on-screen, explanation is irrelevant as one would need to prove the logical consistency of it rather than use it as an actual analysis or proof for the validity of the feat.

A character “explaining” their feat shouldn’t mean that the feat is automatically logical and valid if the explanation itself makes little to no sense or if it doesn’t follow the actual line of events.

Implications of feats should count as on-screen feats if at least most of the actions are shown but lack context, the context being off-screen doesn’t mean the feats are as well.

Off-screen feats

Feats with less than 50% of their overall actions being on-screen would put them under these criteria, analysis for off-screen feats under this scaling should fit 2 conditions to be considered valid:

1- Consistency with the main narrative and the character's general approach and actions.
2- Holds a sustainable amount of logical and/or empirical evidence to prove the direct actions of the feat.

However, it's important to note that off-screen feats are NOT equal to statements, if the "feat" in question is stated to have happened in such a way that it's literally impossible to understand the process of, then it doesn't identify as a valid feat in this scaling, and at most, can simply be used for scaling FSIQ under the stated conditions.

Additionally, to make it clear-cut:
1- A statement by PA's definition is a narrative prospect that implies/states that X character is capable of a certain level of skill/cognition, either via inference, personal guesswork, or potentially general narrative implications.

2- An off-screen feat by PA's definition is a narrative material that explains/states that X had already done a certain level of skill/cognition, whether it be to achieve a certain goal or otherwise.

In both cases, they still follow the rules followed in PA to be valid

Statements

Statements can only be valid if they are spoken by a character with a trustworthy narration, or if they are stated directly by an in-universe narration. Author statements that aren't directly a part of actual material for the series aren't considered if they directly clash with the story's own narrative.

Statements can be used for categories where there is no need for interpretation, or at least, it's not needed to a degree with multiple equally plausible interpretations pop up that make it impossible to discern the meaning of the statement.

If a character is stated by a reliable source to be able to perform this VSI feat, they scale to it by Proven Ability.

If a character is stated to be able to perform a degree of EP, they scale to it by Proven Ability.

However, the same can't be applied to strategy, or even less, General Outsmarting as a whole due to the sheer amount of inconsistencies it would create in the logical narrative of any given series and in scaling in general.

To extend upon this, in-verse statements apply to this rule generally, if a character who admires X heavily says X can do something very easily, it should be taken with a grain of salt, and it's better to search for more proof of the statement.

However, when it comes to author statements, they are completely valid if the source is a data book, as it's a part of the canonical material for the verse and can't be denied, and if contradictions occur with the main material, there should be interpretations that can fix such contradictions logically.

But in the case of author statements via interviews, the situation is slightly different, and these conditions must be met:
1. There's a valid source to prove the statement is true, and was actually said by the author.

2. The statement logically follows and be easily interpreted via the source material itself, and hence said statement **will be a confirmation rather than proof.**

Unspoken narrative

This specific section focuses on the logical consistency within any narrative in any given fictional universe.

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 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.

Hax + Gadgets

When it comes to Hax and Gadgets, the default is to not include them when comparing the characters in outsmarting, however, when it comes to Hax, as in some cases they're considered a part of the character themselves, they can be used when distinguished from the character's base form, eg; "Nagito (with luck)"

In both cases the characters' thought process when using the Hax/Gadget, or the way they use them or their inferences from the information they get from them, is factored into the character's base abilities.

Oliver Queen from the show "Arrow" is shown multiple times to use gadgets for information gathering, and while his information gathering wouldn't scale off the gadget, his logical inferences from the information provided would remain unaffected from the usage of the gadget when scaling by PA.

When it comes to scaling General Outsmarting, only a character's base form can be used to directly compare their proven abilities, yet when it comes to Real Life Situations, characters can be distinguished with their appropriate Hax and Gadgets and can use them within the same limitations they have in canon.

E.g; Olive Queen (with Gadgets) vs Nagito Komadea (With Luck) in RLS (Scratch)

It must be added that RLS work differently than General Outsmarting, as in, the way to win is "Outsmarting" your opponent in general in a way where they're incapacitated from continuing the match, like (and not limited to):

- Killing your opp (directly or indirectly)
- Framing your opp for something and getting them into jail
- "Trapping" your opp so they can't continue the match
- Forcing them to give up somehow (like destroying them mentally)

Main Rule: It has to be done via "Outsmarting" them, so simply being strong enough to one-tap them doesn't count (looking at Goku Scalers rn)

Countering and Character types

Characters in Proven Ability can be categorized into different “Types” depending on their “Approach” and “Kit”

Approaches include Aggressive characters, Passive, and Balanced ones.

Kits include Planners, Strategists, and Detectives.

Any character can be categorized up to the individual's understanding of them, the criteria for categorizing a character’s approach and kit comes down to their most dominant and consistent feats and narrative.

Examples:

Takuya Yagami - Constantly uses large-scale strategies to achieve as many objectives as possible: Aggressive Strategist.

L Lawliet - Specializes in short-term tactics through information control and setting traps, relies on intuition and patience and long-term observation and information gathering for his schemes: Passive Planner.

Riku Dola - Develops plans on the spot, utilizes information control for long-term goals, uses basic strategies to cover for complex planning: Aggressive Planner.

Patrick Jane - Utilizes mainly observation and logical reasoning, can switch between trap-setting and aggressive tactical attacks depending on his opponent: Balanced Detective.

Arguments for approaches and kits countering each other are down to the individual and have no based metric, this is the functionality that destroys the A > B > C notion that most other scaling systems follow.

Next off is Countering; fundamentally, this is a concept that existed since comparisons of fictional characters did, but in the scale of the intel scaling community that currently exists, this is the first Scaling System to introduce it, conversely, Countering in Proven Ability context is the potency in which a character can abuse specific vulnerabilities or potential loopholes in the way they operate. The most basic example would be that a character with narcissisticly aggressive tendencies like Hannibal Lecter would be a great counter for an easily provoked and egotistical character like Light Yagami, and while this doesn't directly imply Hannibal > Light, it makes the resulted outcome to be tipped closer to Hannibal's favor ON TOP of the result of scaling them against each other in terms of ability.

Countering can be expressed in 2 ways in Proven Ability:

1- Countering based off opposing types:
In this example, characters whom inherently function in a certain manner in outsmarting scenarios, like perhaps a Passive Detective, tend to give certain other characters natural advantages, like an Aggressive Planner would be in this case.
Since in this example, the First character will be more prone to collecting information and details about their opponent and only making moves when necessary, meanwhile the Second character will be acting far more quickly and intend to set up all their tactics and traps in advance which would make it harder for the First character to discern the true intentions of the Second character and act accordingly in time.

2- Countering based off Vulnerability and Invulnerability:
This example can be manifested in several ways, but the core idea is that it doesn't rely on Character Types, but rather Characters' Mentalities.
Similarly to what was stated before with Hannibal and Light, one could argue that a character like Baku would counter Johan due to being able to withstand his general manipulation methods and be generally unaffected by them due to having higher mental tolerance than Johan's typical victims and having no vulnerabilities that Johan could extrapolate methodologically.

Such descriptions of this type of countering can be summarized as:
A- U>R Outscaling: Where the First character's EU shows higher potency than the Second character's ER, enough to create a power gap in their match-up.

B- Best-Kit Resistance (BKR): Where the First character has demonstrations of being able to directly resist or outscale the Second character's best approach or tactic in a general match-up.

It must be noted, however, that countering in G.O. should be the universal standard for Countering in PA, and that it would naturally carry over to other scenarios, but Countering that is strictly based on other scenarios' conditions, doesn't carry over to G.O.

Example:
1- Countering based on Hax: If X can resist a sort of Magic manipulation from Y, this would matter for an RLS, but it would have 0 effects on G.O.

Clearing Misconceptions

!! Proven Ability is a system designed to scale COTE higher

This sort of misconception ignores the fact that, while it's true that COTE characters scale higher in this scaling due to it prioritizing logic over narrative implications, COTE isn't the only verse that scales higher by PA.
Kakegurui, The Mentalist, Tomodachi Game, Liar Game, and several other verses scale higher using PA than they do in most other scaling systems.

!! Proven Ability values process only

If reading this document wasn't enough to debunk this, it will be stated once more here, the process matters more, but the difficulty of the context isn't voided, unlike Methodology scaling or Stop's scaling as examples.

!! Proven Ability demerits xyz characters

The same could be said about any scaling system, Stop's scaling demerits literally every verse that isn't Liar Game, Narrative/Normal scaling prioritizes verses with "high risk" in their mind games, and so on.

!! X > Y no diff in Z category by Proven Ability because X has an on-screen feat when Y doesn't

This misconception exists somehow despite this document explaining the complete opposite, needless to say, unless Y has no feats or statements or narrative for Z in question, this take is not valid.

!! Proven Ability isn't the best scaling objectively

Nor was it ever stated to be.

!! Proven Ability is a fixed scaling

Again, if reading this document wasn't enough to debunk this, it will be stated once more here: Proven Ability is lenient, nearly any "hot take" can be made as long as your argumentation follows the rules of the scaling. This isn't Stop's system where the scaling in question is catering to a single author's approach to writing smart characters, but rather a fluid metric that leaves as much room as possible for creative discussions regarding fictional match-ups.

!! Composite Scaling Is Consistent

Despite this being clearly implied in the doc, some people tend to overlook it; but scaling characters compositely is invalid. The result is a character who exists in multiple hypothetical timelines and continuities at the same time, which even if validated, is impossible to scale due to how they can't be connected to one storyline where all their feats actually happened.

!! X performed Z feat which is impossible logically, this scales them higher

Feats that are impossible logically, would naturally get attributed to a form of chance, luck, or guesswork. Even if the narrative implies the logical superiority of the feat, it has to be possible to at least explain even on a surface level for it to be logically valid and possible to scale.

PA Fallacies

Several people attempt to either "debunk" PA or make arguments of "scaling by PA" when it's not the case by applying fallacies; these fallacies will be adapted into PA just to simplify how they actually fit into these false arguments.

Appeal to Authority - *The Author's Take:* Should be obvious, but **NO ONE** can have an objective take in PA, anyone's takes are as good as mine as long as they're following PA rules.

Appeal to Ignorance - *The Need for Analysis:* PA encourages analysis, but nothing stops anyone from gauging the characters' abilities based on assumed analysis on them or even surface level analysis; though yes, it'd make them weaker than if you analyzed the full process, it's not a requirement to analyze them 120% before scaling them.

Texas Sharpshooter - *Objectifying Opinions:* The thought that X is great in PA because he's great in other scaling systems, and the reasons he's good in PA are the same reasons he's good in said other systems.

Denying The Antecedent - *No Ability is Proven:* It's the argument that PA shouldn't exist as a system because its rules don't allow a character to win via No Limit Fallacy, or that a character being weaker in PA is a product of bias against them simply because the nature of their feats prioritizes the lack of process for writing or enjoyability purposes.

No Limits Fallacy - *Assumed Ability:* The argument that a character being implied canonically to be intelligent makes it, so any logical inconsistencies are just a lack of understanding by us real humans; this argument is obviously dismissed easily via the authors of any fictional series being humans themselves - if a logical process doesn't exist, then the character simply didn't use logic, and hence, a better interpretation must be found.

Personal Incredulity and Appeal to Reality - *Laymen Limitations:* Any argument that only holds value by dismissing the context of the series the character is from.

Common Categories

These categories are not all mandatory for the scaling system, the categories will be colored as to indicate if they're necessary, replaceable or disposable, and if they are free points.

Intellectual Categories:
FSIQ: VSI + PSI + FRI + VCI + WMI + GAI + CPI + NVI
Fluid Intelligence: CPI(WMI>PSI) + Logical Reasoning + Adaptability + Learning Ability + Problem-Solving
General Intelligence: Crystallized Intelligence + Fluid Intelligence
Overall Thinking: Abstract Thinking + Divergent Thinking + Convergent Thinking
Overall Memory: Long-Term Memory + Short-Term Memory + WMI + SRI(NSI+STI)

General Tactics:
Planning: Coverage + Process + Aim
Strategy: Strategy Building + Resource Management + Strategy Success-rate + More Limitations + Decision-Making + Countering difficulty + Logical Prediction + Setting Traps + Strategy Length
Deception: Information Control + Acting Skills + Misdirection + Fabrication + Bluffing
Manipulation: Direct + Indirect + Emotional + Logical + Mass + Blackmail
Foresight: Trap Evasion + Anticipation
Tactics

Miscellaneous Categories:

Logical Reasoning: Deductive + Inductive + Abductive
EI: EP + EE + EF +EU + ER + EM

Freebies:
Intuitive Prediction: Intuition + Effective Guesswork
Abstract Control Over The Victim
Potential

Categories Definitions (WIP)

FSIQ (WISC):

WMI - Working Memory Index:

This index measures the ability to register, maintain and manipulate visual and auditory information in conscious awareness. These tasks measure one's skills in attention, concentration and mental reasoning, as well as visual and auditory discrimination. This skill is closely related to learning and achievement.

WMI has two subtests:

1. Digit Span:

A test for this generally involves the individual first repeating the digits in forward, then in reverse and finally in ascending order. This test measures **auditory recall, short-term memory and working memory.**

2. Picture Span:

This test requires memorizing parts of scene images while comprehending various scene situations simultaneously. This test measures **visual working memory capacity involved in remembering and comprehension.**

PSI - Processing Speed Index:

This index measures one's speed and accuracy of visual identification, decision-making and decision implementation. Performance is related to visual scanning, visual discrimination, short-term visual memory, visuomotor coordination and concentration. This skill may be important to one's development in reading and ability to think quickly in general. It is important to note that the information also must be applied in some way for it to be considered PSI. An example is the Flash Mental Arithmetic feat from Classroom Of The Elite.

PSI has 2 subtests:

1. Symbol Search:

A test for this generally involves the client, under time pressure, scanning a search group and indicating whether one of the symbols in the target group matches. This test measures **processing speed and working memory with visual stimuli.**

2. Coding:

A test for this generally involves the individuals recording associations between different symbols and numbers within time limits. This test measures **psychomotor speed** [*the amount of time taken to process a set of cognitive operations*], **ability to absorb new material, visual motor speed and drive for achievement.**

VCI - Verbal Comprehension Index:

This index reflects an individual's ability to understand, use and think with spoken language. It measures one's ability to access and apply acquired word knowledge. Specifically, this score reflects one's ability to verbalize meaningful concepts, think about verbal information and express oneself using words.
It has four subtests:
1. Information: [General Knowledge]
A test for this is generally aimed at determining how much general knowledge the client has accumulated from his environment. It reflects **ability to learn and recall facts, intellectual curiosity, quality of education, alertness to environment and retrieval of information from long-term memory.**
2. Vocabulary: [Word knowledge and application of it]
A test for this is aimed at determining how much general knowledge the client has by asking them to define words. It reflects **language development, expressing language skills, cultural and educational experiences, ability to use words appropriately and retrieval of information from long-term memory.**
3. Similarities: [Understanding the underlying patterns in the meaning of words]
A test for this is aimed at identifying the qualitative relationship between the two words. In general, it is the ability to represent common objects and concepts and being able to describe how they're similar. It reflects **abstract thinking skills, concept formation skills and verbal reasoning.**
4. Comprehension: [Social comprehension]
It assesses your ability to understand and apply general knowledge and social reasoning. Through questions that explore abstract concepts, proverbs, and everyday situations, the subtest reveals an individual's ability to **grasp complex information, make inferences, and apply knowledge to practical situations.**

VSI - Visual Spatial Index:

This index measures one's ability to evaluate visual details and understand visual-spatial relationships to construct geometric designs from a model. This skill requires visual-spatial reasoning, integration and synthesis of part-whole relationships, attentiveness to visual detail, sometimes using hand-eye coordination, and working quickly and efficiently with visual information.

VSI two subtests:

1. Block Design:

This subtest consists of two-dimensional designs which the client tries to copy using three-dimensional blocks. This subtest reflects **visual-motor skills, ability to analyze geometric patterns and part-whole recognition skills.**

2. Visual Puzzles:

In this subtest individuals view a completed puzzle and then select three response options that can be combined to reconstruct the puzzle. This subtest reflects **visual processing skills, attention to details, thinking with visual patterns and fluid reasoning skills.**

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.

FRI for the scaling of scaling it for 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 academical 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 problem in newly-found situations/scenarios with no to minimal usage of past information.

Emotional Intelligence (Ability Model):

1. Emotional Perception:
The ability to perceive emotions in others through facial expression, body language, pictures, voices, and reasoning.

2. Emotional Engagement (Intrapersonal Facilitation):
The ability to utilize one's emotions to achieve cognitive tasks.

3. Emotional Facilitation (Interpersonal Facilitation/Management):
The ability to recognize and utilize the emotional impact of one's actions on others and manage their emotional state.

4. Emotional Understanding:
The ability to understand the nuanced differences between overlapping and complex emotions beyond the surface recognition of facial features and body language.

5. Emotional Realization (Intrapersonal Understanding/Perception):
The ability to identify, recognize, and understand the emotional and cognitive shortcomings and nuances in one's self.

6. Emotional Management (Intrapersonal):
The ability to manage and disengage emotions at will.

Afterword

With this, I hope Proven Ability Scaling has been cleared up and fully understood by anyone reading.

If you plan to use this scaling, all that I ask is you use it genuinely and stick to its rules, and most importantly, have fun.