SAMPLE, NOT CLIENT WORK · A MADE-UP CLIENT

Signal v4: does the headline number reproduce?

Triage memo. One strategy, one number: can we get the claimed result out of the code and data the client sent? The strategy, the client and every number are made up.

RESULT · REPRODUCES

Your code gives your number, every time.

Re-run 20 times on two machines: +38.0% a year each time, within 0.31 points. The hit rate was identical on every run.

RETURN A YEAR

+38.0%

claimed +38.0%. Our re-runs: +37.8% to +38.1%

CALLS RIGHT

61.4%

claimed 61.4%. The same on every run

RUNS

20

on two machines, plus a run with the hidden ordering setting changed

THE CLAIM, RE-RUN

WHAT WAS CLAIMED	CLAIMED	RE-RUN	SPREAD	RESULT
Return a year, 2023–2025	+38.0%	+38.0%	±0.31	Reproduces
Calls right	61.4%	61.4%	0	Reproduces
Worst fall from a peak	-11.2%	-11.2%	0	Reproduces
Calls made	7,104	7,104	0	Reproduces
Same answer on a second machine	–	yes	–	Holds

What we looked at: The code, three years of order-book snapshots, the price data used to score each call, and the two documents making the claim (the strategy memo and the investor one-pager). **Scope:** check 1 of 8, does it repeat?

WHAT THIS MEANS

The claimed record comes out of the code and data you sent, and it comes out the same every time. That is a real credential: most strategies that reach us fail here. It does not mean the number is right. A Triage tests whether the result repeats, not whether the test behind it was realistic. While re-running it we noticed four things that could move the number a lot; they are listed on page 3 as questions, not findings.

Important notice. This report was prepared by Arcobaleno Research solely for Example Capital Ltd under an engagement letter dated 1 October 2026, and is addressed only to Example Capital Ltd. It reports on whether the headline record claimed for Signal v4 for 2023–2025 (+38.0% a year) could be reproduced from the material supplied by Example Capital Ltd, as at 31 December 2025. It is a review of a trading strategy and its backtest: it is not an audit of financial statements and not a statutory audit (revisjon) under the Norwegian Auditors Act (revisorloven); it is not investment advice, and not an assessment of future performance. We have not verified the supplied material except as stated under “Basis, assumptions and limits” on page 2. Any other reader receives this report for information only: we have accepted no responsibility to that reader, who may not rely on it for any investment or other decision. **A reader who wishes to rely on this report must first agree terms with us in writing.**

BASIS, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITS

What this report rests on, set out before the findings. Read it first: every conclusion that follows depends on it.

MATERIAL REVIEWED	The strategy's code (repository at commit 4e1c9a2), the data it runs on (order-book snapshots for 12 markets, 2023–2025), and the strategy memo and investor one-pager that state the claim. The sha256 of each archive as received is in checks/RECEIVED.sha256.
AS AT	The material runs to 31 December 2025. This memo is dated 9 November 2026 and is not updated after delivery.
NOT INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED	All of it. A Triage re-runs the client's own code on the client's own data and changes nothing.
WHAT WAS TESTED	Check 1 only, does it repeat: 20 runs on two machines, plus one with the hidden ordering setting changed. Passed.
WHAT WAS NOT TESTED	Checks 2 to 8: whether the test is realistic (costs, prices, fills, timing, the market list, how the version was chosen, how the claim is stated). Also the live trading system, counterparty, custody and margin risks, and future performance.
PRINCIPAL ASSUMPTIONS	The environment the client described (library versions, settings) is the one the claimed record was made in. If it wasn't, a match here says nothing about the original run.
SEALED OR WITHHELD	None. The client showed us everything we asked for.

CHECK 1, IN FULL

CHECK 1 — **Does it repeat?** — Passed — no change

Same answer on every run and every machine.

WE ASKED If we run your code again, on a different computer, do we get the same number?

We ran it 20 times on two different machines, and again with a hidden setting changed that often reshuffles how programs order their work. The yearly return never moved by more than 0.31 points, and the hit rate was identical every time.

This is a real credential. Most strategies that reach us fail here. Because the number came back the same, the other seven checks could test the method instead of chasing a moving target. Passing doesn't mean the number is right, only that it's stable.

NOTHING TO FIX, ONE THING TO KEEP

Lock those settings in your automated tests, so the result stays repeatable as the code changes.

Effort: under an hour, once

WHAT WE NOTICED ON THE WAY

Not findings: we didn't test them. Each one is what a later check would measure, and each could move the number a lot.

WHAT WE SAW	WHERE	THE CHECK THAT WOULD TEST IT
Every trade is given the cheaper waiting-order fee	the cost settings	3 · Are the costs real?
Calls are scored against a charting website's price, not the traded exchange's	the scoring script	4 · Is the data clean?
The test assumes every waiting order is filled at the mid-price	the fill model	7 · Could you have traded it?
The code holds 41 versions of the settings; the best one was shipped	the settings folder	6 · Was it cherry-picked?

YOUR NEXT STEP

- **If the number only needs to repeat**, for example for an internal record, this memo is enough.
- **If investors will rely on it**, the four questions above need answers first. A Full audit tests them, and the other four checks, with a script for each finding.
- **The Triage fee counts in full** towards a Full audit of the same strategy booked within 30 days. A Triage is the first step of a Full audit, so nothing is done twice.

WHAT WE DID NOT CHECK

- Whether the test is realistic: costs, prices, fills, timing, the market list, how the version was chosen. That is checks 2 to 8.
- Anything after 31 December 2025. The material supplied ends there.
- The live trading system, and counterparty, custody and margin risks.

CHECK IT YOURSELF

The re-run is a script delivered with this memo. The fctools script is free and public.

TO REPRODUCE	SCRIPT OR FILE
1 · the same answer on every run	`fctools/fc1_reproduce.py`
The run log: 20 runs, both machines	`checks/fc1_runs.csv`

INDEPENDENCE

- We don't carry out fixes on a strategy we have audited. An auditor who also sells the repair has a reason to make the problems look bigger.
- Nor do we tell you how to make the signal better. Making your measurement honest is our job; making the strategy better is your edge.
- Our fee is fixed and doesn't depend on the result. We hold no position in the markets this strategy trades.
- This is a check of a reported track record. It is not investment advice, and not an offer to manage money.

We re-ran the claimed record from the client's own code and data, without changing anything. The result below says whether it repeats; it says nothing yet about whether the test was realistic.

CHECKED BY	CLAIM CHECKED	DATE	RESULT
Duy Vo ARCOBALENO RESEARCH · ARCOBALENO.CLOUD	Strategy memo and investor one-pager (made up)	9 November 2026	REPRODUCES