

Five Predicted Signatures, and What a Failure of Each Would Mean

Where this framework is exposed. Five predicted signatures, each with a test and — the column that gives the table its value — what a failure would mean. A framework this broad can absorb a surprising amount of data unless it says in advance which failures are fatal and which are merely inconvenient, and that is what the third column is for. All five are open in the experimental sense: the prediction is on the page and the verdict is the next decade of measurements. In full: Table 54, p. 228.

Predicted signature	Test idea	What failure would mean
Current-locking constraints	Estimate event-level energy/charge/information budgets in repeated micro-events; test whether one locked ledger explains them.	Persistent inability to define a coherent event ledger would challenge Qi-QUA.
Selector behavior	Perturb pathway options and test whether realized trajectories follow a common PLA/PLT/MEPP/FEPstyle selector.	If no selector family fits across domains, Qi-EP loses force.
Two-knee scale signatures	Measure spectra, burst statistics, and fractal indicators under controlled conditions.	Absence of multiscale diagnostic structure would weaken Qi-CON.
Exploration-to-commitment lag	Time-resolve candidate-state exploration, branch selection, and stable report or action.	If selection/stabilization staging is absent, the DGI $\rightarrow$ GSSB $\rightarrow$ GA pipeline is incomplete.
Motion-conditioned model quality	Restrict action while preserving passive input and test whether internal model quality degrades.	Failure would challenge the action-conditioned observability theorem behind IH.