# Geometry-First Motion Analysis: A Descriptive Standard

How To Reason About Motion When Certainty Is Unavailable

Cassandra Perry

December 2025

## 1 Why This Exists

Motion analysis is often introduced through models—equations, algorithms, architectures, or predictions. These tools are powerful and, when used appropriately, indispensable. They also tend to assume something that is not always true: that the available data is sufficiently complete, reliable, and well characterized to support inference.

In many real situations, it is not.

Motion data is frequently partial, noisy, compressed, projected, sparsely sampled, or separated from its original context. Sensor properties may be unknown. Depth and scale may be unavailable. Ground truth may not exist at all. And yet, motion itself remains visible.

Something shifts.

A trajectory forms. Direction changes. Structure appears.

This document exists for that space.

It exists for moments when motion can be observed, but certainty cannot.

Faced with uncertainty, it is tempting to reach immediately for sophisticated models. Prediction, classification, and inference can feel like progress. They produce outputs. They translate ambiguity into numbers.

But when data cannot meaningfully constrain those models, complexity can quietly replace understanding. Assumptions become embedded rather than examined. Outputs begin to carry the appearance of authority without the support of evidence. Interpretation becomes difficult to challenge—not because it is correct, but because it is opaque.

This is not a failure of modeling. It is a mismatch of timing.

Before asking why motion occurs, or what it will do next, there is value in asking a simpler question:

*What does the motion, as observed, actually do?*

## 2 The Reader's Commitments

This framework does not ask the reader to adopt a belief or accept a conclusion about what motion means. Instead, it asks for a way of approaching motion that remains careful when certainty is unavailable.

Throughout this document, analysis begins with what can be directly observed. Position, trajectory shape, continuity, and change over time are treated as primary evidence. When information such as force, intent, internal state, or system dynamics is not present in the data, that absence is acknowledged rather than filled through inference. This choice does not deny the existence of underlying mechanisms; it simply avoids speculating about them without support.

From this starting point, description comes before inference.

Motion is first examined as a geometric object evolving through space and time. Directional change, smoothness, segmentation, and irregularity are considered on their own terms, without assigning cause or purpose. Only once the structure of motion is clearly described does interpretation become possible—and even then, it remains optional rather than required.

Patterns identified through this process are treated as descriptive structures, not explanations. A straight segment does not imply efficiency. A turn does not imply intent. A transition does not imply a mechanism. These labels exist to organize what is visible in the data, not to explain what produces it. Maintaining this distinction preserves clarity and keeps interpretation proportional to evidence.

Every analytical choice carries assumptions. Thresholds, segmentation criteria, smoothing decisions, and state definitions are therefore treated as parameters to be stated openly rather than truths to be hidden. When an assumption cannot be articulated clearly, it is left unresolved rather than silently adopted. Here, transparency takes precedence over completeness.

Uncertainty is not treated as a defect to be eliminated. In constrained data environments, ambiguity is often irreducible. Rather than resolving it prematurely through inference, this framework allows uncertainty to remain visible. Multiple interpretations may coexist, provided they are grounded in the same observable structure. In this way, clarity is prioritized over certainty.

Finally, this framework does not position itself as authoritative or competitive. It is not intended to replace physical models, statistical methods, or learning-based approaches. Its purpose is alignment—to provide a shared descriptive baseline that can support collaboration across domains and analytical traditions. Where richer data or stronger assumptions are available, other methods may be entirely appropriate.

Together, these commitments define a way of working rather than a set of conclusions. They are meant to be revisited and refined, not defended. By adopting them, the reader agrees only to slow down, observe carefully, and allow structure to emerge before meaning is assigned.

Everything that follows is built from this stance.

# 3 Motion as Structure Before Meaning

Before motion can be explained, predicted, or classified, it must first be seen.

In many analytical pipelines, meaning is assigned to motion almost immediately. Directional change is labeled as intent. Stability is interpreted as control. Irregularity is treated as noise or anomaly. These interpretations often occur before the structure of the motion itself has been carefully examined.

A geometry-first approach deliberately reverses this order.

At its most basic level, motion is an observable structure: a sequence of spatial relationships unfolding over time. When interpretation is set aside, a trajectory becomes simply a path traced through space—composed of positional change, shifts in direction, and varying degrees of continuity. Treating motion this way allows analysis to begin without committing to explanation.

From this perspective, the initial questions are modest but precise. How does the path evolve? Where does direction change, and how abruptly? Are segments smooth or irregular? Do certain patterns persist, repeat, or dissolve over time? These questions do not ask what the motion means or why it occurs. They ask only how it appears in the data.

This shift creates analytical stability. Structure can be inspected, visualized, and reproduced without relying on assumptions about mechanism, intent, or purpose. Multiple observers can agree on what is visible, even if they later diverge in interpretation.

Delaying meaning in this way is not an avoidance of understanding. It is a methodological safeguard. When interpretation precedes structural examination, assumptions can become embedded in the analysis itself. Once embedded, they are difficult to isolate or challenge. When structure is examined first, interpretation remains optional rather than compulsory.

This separation allows competing interpretations to coexist without conflict, provided they remain consistent with the same observable structure. Disagreement moves from what happened to how it might be understood, which is a healthier and more testable space for inquiry.

Geometry provides a way to hold motion steady long enough to examine it. Geometric properties such as curvature, continuity, and segmentation do not explain motion. They describe how a trajectory behaves relative to itself over time. Because these properties are derived directly from position, they remain applicable even when information about scale, depth, force, or system dynamics is unavailable.

In constrained settings—where over-interpretation poses the greatest risk—geometry acts as a stabilizing lens. It constrains what can be claimed without constraining what may later be explored.

Treating motion as structure before meaning also creates a shared reference point. Analysts may disagree about interpretation, but they can still agree on geometric description. This common ground supports comparison across datasets and collaboration across disciplines, keeping discussion anchored to observable features rather than inferred narratives.

Meaning may come later—or not at all. In some cases, descriptive structure is sufficient. In others, it may inform further modeling, hypothesis generation, or domain-specific analysis. What matters is that meaning, if introduced, is clearly distinguished from description and remains proportional to the evidence available.

By approaching motion as structure before meaning, geometry-first analysis preserves clarity, resists overreach, and creates space for careful, responsible inquiry—whether or not explanation ultimately follows.

# 4 Limits of Interpretation in Constrained Motion Data

Any analytical framework operating under data constraints must be explicit about what it cannot do.

A geometry-first approach provides structure, not explanation. It describes how motion appears in the available observations, but it does not—and cannot—establish why that motion occurs. Recognizing this boundary is not a weakness of the framework. It is a condition of methodological integrity.

Geometric descriptors such as curvature, continuity, and segmentation are derived solely from positional change over time. They capture form, not cause. As a result, multiple underlying processes may give rise to indistinguishable geometric patterns. Two trajectories may exhibit similar curvature profiles while originating from entirely different physical, behavioral, or mechanical systems.

Without additional information—such as force measurements, depth estimates, or contextual knowledge—geometry alone cannot distinguish between these possibilities. This ambiguity is not a failure of the method. It is a property of the data.

Under constrained conditions, the temptation to infer intent, control, optimization, or mechanism from observed motion is strong. Directional stability may be interpreted as guidance. Irregularity may be framed as anomaly. Transitions may be treated as evidence of decision or response. Yet such interpretations often rely on assumptions the data cannot independently support.

When interpretation begins to outpace observation, conclusions become increasingly sensitive to prior belief rather than to measurable structure. Analytical narratives may feel coherent while remaining difficult to falsify—not because they are correct, but because they are insulated from challenge.

A geometry-first framework resists this drift by keeping interpretation secondary. It does not prohibit hypothesis formation, but it requires that hypotheses remain clearly separated from descriptive findings. What is observed is distinguished from what is inferred, and neither is allowed to quietly replace the other.

Data quality further constrains interpretation in ways that must remain visible. Noise, tracking error, temporal sparsity, and projection effects can all shape the apparent structure of motion. Choices made during preprocessing—such as smoothing, interpolation, or threshold selection—may significantly influence curvature estimates or segmentation boundaries.

For this reason, geometric descriptions should always be treated as provisional. They describe motion as observed under specific conditions, not as immutable properties of the underlying system. Changes in data quality or analytical choices may lead to different structural characterizations, and this variability must be acknowledged rather than obscured.

Discrete motion states, when introduced, are analytical constructs rather than intrinsic categories. Their boundaries are defined by operational criteria, not discovered as natural divisions within the data. This does not diminish their usefulness, but it does limit their interpretive reach. State labels organize observation; they do not explain behavior.

A geometry-first approach therefore makes no claim to infer causation, identify mechanisms, predict future behavior, or resolve ambiguity inherent in limited data. Its role is narrower and more disciplined: to describe observable motion faithfully, to make assumptions explicit, and to prevent interpretation from exceeding what the data can support.

By stating these limits clearly, the framework protects both the analysis and the analyst. Conclusions remain proportional to evidence, and uncertainty is handled transparently rather than implicitly. In constrained settings, this restraint is not a loss of ambition. It is a form of rigor.

When interpretation is carefully bounded, structure can be examined honestly, compared across contexts, and shared without overstating its significance. This makes geometry-first analysis a stable foundation upon which deeper inquiry may be built, if and when the data allow.

# 5 What This Framework Is For

A framework defined by its limits should also be clear about its purpose.

This geometry-first approach is not meant to answer every question about motion, nor is it a substitute for domain modeling, physical theory, or learning-based methods. Its role is narrower and more deliberate: it provides a disciplined starting point when motion must be examined under uncertainty.

## A tool for early-stage reasoning

This framework is most useful at the beginning.

When encountering unfamiliar motion data—especially data that is incomplete, noisy, compressed, or poorly characterized—geometry-first analysis allows engagement without committing too early to a story about what the motion *means*. It helps establish what is visible, what is ambiguous, and what is absent before deciding which questions the data can realistically support.

In this sense, the framework functions as orientation. It does not resolve uncertainty. It keeps the analyst honest about where uncertainty enters and how much weight the data can bear.

## Support for transparency and comparison

Because geometric descriptors operate directly on observed trajectories, they provide a shared language for describing structure across datasets and domains. Analysts may disagree about interpretation, but they can still compare what the motion does geometrically.

This makes the framework particularly useful for exploratory work, comparative analysis, and methodological validation—especially in collaborative settings where assumptions differ and must remain visible.

## A guardrail against premature certainty

One of the most practical roles of this framework is protective.

In constrained environments, inference can quietly outpace evidence. Geometry-first analysis slows that drift. It keeps interpretation optional, secondary, and clearly separated from what is directly observed.

This does not eliminate interpretation. It ensures that interpretation remains proportional to what the data can support.

## A foundation for other methods

Although geometry-first analysis is intentionally descriptive, it is not isolated. When additional information becomes available—such as depth estimates, contextual knowledge, improved sensor characterization, or stronger temporal resolution—its outputs can inform more sophisticated approaches.

At times, it also serves an equally important function: it makes clear when richer modeling is not yet justified.

### For careful inquiry, not definitive answers

Ultimately, this framework is for analysts who value clarity over certainty and discipline over speed.

It offers a way to work meaningfully with motion data while respecting its limits—describing what is visible, documenting what is assumed, and leaving the rest explicitly open.

## 6 A Descriptive Standard

This document does not conclude with a result or a claim. It concludes with a standard.

The geometry-first approach outlined here is defined not by what it proves, but by how it approaches motion when certainty is unavailable. It offers a way of working that prioritizes observable structure, explicit assumptions, and methodological restraint. In doing so, it establishes a posture that can be carried across contexts where interpretation must remain proportional to evidence.

This standard does not require agreement on meaning, mechanism, or outcome. It asks only that description and inference remain clearly separated, and that claims never extend beyond what can be observed. When these boundaries are maintained, analysis remains interpretable, revisable, and grounded.

Adopting a descriptive standard does not prevent deeper inquiry. It prepares for it.

When additional data, context, or domain knowledge becomes available, richer explanations may follow. When they do not, description remains valuable in its own right—providing clarity without over-extension, and structure without speculation.

This framework is not fixed. It can be revisited, questioned, and refined. What remains constant is the commitment it represents: to let structure speak before meaning is assigned, and to allow clarity to guide inquiry when certainty cannot.

That is the standard.

This document is offered as a methodological companion to ongoing independent research in motion analysis. It reflects a set of working principles rather than a finalized doctrine, and is intended to remain open to revision as new data, methods, and perspectives emerge.