Building a Falsifiable Investment Thesis: A First-Principles Guide By Capital Flows

https://www.capitalflowsresearch.com/

Introduction

Developing an investment thesis is often treated as an art steeped in stories and intuition. However, sophisticated traders can benefit from approaching thesis development as a science. By applying first-principles thinking and insisting on testability (a concept inspired by physicist David Deutsch's philosophy in *The Beginning of Infinity*), investors ground their decisions in logic and evidence rather than market lore or fashionable narratives. This guide provides a structured, rigorous primer on crafting an investment thesis in a scientific framework – formulating hypotheses, identifying causal drivers, setting falsifiable conditions, and iterating based on results. The aim is to help you create a dynamic thesis that adjusts with price action and new data, much like a scientific theory that evolves with experimental evidence. We will illustrate principles with examples across asset classes (rates, equities, commodities), highlight the difference between testable vs. purely narrative approaches, and show how to integrate multiple time horizons into your analysis. The tone throughout is formal and practical – focusing on clarity, process rigor, and causal understanding – so you can directly apply this framework to your own investment process.

The Pitfall of Narrative-Driven Investing

Humans are natural storytellers, and financial markets are full of enticing narratives. A narrative-driven thesis might sound compelling ("Tech stocks are the future; this company will dominate its industry because it has a visionary CEO"), but if it lacks testable hypotheses and specific evidence, it can lead investors astray. Narrative-driven approaches often suffer from:

- **Vagueness:** They rely on broad stories ("the sector is booming" or "this asset is safe because everyone believes in it") without concrete numbers or timelines. Such theses are hard to disprove because they never specify what would indicate the story is wrong. Investors can always rationalize setbacks, morphing the story to fit

the outcome – an unfalsifiable loop.

- **Confirmation Bias:** Once committed to a story, narrative-focused investors often seek information that confirms it and ignore contradictory evidence. Without predefined "exit criteria," they may hold losing positions too long, attributing losses to temporary noise while awaiting a comeback that never occurs.

- **Sunk Cost & Stubbornness:** Lacking clear signals for when to abandon a thesis, an investor's ego and prior investment can take over. They double down on positions even as losses mount, turning what should have been a testable thesis into a matter of faith.

The downstream effects of a flawed, narrative-driven thesis can be disastrous. Investors might miss critical inflection points or warning signs because their thesis wasn't grounded in causal logic or data. For example, during the dot-com bubble of the late 1990s, many bought into the narrative that "internet companies will eventually profit because the internet changes everything," without specifying *how* or *when* those profits would materialize. As a result, they ignored clear signs of untenable business models (no revenue or cash flow) and rode positions into catastrophic losses when reality diverged from the story. A more recent example is the "meme stock" mania, where narratives about "sticking it to hedge funds" and *potential* turnaround stories drove stocks to irrational levels; investors who traded purely on the narrative often lacked an objective basis to gauge when those stocks were overpriced or when the story had run its course.

In contrast, a testable, first-principles thesis forces clarity. It asks: *What must happen in the real world for this idea to succeed?* And equally, *what observable events would prove it false?* By demanding answers, we inoculate ourselves against the seductive but fuzzy stories that dominate financial media. In the following sections, we shift from these pitfalls to constructing an investment thesis on firmer scientific ground.

First-Principles Thinking in Market Analysis

At the heart of a first-principles approach is the idea of breaking a problem down to its fundamental truths. Rather than taking cues from consensus opinions or analogies ("this stock is the next Amazon" or "markets always do X when the Fed does Y"), first-principles thinking asks *why* and *how* from the ground up:

- **Identify Fundamental Drivers:** Start by understanding the core drivers of the asset's value or price. For equities, this might be earnings growth, competitive advantage, industry demand, etc. For bonds, fundamental drivers include interest rates, inflation expectations, credit risk. For commodities, supply and demand dynamics, inventory levels, and production costs are first principles. Strip away any buzzwords or assumptions and focus on basic economic relationships.

- **Use Causal Logic:** Establish cause-and-effect linkages between those fundamental drivers and the asset's performance. For example, instead of saying "Commodity X is in high demand so price will rise" (a simplistic narrative), break it down: *High demand relative to supply causes inventory drawdowns, which in turn cause prices to rise.* Now you have a causal chain that can be tested with data (are inventories actually drawing down?).

- **Good Explanations vs. Good Stories:** David Deutsch emphasizes that "good explanations are deep, causal, and falsifiable", addressing underlying principles rather than surface details. They don't just describe *what* is happening, but explain *why* it's happening and under what conditions the explanation would no longer hold. In our context, a strong thesis isn't "the stock is going up because people are buying" – that's a shallow description. A strong thesis might be: "Consumers are shifting to electric vehicles (cause), which increases demand for lithium (effect), so lithium mining stocks with low extraction costs should see higher earnings, leading to stock price appreciation." This explains *why* the price should rise and is rooted in a fundamental driver (demand for lithium). Crucially, it also implies what could *falsify* the thesis: e.g., if EV adoption stalls or new lithium supply floods the market, the expected price appreciation won't materialize.

- **Hard to Vary:** Another hallmark of a robust, first-principles thesis (borrowing from Deutsch's criteria for good explanations) is that it should be *specific enough that you can't arbitrarily change parts of it to retrofit outcomes*. In other words, the thesis is "hard to vary while still accounting for the facts". If your explanation is so flexible that any market condition can be rationalized to fit ("if growth slows, that's just temporary; if it speeds up, it confirms I'm right"), then it's not truly grounded in first principles – it's an unfalsifiable story. A well-constructed thesis pins itself to concrete relationships and predictions that cannot be easily bent without breaking the logic.

- **Example – First Principles in Practice:** Suppose you're developing a thesis on a renewable energy company. A narrative approach might say, "Renewables are the

future; this company will do well because green energy is hot." A first-principles approach digs deeper: examine the company's cost of production relative to traditional energy (fundamental cost driver), government policies on carbon (regulatory driver), and the company's technology efficiency. Your thesis might become: *"This solar company's new panel technology reduces cost per watt by 20% (first principle: cost competitiveness). If oil/gas prices remain high or carbon taxes increase (external drivers), utilities will accelerate solar adoption. Therefore, the company's revenue should grow ~15% annually for the next 5 years, supporting a higher stock valuation."* This thesis is *specific and causally driven* – it identifies why the company should outperform (tech advantage + favorable macro drivers) and is testable (if adoption or cost savings don't actually occur, the thesis fails).

In essence, first-principles thinking forces you to **justify each element of your investment thesis with fundamental cause-effect reasoning**. By doing so, you lay a solid foundation before you even invest a dollar. Now, we build on that foundation by adopting the scientific method to structure the thesis formally.

The Scientific Method Applied to Investing

Approach each investment idea as a scientist would approach a hypothesis. The scientific method can be adapted to investing in the following framework:

1. **Formulate a Clear Hypothesis (Thesis Statement):** Begin with a concise statement of your investment hypothesis. This is your *theory* of how a certain investment will play out and why. Crucially, phrase it in a way that is **falsifiable** – it should make specific predictions. For example: *"I hypothesize that Commodity ABC will rise by 30% over the next 12 months because global supply is tightening while demand is surging. If monthly inventory reports show draws of at least X units and demand growth remains ≥Y%, it will confirm the thesis."* Notice this hypothesis links cause and expected effect, and it's specific about the magnitude and timing. It's not a vague "ABC will go up eventually"; it's a time-bound, cause-and-effect proposition. **Clarity is key** – if your hypothesis sounds like "Company will win because it's great" or "Asset will go up because others will buy," step back and refine the logic and specifics.

2. **Identify Testable Predictions and Metrics:** For a hypothesis to be scientific, it must yield predictions you can check. Determine **which indicators, financial metrics, or market data points will validate or invalidate your thesis**. For an equity thesis, this might include company KPIs (revenue growth, profit margins, user acquisition rates),

industry data, or macro indicators. For a macro trade (rates or FX), it might be inflation prints, central bank policy moves, yield curve changes, etc. Define the **expected ranges or thresholds** for these metrics. For instance, your thesis might predict "10-year Treasury yields will reach 4% in six months, given our inflation hypothesis." A testable prediction could be, *"If core CPI remains above 0.5% MoM for the next 3 readings, the Fed will signal tighter policy, pushing 10-year yields to ~4%. Conversely, if CPI falls below 0.2% MoM, the thesis of sustained inflation leading to higher yields is falsified."* By **mapping predictions to observable metrics**, you set the stage for real-world testing.

3. **Establish Falsification Criteria (Refutation Checklist):** This step is the heart of making your thesis falsifiable. **Ask yourself:** *"What evidence would prove me wrong?"* Write down specific conditions that would invalidate the thesis. For example, you might say *"I will consider this hypothesis invalid if quarterly revenue growth falls below 10% year-over-year for two consecutive quarters, or if a major competitor captures >15% market share from our company"*. By doing this, you are effectively building a refutation or "stop-loss" trigger into your thesis from the start. **Predefine the "kill switch."** This has several benefits: it forces you to be objective and honest with yourself, and it prevents the dangerous habit of rationalizing away bad news. With clear falsification criteria, *you've decided in advance what "bad" looks like*, so when it occurs, you can act decisively. In other words, *"with a falsifiable thesis, you've effectively set a stop-loss on your conviction"* – you won't keep throwing good money after bad because your thesis itself told you to get out if certain negative signals appear. (These criteria can be quantitative or qualitative, as long as they're observable. For instance, losing a key patent or a CEO's departure could be qualitative falsifiers if they strike at the core of your thesis.)

4. **Design an "Experiment" or Tactical Plan:** In science you'd run a controlled experiment; in markets, you deploy capital – but you can control how you do it. Consider starting with a **small position or pilot trade** as an "experiment" to gather data. For example, rather than immediately allocating 100% of your intended position, you might start with 25%. This is akin to a trial: as new data (earnings reports, economic releases, price action) comes in, you observe whether it supports your hypothesis. If the early evidence aligns (say the company's first quarter results after your investment show the 15% growth you expected), you can scale up the position – effectively **"scaling up the experiment"**. If the evidence starts to contradict, you can cut the position quickly, limiting risk. This step is about **marrying the thesis with prudent risk management** so that your testing process doesn't

jeopardize your capital.

5. **Monitor Results and Collect Data:** Once the position is on, **actively monitor the key metrics and signals you identified.** Treat each earnings release, economic data point, or price movement as a new data input that needs to be evaluated against your hypothesis. It can be helpful to log these observations in an investment journal or spreadsheet. (In fact, writing down your thesis and each confirming or disconfirming data point is strongly recommended – it externalizes your thought process and keeps you honest.) As legendary investor Charlie Munger admired, Charles Darwin trained himself to diligently note any fact that contradicted his theory **as soon as he noticed it**, knowing his mind might try to ignore inconvenient details. An investor can adopt the same discipline: when news or data introduces doubt, record it immediately and revisit your thesis – **do not sweep it under the rug.** By tracking evidence in real time, you create a feedback loop where the thesis is continuously tested against reality.

6. **Iterate: Confirm, Refine, or Abandon:** Based on the accumulating evidence, decide whether to **confirm, adjust, or abandon** the thesis. This is the critical juncture of the scientific approach – honest evaluation. If the thesis is playing out as expected (your predicted drivers are indeed causing the anticipated effects), you might gain confidence to hold or even increase the position. If some aspects of the thesis are right but others need tweaking, refine the hypothesis. Perhaps your thesis predicted 15% growth but only 10% is coming through – is the core idea still intact? You may revise your expectations or identify a new variable that needs consideration. **If the thesis is failing – your falsification criteria are triggered or the rationale appears invalidated – then have the discipline to exit or hedge the position.** This can be difficult, but remember, in science, a failed hypothesis is not shameful; it's informative. As one investing maxim goes, *"It's not about being right, it's about getting it right."* By willingly scrapping a busted thesis, you free up capital (and mental bandwidth) for the next opportunity, and you carry forward the lessons learned. In the words of George Soros, *"I'm only rich because I know when I'm wrong... I basically have survived by recognizing my mistakes."*. Embracing that mindset – cutting losers early and absorbing the knowledge from them – is crucial.

7. **Attribution and Learning:** After a thesis has run its course (maybe you've closed the trade, or a certain time horizon has passed), **analyze the outcome rigorously.** If the investment succeeded, *why* did it succeed? Was it truly because your stated hypothesis was correct, or did some other factor drive the profit? (Sometimes even a flawed thesis can make money due to luck or unrelated market moves – you need to

discern the difference.) If the investment failed, what specifically went wrong? Were your assumptions off, or did an unanticipated variable derail it? This is analogous to a scientist publishing findings and then reflecting on what the experiment revealed. By attributing outcomes to their real causes, you refine your understanding of the market. **Each thesis, win or lose, becomes a data point to improve your future hypotheses.** As Deutsch might argue, knowledge grows through the correction of errors – *every refuted investment hypothesis teaches you something new about how the market truly works*. Over time, this iterative learning process can significantly elevate your skill. Indeed, approaching investing in this scientific manner "creates a feedback loop to validate or refute your ideas in real time", accelerating your learning. The end result is an investor who is increasingly deliberate, self-aware, and responsive to evidence.

To summarize this scientific framework, think of each investment idea as a cycle of conjecture and refutation:

- *Conjecture:* Form a hypothesis for why an asset is mispriced or will move a certain way (based on first principles causal reasoning).
- *Test:* Deploy capital in a measured way and observe real-world data (market "experiments").
- *Refutation or Confirmation:* If evidence refutes the hypothesis, acknowledge it and adjust or exit; if evidence corroborates it, stick with it (perhaps with more conviction).
- *Learn:* Carry forward the insights gained, whether the hypothesis succeeded or failed.

This mindset shift – from trying to be right to trying to find out what's right – is profound. You are no longer wed to your opinions for ego's sake; you are actively probing them. In doing so, *negative information becomes just as valuable as positive information*, because it's telling you how to refine your view or avoid a loss. You've pre-committed to being objective. This scientific approach won't eliminate risk or guarantee profits (markets will always retain some level of unpredictability and "art"), but it will make you far more systematic and prepared to deal with whatever happens.

Illustration: Falsifiable vs. Non-Falsifiable Theses

Let's concretize the difference between a loose narrative and a rigorous, falsifiable thesis. Below is an illustration of *non-falsifiable* vs. *falsifiable* investment statements across different types of companies. Notice how the left-hand (non-falsifiable) examples are essentially untestable stories or vague claims, whereas the right-hand (falsifiable) examples set clear conditions and measurable checkpoints for the thesis to hold:

Examples of vague, narrative-driven theses (left) vs. specific, falsifiable hypotheses (right). The falsifiable versions include concrete metrics (growth rates, margins, user retention, etc.) and "tripwires" that would signal the thesis is invalid. By articulating such conditions, investors ensure their thesis can be tested and adjusted rather than simply believed in.

In each case above, the improved thesis doesn't just claim "this will be successful because it's a good story." It states *what success looks like in numbers or observable facts*, and sometimes even gives a timeframe. For instance, a non-falsifiable claim like "This tech company will disrupt its industry and be huge" is transformed into **"This company can grow its revenues 50% annually for the next 3 years by capturing at least 5% of the industry's market share; if we don't see at least 40-50% annual growth in active users or if customer acquisition costs rise above X, the thesis fails."** This clarity does two things: (1) it anchors your expectations to reality – as data comes in, you have benchmarks to compare against, and (2) it forces you to confront possible failure upfront – if those growth or cost numbers don't materialize, you know your 'disruption' thesis was wrong, rather than finding excuses. By contrast, a narrative like "disruption is coming, just wait" leaves an investor with no clear signal to ever admit error (it invites *permanent* optimism or bag-holding).

Always aim to convert your investment "story" into this kind of **testable hypothesis.** If you cannot, that's a warning sign that your thesis might be too flimsy. As one investing blog put it, *"high-level observations are a good start, but you need to dig below the surface and weave everything into a narrative that is rational, self-consistent and testable"*. And importantly, *"your story must continue to evolve as circumstances change — a reasonable thesis can quickly become a fool's fairy tale if you fail to adapt to new information."* In the next section, we'll explore examples in major asset classes, demonstrating how to build testable theses and how flawed approaches compare.

Examples Across Asset Classes: Testable vs. Flawed Approaches

Let's walk through a few example scenarios in different markets – rates, equities, and commodities – to see how a first-principles, falsifiable thesis can be constructed, and how it contrasts with a more narrative-driven approach. Each example will illustrate the mindset and the downstream effects of each approach:

- **Rates (Macro Interest Rates):** Imagine in mid-2025 you have a view on U.S. interest rates. A *flawed narrative-driven thesis* might be: *"The government has printed trillions of dollars; eventually this must cause hyperinflation and bond yields will skyrocket. I'll short Treasury bonds because everyone knows high debt leads to inflation."* This statement is sweeping, lacks timing or specific triggers, and isn't actually testing a causal model (it assumes rather than demonstrates that money supply will translate to inflation in the near term). Many investors placed such bets shorting Japanese government bonds for years – the infamous "widowmaker" trade – under a narrative that Japan's high debt and easy monetary policy would inevitably send yields up. Instead, Japan had deflationary forces and aggressive central bank intervention that kept yields low for decades, and those who shorted without clear falsifiable conditions suffered repeated losses as the *market defied the simplistic story*. A *scientific thesis* on rates would be more precise: "Inflation is currently 5% and running above the central bank's target. My hypothesis is that if inflation stays >4% for the next 6 months, the Federal Reserve will signal tighter policy and 10-year Treasury yields will rise from 3% to ~4%+. Conversely, if upcoming inflation prints drop back towards 2%, the Fed will likely hold or cut rates, and long-term yields will fall – which would invalidate the 'rates up' thesis." This thesis identifies a mechanism (persistent inflation causing policy reaction) and sets a measurable condition for validation (inflation above a threshold over a period) and invalidation (inflation reverting). It also incorporates timeframe and magnitude (6 months, yields ~1% higher). If, say, three months in, inflation surprises on the downside significantly, a falsifiable framework would have you reduce or exit the short-bond position – you'd acknowledge the hypothesis didn't pan out and avoid deeper losses. The narrative-driven investor, however, might continue shorting bonds even as yields fall, insisting "just wait, it'll blow up eventually," possibly incurring ever-growing losses. The difference in outcomes can be striking: the testable approach limits damage and pivots when the data contradicts the thesis, whereas the narrative approach can become a conviction that ignores reality (sometimes until catastrophic loss).

- **Equities (Stock Investment):** Consider two investors evaluating a growth stock in the e-commerce sector. The *narrative-driven investor* says: *"This is the next Amazon. It has a charismatic founder and a great brand; I'm buying and holding because I believe*

in the story." This thesis leans on analogies ("next Amazon") and qualitative excitement, but provides no specific performance indicators or causal drivers. As a result, it's not clear what success looks like except "stock goes up a lot", and nothing is identified that would prove the investor wrong short of the company outright going bankrupt (even many missteps could be rationalized as "growing pains" due to the strength of the belief). Now contrast that with a *first-principles, falsifiable thesis*: *"This e-commerce company is currently growing revenues at 30% annually with improving unit economics. My investment hypothesis is that over the next 2 years, its revenue can compound ~25-30% annually with operating margins rising into positive territory, driven by its network effects in niche product categories. If so, earnings will turn positive by next year and I estimate the stock's fair value is 50% higher. However, if quarterly revenue growth decelerates below 15% for two consecutive quarters, or if customer acquisition costs rise to the point that margins can't improve, then my thesis is broken and I will exit the position."* Notice how this thesis is rooted in concrete drivers (growth rate, margins, network effects) and sets benchmarks: <15% growth or worsening costs are clear "exit" signals. Suppose after one year, the company's growth falls to 10% and several new competitors steal market share – these are precisely the falsifying observations anticipated. The disciplined investor would recognize that the original "growth story" isn't holding up, sell the stock, and protect their capital (perhaps even at a small profit if they entered early). The narrative-driven investor, however, might still be holding, saying "I'm in it for the long run, the founder says they have big plans, it's just a temporary setback." They might hold as the stock continues to languish or fall, turning a blind eye to the fact that *the core reason to invest (high growth leading to scale economies) has been invalidated*. On the other hand, if the company did achieve 30% growth and margin improvement, the falsifiable-thesis investor would be rewarded and would have the confidence to continue holding or add to the position, knowing the hypothesis is playing out. They'd also be monitoring each earnings report for those predefined metrics, ready to act if the trend changed. This example demonstrates how a testable thesis creates a win-win: it protects you from riding losers down, and it gives you conviction to ride winners up (because as long as none of your "major alarms" have tripped, you can ignore minor fluctuations and let the thesis play out).

- **Commodities:** Let's say an investor is interested in oil. A *loose narrative approach* might assert: *"Oil prices are going to the moon because geopolitical tensions are high and everyone's talking about a new supercycle."* This is speculative and emotion-driven – while geopolitics and supercycle narratives might influence price, the thesis doesn't quantify *how* or *when*, nor does it factor in counter-forces (like demand destruction at high prices or new supply coming online). It's essentially "oil

will go up because I feel it will," which isn't a reliable strategy. Now consider a *principle-based, falsifiable thesis*: *"Global oil demand is recovering to pre-pandemic highs while supply growth is constrained by years of underinvestment and OPEC discipline. My hypothesis: over the next 12 months, this demand/supply imbalance will draw down global crude inventories by at least X million barrels per month. If inventories decline at that pace or more, oil prices should rise into the $90-100 per barrel range. However, if I see inventory builds for more than 2-3 weeks in a row, or if major economies enter recession (crushing demand growth), that would falsify the tight-supply thesis and I'd expect oil to trade below $70, prompting me to exit long positions."* This thesis is testable via weekly inventory data and economic indicators. Imagine after 4 months, data shows that inventories are *building* instead (perhaps a sign of weaker demand or hidden supply). A scientific-minded investor would take that as a serious red flag that their thesis isn't playing out – perhaps scaling down or closing the trade to avoid a larger loss, and investigating what they missed (e.g., was demand weaker than assumed?). In contrast, a narrative investor might ignore those inventory numbers and hold on, saying "It's just a temporary glut, the story is intact" – potentially suffering if oil prices drop further amid the glut. Conversely, if the data confirms draws and no demand destruction, the testable thesis investor will stay with the trade confidently. In commodities especially, many traders fall victim to sticking with narratives ("Peak oil! Only higher from here!" or "Shale will flood the market forever, oil can't rally") well after evidence shifts – because they never set objective criteria. A falsifiable thesis saves you from that by forcing you to continually reconcile your views with real-world evidence.

Through these examples, the pattern should be clear: **the correct, testable approach demands defining your terms of success *and* failure upfront**, whereas the flawed approach hinges on a story that often shifts or resists disproof. The testable approach yields a structured decision process (if X happens, do Y; if not, do Z), whereas the narrative approach often yields only hindsight justification ("I was right eventually" or "this shouldn't have happened, but…").

By studying a variety of assets, we also see that this framework is **universally applicable** – whether you're trading bonds, picking stocks, or speculating on commodities, the principles of hypothesis, evidence, and falsification apply. Next, we address how to handle multiple time horizons in your thesis and why uncertainty grows as we peer further into the future.

Integrating Multiple Timeframes and Navigating Uncertainty

Financial markets are influenced by forces operating on different time scales – from minute-by-minute trading technicals to decade-long macroeconomic trends. **Integrating multiple timeframes** into an investment thesis means being aware of how your idea plays out in the short, medium, and long term, and understanding how confidence levels change with time.

1. Define the Time Horizon for Each Hypothesis: A well-formed thesis should explicitly state its intended timeframe. Are you making a *six-month trade* based on an upcoming catalyst, or a *five-year investment* based on structural trends? Sometimes it's both – you may have a **core long-term thesis** (e.g., "over the next 5-10 years, electric vehicle adoption will significantly increase demand for copper, supporting higher copper prices") and **shorter-term sub-theses** or tactical timing elements ("in the next 3-6 months, I expect a pullback in copper, giving a better entry point, because Chinese construction demand is seasonally weak"). It helps to break these out: what do I expect in the *near term* vs. the *far term*? By doing so, you can set appropriate falsification criteria at each horizon (for the long-term EV/copper thesis, you might say "if by year 3 we haven't seen any uptick in copper demand from EVs in global data, then the long-term thesis is in question" – you're giving it time, but not infinite leeway).

2. Acknowledge the Cone of Uncertainty: The further out in time you project, the more uncertainty you must accept. This is akin to weather forecasting: a prediction for tomorrow is far more reliable than a prediction for next month. In investing, many more variables and random events can intervene over years than over days or weeks. As a result, **long-term theses should be treated as more tentative and subject to revision** than near-term theses. One practical approach is to use **scenario planning** for long horizons: instead of one definitive prediction for 5 years out (which can be wildly off), outline 2-3 plausible scenarios. For example, "In five years, copper could base-case be 30% higher if EV demand plays out, but if alternative battery tech reduces copper usage, prices could stagnate – I will track technology developments to gauge which scenario is unfolding." This way, your long-term view isn't a single bet, but a set of hypotheses with signposts. Tie these scenarios to falsifiable conditions as well (e.g., "if by 2027, 50% of EVs use low-copper batteries, my bull case for copper is void").

3. Link Short-Term and Long-Term Feedback: Often, short-term price action or data releases can provide early evidence for or against long-term theses. **However, be careful:** short-term fluctuations can be noisy and driven by transient factors. The key is to

distinguish between *signal* and *noise*. For instance, if you have a long-term bullish thesis on a stock due to a 5-year expansion plan, a single bad quarter might not invalidate it – but you'd examine *why* it was bad. If it's due to a one-time factor, your long-term thesis might remain intact; if it reveals a fundamental issue (a product flop that calls the whole expansion into question), it could indeed be an early falsification. One strategy is to set **multi-timeframe checkpoints**: e.g., *"Within 6 months, I expect to see at least initial evidence of user growth re-accelerating after the new product launch (short-term checkpoint). In 18-24 months, I expect that to translate into noticeably higher revenue and margin (medium-term checkpoint). And in 5 years, the company should roughly double its earnings if the thesis fully plays out (long-term goal)."* At each point, you evaluate the evidence. This creates a layered thesis: short-term hypotheses feed into the medium-term, which feed into the long-term. If the short-term evidence contradicts your expectation, it prompts a timely reassessment rather than waiting years to find out you were wrong.

4. Adjust Position Sizing by Timeframe Confidence: Because uncertainty increases with time, you might choose to size your positions or risk exposure according to confidence in each timeframe. For instance, you may go smaller on trades that rely on very long-term predictions (or use options or structures that limit downside) because there are more unknowns that could derail them. Conversely, if you have a short-term thesis around an event next month with clear odds, you might size it larger for that short window. The key is to be explicit: *"This portion of my position is a long-term core (I will give it room and only remove it if long-run thesis clearly breaks), whereas this other portion is a short-term tactical trade around earnings (I will cut it quickly if the trade doesn't work)."* Blending these can lead to confusion – for example, turning a failed short-term trade into an "investment" unintentionally (a common mistake). Maintaining clarity on what part of your position corresponds to which thesis horizon helps you apply the right criteria to each.

5. Be Prepared for Cross-Timeframe Contradictions: Sometimes, different timeframes will send different signals. It's possible the long-term outlook is great, but short-term sentiment or technicals are terrible (or vice versa). For example, commodity prices might drop in the short term due to a mild season, even if the long-term trend is up. Or a stock might rally on hype near-term even if its long-term fundamentals are shaky. Reconciling this is tough but important: you might decide to stomach short-term volatility in service of the long-term thesis *if* you're convinced the short-term factors are indeed noise. Alternatively, you might opportunistically trade around a core position – e.g., reduce exposure when short-term risks arise, add back when they clear, while keeping the long-term stake. The main point is to recognize when short-term developments conflict with your thesis and consciously choose how to respond, rather than ignoring one or the other. If a short-term price move against you is actually indicating something fundamental you missed, your framework should force you to revisit your thesis (not just label it noise because you don't

like it). Many investors talk about "strong opinions, weakly held" – meaning have conviction in your thesis, but hold that conviction tentatively and be ready to change when contradicted. Nowhere is this more necessary than when short-term and long-term signals diverge; it might mean your long-term thesis needs modification or just patience, but you must investigate which.

In summary, **integrating multiple timeframes** into your thesis adds robustness but also complexity. The scientific mindset helps here too: treat each timeframe's expectation as its own hypothesis, with its own evidentiary tests. Understand that as you move further out, your "error bars" widen – so approach long-term forecasts with humility and flexibility. By doing so, you can build an investment strategy that benefits from long-term structural insights *and* short-term timing tactics, all under a unifying, logical thesis. You won't be blindsided by near-term events (because you have checkpoints and contingency plans), and you won't lose sight of the big picture (because you've articulated it and know what would change it).

Long-Term Risk Premium vs. Knowledge-Based Thesis Investing

It's worth distinguishing between two broad approaches to investing, to clarify the value of the knowledge-driven, thesis-testing framework we're advocating.

- **"Risk Premium" Investing (Buy and Hold):** This is the idea of holding assets mainly to earn their long-term expected returns, or *risk premia*. For example, simply owning a diversified stock index because over decades equities tend to return more than bonds or cash (the equity risk premium), or buying and holding bonds for the yield. This approach often doesn't require a detailed thesis about *why* the asset will rise in the near term; the rationale is statistical and historical (e.g., "stocks on average return ~7% per year over the long run, so I'll just hold through ups and downs"). It is a **passive, non-knowledge-intensive strategy**. One doesn't necessarily need to predict anything about specific companies or economic conditions; one simply relies on the idea that being invested in risky assets will pay off eventually. There's nothing inherently wrong with this – many investors, especially in portfolio contexts, allocate to capture risk premia. However, this approach can be relatively rigid: if the market drops, the strategy is often to hold or even buy more (since over long horizons it should recover). There's typically **no falsification point** – what would make you sell? If the premise is "stocks go up in the long run," the only potential falsification is truly secular stagnation or collapse of the system, by which time losses would already be severe. In other words, a pure risk-premium approach has *no dynamic element*; it

doesn't adjust to new information except maybe in extreme regime changes, and even then, often with a lag. It's also **built on historical inference rather than causal understanding** – you expect a risk premium because historically it existed, not necessarily because you have a theory for why it will continue (aside from "investors demand it for bearing risk").

- **Knowledge-Based Thesis Investing:** Here, you actively form theses and try to *earn returns in excess of the baseline risk premia by applying knowledge and skill*. It's the difference between just **holding** an asset class versus **tactically allocating or selecting within it** based on your understanding. A knowledge-based approach requires more effort – researching companies or macro conditions, identifying why something might be mispriced, and constantly updating your views. It embraces the scientific method we've discussed: you develop an explanation for why an investment should earn returns beyond just "because markets go up." For example, rather than owning the broad market blindly, a knowledge-based investor might overweight certain sectors or stocks because they have a thesis that those will outperform (and underweight or short others expected to underperform). This approach **seeks to generate alpha (excess returns)** through correct hypotheses. Because it's active, it inherently must be more **dynamic** – when the facts change, a knowledge-driven investor changes their stance. One could say knowledge-based investing is about *earning the risk premium and then some*, by knowing when to step in or out, when to concentrate or diversify, based on a logically constructed view of the world.

Let's illustrate the contrast: Suppose an investor is considering whether to hold a 10-year government bond. A pure risk-premium approach might say, "Historically, bonds give a modest positive return; I'll hold it for yield and diversification, unless something extreme happens." A knowledge-based thesis approach might say, "I believe this bond is mispriced given my outlook: my thesis is that inflation will rise over the next 2 years (for reasons A, B, C), which will hurt bond prices. Therefore I'll underweight or short this bond. I'll know I'm wrong if inflation stays low or the economy weakens (in which case bonds would perform well)." The latter approach could lead to avoiding a loss (or making a profit) by actively adjusting exposure, whereas the former would just endure the loss as part of the long-term plan.

Another example: Equity investors often debate active vs passive. The passive investor is essentially saying "I don't know which stocks will do well, but on average they go up, so I'll hold all of them and earn the market's risk premium." The active (knowledge-based) investor says "I have a hypothesis that certain companies or strategies will beat the market

because of XYZ reasons, so I'll invest in those." The active investor's success hinges on the quality of their theses and their ability to test and adjust them – which is exactly why adopting a rigorous framework is important.

The key point is that knowledge-based thesis investing demands process and discipline, but can potentially yield better risk-adjusted returns if one's knowledge is sound. As an advisory firm aptly put it, *"today's fast-paced global economy and challenging markets remind us that knowledge-based investing requires more than a traditional buy-and-hold model for success"*. It requires active decision-making, tactical adjustments, and the kind of first-principles analysis we've been discussing. It is by no means easy – one must constantly seek good explanations and stay open to being wrong – but for those aiming to outperform or to manage risk more tightly, it's a necessity. If you do not have the time or inclination to follow this path, sticking with a risk-premium approach (and accepting the market's ups and downs) might be more appropriate. But if you are going to be active, do it right: ground each decision in a thesis you can evaluate.

Finally, consider how these approaches fare in changing environments. A long-term risk-premium holder might suffer greatly in a regime shift (say the historic risk premium diminishes or vanishes) because their strategy is inflexible. A knowledge-based investor, by continually updating their theses, is more likely to detect such regime changes or even capitalize on them. Their portfolio is knowledge-structured rather than just market-structured. They treat investing as a learning journey – as conditions evolve, so does their strategy, ideally staying one step ahead of the complacent buy-and-hold crowd. This is analogous to how businesses that adapt to new technology outcompete those that cling to old ways.

In summary, holding assets for a long-term risk premium is a valid but passive strategy that doesn't by itself require first-principles thinking, while building knowledge-based thesis structures is an active strategy that leverages understanding and adaptability. The latter is where the scientific approach shines. By all means, capture the long-term risk premia (they are the baseline of returns), but if you seek to outperform or avoid downturns, layer on a rigorous thesis framework to tilt the odds in your favor.

A Repeatable Template and Feedback Loop for Thesis Development

Having walked through the philosophy and examples, it's useful to end with a **practical template** – a step-by-step checklist you can use every time you formulate and execute an

investment thesis. This also includes how to create a feedback loop so that each investment makes you smarter for the next. Consider the following template as a starting point:

Investment Thesis Checklist

1. **Thesis Title and Timeframe:** Write a one-line title (e.g., "Bullish on Copper due to EV Demand (12-18 month view)"). Specify whether it's short-term, medium-term, or long-term. This frames the context of all further steps.

2. **Hypothesis Statement:** In a few sentences, describe *what you expect to happen and why*. Be concrete: "I expect X asset to do Y by Z date because…". Ensure you mention the primary drivers (causes) and the expected effect (price movement, earnings, etc.). This is your core conjecture.

3. **Key Assumptions/Drivers:** List the first-principles drivers that must behave as you expect for the thesis to hold. These might be macro conditions (e.g., GDP growth, interest rates), company-specific metrics (profit margins, user growth), or behavioral factors. Essentially, answer: "What needs to be true in the world for my thesis to play out?" If any of these drivers are especially uncertain, note them – they might require extra attention or scenario analysis.

4. **Falsification Triggers:** Arguably the most important section – enumerate the specific conditions that would invalidate the thesis. Think of 2-5 key conditions/events. They can be in the form, *"If [metric] falls below/above [threshold]…", "If [event] happens…", "If [time passes] without [certain progress]…"*. For each, decide what action you'll take (reduce position, exit entirely, etc.). This pre-commitment device is your discipline check. As one investor put it, a hypothesis-oriented thesis says, *"I think I'm right, but I'll know I'm wrong if X, Y, or Z happens."*

5. **Evidence to Gather (Test Plan):** List what data or signals you will track to test the thesis. This could be scheduled reports (earnings dates, economic data releases), market prices or technical indicators, industry news, etc. If possible, also note expected timing ("Q3 earnings in Oct should show X; monthly inflation on the 15th of each month," etc.). Essentially, plan your "experiments." You might even set up alerts or calendar reminders for these evidence-gathering points.

6. **Position Strategy:** Outline how you will implement the trade/investment. Include initial position size, any plans to add or trim (e.g., "will add 50% more if thesis is on track after first data release"), and risk management tools (stop-loss orders, options hedges, etc., aside from the thesis falsification triggers). This is where you enforce

that *testing mentality* – maybe starting small and scaling is appropriate if you're less certain. It's also where you note the intended holding period ("I aim to hold for 1 year unless falsified earlier").

7. **Ongoing Monitoring & Journal:** Keep an active log of relevant developments. Every time new data comes in, write down: Did it confirm, weaken, or refute the thesis? By keeping this log, you maintain objectivity and have a reference to review later. It can be as simple as bullet points with dates: "Jan 15: Competitor launched similar product – watch if it affects our company's sales (possible risk). Feb 1: Quarterly report out – revenue grew 12%, short of expected 15% (caution)." This habit will also reveal if you are selectively remembering positives and forgetting negatives, helping to counteract confirmation bias.

8. **Review and Decision Points:** Pre-schedule periodic reviews. For a fast-moving trade, it could be daily or weekly; for a longer thesis, maybe monthly or tied to key events. In each review, formally re-read your hypothesis and ask *"Is this thesis still intact? What has changed?"* If a falsification trigger has tripped, you **must act** (either exit or, if you decide to hold on, explicitly document why – perhaps you choose to give one more quarter, but that should be a conscious decision, not inertia). If the thesis is on track, you might increase your commitment as confidence rises. Basically, this step enforces the **feedback loop**: hypothesis -> test -> adjust. A good mental habit is asking periodically, *"Knowing what I know now, would I still initiate this position today?"* If the answer is no (and especially if disconfirming evidence is mounting), it's time to adjust or close the trade.

9. **Post-Mortem Analysis:** Once the thesis has played out (either you closed it or reached the forecast horizon), do a concise post-mortem. Document the outcome (gain/loss), and – most crucially – why it turned out that way. Was your hypothesis correct? Were the drivers you identified actually the ones that mattered? Did any unexpected factor spoil or boost the trade? What can you learn about your analytical process from this? Perhaps you realize you overweighted one data point too much, or you had a blind spot about a certain risk. This final step completes the learning cycle. Over time, collecting these post-mortems builds a personal knowledge base that can greatly refine your future hypotheses. (Many top investors keep detailed journals and review their past trades to glean patterns of what works and what doesn't.)

Using this kind of template ensures that **each investment decision is approached with scientific rigor and self-reflection.** It may seem like a lot of work, but if you are an active

investor aiming to consistently outperform, this is the level of process that separates luck from skill. Moreover, much of this can be internalized – once you get used to thinking this way, it becomes second nature to ask "What would convince me I'm wrong?" or to pinpoint the key drivers before jumping in.

Importantly, this process also helps manage the emotional side of investing. By setting out your plan and criteria in advance, you reduce reactive, emotion-driven decisions. If the price suddenly drops, you don't panic-sell because you check your thesis: perhaps nothing fundamental has changed, so it's a chance to add rather than sell. Conversely, if you're very attached to a stock, having written down "I'll sell if XYZ goes wrong" forces you to overcome denial when XYZ indeed goes wrong. In essence, you are **outsourcing decisions from hot-blooded moments in the future back to the cool, rational mindset you have in the present** when writing the plan. This is how professional traders and investors maintain discipline – they rely on a predefined system rather than on willpower alone in the heat of the moment.

Finally, remember the spirit of David Deutsch's *Beginning of Infinity*: human knowledge is ever-expanding, and problems are solvable with the right approach. By treating your investment ideas as hypotheses, you engage in continuous problem-solving – refining your understanding of what drives markets. Each falsified thesis is not a failure but a step towards better knowledge ("error correction"). Over time, your "knowledge portfolio" compounds just like your financial portfolio can. In practical terms, this means your ability to discern cause and effect in markets, to sniff out good opportunities and avoid pitfalls, grows with each iteration of the feedback loop. This compounding of skill is one of the greatest advantages of a rigorous approach.

Conclusion

Developing a falsifiable investment thesis using first principles and scientific thinking is about **elevating your process to be on par with the complexity of markets**. Rather than being a passive observer or a storyteller who might be seduced by narratives, you become an active experimenter in the market laboratory. You form hypotheses grounded in causal logic, you define what success and failure look like in advance, and you let the evidence (price action, data) guide you to the truth – adjusting your positions as needed. This approach transforms investing from a game of **trying to be right** (and then often cherry-picking facts to claim you were) into a process of **trying to find out what is right** and align with it. In other words, you shift "the goal from being right to getting it right," which is *"a hallmark of both good science and good investing."*

By teaching yourself to build *testable* theses and to embrace falsifiability, you instill a discipline that guards against many common investor mistakes – overconfidence, confirmation bias, stubbornly holding losers. You also gain the confidence to let winners run until objective signals tell you otherwise, because you know exactly what you're watching for. The dynamic, knowledge-driven strategy stands in contrast to simply holding assets in hopes of generic long-term returns; it is **proactive and adaptable.**

In practice, not every investment decision will neatly follow a textbook scientific method – markets can throw curveballs and some decisions must be made with incomplete information. But by adhering to the principles outlined – clarity of hypothesis, focus on causality, falsifiability, iterative feedback – you greatly increase your odds of making rational decisions and learning from every outcome. In a sense, you become your own scientist and your portfolio becomes a continuous research project, one where the payoff is measured in both financial returns and in accumulated wisdom.

Remember: no thesis is so precious that it should survive in the face of contradictory evidence. Stay curious, stay critical of your own ideas, and remain willing to update or abandon them as the world reveals new information. This intellectual humility, paired with a structured process, is what allows investors to navigate the infinite complexities of markets. It keeps you moving forward, always seeking a better thesis – a better explanation – for what you observe. In the long run, this scientific approach doesn't just build better portfolios; it builds better investors.

database or other repository nor to otherwise make it available to any other entity/person/third party, without the prior written consent of Capital Flows.