# When Identical Interventions Are Not Structurally Equivalent

Maksim Barziankou, Poznan 2026

**Abstract**

Adaptive and autonomous systems routinely evaluate the cost of intervention through measures such as control energy, action magnitude, or error reduction. These measures implicitly assume that identical interventions impose comparable internal burden on the system. This assumption fails under variable interaction coupling, where the relationship between an applied intervention and its realized effect depends on properties of the interaction channel rather than on the intervention itself.

This work introduces and formalizes a conceptual distinction between nominal intervention and structural intervention burden. We argue that identical nominal interventions may impose fundamentally different long-horizon structural costs depending on how efficiently the intervention couples into realized correction through the environment–system interaction. This structural burden may accumulate silently even when trajectories, errors, or rewards remain acceptable.

The contribution of this work is not a control method or algorithm, but the identification and clarification of an architectural phenomenon: the non-equivalence between nominal intervention and structural cost under variable coupling. We show why existing control and learning frameworks fail to represent this distinction and why ignoring it leads to silent degradation modes in long-horizon adaptive systems. No mechanism for estimating coupling, computing cost, or acting upon it is disclosed.

## 1 Introduction

Adaptive systems influence their environment through intervention. A robot applies torque, a controller issues corrective inputs, and a learning agent updates internal parameters, all with the intent of producing a corrective or stabilizing effect. Classical control theory and modern learning-based methods provide well-developed frameworks for generating such interventions efficiently with respect to stability, accuracy, or reward optimization.

In prevailing formulations, the cost of intervention is implicitly equated with properties of the intervention itself. Quantities such as control energy, action magnitude, update norm, or instantaneous error reduction are commonly used as proxies for the internal burden imposed on the system. This treatment presumes that identical interventions impose comparable structural cost whenever observable behavior remains similar.

This presumption holds only under restrictive conditions in which the interaction channel between the system and its environment is stable, efficient, and well-characterized. Outside these conditions, the relationship between an applied intervention and its realized effect is mediated by interaction properties that are not intrinsic to the intervention or the control policy. These properties include delay, dissipation, compliance, phase mismatch, partial observability, and evolving environmental dynamics.

Under variable interaction coupling, two interventions that are nominally identical may produce similar external outcomes while imposing fundamentally different internal structural burdens. One intervention may propagate coherently and require minimal repetition, while another may require sustained or repeated application to achieve a comparable effect. Conventional performance metrics may fail to distinguish these cases, as trajectories, errors, or rewards can remain within acceptable bounds despite accumulating internal strain.

The central observation of this work is that existing adaptive architectures lack an explicit representational distinction between nominal intervention and the structural burden imposed by intervention under interaction-dependent coupling. This omission leads to failure modes in which structural degradation accumulates silently, unreflected in standard control or learning signals. The present work isolates and formalizes this discrepancy as an architectural phenomenon independent of control objectives, optimization criteria, or algorithmic implementation.

## 2 The Limitation of Nominal Intervention Accounting

In prevailing adaptive and learning-based architectures, the cost of intervention is typically represented through quantities tied directly to the applied actuation or to immediate observable response. Common examples include control energy or actuator effort, action magnitude or update norm, deviation from a desired state or trajectory, and accumulated loss or reward signals. While these quantities are effective for short-horizon stabilization and local performance assessment, they share a structural limitation: they treat the burden of intervention as a function of the nominal intervention itself, or of its near-term observable outcome.

This treatment implicitly assumes that interventions that are nominally similar and produce similar trajectories impose comparable internal burden on the system. Stated differently, a hidden equivalence is embedded in conventional accounting: if an intervention is the same in magnitude and produces similar external behavior, then the structural cost of having applied it is also the same. Under stable and efficient interaction channels, this approximation may be acceptable. Under variable interaction coupling, it is not.

When interaction coupling is efficient, a nominal intervention can propagate into realized correction with minimal repetition and limited forced compensation. When coupling is inefficient, the same nominal intervention can be partially realized, delayed, dissipated, or otherwise ineffectively transmitted through the interaction channel, requiring repeated application or sustained forcing to achieve comparable external effect. In both cases, the nominal intervention may appear identical and the external outcome may appear acceptable, yet the long-horizon structural burden imposed on the system differs materially.

The limitation is therefore representational rather than algorithmic. Conventional metrics do not provide an explicit dimension for distinguishing nominal intervention from interaction-mediated structural burden. As a result, systems can appear locally correct while accumulating latent structural degradation associated with repeated correction under weak coupling conditions. This gap motivates the need for an architectural distinction between what is applied and what it costs structurally under prevailing interaction coupling, without presupposing any particular method of estimation, computation, or downstream use.

Importantly, the structural burden described here is not reducible to the mere count or sum of repeated interventions. Repetition is a surface manifestation, whereas the burden arises from the interaction-mediated necessity to sustain correction under inefficient coupling, even when nominal effort and observable outcomes remain bounded.

## 3 Interaction Coupling as a Structural Factor

The realization of an intervention is mediated by the interaction channel through which the intervention propagates, rather than being determined solely by the intervention itself. Between application and realized effect, directed influence is subject to properties of the environment–system interaction that shape how, when, and whether the intervention is absorbed as correction.

Interaction coupling is affected by factors such as temporal delay between action and effect, dissipation or compliance in physical or informational channels, phase mismatch between internal system dynamics and environmental response, partial observability or sensor–actuator mismatch, and changes in environmental dynamics or operational context. These factors influence the fidelity with which applied influence is transmitted, sustained, or degraded over time. Interaction coupling, as used here, is distinct from stochastic noise, model uncertainty, or disturbance terms: it refers to the efficiency of realization of directed influence through the interaction channel, not to unpredictability of outcomes.

Crucially, such factors are properties of the interaction itself rather than intrinsic attributes of the nominal intervention or the agent's policy. They do not alter what the system applies, but they alter how the applied influence is realized. Under efficient coupling, interventions propagate coherently and require minimal repetition. Under inefficient coupling, the same interventions may degrade into delayed, dissipated, or partial realization, necessitating sustained or repeated correction.

From an architectural perspective, interaction coupling modulates the structural burden imposed by intervention independently of whether the intervention ultimately succeeds in producing the intended external outcome. The cost arises from how correction is achieved through the interaction channel, not merely from whether correction is achieved.

## 4 Nominal Intervention vs. Structural Burden

We introduce a conceptual and architectural distinction between nominal intervention and structural intervention burden. Nominal intervention refers to the applied control action, update, or directed influence issued by the system as part of its decision-making or control process. Structural intervention burden refers to the internal structural cost imposed on the system as a consequence of applying that intervention under prevailing interaction conditions.

This distinction is observational and architectural rather than algorithmic. It does not prescribe how structural burden is measured, estimated, or acted upon, nor does it require any modification to the mechanism that generates nominal interventions. The distinction asserts only that nominal intervention and structural burden are not generally equivalent quantities.

Under conditions of efficient interaction coupling, nominal intervention and structural burden may closely align, as corrective influence propagates with minimal dissipation or repetition. Under conditions of inefficient coupling, the same nominal intervention may impose a substantially greater structural burden due to delayed realization, partial transmission, or sustained forced correction. In such cases, repeated application of nominally identical interventions may be required to maintain acceptable external behavior.

Importantly, the accumulation of structural intervention burden may proceed without visible degradation in conventional performance metrics. Trajectories may remain correct, errors may remain bounded, and rewards may remain stable, even as internal structural capacity is progressively consumed. This non-equivalence between nominal intervention and structural burden is therefore not reliably observable through standard control or learning signals, motivating the need for an explicit architectural distinction.

## 5 Silent Accumulation and Long-Horizon Degradation

A critical consequence of ignoring interaction-dependent structural burden is the emergence of silent degradation modes. In such modes, adaptive systems may exhibit externally correct behavior over extended periods while internally consuming structural capacity at an accelerated rate. Trajectories can remain within acceptable bounds, instantaneous errors may be continuously corrected, and reward or performance signals may remain stable, giving the appearance of satisfactory operation.

Despite this apparent correctness, the system may rely on repeated or sustained correction under conditions of inefficient interaction coupling. Each corrective cycle imposes additional structural burden that is not reflected in conventional metrics. Because nominal intervention magnitude and observable outcomes remain within expected ranges, no explicit signal indicates that degradation is occurring.

As a result, structural capacity may be progressively depleted without detection until a sudden loss of viability, stability, or identity continuity occurs. Such failures often appear abrupt or unexpected precisely because the underlying degradation was not represented or accumulated in any control- or performance-level quantity.

This phenomenon cannot be adequately captured by short-horizon optimization, local performance metrics, or trajectory-based evaluation. It requires an architectural accounting dimension that explicitly separates structural burden from nominal intervention success, enabling recognition of long-horizon degradation processes that remain invisible to conventional adaptive mechanisms.

## 6 Distinction from Existing Approaches

Existing approaches to interaction uncertainty and variability typically operate by modifying the behavior of the system in response to observed conditions. Techniques such as gain scheduling, adaptive control tuning, robust margin design, and noise modeling adjust control laws, policy parameters, or estimation assumptions in order to improve stability or performance under uncertainty. In these approaches, interaction-related considerations are embedded directly into the mechanisms that generate intervention.

Such methods fundamentally change what the system does in response to uncertainty. They reshape the mapping from state to action, alter optimization objectives, or introduce compensatory dynamics intended to counteract mismatch or variability in the interaction channel.

The phenomenon described in this work concerns a different architectural question. Rather than altering intervention generation, it concerns how the system accounts for the structural burden imposed by intervention under interaction-dependent coupling. The distinction identified here does not require modifying the controller, the reward function, the optimization process, or the decision policy. It identifies a representational gap in existing architectures rather than proposing a compensatory control mechanism.

By externalizing structural burden accounting from action generation and optimization, the present work operates outside the scope of conventional robustness and adaptation techniques. It addresses how intervention cost is represented and accumulated, not how intervention is selected or executed, thereby defining an architectural dimension that is orthogonal to existing control and learning methodologies.

# 7 Scope and Non-Disclosure Boundary

This work intentionally limits its scope to the identification and architectural framing of a previously unarticulated representational distinction in adaptive systems. In particular, the present disclosure deliberately refrains from specifying any concrete mechanisms, algorithms, or procedures for realizing the concepts described herein.

Specifically, this work does not disclose how interaction coupling is measured, estimated, sensed, or inferred; does not define how structural burden is computed, quantified, accumulated, or parameterized; and does not prescribe how any such burden is used for control, optimization, decision-making, policy adaptation, or behavioral modulation.

These aspects are considered implementation-dependent and lie outside the scope of the present work. The contribution of this disclosure is not operational or algorithmic, but architectural and conceptual. It establishes that nominal intervention and structural burden under variable interaction coupling are distinct quantities that cannot, in general, be reduced to one another without loss of explanatory power in long-horizon adaptive behavior.

Accordingly, the scope of this work is limited to defining the conceptual space in which this distinction exists and to articulating its relevance for long-horizon viability and structural integrity. Any system, architecture, or method that explicitly recognizes and accounts for the non-equivalence between nominal intervention and structural burden under variable coupling operates within the representational domain established by this disclosure, regardless of how such recognition is implemented. The absence of this distinction constitutes a representational incompleteness in adaptive architectures, rather than a missing optimization heuristic. Systems lacking this representational separation are structurally incapable of distinguishing between coherent propagation and forced compensation under variable coupling, regardless of implementation details.

## 8 Conclusion

This work establishes a fundamental architectural distinction in adaptive systems between *nominal intervention* and *structural intervention burden* under variable interaction coupling. We show that the internal cost imposed on a system by an intervention cannot, in general, be inferred from the intervention's magnitude, energy, or apparent effectiveness, and that identical interventions may incur radically different long-horizon structural burden solely as a function of interaction quality.

By isolating this non-equivalence, the work exposes a class of silent degradation modes in which adaptive systems maintain acceptable trajectories, bounded error, or stable reward signals while progressively consuming internal structural capacity through repeated correction under poor coupling. Such failure modes are invisible to conventional performance metrics and lie outside the explanatory scope of classical control theory and contemporary learning-based frameworks.

The contribution of this work is architectural rather than algorithmic. It does not propose a control mechanism, optimization strategy, or corrective policy. Instead, it establishes prior art for the representational necessity of interpreting intervention cost through the interaction channel itself, independently of task success, trajectory correctness, or optimization criteria.

This distinction defines a conceptual boundary that any long-horizon adaptive system must respect if it is to preserve structural integrity and viability under real-world interaction variability. Recognizing the separation between what an adaptive system *does* and what it *costs the system structurally to do it* is a prerequisite for the design, analysis, and evaluation of durable adaptive architectures operating beyond idealized coupling assumptions.

MxBv, 2026

10.5281/zenodo.18175922