

Omega Protocol

Structure

Input: Claim or statement ↓ [1] What it claims [2] What it assumes [3] What's actually shown [4] What's missing / unclear [5] Other framings ↓ **Output:** Structured inspection

Sequence

1. Identify the core claim or statement
2. Extract what is explicitly asserted
3. Identify hidden assumptions and dependencies
4. Distinguish what is shown vs implied
5. Identify missing context or evidence
6. Explore alternative interpretations

Stopping Rule

Stop when all five elements (claims, assumptions, shown, missing, framings) are populated. Do not add conclusions, verdicts, or advice. The protocol exposes structure only.

What It's Not

- Not a verdict or judgment
- Not advice or recommendations
- Not persuasion or argumentation
- Not a conclusion generator
- Not a truth detector

Omega Protocol — Worked Example

Claim:

"AI-powered skin cancer detection app achieves 95% accuracy, matching dermatologist performance."

What it claims

An AI app for detecting skin cancer achieves 95% accuracy and performs as well as dermatologists.

What it assumes

- 95% accuracy is sufficient for clinical use
- "Matching dermatologist performance" means equivalent outcomes
- The app works across diverse skin types and conditions
- Accuracy metrics are comparable between app and dermatologists
- False negatives and false positives have acceptable clinical impact

What's actually shown

- No specific study details provided
- No sample size or demographics
- No definition of "accuracy" (sensitivity? specificity? overall?)
- No comparison methodology described
- No information about test conditions or image quality

What's missing / unclear

- What dataset was used for training and testing
- How dermatologist performance was measured
- What types of skin lesions were included

- Whether accuracy holds across different populations
- What happens in cases of uncertainty
- Regulatory approval status
- Clinical validation results

Other framings

- Could emphasize screening utility vs diagnostic accuracy
- Could focus on accessibility (app available everywhere) vs accuracy tradeoffs
- Could interpret "matching" as meeting minimum threshold vs equivalent performance
- Could emphasize cost-effectiveness vs clinical accuracy