PLAGGE CONSULTING

NINJATRADER® ECOSYSTEM · COMPLIANCE ADDENDUM

Risk & hypothetical performance disclosures

Added 21 August 2026 for the public website distribution copy. The original research pages remain unchanged; this addendum provides the risk and hypothetical-performance disclosures applicable to the quantitative historical, simulated and backtest-derived material that follows.

MATERIAL ASSUMPTIONS / RESULT CLASSIFICATION

Material assumptions: Version 1 is an end-of-day structural research test, not a customer-account or account-return simulation. Hit-ratio metrics use neither an initial account balance nor a profit-reinvestment assumption. Unless a specific historical comparison states otherwise, the V1 baseline excludes commissions, slippage, market impact, intraday event ordering, complete stop/break-even/trailing logic and full APS integration. No management or incentive fees are modelled because no managed customer account is represented.

RISK DISCLOSURE

Futures and forex trading contains substantial risk and is not for every investor. An investor could potentially lose all or more than the initial investment. Risk capital is money that can be lost without jeopardizing ones financial security or life style. Only risk capital should be used for trading and only those with sufficient risk capital should consider trading. Past performance is not necessarily indicative of future results.

HYPOTHETICAL PERFORMANCE DISCLAIMER

HYPOTHETICAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS HAVE MANY INHERENT LIMITATIONS, SOME OF WHICH ARE DESCRIBED BELOW. NO REPRESENTATION IS BEING MADE THAT ANY ACCOUNT WILL OR IS LIKELY TO ACHIEVE PROFITS OR LOSSES SIMILAR TO THOSE SHOWN; IN FACT, THERE ARE FREQUENTLY SHARP DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HYPOTHETICAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS AND THE ACTUAL RESULTS SUBSEQUENTLY ACHIEVED BY ANY PARTICULAR TRADING PROGRAM.

ONE OF THE LIMITATIONS OF HYPOTHETICAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS IS THAT THEY ARE GENERALLY PREPARED WITH THE BENEFIT OF HINDSIGHT. IN ADDITION, HYPOTHETICAL TRADING DOES NOT INVOLVE FINANCIAL RISK, AND NO HYPOTHETICAL TRADING RECORD CAN COMPLETELY ACCOUNT FOR THE IMPACT OF FINANCIAL RISK IN ACTUAL TRADING. FOR EXAMPLE, THE ABILITY TO WITHSTAND LOSSES OR TO ADHERE TO A PARTICULAR TRADING PROGRAM IN SPITE OF TRADING LOSSES ARE MATERIAL POINTS WHICH CAN ALSO ADVERSELY AFFECT ACTUAL TRADING RESULTS.

THERE ARE NUMEROUS OTHER FACTORS RELATED TO THE MARKETS IN GENERAL OR TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY SPECIFIC TRADING PROGRAM WHICH CANNOT BE FULLY ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE PREPARATION OF HYPOTHETICAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS AND ALL OF WHICH CAN ADVERSELY AFFECT ACTUAL TRADING RESULTS.

Public review document · Version 1.1

Institutional Trading Decision & Risk Framework

Evidence & Validation Brief

Evidence status, limitations and acceptance criteria for the documented research state, the APS Risk Layer and the Version 2 validation programme.

Purpose of this document This brief complements the Executive Overview. Its primary purpose is not to introduce the project, but to show which core statements are supported at which level today, where the limitations are and which concrete test would strengthen each claim. It is not a sales prospectus and makes no return promise.

Status: 16 September 2026 · Public review layer · Plagge Consulting

1 · EVIDENCE LOGIC

Four evidence states instead of a blanket “validated”

The status describes current support, not the strategic importance of an idea.

DOCUMENTED	HISTORICAL	RE-TEST	PLANNED
Source- or data-based	**Configuration-specific**	**Revalidation open**	**Development target**
Traceable in the current project record.	Specific historical test, not automatically generalisable.	Substance exists; independent or more realistic proof is pending.	Becomes evidence only after actual completion.
Status D	**Status H**	**Status R**	**Status P**

ID	Core statement	Status
A1	Broad Version 1 test base	D
A2	Hit ratio: real vs control	D / R
A3	Historical protected APS path	H
A4	Independent reproduction of Decision Core	R
A5	Intraday, cost, APS and forward validation	P

Governing rule A statement moves to a stronger evidence level only after the defined test has actually been passed.

2 · VERSION 1

Breadth is a research argument – not a shortcut to real performance

Metric	Documented state	Interpretation
Data period	2009–2025	approx. 17 years
Real instruments	94	11 market segments
Oscillators	60	23 originals · 28 variants · 9 proprietary
Individual tests	5,640	94 × 60
Trade events	extensive record	documented project record

Hit ratio = winners ÷ losers

Historical detailed values are not carried forward publicly for now. The metric has no unit and is not the monetary profit factor.

- The real-market test matrix and synthetic control group reacted differently under the same pipeline.
- Specific historical comparison values remain internal until external disclosure status is cleared.

Methodological limit 5,640 combinations are not 5,640 independent experiments. Instruments correlate, oscillators share price inputs and formula families, and all tests use the same underlying architecture.

Matrix structure 94 real instruments + 6 synthetic control series = 100 price series. Across 60 oscillators this creates 6,000 test combinations: 5,640 real-instrument tests + 360 control tests.

HYPOTHETICAL / SIMULATED RESULTS - See compliance addendum on page 1.

3 · CONTROL GROUPS

A counter-test is useful - but one generator family is not a universal null hypothesis

The current control group consists of six independent synthetic OHLC series with deliberately different trend and noise parameters. All six are processed through the same pipeline as the 94 real instruments.

Documented today	Open reproducibility question	Version 2 extension
6 synthetic trend regimes · 360 tests	generator and parameters documented; future regeneration with deterministic seed	regenerate controls deterministically
historical detail values internal	different regimes, but the same generator family	block permutation / bootstrap
identical test pipeline	null model must match the review question	regime-preserving procedures

Why this openness matters A strong control group is not decorative confirmation. It must itself be reproducible and challenge different plausible explanations for an apparent pattern.

Construction of the six control series

The six series are not identical random-walk copies. The generator varies starting drift, trend-switch probability, drift persistence, drift noise, close noise and high/low range. The gradation is deliberate because the Version 1 logic is trend-following rather than mean-reverting.

R1 ER ≈ 0.001
near-pure noise

R2 ER ≈ 0.02
slightly trending

R3 ER ≈ 0.15
moderate

R4 ER ≈ 0.31
clearly trending

R5 ER ≈ 0.52
strong

R6 ER ≈ 0.87
very strong / stress test

All six come from the same generator family. Version 2 should make regeneration deterministic and reproducible and add additional, differently constructed null models.

4 · EXECUTION REALISM

Daily data know the high and low – but not reliably which came first

For a trading logic with entry, target and stop, the intraday order can be decisive. Daily OHLC data may contain both thresholds without revealing which event occurred first.

Version 1	Version 2 – required	Why
End-of-day structural test	chronological intraday data	resolve target/stop conflicts in time
no complete real stop path	stop, break-even, trailing separately	measure each effect in isolation
costs not fully in core	commissions and slippage	economic viability, not only structure
historical development data	Out-of-Sample / Walk-forward	stability on unseen periods

Acceptance criterion A result should only be described as more realistic execution validation once event order is derived from chronological data and costs and risk mechanisms are handled transparently.

5 · APS RISK LAYER

Make the historical mechanism visible – without mixing different APS variants

APS does not decide what or when to trade. The risk layer controls position size, protection references, warning states, de-escalation and the controlled restart of an attack plan. The source record documents several development states from 2013 to 2020.

Component	Function
Stage model	release exposure and target path in controlled stages
High-watermark protection	use achieved plan equity as a dynamic protection reference
Warning system	translate remaining buffer into explicit states
Tactical governance	govern reduction, pauses, exceptional states and restart

Historical 81-trade path - mechanics documented

A specific protected APS variant was historically compared with a conventional path. The result and drawdown profile changed in this single path. The exact historical comparison values remain in the internal versioned record and will only be carried forward publicly after renewed reproduction and a cleared disclosure status.

Key limitation This public comparison refers to one specific protected APS variant and one historical path. The APS source record contains other development states and configurations with different risk characteristics. It must not be converted into a universal superiority claim.

HYPOTHETICAL / SIMULATED RESULTS - See compliance addendum on page 1.

6 · VALIDATION GATES

Status advances through passed tests – not through new terminology

Gate	Test	Acceptance principle
G1	Freeze reference state	Version source data, parameters, rules and results unambiguously.
G2	Reproduce independently	Compare a new implementation against the reference record.
G3	Intraday sequence	Evaluate entry, target and stop chronologically.
G4	Economic realism	Add costs, slippage and risk mechanisms in isolation.
G5	Control groups	Reproduce controls and use several null models.
G6	Incremental APS value	Compare with/without APS under identical conditions.
G7	New data	Out-of-sample and walk-forward testing.

Documentation rule A new data state does not overwrite an old finding. Changes create a new version with comparison and a deviation register.

7 · DUE DILIGENCE

Eleven questions that should be answerable before deeper technical disclosure

- Are data source, period and cleaning rules documented unambiguously?
- Was the rule version fixed and versioned before the result?
- How are look-ahead and data leakage prevented?
- How is intraday event order determined?
- Which cost and slippage assumptions apply?
- How are control series generated and reproduced?
- Can an independent calculation path reproduce the reference values?
- Which contribution comes from the Decision Core, execution or APS?
- How does the system behave on new data?
- Which statement remains valid after all limitations are applied?
- Which data and third-party rights apply to the underlying dataset and to external disclosure?

Disclosure logic

Public documents provide orientation. Confidential whitepaper, architecture, data or core-IP material follows only when a qualified review requires it and under appropriate confidentiality. An NDA does not extend market-data or third-party rights.

8 · NEXT STEP

The goal is not a bigger claim – it is a smaller set of unresolved questions

Website 0.6.0 first made the public evidence logic more explicit. Website 0.9.0 integrated historical APS primary sources, refined documentation of the synthetic control series and the updated public Framework documents. Website 1.0.0 is the first fully released public overall state. The documented research state itself remains unchanged.

TODAY

Documented substance

Version 1, historical APS work, public methodology and documentation.

not a product promise

NEXT

Revalidation

Reproduction, intraday, costs, controls, APS and new data.

Version 2

TARGET

Reviewable product architecture

Every material claim remains tied to data, rules, tests, limitations and disclosure status.

Due diligence

Risk note Historical simulations and backtests are not a promise of future results. This document describes research and validation status and is not investment advice.

PLAGGE CONSULTING

Institutional Trading Decision & Risk Framework

www.aplagge.com · info@aplagge.com

Editorial responsibility & AI transparency

The contents of this document are reviewed, professionally contextualised and approved by Andreas Plagge before publication. Statements of fact, figures and professional assessments are editorially reviewed and, where necessary, checked against the underlying data or sources. Where generative AI is used as a supporting tool for drafting, structuring, language editing or design, editorial responsibility remains with Andreas Plagge, Plagge Consulting. Further information: www.aplagge.com/en/ai-transparency.php