

METHODOLOGICAL REVIEW REQUEST

Silk Clarity™

An invitation to qualified academic reviewers to interrogate the methodology before further claims are made.

Version 1.0 · June 2026

Document classification: Controlled External

© 2026 Silk Clarity

Contents

1 Purpose of this request

2 Methodology in brief

3 Scope of independent review

4 Current stage of development

5 Questions for reviewers

6 Critical feedback we invite

7 How to respond

8 Closing

1 Purpose of this request

Silk Clarity invites independent methodological scrutiny of the Communication Performance Methodology, its evidence architecture and its synthesis logic — before the platform is presented as a research instrument.

2 Methodology in brief

Six dimensions — Clarity, Credibility, Integrity, Composure, Influence, Adaptability — operationalised through observable indicators, captured from five evidence sources and synthesised into a Communication Signature™ with explicit provenance and confidence calibration.

3 Scope of independent review

- Construct definitions and decomposition into competencies and indicators.
- Evidence sources and their differential weighting.
- AI synthesis logic, prompt design and provenance preservation.
- Reliability and validity protocols set out in Appendix B.
- Ethical safeguards and explicit non-claims.

4 Current stage of development

Silk Clarity is in an applied development phase: the methodology is operationalised, the platform is in pilot use, and a structured validation programme is published openly in Appendix B. We are not yet presenting reliability or validity statistics; we are presenting a method, an instrument and a roadmap, and we are inviting scrutiny at that stage. The intention is methodological transparency rather than premature claim.

5 Questions for reviewers

- Are the six dimensions defined with sufficient behavioural specificity?
- Are the observable indicators operationalised at the right grain?
- Are the five evidence sources independent enough to justify differential weighting?
- Is the synthesis logic — including provenance and confidence calibration — defensible?
- Are the reliability protocols in Appendix B adequate as designed?
- Are the validity protocols in Appendix B adequate as designed?
- Are the explicit non-claims sufficient and clearly stated?

- Are the ethical safeguards proportionate to the use cases?
- Are there omitted constructs that should be in scope?
- Are there included constructs that should be out of scope?
- What single issue, if unaddressed, would most undermine the credibility of the work as it stands today?

6 Critical feedback we invite

- Construct definitions — clarity, specificity and behavioural anchoring.
- Indicator operationalisation — grain, observability and aggregation.
- AI synthesis prompts — robustness, transparency and risk of drift.
- Provenance and confidence calibration — coherence and traceability.
- Validation roadmap — adequacy, sequencing and ethical proportionality.
- Communication of non-claims — visibility and sufficiency.
- Risks of misuse — and proportionate mitigations.

7 How to respond

Reviewers may submit feedback through the platform's structured review instrument or directly by email to hello@silkclarity.com. Substantive feedback is acknowledged in the methodology change record with optional attribution.

8 Closing

Silk Clarity is published in this form so that the methodology can be examined before claims are made. Independent scrutiny is the precondition for the validation programme that follows.