

Compare

Exported : 01/10/2026, 22:19:27

ASML · v4 / APPLE · v1

GLOBAL MULTILINGUAL V1.8 · WATCH BRIDGE RELIABILITY

FRAMEWORK COMPARABILITY · STRONG Question overlap: 100%

The two theses use substantially comparable question structures, so dimension-level differences are directly interpretable.

ASML · ANSWER ALIGNMENT ALIGNED

The saved answers appear aligned with the current question semantics.

APPLE · ANSWER ALIGNMENT ALIGNED

The saved answers appear aligned with the current question semantics.

ASML

STOCK

Decision Readiness **56/100**

Reasoning is usable, but important gaps can still change the conclusion.

Evidence Coverage **50/100**

Evidence is meaningful but still incomplete across important claims.

Falsifiability Coverage **47/100**

Some invalidation conditions are explicit, but important ones remain vague.

Material Assumption Signals **29**

29 assumption signals are visible. A higher count is not automatically worse: mature reasoning often makes hidden assumptions explicit. The useful question is how many are actually supported.

Primary dependency

technology execution

Possible portfolio role

Strategic semiconductor infrastructure / technology-moat exposure

APPLE

STOCK

Decision Readiness **38/100**

The thesis still needs substantial work before relying on it for a decision.

Evidence Coverage **25/100**

Too much of the thesis still depends on weak or missing evidence.

Falsifiability Coverage **11/100**

The thesis is difficult to disprove, increasing confirmation-bias risk.

Material Assumption Signals **18**

18 assumption signals are visible. A higher count is not automatically worse: mature reasoning often makes hidden assumptions explicit. The useful question is how many are actually supported.

Primary dependency

customer loyalty and brand strength

Possible portfolio role

Ecosystem compounder / recurring-services and cash-flow exposure

COMPARISON INTEGRITY · STRONG

Both analyses appear structurally and semantically aligned for direct comparison.

THESIS COMPARISON

BETTER-SUPPORTED THESIS — ASML

CONFIDENCE · HIGH

- Stronger explicit evidence base: ASML 50/100 vs APPLE 25/100.
- More falsifiable reasoning: the saved thesis defines clearer conditions that could prove it wrong.
- Stronger VALUATION structure: ASML 82/100 vs APPLE 59/100.
- Stronger MOAT structure: ASML 73/100 vs APPLE 52/100.
- Stronger assumption-support signal in the comparison model. Read this alongside the raw assumption count, which measures visibility rather than quality.

Confidence measures the relative separation between the two saved theses, not absolute conviction in either asset. This is not a recommendation to buy, sell, hold or allocate a specific portfolio weight.

DECISION VALUE

What the comparison shows

ASML is currently the better-supported thesis in this comparison, with the most material gaps in VALUATION +23, MOAT +21. This measures the relative quality of the saved reasoning, not the absolute quality of the asset.

Why it matters

The gap helps identify where one thesis carries more evidence and where the other still requires more unverified conviction. It does not automatically make ASML the better investment.

Next useful action

Prioritize evidence capable of confirming or invalidating APPLE around its primary dependency — customer loyalty and brand strength. Then reassess whether that evidence genuinely closes the gap rather than merely adding more information.

Key trade-off

ASML's clearest relative edge is VALUATION. APPLE does not currently lead by five or more points in any dimension, but its thesis is structurally differentiated by customer loyalty and brand strength. The deeper trade-off is technology execution versus customer loyalty and brand strength.

Dimension	ASML	APPLE	Delta A-B
PURPOSE	60/100	51/100	+9
QUALITY	80/100	62/100	+18
MOAT	73/100	52/100	+21
FUTURE	67/100	53/100	+14
ECONOMICS	70/100	58/100	+12
VALUATION	82/100	59/100	+23

ASML — Primary failure path

The most credible failure path is that technology execution fails to preserve leadership, productivity or customer adoption, while competitive advantage erodes as alternatives become more credible or customer bargaining power increases. Even if the business remains capable, valuation can still turn that operating success into a disappointing investment outcome.

APPLE — Primary failure path

The most credible failure path is that customer loyalty or willingness to pay a premium weakens materially, while ecosystem relevance weakens because retention, switching costs or monetization stop reinforcing one another. Even if the business remains capable, valuation can still turn that operating success into a disappointing investment outcome.

Shared risks

- technology execution
- cash generation and capital allocation
- customer loyalty and brand strength
- valuation and expectations

Divergent risks

ASML: demand and cycle exposure

APPLE: —

PORTFOLIO ROLE

ASML

Strategic semiconductor infrastructure / technology-moat exposure

- Potential portfolio function: strategic exposure to semiconductor infrastructure and advanced technology leadership, with the investment thesis depending heavily on sustained execution and customer adoption.
- Primary dependency to monitor: technology execution.
- Primary thesis risk: The most credible failure path is that technology execution fails to preserve leadership, productivity or customer adoption, while competitive advantage erodes as alternatives become more credible or customer bargaining power increases. Even if the business remains capable, valuation can still turn that operating success into a disappointing investment outcome.

APPLE

Ecosystem compounder / recurring-services and cash-flow exposure

- Potential portfolio function: exposure to a high-quality ecosystem business combining customer retention, recurring services, cash generation and brand strength.
- Primary dependency to monitor: customer loyalty and brand strength.
- Primary thesis risk: The most credible failure path is that customer loyalty or willingness to pay a premium weakens materially, while ecosystem relevance weakens because retention, switching costs or monetization stop reinforcing one another. Even if the business remains capable, valuation can still turn that operating success into a disappointing investment outcome.

How the other thesis could become better supported

APPLE's saved thesis remains structurally interpretable, but the current reasoning gap would narrow only if evidence around customer loyalty and brand strength improves and falsification criteria become clearer.

What could reverse the thesis lead?

The current reasoning lead could reverse if APPLE materially strengthens evidence around customer loyalty and brand strength and defines clearer falsification thresholds relative to ASML.

DECISION INTELLIGENCE

1

Which investment risk are you more prepared to accept and monitor: ASML's dependence on technology execution, or APPLE's dependence on customer loyalty and brand strength?

2

Which thesis has the stronger combination of evidence quality, falsifiability and portfolio fit for your original investment purpose?

3

What new evidence would be strong enough to reverse the current reasoning lead rather than merely narrow the gap?

This comparison is educational investment analysis. It evaluates the structure, evidence, dependencies, risks and possible portfolio roles of the saved theses. Portfolio-role language helps you think about how an asset may function in a portfolio; it is not personalized investment advice or a recommendation to buy, sell, hold or allocate a specific weight.

Export of the displayed reasoning record. Scores describe the analysis, not expected investment returns.