

# The Hidden Reference Problem: Blanks, Standards, Controls and Calibrations Are Part of the Measurement System

Juan Seguro

3Dresyns by Resyner Technologies S.L.

© 2026 Juan Seguro. All Rights Reserved.

Correspondence: [info@3Dresyns.com](mailto:info@3Dresyns.com) · [www.3Dresyns.com](http://www.3Dresyns.com)

HEB-005 · Independent Technical Article · Version v0.2 · 22 September 2026

## Abstract

A reference is often treated as the stable part of an experiment: the blank is assumed to be zero, the standard is assumed to be correct, the control is assumed to define normal behaviour, and a calibration certificate is assumed to anchor the instrument. In practice, each reference is itself a measured object embedded in a measurement system. Its identity, preparation, matrix, geometry, ageing, timing, environmental exposure, range, uncertainty and mode of use can all become part of the final error. This article develops the hidden reference problem as a general methodological failure in which confidence is transferred from a reference label to a scientific conclusion without demonstrating that the reference remains valid for the sample, time and decision under study. A documented photochemical case illustrates temporal invalidation: a chemically appropriate benzophenone reference could become metrologically inappropriate when instrument response drifted between reference and unknown. Radiometric calibration provides a second example: traceability at one spectrum, geometry or plane does not automatically validate readings under different conditions. The discussion distinguishes blanks, standards, controls, calibration artefacts and check samples, and proposes a reference-validity framework based on identity, commutability, temporal proximity, range, state, uncertainty, bracketing and independent verification. The central conclusion is that a reference does not sit outside the experiment. It is one of the experimental components that must itself be qualified.

Keywords: reference material; blank; control; calibration; traceability; commutability; drift; bracketing; measurement uncertainty; measurement system; photochemistry; radiometry; scientific inference

## 1. Purpose and evidence boundary

Many experiments are organised around an apparently stable comparison object. A blank defines background. A standard defines a scale. A positive or negative control defines expected behaviour. A calibration artefact links an instrument indication to a reference value. A check sample monitors whether a process remains in control. These devices are indispensable, but their authority can become misleading when the reference is treated as intrinsically correct rather than conditionally valid.

This article is methodological. It does not propose a universal calibration interval, a universal blank criterion or a domain-specific acceptance limit. Those belong to the relevant technical standards and Engineering Reviews. The HEB question is prior to qualification: what assumptions are being made when a reference is used to transform an indication into a claim?

HEB-001 established that the measurement system includes the instrument, specimen, reference, environment, operator, protocol and statistical treatment acting together [1]. HEB-005 develops the reference component of that system.

The central proposition is:

A reference is valid only for the conditions under which its relationship to the unknown is demonstrated.

## 2. A reference is not a label

The International Vocabulary of Metrology distinguishes a measurement result from the indication produced by an instrument and treats metrological traceability as a property of a measurement result related to a reference through a documented unbroken chain of calibrations, each contributing to measurement uncertainty [2]. The implication is important: the word “calibrated” does not attach permanently to an instrument independent of use conditions.

A reference has physical state. It may age, evaporate, polymerise, adsorb moisture, change concentration, accumulate contamination, suffer photobleaching, drift thermally, lose homogeneity or be handled differently from the unknown. Even when its certified or assigned value is correct, its use in a particular experiment can still be invalid.

It is useful to separate five questions: Is the reference identity correct? Is its assigned value appropriate? Is the reference physically comparable with the unknown? Was it measured in the same relevant instrumental state? Is the uncertainty introduced by the reference small enough for the intended decision?

Reference validity therefore has at least two layers: value validity and use validity. A reference can pass the first and fail the second.

## 3. Blanks are measurements, not zeros

A blank is commonly subtracted from a sample result as though it represented an exact zero. In reality, a blank estimates contributions from solvents, reagents, vessels, detector offsets, background radiation, contamination, baseline structure or another part of the procedure. If those contributions vary, the blank has its own uncertainty and may have its own drift.

Blank subtraction can therefore reduce bias only when the blank reproduces the background affecting the unknown. A solvent blank may not reproduce scattering from a filled sample. An empty-cell blank may not reproduce reflections from a specimen interface. A reagent blank prepared on a different day may not represent contamination introduced during the actual sample sequence.

The general rule is simple: subtraction does not remove an effect that the blank did not contain, and it can introduce an error if the blank contains an effect that the sample does not share.

#### 4. Standards require commutability with the unknown

A standard can be accurate as an artefact yet still be a poor comparator for a particular sample. The relation between standard and unknown depends on what the measurement system responds to. Matrix, geometry, spectral distribution, refractive index, thermal properties, viscosity, surface state and spatial distribution can alter the response even when the nominal analyte or property is the same.

This is a problem of commutability in the broad methodological sense: does the reference behave sufficiently like the unknown for the intended measurement relation? The answer cannot be assumed from a shared name or nominal value.

A reference designed to calibrate one range can also become unreliable when extrapolated. Linearity, detector range, saturation, background fraction and signal-to-noise can all change across a measurement interval. A reference near the centre of a range does not automatically validate the extremes.

#### 5. Case study I: a correct reference measured at the wrong time

HEB-001 documents a retrospective photochemical case from the author's doctoral work. Relative phosphorescence quantum-yield measurements used benzophenone as the reference. The chemically appropriate reference did not solve the complete problem because the luminescence response changed during a measurement session [1]. Relative quantum-yield methodology more generally depends on comparison with an established reference under controlled conditions [4].

If the unknown was measured substantially before or after the reference, the denominator used in the relative calculation could represent a different instrumental state. The practical response was to bracket the unknown with reference measurements made immediately before and after the sample. Under sufficiently smooth drift, the local reference response could then be estimated by interpolation.

The methodological lesson is broader than luminescence spectroscopy:

A correct reference measured in the wrong system state is an incorrect reference for that measurement.

Temporal proximity is therefore part of reference validity whenever the system is not demonstrably stationary.

#### 6. Case study II: calibration can be spectrally and geometrically wrong

ER-203 treats radiometric and actinometric traceability in photopolymer processing and states that traceability is an unbroken calibration chain with stated uncertainties, not a brand name or a recent calibration sticker [5]. It also shows why a working meter calibrated under one spectrum and geometry does not make all later readings traceable when spectral mismatch, angular response, range or temperature are uncontrolled.

This is an example of reference transfer. The calibrated detector or source is not the final measurand. A chain connects the reference to the working instrument and then to the sample plane. Every transfer step introduces conditions and uncertainty.

The HEB-005 point is not radiometric procedure design. ER-203 owns that engineering problem. The general point is that calibration validates a relationship, not an object in isolation.

#### 7. Controls answer narrower questions than they appear to

A positive control can show that a system is capable of producing an expected response. A negative control can show that a response is absent under a declared comparison condition. Neither automatically proves that the experimental sample is free from every alternative explanation.

Control interpretation depends on failure mode. If a positive control succeeds, the assay may still be insensitive to a different matrix. If a negative control is clean, contamination may still enter through a sample-specific preparation step. If both controls behave as expected, the unknown may still lie outside the validated response range.

The question should therefore be phrased narrowly: which failure mode does this control exclude, under which conditions? A control should not inherit responsibility for failures it was never designed to detect.

#### 8. Bracketing, check standards and local validity

When drift is plausible, local checks are often more informative than distant calibration events. Bracketing places reference observations around the unknown in time. Check standards test whether a previously established relation still holds. Duplicate references can reveal preparation or handling variability. Reference rotation can reveal whether one artefact has developed a hidden defect.

These strategies do not eliminate uncertainty. They expose it. Their purpose is to make the reference state observable rather than assumed.

A reference-validity sequence can be written as: define the target measurand; identify what role the reference plays; verify identity and assigned value; test commutability with the unknown; establish relevant range and geometry; control temporal state; propagate reference uncertainty [3]; and challenge the result with an independent check where the decision is consequential.

#### 9. Calibration interval is a scientific question before it is an administrative one

A fixed calendar interval is convenient for quality systems, but scientific validity depends on stability between calibrations. A stable instrument may remain within tolerance for a long period; a disturbed or ageing system may drift rapidly. The appropriate evidence is therefore not the date on the certificate alone but the combination of calibration history, intermediate checks, use severity, environmental history and the sensitivity of the decision to drift.

The same logic applies to reference solutions, working standards and control materials. Expiry dates and storage instructions are necessary controls, but they do not prove that a particular preparation remained unchanged after opening, repeated handling or environmental exposure.

## 10. Independent references are valuable when they fail differently

Confidence increases when two references constrain the same result through different physical routes. Agreement between a spectroscopic standard and an independently prepared gravimetric standard can be more informative than repeated measurements of the same standard. A second instrument based on the same calibration artefact may reproduce the same hidden error and therefore provide false reassurance.

Independent references are especially useful for detecting common-mode failure: a shared wrong concentration, an incorrect assigned value, a contaminated stock, a geometric mismatch or a software correction applied to both primary and check measurements.

## 11. Reference failure modes

Recurring failure modes include identity failure, value-assignment failure, contamination, ageing, matrix mismatch, geometric mismatch, temporal drift, range extrapolation, non-linearity, environmental mismatch, handling asymmetry, software correction mismatch and common-mode dependence between nominally independent checks.

The most dangerous failures are often not large random errors. They are stable biases that survive replication because the same reference assumption is repeated consistently.

Replication can demonstrate that a reference procedure is repeatable. It cannot prove that the reference relationship is correct.

## 12. Relationship to the Engineering Review corpus

HEB-005 asks whether a reference actually supports the inferential role assigned to it. HEB-002 addresses hidden conceptual boundaries in scientific reasoning, HEB-003 addresses structure-based visual reasoning in chemistry and photochemistry, and HEB-004 addresses mismatch between a proxy and the measurand it is used to represent. HEB-005 is distinct: it addresses the validity of the comparator, blank, standard, control or calibration relation itself. Application-specific Engineering Reviews retain the detailed qualification problems. ER-203 owns radiometric and actinometric traceability. ER-209 owns interlaboratory round-robin design, including calibration status, blinding and distributed measurement capability [5,6]. HEB-001 retains the historical measurement-system cases from which the present generalisation is drawn [1].

The boundary is therefore methodological: HEB-005 identifies reference failure as a class of reasoning and measurement-system error; the ER corpus defines the evidence required to control that failure in specific engineering contexts.

## 13. Conclusions

References are indispensable because measurement is relational. Their danger begins when the word reference is treated as a guarantee rather than a role that must be validated.

The main conclusions are:

1. A blank, standard, control or calibration artefact is part of the measurement system, not an external source of certainty.
2. Reference validity includes both the correctness of the assigned value and the correctness of its use for the unknown.
3. Blank subtraction is valid only for background components actually shared by blank and sample.
4. A standard must be sufficiently commutable with the unknown for the intended measurement relation.
5. A correct reference can become invalid when measured in a different temporal, environmental, spectral or geometric state.
6. Calibration validates a relationship under stated conditions; it does not make an instrument universally correct.
7. Controls exclude defined failure modes, not every alternative explanation.
8. Bracketing and check standards make reference stability observable and should be used when drift matters to the decision.
9. Independent references are most informative when their failure modes are genuinely different.
10. Repeatability of a reference procedure does not establish correctness of the reference relationship.

The reference that is never questioned can become the most stable source of error in the experiment.

## References

- [1] Segurola, J. The Hidden Error Budget: Measurement-System Failure, False Precision and Experimental Design in Laboratory Science. HEB-001. 3Dresyns Independent Technical Articles (2026). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22862642.
- [2] Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology. International Vocabulary of Metrology - Basic and General Concepts and Associated Terms (VIM), 3rd ed., JCGM 200:2012. DOI: 10.59161/JCGM200-2012.
- [3] Joint Committee for Guides in Metrology. Evaluation of Measurement Data - Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement. JCGM 100:2008, with JCGM 100:2008/Amd.1:2026. Base document DOI: 10.59161/JCGM100-2008E. Amendment DOI: 10.59161/PPDI3267.
- [4] Brouwer, A. M. Standards for photoluminescence quantum yield measurements in solution (IUPAC Technical Report). Pure and Applied Chemistry 83(12) (2011) 2213-2228. DOI: 10.1351/PAC-REP-10-09-31.
- [5] Segurola, J. Radiometric and Actinometric Traceability for Photopolymer Processing: Irradiance, spectral dose, geometry and calibration transfer. ER-203. 3Dresyns Engineering Publications (2026). Version DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22842498.
- [6] Segurola, J. Interlaboratory Round-Robin Design for Vat-Photopolymer Materials: Specimen state, protocol transfer and reproducibility statistics. ER-209. 3Dresyns Engineering Publications (2026). Version DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22862020.

## Knowledge boundary

This article uses metrological definitions already established in the HEB and ER corpus and treats the HEB-001 quantum-yield case as a documented methodological example. It does not create new certified-reference-material requirements, define laboratory accreditation rules or replace any domain standard.

## Limitations

No quantitative meta-analysis of reference drift, commutability or calibration interval is attempted. The relative importance of each reference failure mode depends on the measurement principle, sample, uncertainty requirement and decision. The examples are illustrative and should not be converted into universal numerical acceptance limits.