

Validating a Growth Equity Investment Thesis for an Advanced Semiconductor Packaging Company

Yuandong Li*

Department of Computer and
Mathematical Sciences,
University of Toronto Scarborough,
Toronto, Canada, M1C1A4

*Corresponding author: yuandong.
li@mail.utoronto.ca

Abstract:

Growth equity investors often evaluate companies with short operating histories, limited disclosure, and uncertain commercialization paths. This study develops a case-based framework for forming and validating an investment thesis under such conditions. Using an anonymized advanced-semiconductor-packaging company, the analysis combines qualitative due diligence, lightweight quantitative validation, and downside stress testing. Evidence on market opportunity, technology, customer progress, production readiness, management, and exit feasibility is translated into testable assumptions concerning order conversion, capacity ramp-up, revenue growth, financing, and valuation. Confidential internal data are anonymized, indexed, and aggregated, then cross-validated against academic research, official downstream disclosures, and listed-company benchmarks. The results suggest that Company A has a credible commercialization pathway, but the thesis remains conditional. Revenue expectations exceed mature-peer growth rates and depend on later-stage customer execution, successful production ramp-up, and continued financing access. Reverse stress tests show that weaker customer conversion, underutilized capacity, liquidity pressure, and valuation compression may reinforce one another. The study concludes that growth equity decisions are more defensible when qualitative judgments are converted into observable assumptions and tested through transparent, conservative scenarios.

Keywords: Growth equity; investment thesis; due diligence; advanced packaging; scenario analysis.

1. Introduction

Growth equity occupies the space between venture

capital and mature private equity. Target companies have usually moved beyond the earliest development stage and may already possess products, customers,

and initial revenue, yet their profitability, scalability, and exit paths remain uncertain. Their operating histories are often too short to support a conventional long-horizon valuation, while limited standardized disclosure creates substantial information asymmetry. These characteristics are especially pronounced in capital-intensive hard-technology sectors, where research expenditure, production-line construction, technical qualification, and customer adoption occur over different time horizons. As a result, historical financial statements may describe the resources already consumed without fully revealing whether commercialization will succeed.

Investment decisions in this setting cannot rely only on traditional valuation models or recent revenue growth. Investors first need a structured explanation of how value may be created. An investment thesis performs this function by identifying the market opportunity, the company-specific capabilities that may capture it, the operating milestones required for value realization, and the risks that could invalidate the logic. Qualitative due diligence is therefore indispensable, because technology maturity, customer quality, management execution, and production readiness are not adequately captured by headline financial indicators. However, qualitative evidence can also encourage overconfidence when technical achievement or customer interest is treated as equivalent to scalable commercial demand. A disciplined process must therefore distinguish evidence of capability from evidence of repeatable economics.

This paper asks: how can private equity investors form and validate an investment thesis for a growth-stage company when information is incomplete and uncertainty is material? The question is examined through three linked issues. First, how can qualitative due diligence convert fragmented information on markets, technology, customers, production, and management into a coherent initial thesis? Second, how can market evidence, operating indicators, comparable-company performance, and valuation multiples support, revise, or challenge that thesis? Third, does the investment logic remain credible when customer conversion slows, production is delayed, financing becomes tighter, or exit multiples decline?

The study applies a single-case framework to an anonymized advanced-packaging company, Company A. The analytical sequence is investment-thesis formation, lightweight quantitative validation, and downside testing. Lightweight analysis is used deliberately: the available information is sufficient for indexed comparisons, scenario analysis, and cross-validation, but not for a statistically estimated forecasting model or a reliable long-term discounted-cash-flow valuation. More specifically, the study offers three interrelated innovations, progressing from conceptual reframing to methodological design and practical application.

First, at the conceptual level, it reframes growth-equity due diligence as an assumption-based decision process rather than a static assessment of technological attractiveness. The framework separates technological promise from commercial investability by requiring each investment claim to be connected to a measurable commercialization condition.

Second, at the methodological level, it develops a lightweight validation approach for situations in which company-level data are incomplete or uneven. Indexed comparisons, external benchmarks, cross-validation, and scenario analysis are combined to test the direction and credibility of key assumptions without introducing the false precision of a complex forecasting or valuation model.

Third, at the practical level, the framework integrates pre-investment assessment with post-investment monitoring. Customer conversion, capacity ramp-up, financing availability, and valuation conditions are translated into observable milestones and failure triggers. This allows investors not only to evaluate the initial thesis, but also to identify when the thesis should be maintained, revised, or rejected as new information becomes available.

2. Literature Review and Conceptual Background

Private equity research has traditionally emphasized governance, screening, contracting, and post-investment operational improvement. Kaplan and Strömberg largely examine venture contracting and leveraged buyouts, where investors can influence governance structures, capital allocation, and post-transaction operations [1,2]. By contrast, Gompers et al. show that venture capitalists place substantial weight on market size, management quality, technology, and business models [3]. Growth-stage hard-technology companies lie between these two settings. They possess more technical and operating evidence than early-stage start-ups but have less stable profitability, less predictable cash flow, and fewer standardized disclosures than mature buyout targets. Existing private equity and venture capital research therefore provides relevant analytical components without fully explaining how they should be combined when evaluating capital-intensive firms that have entered commercialization but not yet achieved stable scale.

Information asymmetry is central to this problem. Akerlof demonstrates how unequal information can distort selection and valuation. In private technology transactions, management generally possesses superior knowledge of technical maturity, customer qualification, production progress, yield, and expected orders [4]. Due diligence can reduce this gap through document review, management and customer interviews, technical verification, and com-

parison with external evidence, but it cannot eliminate uncertainty. The analytical challenge is therefore not simply to collect more information, but to convert private claims into propositions that can be compared with observable evidence. In this sense, due diligence helps distinguish assumptions supported by verifiable evidence from those that remain dependent on management expectations.

Valuation research provides a second set of tools. Bhojraj and Lee emphasize that comparable-company selection should reflect operating characteristics rather than industry labels alone, while Liu et al. show that the explanatory power of valuation multiples depends on the metric selected [5, 6]. For a loss-making growth company, enterprise value to revenue may be more usable than earnings-based multiples, but it remains highly sensitive to assumptions concerning order conversion, capacity utilization, and future margins. Comparable companies can therefore establish a reasonableness range, but they should not mechanically determine value when firms differ materially in scale, maturity, product mix, and financing requirements. Their more important role is to identify when internal projections require unusually strong supporting evidence.

Advanced packaging introduces additional sector-specific uncertainty. Conventional process scaling faces increasing technical and economic constraints, which has strengthened the importance of heterogeneous integration and hybrid bonding [7, 8]. These technologies can improve bandwidth density, energy efficiency, and system-level performance, particularly in artificial-intelligence applications [9]. Commercialization, however, depends on design integration, alignment accuracy, interface reliability, yield improvement, specialized equipment, and supply-chain coordination [10, 11]. Market growth therefore does not automatically translate into company-level success. A target firm must repeatedly manufacture qualified products at an economically viable scale.

Taken together, the financial and semiconductor literature remains insufficiently connected. Financial due-diligence and valuation research provides tools for assessing information quality, comparability, and downside risk, but rarely explains how technical commercialization milestones should be translated into investable financial assumptions. Conversely, semiconductor research identifies the engineering and operational conditions required for commercialization, yet generally does not examine how customer qualification, yield improvement, capacity ramp-up, and financing dependence should affect screening, valuation, and monitoring. The resulting cross-disciplinary gap is the absence of a unified evidence chain linking technical progress to order conversion, revenue realization, funding requirements, and valuation risk.

Three specific gaps therefore follow. First, mature-buyout and early-stage venture frameworks do not fully address capital-intensive firms that have begun commercialization

without achieving stable scale. Second, due diligence, valuation, and downside analysis are often treated separately rather than as one evidence chain. Third, generic investment frameworks insufficiently incorporate customer-stage migration, yield, capacity ramp-up, and financing dependence. This study addresses these gaps by integrating qualitative thesis formation, lightweight quantitative cross-validation, and reverse stress testing within a unified case-based framework.

3. Case and Methodology

3.1 Case Selection

Company A is an anonymized growth-stage semiconductor-packaging company centered on wafer-level advanced packaging and hybrid bonding. It has established pilot-scale manufacturing, completed initial commercial deliveries, developed multiple product platforms, and accumulated customers at different validation stages. The case is analytically useful because it contains both positive commercialization signals and material execution uncertainty. The preliminary thesis is that the company's technology platform, product coverage, and customer pipeline can support rapid revenue growth if qualified projects convert into recurring orders, the new production line reaches stable utilization, and financing remains available. These conditions are sufficiently observable to permit cross-validation and scenario analysis, but uncertain enough that a purely historical valuation would be misleading. The case therefore provides a suitable setting for tracing the full sequence from qualitative evidence to quantitative testing and downside assessment.

3.2 Data Sources

The non-public materials were accessed during the author's internship in the growth equity investment division of a professional private equity institution. All internal data acquisition was premised on the official project approval and due diligence access authorization issued by the institution's investment committee. Before participating in the project, the author signed a personal non-disclosure agreement (NDA) with the investment institution; meanwhile, the target semiconductor firm (Company A) and the private equity (PE) institution signed a bilateral commercial confidentiality agreement to authorize limited access to confidential operational, technical and customer data solely for investment due diligence analysis. Four categories of evidence were obtained through separate controlled procedures: customer-interview records were produced from on-site or remote interviews organized by the due-diligence team and archived after internal review; due-diligence drafts were accessed through the

institution's encrypted project library by authorized team members; order-pipeline and financial-forecast data were provided during formal management data handovers with access confirmation; and core technical documents were released after technical verification meetings for restricted offline review without copying or external transmission. No original confidential document is reproduced in this study.

Public evidence was used only to evaluate the external plausibility of internal assumptions, not to disclose or reconstruct confidential information. Academic studies and specialized industry materials were used for sector and technology claims, while official downstream disclosures and listed-company reports supplied demand, revenue, capital-expenditure, and capacity benchmarks. The specific matching and decision rules are set out in Section 3.3.

Customer desensitization: Customers are ranked by forecast annual order value and divided into three reporting groups: the top quartile is classified as major customers, the middle two quartiles as medium-sized customers, and the bottom quartile as small customers. This grouping is created solely for academic analysis and is separate from Company A's internal credit or customer-rating system. All customers are aggregated within their groups. The study prohibits disclosure of any single customer's order scale, revenue contribution, independent validation progress, identity, or exclusive customer-product relationship.

Order and pipeline desensitization: All individual orders, unusually large transactions, and single-batch deliveries are compulsorily merged by annual period, broad product platform, and commercialization stage. Total projected order value is normalized to a base index of 100. No unit price, order quantity, individual transaction, customer-specific amount, or segmented amount interval is reported.

Financial indicator desensitization: Operating revenue and production capacity use the earliest complete fiscal year as the common base value of 100. Gross margin is presented only in ten-percentage-point ranges. Detailed cost allocation, single-period capital expenditure, segmented profit data, and other figures that could reveal the company's absolute operating scale are excluded.

Elimination of reverse-identification information: A pre-analysis screening process removes all information capable of identifying Company A or its downstream customers, including precise production-line launch dates, exclusive product codes, complete contract clauses, unique technical parameters, and traceable customer milestones. Retained evidence is limited to aggregated indicators without unique identifiable features.

3.3 Analytical Framework

The study follows three stages. First, qualitative due diligence evaluates market opportunity, business model, technology, customer progress, production readiness, compet-

itive position, management capability, and exit feasibility. The findings are translated into testable assumptions concerning customer conversion, order realization, capacity ramp-up, revenue growth, financing, and valuation. This step links every quantitative indicator to a specific element of the investment thesis and distinguishes observed facts from forward-looking assumptions.

Second, the assumptions are cross-validated through a hierarchical matching framework. (1) Internal market-size and industrial-demand forecasts are compared with academic studies, specialized advanced-packaging reports, and public information on total addressable market, industry growth, and long-term downstream demand. (2) Company A's revenue-growth trajectory and capacity-ramp plan are benchmarked against listed semiconductor-packaging companies' financial statements, capital-expenditure disclosures, and capacity-expansion announcements. (3) Customer-validation progress and downstream demand expectations are compared with public product roadmaps, capital-expenditure guidance, and formal procurement or supply-chain announcements from downstream semiconductor participants, where available. These comparisons assess plausibility rather than directly verify confidential records.

The 20% deviation threshold applies only to market-scale forecasts, revenue growth, and capacity-expansion speed. An assumption is classified as credible when it falls within the relevant industry or peer range and is supported by at least two independent external indicators. It is classified as uncertain when it exceeds the comparable-company median by more than 20% but is supported by later-stage customer progress, production evidence, or clear downstream demand. It is classified as unreliable and requires downward adjustment when the deviation exceeds 20%, most relevant projects remain at design or validation stage, and no matching downstream-demand or capacity evidence is available. The threshold is a case-specific warning rule, not a universal industry standard.

Company A illustrates how the rule is applied. Its historical and projected growth materially exceeds the 17%–20% range observed among listed packaging peers. However, the aggregated pipeline contains approximately 52% mass-production execution, 39% pilot production or delivery, and 9% design or initial validation. The forecast therefore exceeds the 20% warning threshold but is supported by meaningful later-stage commercialization evidence. It is classified as uncertain rather than unreliable. Accordingly, management projections are not accepted at face value: stage-specific realization rates and capacity-ramp factors are applied, including a 62% aggregate pipeline-realization rate and an 85% capacity factor in the base case. Yield and supply-chain uncertainty are reflected through lower realization and slower ramp-up because sufficiently standardized project-level histories

are unavailable. Scenario analysis then tests the resulting revenue path and forward multiple, while reverse stress testing identifies combinations of customer, production, financing, and valuation outcomes that would materially impair the thesis.

4. Qualitative Due Diligence and Investment Thesis Formation

4.1 Market and Business Model

Company A operates in hybrid-bonding-enabled advanced packaging. The field benefits from demand for artificial-intelligence computing, high-bandwidth memory, heterogeneous integration, photonics-related applications, and customized devices, all of which require dense interconnection, lower power consumption, shorter signal paths, and stronger system integration [8, 9]. The company combines process development, customized design, pilot production, and prospective scaled manufacturing. Revenue can arise from development services, pilot delivery, and manufacturing after qualification. Early co-development may embed the company in customer projects and create switching costs after process parameters are jointly established. A shared platform may also support several product families and improve asset utilization. However, these advantages depend on converting development activity into repeatable production; pilot revenue does not establish mature unit economics because utilization, depreciation, yield, and cost allocation differ materially from full-scale manufacturing.

4.2 Technology, Customers, and Defensibility

Internal evidence shows that Company A has moved beyond a laboratory concept. Its pilot line has completed the principal process flow and supported samples, small-batch delivery, and customer co-development. It has built wafer-to-wafer and chip-to-wafer platforms and an intellectual-property portfolio covering materials, processes, and equipment. The aggregated pipeline includes dozens of customers and more than ten product platforms across design validation, pilot delivery, and mass-production execution. This breadth reduces dependence on a single application and shows that customer contact extends beyond preliminary discussions. However, different qualification requirements, product cycles, and volume profiles may complicate production scheduling and commercial prioritization.

Technical validation is not equivalent to scalable manufacturing. Semiconductor ramp-up requires repeated yield improvement, process control, reliability verification, and coordination between equipment, recipes, and customer-specific requirements [12]. Hybrid bonding is also

sensitive to alignment, interface quality, and thermomechanical stress [11]. Company A has not yet demonstrated stable yield, delivery consistency, equipment utilization, and cost control at full scale. Its current advantage is therefore better understood as an early capability position than as proven market leadership. Patents and facilities raise replication costs, but defensibility will ultimately depend on whether process knowledge can be converted into reliable delivery, competitive economics, and accumulated customer-specific manufacturing experience.

4.3 Management, Exit, and Preliminary Thesis

The management team has experience in semiconductor processes, lithography, yield improvement, manufacturing operations, and advanced packaging. This background supports the integration of research, process development, and factory execution. However, commercial functions are less mature than technical functions, and customer development remains relatively dependent on senior managers and engineers. This approach may be effective during co-development, when technical credibility is essential, but it may become restrictive as the number of production programs increases. Scaling will require more formal project management, quality systems, sales coverage, and after-sales support.

Potential exits include a strategic sale or a domestic listing after the company achieves sustained revenue, standardized governance, and production-scale economics, but no committed exit path is evidenced. Exit feasibility should therefore be treated as an outcome of commercialization rather than as an independent investment rationale. The resulting thesis is conditional: Company A has a differentiated platform, pilot capability, customer projects, and an experienced technical team, yet investment value depends on recurring orders, timely capacity ramp-up, acceptable yield and utilization, and sufficient financing before operating cash flow becomes self-sustaining.

5. Quantitative Validation of the Investment Thesis

5.1 Market and Operating Evidence

External evidence supports the direction of demand. TSMC reported continued CoWoS expansion in response to artificial-intelligence demand while AMD reported strong data-center growth driven by server processors and accelerators [13, 14]. These disclosures are consistent with academic evidence that advanced integration is increasingly important for bandwidth density and energy efficiency. They do not verify Company A's market share, customer relationships, or addressable revenue, but they support the relevance of the application categories repre-

sented in its pipeline. The market assumption is therefore credible at the industry level, while company-level capture remains unproven.

Company A's revenue index rose from 100 in 2024 to approximately 367 in 2025 as several projects moved from development into small-batch delivery. This indicates that commercialization has begun, although the percentage increase is amplified by a low starting base and should not be extrapolated mechanically. Planned first-stage mass-production capacity is approximately 667 relatives to a pilot-capacity index of 100. Capacity therefore expands much faster than historical revenue. The expansion provides a physical basis for growth but also increases execution risk, because equipment installation must be followed by customer qualification, yield stabilization, production scheduling, working-capital support, and sufficient demand to absorb fixed costs.

5.2 Peer Benchmark and Valuation

Tongfu Microelectronics, Huatian Technology, and JCET are used as operating benchmarks rather than direct valuation peers because they are larger, more diversified, and more mature. Their disclosed annual or interim revenue growth was approximately 17%–20% in the relevant period [15–17]. Company A's growth materially exceeds this range and therefore triggers the 20% warning rule. The comparison does not imply that a small company must grow at the same rate as mature firms; instead, it raises the evidentiary requirement for accepting unusually strong internal forecasts.

The assumption is not rejected because the 2026 pipeline is relatively advanced: approximately 52% of projected value is in mass-production execution, 39% in pilot production or delivery, and 9% in design or initial validation.

It is therefore classified as uncertain but supported by commercialization evidence. The reported gross-margin range of 70%–80% is not treated as mature profitability because pilot-stage allocation may omit research, depreciation, and ramp-up costs. The company remains loss-making with negative operating cash flow. These indicators suggest that technical progress is translating into revenue, but they do not yet demonstrate a sustainable operating model.

Because earnings are unstable, enterprise value to revenue is used as the principal valuation indicator. Enterprise value and the 2025 implied multiple are each indexed to 100. Year-end cash fell from 100 to about 49, while long-term borrowing rose from 100 to about 484, showing greater financing dependence during production expansion. Under the scenarios below, the forward multiple indexes fall to 48, 27, and 19, respectively, if enterprise value is unchanged. These decreases do not mean that value automatically increases; they show how much of the current valuation is justified only by future revenue realization. If conversion is delayed while financing needs continue to rise, the present valuation remains difficult to defend.

5.3 Scenario Analysis

The projected pipeline is normalized to 100 and divided by commercialization stage. Realization rates are analytical stress parameters rather than estimated probabilities. Later-stage projects receive higher rates because they have completed more technical and commercial milestones, while the capacity-ramp factor reflects the proportion of planned production capability that can be converted into deliverable output. Table 1 reports the downside, base, and upside scenarios.

Table 1. Stage-Based Pipeline and Valuation Scenarios

Scenario	Design	Pilot	Mass prod.	Ramp factor	Pipeline index	Revenue index*	Multiple index**
Downside	5%	30%	60%	70%	43	772	48
Base	10%	50%	80%	85%	62	1,342	27
Upside	20%	70%	90%	100%	76	1,933	19

Note. * Revenue index uses 2024 actual revenue as 100.

** Multiple indexes use the 2025 implied enterprise-value-to-revenue multiple as 100.

Management projections are not adopted at face value because the implied revenue growth materially exceeds peer benchmarks. The base case applies a 62% pipeline-realization index and an 85% capacity factor. The downside case reflects slower customer conversion, delayed ramp-up, and weaker delivery capability; the upside case as-

sumes rapid conversion and stable production. Even the downside case implies substantial growth from the low historical base, but it still requires execution of a majority of mass-production-stage projects. Overall, the quantitative evidence partially validates the thesis: industry demand, historical revenue growth, and customer-stage distribution support commercialization, while financing dependence, negative cash flow, and valuation sensitivity prevent a fully credible classification.

6. Risk and Downside Analysis

6.1 Failure Conditions

Reverse stress testing examines four connected channels: weaker customer conversion, delayed production, a financing gap, and lower exit valuation. The thesis is considered materially impaired when at least two of the following occur: pipeline realization falls below 20%; the mass-production line cannot achieve utilization sufficient to absorb fixed costs; external financing is delayed while operating cash flow remains negative; the major-customer group is materially postponed or cancelled; or the exit multiple contracts before stable profitability. These are case-specific failure indicators rather than universal industry thresholds. Requiring two conditions to occur simultaneously reflects the fact that a temporary weakness in one dimension may be manageable, while interacting failures can undermine the entire commercialization pathway.

6.2 Demand, Production, and Supply Chain

Although 52% of projected order value is classified as mass-production execution, stage labels do not make revenue certain. Product redesign, qualification failure, inventory adjustment, changes in end-market demand, and customer scheduling can delay even advanced projects. The top customer quartile, reported only as an aggregated group, represents about 65% of projected order value. Concentration therefore affects both revenue and planned utilization. If design projects produce no revenue, pilot projects realize only 10%, and mass-production projects realize 30%, aggregate pipeline realization falls below 20%. Under this condition, the company could still report growth from its low historical base, but the result would be insufficient to support the planned production scale or validate successful commercialization.

About two-thirds of disclosed research projects had reached small-batch output, but the company had not demonstrated stable large-scale production across its portfolio. A delayed ramp would increase depreciation, staffing, utilities, maintenance, and factory-related costs

before sufficient revenue is generated. More than half of the aggregate value of five core equipment categories is sourced overseas, exposing commissioning to delivery, technical-support, licensing, and spare-part delays. Semiconductor supply chains are especially vulnerable to specialized supplier concentration and long lead times [18]. Even where equipment arrives on schedule, customer-specific recipes, bonding performance, yield improvement, and reliability testing may require additional time. Equipment installation alone is therefore not evidence of commercialization.

6.3 Liquidity, Valuation, and Information Reliability

Liquidity is the most immediate downside channel. With reported cash indexed to 100, remaining planned capital expenditure exceeds 3,000, and approximately 40%–50% of cash is restricted. Funding has depended on equity, related-party financing, leases, and government support rather than operating cash flow. This creates a timing risk: customer revenue may be delayed while equipment payments, payroll, interest, leases, and factory expenditure remain due. The company could therefore require bridge financing or a new equity round before reaching the milestones needed to support a favorable valuation, exposing existing investors to dilution, weaker terms, or an interrupted capacity plan.

Valuation is jointly exposed to revenue underperformance and multiple compression. Table 2 shows that if realized revenue reaches 50% of the validated case and the exit multiple also falls to 50%, the normalized enterprise-value index declines to 25. The matrix does not predict a transaction price; it illustrates that moderate weakness in both variables can produce a disproportionate reduction in value. Exit timing is additionally uncertain because a listing or strategic sale requires sustained revenue, governance, reporting quality, and clearer unit economics. A longer holding period would further reduce effective investor returns even if the company ultimately achieves technical success.

Table 2. Normalized Enterprise-Value Stress Matrix

Exit multiple	Revenue: 50%	Revenue: 75%	Revenue: 100%
50%	25	38	50
75%	38	56	75
100%	50	75	100

Note. The validated enterprise-value case is normalized to 100.

Recent management accounts were not fully audited, and project-level revenue, cost, yield, and capacity in-

formation could not always be reconciled. This does not establish that the information is inaccurate, but it reduces confidence in precise forecasts and supports an uncertainty discount. The main monitoring indicators should there-

fore include customer-stage migration, repeat orders after pilot delivery, production-line utilization, yield stability, unrestricted cash, capital commitments, and project-level reconciliation. These variables provide earlier evidence of thesis deterioration than headline revenue growth alone.

7. Discussion, Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Research

This study examined how a growth equity investment thesis can be formed and validated when company-level information is incomplete and commercialization uncertainty remains material. The findings support an integrated analytical process in which qualitative due diligence identifies the proposed mechanism of value creation, lightweight quantitative validation tests whether the mechanism is consistent with observable evidence, and downside analysis identifies the conditions under which the thesis would fail. These approaches are complementary. Qualitative evidence alone may overstate technological differentiation or customer interest, whereas complex financial models may create false precision when their central assumptions remain unverified. The more useful output is therefore a transparent classification of assumptions as credible, uncertain, or unsupported.

The case also demonstrates the importance of distinguishing industry opportunity from company-level execution. Growth in artificial intelligence, heterogeneous integration, and advanced packaging supports the relevance of Company A's target market, but it does not independently verify customer conversion, revenue realization, or sustainable profitability. Company A has a plausible commercialization pathway based on its hybrid-bonding capabilities, pilot production, multiple product platforms, customer projects, and experienced technical team. However, the company's projected growth materially exceeds mature-peer benchmarks. The investment thesis therefore remains conditional on later-stage customer conversion, reliable capacity ramp-up, yield improvement, and continued access to financing.

The downside analysis further shows that capital-intensive commercialization should be evaluated as an interconnected evidence chain. Technology must support customer qualification; qualification must generate recurring orders; orders must support capacity utilization and yield improvement; and operating progress must occur before liquidity is exhausted. Weakness at one stage reduces the credibility of the next. Delayed customer conversion, underutilized capacity, negative cash flow, financing pressure, and valuation compression may therefore reinforce one another. The thesis is credible but execution-dependent and does not yet possess a wide margin of safety.

These findings have practical implications for both pre-in-

vestment evaluation and post-investment monitoring. Investment committees should monitor the assumptions that originally justified the transaction rather than rely only on headline revenue growth. Customer-stage migration, conversion from pilot delivery to repeat production, utilization, yield stability, unrestricted cash, capital commitments, and financing progress provide earlier evidence of thesis improvement or deterioration. By linking each investment assumption to an observable milestone or failure trigger, the framework makes subsequent revisions to the investment recommendation more transparent and accountable.

The study nevertheless has several limitations. First, it relies on a single anonymized case, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Second, confidentiality requirements necessitated aggregation, indexing, and the removal of customer-specific and project-level information. Third, standardized histories of yield, utilization, project conversion, and unit economics were unavailable. Fourth, listed packaging companies provide useful operating benchmarks but are imperfect comparables because they are larger, more diversified, and more mature. Fifth, the scenario realization rates, capacity factors, and 20% deviation threshold are case-specific analytical rules rather than statistically estimated industry parameters. Finally, the case was evaluated at one point in time and therefore cannot directly observe how the investment thesis evolves as commercialization progresses.

Future research should apply the framework to multiple growth-stage hard-technology companies across different technologies and commercialization stages. Comparative case analysis could identify which indicators, thresholds, and failure conditions are company-specific and which can be generalized across investments. Longitudinal research could also track customer-stage migration, pipeline conversion, yield, utilization, liquidity, financing, and valuation over time. Observed outcomes could then be used to calibrate realization rates and downside thresholds more systematically. These extensions would allow the framework to develop from a transparent single-case method into a more empirically grounded and dynamically validated model of growth-stage hard-technology investment.

References

- [1] Kaplan, S. N., Strömberg, P. Venture capitalists as principals: Contracting, screening, and monitoring. *American Economic Review*, 2001, 91(2): 426–430.
- [2] Kaplan, S. N., Strömberg, P. Leveraged buyouts and private equity. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2009, 23(1): 121–146.
- [3] Gompers, P. A., Gornall, W., Kaplan, S. N., Strebulaev, I. A. How do venture capitalists make decisions? *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2020, 135(1): 169–190.

- [4] Akerlof, G. A. The market for “lemons”: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1970, 84(3): 488–500.
- [5] Bhojraj, S., Lee, C. M. C. Who is my peer? A valuation-based approach to the selection of comparable firms. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 2002, 40(2): 407–439.
- [6] Liu, J., Nissim, D., Thomas, J. Equity valuation using multiples. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 2002, 40(1): 135–172.
- [7] VerWey, J. Re-shoring advanced semiconductor packaging: Innovation, supply chain security, and U.S. leadership in the semiconductor industry. *Center for Security and Emerging Technology*, 2022.
- [8] Zhou, A., Zhang, Y., Ding, F., Lian, Z., Jin, R., Yang, Y., Wang, Q., Cao, L. Research progress of hybrid bonding technology for three-dimensional integration. *Microelectronics Reliability*, 2024, 155, 115372.
- [9] Manley, M., Victor, A., Park, H., Kaul, A., Kathaperumal, M., Bakir, M. S. Heterogeneous integration technologies for artificial intelligence applications. *IEEE Journal on Exploratory Solid-State Computational Devices and Circuits*, 2024, 10: 89–97.
- [10] Noor, R., Kottur, H. R., Craig, P. J., Biswas, L. K., Khan, M. S. M., Varshney, N., Dalir, H., Akçali, E., Motlagh, B. G., Woychik, C., Yoon, Y.-K., Asadizanjani, N. U.S. microelectronics packaging ecosystem: Challenges and opportunities, 2023.
- [11] Lhostis, S., Ayoub, B., Frémont, H., Moreau, S., Mattei, J.-G., Lamontagne, P., Tournier, A. Reliability of the hybrid bonding level using submicrometric bonding pads. *Microelectronics Reliability*, 2023, 150, 115189.
- [12] Xu, H.-W., Zhang, Q.-H., Sun, Y.-N., Chen, Q.-L., Qin, W., Lv, Y.-L., Zhang, J. A fast ramp-up framework for wafer yield improvement in semiconductor manufacturing systems. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 2024, 76, 222–233.
- [13] Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited. 2025 annual report, 2026, https://investor.tsmc.com/sites/ir/annual-report/2025/2025%20Annual%20Report_E.pdf
- [14] Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. 2025 annual report, 2026, <https://ir.amd.com/financial-information/sec-filings/content/0000002488-26-000018/0000002488-26-000018.pdf>
- [15] Tongfu Microelectronics Co., Ltd. 2025 annual report, 2026, <https://static.cninfo.com.cn/finalpage/2026-04-17/1225112762.PDF>
- [16] Tianshui Huatian Technology Co., Ltd. 2025 annual report, 2026, <https://static.cninfo.com.cn/finalpage/2026-03-31/1225059982.PDF>
- [17] JCET Group Co., Ltd. 2025 interim report, 2025, <https://static.cninfo.com.cn/finalpage/2025-08-21/1224525817.PDF>
- [18] Xiong, W., Wu, D. D., Yeung, J. H. Y. Semiconductor supply chain resilience and disruption: Insights, mitigation, and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, 2025, 63(9): 3442–3465.