

## Part 1: Why challenger claim is not valid

Challenger claim is these cases follow the pattern below:

*The width value of the submitted video is noticeably edited to hard force a wider dimension with empty fill to reach up to xxx pixels: the real, true and effective width of this video is exactly yyy pixels. This type of post-handling is not allowed and definitely breaks the rule of guideline # 4: "The video quality should be at least 360p". In addition yyy px is still below the possible (current or coming) update of a new minimum of at least 352 pixels.*

### Claim argument #1: video edited for a purpose

*The width value of the submitted video is noticeably edited **to hard force a wider dimension with empty fill to reach up to xxx pixels***

The challenger is determining an intention which can not be proven. There is no evidence to prove that the video was enlarged using stripes. The challenger is making a statement without any real proof.

### Claim argument #2: "real" width of video

*...the real, true and effective width of this video is exactly yyy pixels [...] yyy px is still below the possible (current or coming) update of a new minimum of at least 352 pixels.*

The challenger is adding a new concept called "real, true and effective width of the video" in the rules called "real width of the video" which is not covered in any of the current rules. As per the guideline #4 notice the nonexistence of what the challenger is claiming. Moreover by checking the downloading and checking video quality (Rule#4 / Section 3 - "The video quality should be at least 360p") you can quickly check that the video meets the requirements.

### Claim argument #3: post-handling not allowed

*This type of post-handling is not allowed and definitely breaks the rule of guideline # 4: "The video quality should be at least 360p"*

- First, challenge never explain what is the meaning of post-handling and which part is not allowed. 99% of the uploaded videos in PoH have been post-handled in order to reduce the size.
- Second, there is no rule that indicates that post-handling is not allowed. If we define that post-handling is disallowed then we will need to challenge pretty much all videos by the reason explained above.
- Third: There is no rational behind the challenger reasoning:  
Rule of 360p -> Person modify the video (Post Handling Occur) -> Break of Rule 360p

## Part 2: Why submission is valid

Unfortunately, this challenge is incorrect due to the fact that the content of the video is being challenged and not the quality. It will be exactly the same if the person has curtains or a wall on both sides.

The rule of the guideline #4 clearly states: "The video QUALITY should be at least 360p, at most 2 minutes long, and in the video/webm, video/MP4, video/avi or video/mov format. Lighting conditions and recording device quality should be sufficient to discern facial features and characters composing the Ethereum address displayed"

In this case the video quality meets the required minimum. It was recorded as it is and not modified afterwards to meet any requirement.

Last, if we accept this challenge then we will need to start requesting people to consume 360p with their face and body in order to meet the requirements because basically whatever is next to the person is wrong.