

The dynamics of belief: continuously monitoring and visualising complex systems

Edwin J. Beggs and John V. Tucker

School of Mathematics and Computer Science,
Computational Foundry, Swansea University,
Bay Campus, Fabian Way,
Swansea, SA1 8EN, United Kingdom

Abstract. The rise of AI in human contexts places new demands on systems to be transparent and explainable. We examine some anthropomorphic ideas and principles relevant to such accountability in order to develop a theoretical framework for thinking about digital systems in complex human contexts and the problem of explaining their behaviour. Structurally, complex systems are made of modular and hierarchical components, which we model abstractly using a new notion of *modes* and *mode transitions*. A mode is an independent component of the system with its own objectives, monitoring data, and algorithms. The behaviour of a mode, including its transitions to other modes, is determined by *belief functions* that interpret the mode's monitoring data in the light of its objectives and algorithms. We show how these belief functions can help explain system behaviour by visualising their evaluation in higher-dimensional geometric spaces. These ideas are formalised by abstract and concrete *simplicial complexes*.

Keywords. explainable systems, hierarchical systems, modes, mode transitions, belief functions, simplicial complex, social systems

Keywords: explainable systems, hierarchical systems, modes, mode transitions, belief functions, simplicial complex, social systems

1 Introduction

We cannot afford to continue playing catch-up regarding AI – allowing its use with limited or no boundaries or oversight and dealing with the almost inevitable human rights consequences after the fact.

Michelle Bachelet, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights [26]

1.1 The challenge of explainability

Automation aims to reduce human activity and dependency in all sorts of tasks. To do this, decisions and actions that belong to people must be abstracted,

specified precisely and designed into a relevant system that reduces human involvement and interventions. Automation in this sense has been expanding its nature and scope since the 18th Century [10]. Through the new applications and ambitions of AI, automation is on the rise in the physical world, where it is long established, and in human affairs, where it is novel and controversial.¹ Under the guise of AI, in so many fields we are seeing a triumphant march of measurement, data collection, data classification, computation and autonomous decision making.

Wherever there is automation there is a problem understanding the behaviour it produces: is it functioning as specified or expected, what might need attention and change, what is wrong? In the case of physical devices this is familiar and solvable thanks to centuries of science, engineering and mathematics. In the case of people the situation is quite other. Our understanding is poor, challenged by people's individuality, their limitations, expectations, bias, diverse intangible experiences and so on. Social and personal contexts refuse to yield to neat theories with their limited predictive power and many unintended consequences; social and personal conditions change all the time anyway. We are still learning how not to manage people in highly structured social environments, such as companies, as a century of management science, after Frederick W Taylor, testifies [24,27].

In this paper, we will address design for automation in human contexts, almost from first principles. We will reflect on established criteria of importance to people and suggest some ideas and directions for technical research that reflect these criteria. Thus, the tone of this theoretical paper is anthropomorphic, probing aspects of human thought for technical inspiration: human thought has a record of working, and human thought is explainable to humans. Subsequently, we will introduce high level data structures and their visualisation, which can be applied, using mathematical ideas of belief, to monitoring the dynamics of automation.

In human affairs, AI urgently needs to become transparent and explainable, which means systems must be trustworthy and 'easy' to understand at some level. We address the problem of *transparency*, which due to both safety and human rights considerations can no longer be treated as an *after the fact* investigation [26]. Given the likely future economic importance of people and machines working together [7,12], it is vitally important that machines can clearly reveal their state and intent to human co-workers in realtime. System theory has long recognised that systems are modular and hierarchical and the components are a mix of equipment, software *and* people [14]. Any of these can – and in practice do – fail. Add to this the threat of cyberattack, where the objective is to make systems fail. Absolute security or predictability of a system is impossible, so plans need to be made to contain and work around damage, the classic problem of *resilience*.

¹ For example, we see it in new 'smart' buildings and products, autonomous vehicles and weapons, staff recruitment and monitoring, customer services, medical triage, treatment and aftercare, and surveillance and criminal detection.

1.2 A formal model of explanatory and visual frameworks

These considerations raise technical questions about the structure of the system, its design and deployment. A means of monitoring system behaviour that counts as explanatory is needed, and ways of visualising what is going on. What counts as an explanation and a visualisation? To develop an informal *explanatory framework*, consider some general principles, starting with:

Categorisation. An explanation is based on categorisations of possible behaviours that constitutes a conceptual framework for the human coworker.

Refinement. An explanation is capable of refinement, revealing more detail, according to the significance of the information available.

Tightly coupled to the explanatory framework is a *visualisation framework* ideally satisfying:

Continuity. The behaviour over time should be understandable and predictable from the visualisation;

Faithfulness. The visualisation provides access to the actual functioning of the system, and does not conceal important properties of its function.

One way this can be done is to incorporate the explanatory and visualisation frameworks as an essential part of the design process, allowing us to see what the system is ‘thinking’.

Of course, this framework is impossible without simplification and information hiding on a grand scale. We introduce an abstract notion of system *modes* to describe the structure and functioning of the system, and a geometric realisation of the modes to allow visualisation and implement continuity. The description in terms of modes would be accessible on demand with the visualisation showing not only which mode the system is in, but to which mode it is likely to transition in the near future [23].

Real world systems are driven by data, which may not be reliable. The decisions and actions taken by the system are based on judgements about the data available against known criteria, which we are going to refer to as *beliefs*. Thus, as far as mathematical models are concerned, the behaviour of the system over time is a trajectory in a hugely complex idealised state space. For this to be transparent we need to reveal a dynamics of belief that explain the dynamics of system behaviour. This dynamics of belief is a new trajectory in a space of beliefs about data and perceptions of the system.

We consider a large range of data sources as simply *oracles*, providers of information which might or might not be reliable. Typically, these are gathered by sensors and generated by computations external to the system (e.g., by neural nets or quantum devices). We also include outputs sent to external devices as oracles (as many actuators talk back). By restricting a mode’s access to various oracles we have a high level mechanism for enforcing restrictions on what a mode can do, i.e., a method for enforcing transparency.

1.3 Structure of this paper

Main contributions of this paper and their location are:

1. To consider aspects of human behaviour informally, before formalising a model of how the knowledge and beliefs of a system and its responses change over time (Section 2).
2. To define concepts and principles for modelling systems using modes (Section 3).
3. To address explainability by defining beliefs and visualising changes in beliefs about the data and system, in modes using simplicial complexes (Sections 4 and 5).
4. To illustrate the combination of beliefs and modes in case studies of social systems (Section 6).
5. To highlight the role of theory change in understanding systems (Section 7).

2 Explainability, innovation and human behaviour

Frustra fit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora.

[It is futile to do with more things that which can be done with fewer.]

William of Ockham, Summa Totius Logicae, circa 1323 A.D.

Since explainability is defined in terms of human understanding, and humans have a record of being resilient, we begin by considering how humans understand and control systems. Our purpose is to seek ideas that can be abstractly formulated and used to make up a conceptual framework for explainability and be used to shape our technical proposals.

2.1 Designing scenarios

Consider a person responsible for a system and imagine him or her in a scenario composed of the following:

Modes. The system is in a state and they are presented with a choice of possible actions.

Objectives. A person has long term *aims* which entail shorter term *objectives*.

Principles. There are principles implying that actions have certain consequences, good or ill.

Intent. They *intend* to take the actions whose consequences they believe will best further their objectives.

We need to distinguish between (a) *principles* and *theories* of reality, (b) *observations* of reality and (c) *actions* applied to reality. For instance, Newton's laws of motion would be a set of principles, an observation would be measuring the velocity of an object which might hit a target, and an action would be to change the velocity so that it did hit the target (an objective).

Oracles. A person who is uncertain will *observe* more information about *reality*.

Beliefs. Using this information and their *principles* they will evaluate them to form *beliefs* about how possible actions best further their objectives.

Choice. They choose actions based on these beliefs.

Aims. They may change objectives based on aims and information about reality.

An objective may merely be the legacy of a past decision. For instance, a general decides to capture a hill, and from then onwards many decisions are taken using this as an objective. If capturing the hill proves impossible, the general will likely choose another objective. In turn, the aims within which the general operates may have been set by a dictator deciding to invade another country.

When humans design or control systems they have an opportunity to specify objectives which the systems cannot override. For example, the average electronic heating controller cannot decide to vary the temperature outside a specified range (unless an error happens). At an extreme of the AI spectrum, Isaac Asimov's fictional robots were programmed with three laws of robotics as immutable objectives which would override any other objectives.

2.2 Designing components for actions

Consider two guidelines for people on how to organise the set of possible actions in a given scenario, one of these addressing *simplicity* (and, so, indirectly explainability) and the other addressing *resilience*, when current assumptions fail.

Occam's Razor (1). A person will prefer a smaller number of possible actions rather than a larger number if they believe the smaller number can bring their intent about.

Incompleteness (1). If they believe that the possible actions will not bring about their objectives, they seek more possible actions.

Thus, we reduce the set of possible actions when we can, and expand it when we have to. Of course, these two guidelines also apply to the principles and theories we use to design and reason about the system.

Occam's Razor (2). In a given scenario, use the least number of principles required to explain reality and model the objectives.

Incompleteness (2). When reality becomes inconsistent with the principles, seek other principles.

We can also consider Occam's Razor as a guide to hiding irrelevant data. Information hiding is an idea central to software engineering, formulated explicitly as a methodological principle by David Parnas in the 1970s and brought into mainstream software development in abstract data types and object oriented programming languages, long before our current data-overloaded society. In societies, people have specialised roles, often related to data hiding:

Specialisation. People only see a minimal amount of information for a role which they do not perform.

Restricted access. Only certain people have a right to access certain data to maintain security or privacy.

Of course, in applying these points to automatic systems we have to make allowances. The average electronic heating controller has no idea of the laws of

convection or conduction, it only knows the formulae it has been programmed with. However, even it has some understanding of incompleteness – e.g., when its actions seem not to work – it uses its fault light and hopes for an intervention by a technician.

The big problem with incompleteness is that the person’s existing knowledge may not have a previously prepared method to achieve the objectives – this is the acquiring of new skills. The person has to be able to make new possible courses of action, which need to be checked, first purely theoretically and then more practically.

Innovation. The generation of new possibilities.

Imagination. New possibilities are matched against existing principles to predict their effect.

Testing. Controlled experiments are used to validate new possibilities.

In the rest of this paper we shall use these ideas to inspire formal concepts that make up a possible formal complement to this informal framework. In particular, we consider how to both formalise and visualise the scenarios, using the dynamics generated by belief applied to the basic monitoring data available to the system. The structure of our thinking is, essentially, to formalise this *Critical Path*:

$$\text{Data} \xrightarrow{\text{Evaluate}} \text{Belief about data} \xrightarrow{\text{Visualise}} \text{Visualisation of belief} \quad (1)$$

3 Modes and visualisation

My thesis has been that one path to the construction of a non-trivial theory of complex systems is by way of a theory of hierarchy. Empirically, a large proportion of the complex systems we observe in nature exhibit hierarchic structure. On theoretical grounds we could expect complex systems to be hierarchies in a world in which complexity had to evolve from simplicity.

Herbert Simon [14]

3.1 What is a mode?

Modes are a multi-level categorisation of the behaviours of systems. A mode combines data relevant to the objectives and operation of the system with algorithms governing the behaviour and the oracles, the external communication channels and protocols used by the mode.

Completeness. A set of modes for a system is a classification of the operation or behaviour of a system. At any time, a system can be in one, or more, modes.

Composition. When a system is in a number of modes then that situation itself constitutes a mode.

Component. A set of modes for a system consists of a (i) a set of *basic modes* and (ii) *joint modes* made by combining other modes.

Localisation. Each mode possesses its own data about its behaviour and environment. This monitoring data determines the mode’s own state space and data types.

Thus, our knowledge of the system at any time is localised to the mode it is in at that time.

Quantification. If a state of the system is meaningful for a number of modes then the relevance or suitability of these modes for the state of the system must be quantified, calibrated and interpreted.

We shall visualise in space the basic modes by vertices, and the joint modes arising by combining them as lines, triangles, tetrahedra etc. Quantification can take the form of a position in the space representing the suitability of the mode for the state of the system, in a line or triangle or tetrahedron, etc. representing the joint mode. In Section 5 we shall explain this by using a hypothetical global *state space*.

In the time evolution of the system we need to decide

- (i) if and when a system should change from one mode to another, and
- (ii) which new mode should chosen.

Thresholds. The transition out of one mode into another is governed by the results of the quantification and calibration. The decision to move to a new mode may be specified by numerical thresholds.

Explanation. The conceptual system of modes, mode evaluation functions and mode transition functions, and their visual representation in simplicial complexes, can serves as an *explanatory framework* for the dynamical behaviour of automatic systems.

3.2 Simple physical examples

We consider some examples to clarify the informal idea of a system of modes and its evaluation and visualisation.




Fig. 1: Visualising a mode transition for a Mars probe and a motor vehicle

Example 1. In Figure 1, the left diagram represents the dangerous part of the landing of a Mars probe between the deployment of a parachute (the point at the top of the interval) and jettisoning it (the point at the bottom). Unlike a usual state transition picture where lines merely represent transitions, here the line itself represents a mode where the probe descends by parachute, with all its complicated monitoring of position and altitude. These observations are formed into a representation of the state of the system as a point along along

the line, beginning at the top and moving to the bottom as the probe descends. On reaching the bottom, the parachute is jettisoned.

Any passengers on the probe would doubtless like to be reassured that the descent was progressing correctly, and could look out the window and at the position along the line to see how things were going. Such a point on a line indicator – a task bar – is quite common. However, our position is not an after the fact indicator bolted on to reassure people, it is displaying the information which the control system is actually using to make decisions. If the point is near the top, then the passengers know that the control system has no intention of jettisoning the parachute soon because they are directly looking at the system’s own assessment of the situation, and can take action appropriately. \square

We see that one key to transparency is continuity, where we do not discontinuously move between vertices on a graph, but have a continuous motion on a geometric visualisation which allows an estimate of what the system is about to do and when. Another key is reliability, that what we see is really related to the state of the system, not just an average estimate ‘this process should take about 5 minutes’. Of course, this means that *the geometry of the visualisation is intimately related to how the system actually makes decisions.*

Example 2. In the centre diagram of Figure 1 we consider an autonomous car having received a warning of a possible collision. Its obvious choices are to steer left or right or to brake, and these are represented by vertices in the diagram. However, between the separate actions ‘steer left’ and ‘brake’ we have a combination action of doing both simultaneously, and that is represented in the diagram by a line between the two vertices.

The filled in tetrahedron between the four vertices is the mode which gathers information and assesses the response. When the state of the system (represented by a point in this tetrahedron or 3-simplex) reaches the triangle at the end then an avoiding action is instigated. If the threat goes away then the point returns to the warning vertex, and then to the rest of the system (not shown).

The state when an action is taken should be one of the three action vertices two of the lines between them. Another state, e.g., a combination of steering both left and right, would indicate an error and would request driver intervention. One way for this to happen would be if a system only designed to cope with one potential collision was presented with two at once. \square

Systems frequently have to take account of several factors or carry out several tasks, and we take account of this by allowing combinations of modes to form modes, thus edges and triangles, etc. can represent modes. In general, we shall represent the state of a system as a point in a *simplicial complex*. A 0-simplex is just a point, and a 1-simplex is a line between some of the 0-simplices. Thus, a simplicial complex consisting of only 0 and 1-simplices is just a graph with edges the 1-simplices and vertices the 0-simplices. We shall not assume that this graph is directed – if there are arrows they are either imposed by principles (e.g., not being able to deploy a parachute which we have already jettisoned) or by the

current objectives. Increasing the dimension, a 2-simplex is a filled in triangle and a 3-simplex is a solid tetrahedron, and so on.

4 Simplicial complexes

The Critical Path (1), from monitoring to belief to a visualisation of belief for our general conception of modes, can be modelled mathematically by abstract and concrete simplicial complexes, which we describe in this and the next section.

4.1 Simplicial complexes

Definition 1. *An abstract simplicial complex consists of a collection of finite subsets \mathcal{C} of a set \mathcal{M} with the property that if $Y \subset X \in \mathcal{C}$ then $Y \in \mathcal{C}$.*

In line with the principle of *Components* in Section 3 we can take \mathcal{M} to be the set of basic modes of the system, and \mathcal{C} will be the set of joint modes. Thus, a basic mode becomes a singleton set $\{\alpha\}$ and a joint mode is a set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}$. The rule means that any subset of modes is a mode.

We visualise this abstract simplicial complex as a *geometric simplicial complex* by taking each basic mode $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ to be a point (a 0-simplex). Then the subsets of size two $\{\alpha, \beta\} \in \mathcal{C}$ are visualised as a line (a 1-simplex) connecting the points α and β . The resulting structure is an undirected graph, but now we continue in higher dimensions. For example, the subsets of size three $\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \in \mathcal{C}$ are visualised as a filled in triangle (a 2-simplex) connecting the points α , β and γ .

Proposition 1. *To every abstract simplicial complex (as in Definition 1) is associated its standard realisation $\Delta_{\mathcal{C}}$, a simplicial complex. Form a vector space $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ with basis e_{α} for $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$. The simplex spanned by $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is*

$$\Delta_X = \left\{ \sum_{x \in X} \lambda_x e_x : \lambda_x \in [0, 1], \sum_{x \in X} \lambda_x = 1 \right\}.$$

The simplex Δ_X is a $(|X| - 1)$ -simplex where $|X|$ is the size of X , and if $Y \subset X$ then Δ_Y is a face of Δ_X .

It is usually possible to draw the geometric simplicial complex in a smaller number of dimensions, the very large number in the Proposition simply gives an existence result.

4.2 Evaluating states

In line with the principle of *Quantification* in Section 3 we would like to associate a point in the geometric simplicial complex to a state of the system. To do this it is easiest to consider a space S of possible states of the system. The basic mode α will apply when the system state is in a certain subset $U_{\alpha} \subset S$ of all the

possible states. If we want every possible state of the system to be assigned to a mode then the union of all the $U_\alpha \subset S$ is all of S , i.e., we have a *cover* of S . Then the joint mode $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ will apply to states in the subset $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \subset S$, and so on. Now define

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X \subset \mathcal{M} : \cap_{\alpha \in X} U_\alpha \neq \emptyset\},$$

and it is immediate that \mathcal{C} is an abstract simplicial complex.

Definition 2. A partition of unity for the cover $U_\alpha \subset S$ is a function $\phi_\alpha : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$ such that

- (1) if $\phi_\alpha(s) \neq 0$ then $s \in U_\alpha$
- (2) $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{M}} \phi_\alpha(s) = 1$ for all $s \in S$.

For specific circumstances we can impose extra conditions, e.g., continuity or computability.

We then have a function $\underline{\phi} : S \rightarrow \Delta_{\mathcal{C}}$ given by

$$\underline{\phi}(s) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{M}} \phi_\alpha(s) e_\alpha .$$

Figure 2 visualises a simplicial complex and partition of unity for a cover by four sets. Note that the triangle in Figure 2 is shaded to form a 2-simplex precisely because $U_\alpha \cap U_\beta \cap U_\gamma$ is not empty.




Fig. 2: A partition of unity for a cover by four sets

5 Belief and visualisation

Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast.

Lewis Carroll, The white queen in Through the looking-glass

We shall use the Dempster-Shafer theory of belief functions [16] to quantify belief on a scale of 0 (no evidence) to 1 (convincing evidence). There is a large literature on this subject, but it reduces to a measure of belief which can be updated on the presentation of additional evidence. Here we are not concerned with any particular mechanism of how this update is performed.

We emphasise that we are using beliefs as dynamic quantities, they are not merely assessing the likelihood of constant properties. In complex systems beliefs change. When a plane approaches within, say, 100 miles of its target airport the pilot will believe that it should prepare to land. If it is then found to be running out of fuel then the belief in landing will rise to absolute necessity, even overriding bad weather warnings.

5.1 Belief

It is important to distinguish between belief in something and a probability that that thing occurs. On being told by a completely reliable source that a person has a car which has a single colour, we could form two statements,

$$B = \text{'the car is blue'} \text{ and } NB = \text{'the car is not blue'}.$$

The combination B or NB we would consider to have a belief of 1, but in the absence of any other information we would have no basis to assign a non-zero belief value to the separate statement B or to the statement NB . We could randomly assign belief values to each which added up to 1, but this would only undermine the idea that *belief ought be assigned according to evidence*. Sensibly our belief $\text{Bel}(\{B, NB\})$ in $(B \text{ or } NB)$ is strictly greater than the sum of $\text{Bel}(\{B\})$ and $\text{Bel}(\{NB\})$. Such a conclusion means that we are not dealing with a probability distribution.

Definition 3. *We consider beliefs in a finite set X of statements. A generalised belief function on X is a function*

$$\text{Bel} : P(X) \rightarrow [0, 1],$$

where $P(X)$ is the set of subsets of X . Furthermore, for the empty set $\text{Bel}(\emptyset) = 0$ and the sets satisfy the ‘super-additivity’ property

$$\text{Bel}(Y \cup Z) + \text{Bel}(Y \cap Z) \geq \text{Bel}(Y) + \text{Bel}(Z) \quad \text{for all } Y, Z \subset X. \quad (2)$$

We denote by $\mathcal{B}(X)$ the set of belief functions on X .

We shall say that a belief function is *normalised* if $\text{Bel}(X) = 1$. It is important to note that we do *not* impose this normalisation condition – hence our word *generalised* above. Thus, we reserve the right to believe that the set of presented alternatives X may be incomplete. The ‘super-additivity’ property is simply justified in that, in addition to those people who believe in Y and those who believe in Z , there may be people who just believe that at least one is true.

Dual to the belief function is this:

Definition 4. *The plausibility function*

$$\text{Pla} : P(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

is defined by

$$\text{Pla}(Y) = \text{Bel}(X) - \text{Bel}(X \setminus Y),$$

where $X \setminus Y$ is the complement of Y in X .

The plausibility of a subset may be taken as the extent to which people think that it might possibly be true. Note that as

$$\text{Bel}(Y) \leq \text{Bel}(Y \cup (X \setminus Y)) - \text{Bel}(X \setminus Y) = \text{Bel}(X) - \text{Bel}(X \setminus Y)$$

we have $\text{Bel}(Y) \leq \text{Pla}(Y)$ for all $Y \subset X$.

Also, we can deduce that the plausibility function is sub-additive, i.e.,

$$\text{Pla}(Y \cup Z) + \text{Pla}(Y \cap Z) \leq \text{Pla}(Y) + \text{Pla}(Z) \quad \text{for all } Y, Z \subset X.$$

5.2 Visualisation of a belief function

In principle, belief functions give a large amount of data which is difficult to understand - for a set X of size n we have 2^n values. (For a probability measure we would only need the n point measures by additivity, but belief functions contain much more information.) However, as long as we are clear about what information we actually want, it is possible to visualise the results in a much lower dimension.

So, in practice, what do we need to know about beliefs?

- 1) We need to know when to add to our list of things X to believe – when our existing tool collection is *incomplete*, as described in Section 2.
- 2) We need to subtract things from X which we no longer think are necessary, in accordance with *Occam's razor*, as described in Section 2.

Now (1) has a simple answer, even though in practice that answer might lead to many more questions (e.g., it is that moment when a new manager looks at a business and says ‘I don’t believe any of this’).

Definition 5. Let $\mathcal{B}(X)$ be the set of belief functions on X . The first piece of the visualisation of a belief function $\text{Bel} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ is the belief in the whole of X , that is $\text{Bel}(X) \in [0, 1]$.

For (2), how can we visualise a belief in subsets of X so that it is obvious which objects in X are no longer needed? Answer: we visualise the belief as a point in the simplex Δ_X spanned by X , as in Proposition 1.

Definition 6. The second piece of the visualisation of a belief function $\text{Bel} \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ is the point in the simplex

$$\frac{\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\}) e_x}{\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\})} \in \Delta_X .$$

The first thing to note is that the behaviour of a fraction is, shall we say, erratic if the denominator is small. In our case, by sub-additivity, the denominator is

$$\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\}) \geq \text{Pla}(X) = \text{Bel}(X).$$

Thus, it is reasonable to take the fraction if $\text{Bel}(X) \in [0, 1]$ is close to 1. If it is close to zero we may have problems, but in that case our belief in the set X is so small that all conclusions will be considered unreliable.

The second thing to note is that this function in Definition 6 really does solve requirement (2). To make this precise we need the idea of a face of a simplex.

Definition 7. For $Y \subset X$ the face $\Delta_Y \subset \Delta_X$ of Δ_X is

$$\Delta_Y = \left\{ \sum_{x \in Y} \lambda_x e_x : \lambda_x \geq 0, \sum_{x \in Y} \lambda_x = 1 \right\} \subset \Delta_X .$$

Proposition 2. For a belief function on X with $\text{Bel}(X) \neq 0$ and $Y \subset X$

$$\text{Bel}(Y) = \text{Bel}(X) \text{ if, and only, if } \frac{\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\}) e_x}{\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\})} \in \Delta_Y .$$

Proof: First, we assume the RHS. Then, for $x \in X \setminus Y$ we have $\text{Pla}(\{x\}) = 0$, and, by sub-additivity, $\text{Pla}(X \setminus Y) = 0$; by definition of Pla, we get $\text{Bel}(Y) = \text{Bel}(X)$.

Second, we assume the LHS. Then for $x \in X \setminus Y$ we have $\text{Bel}(X) \geq \text{Bel}(X \setminus \{x\}) \geq \text{Bel}(Y) = \text{Bel}(X)$ so $\text{Bel}(X \setminus \{x\}) = \text{Bel}(X)$. We deduce $\text{Pla}(\{x\}) = 0$ and so we get the RHS. \square

Definition 8. For a belief function on X with $\text{Bel}(X) \neq 0$ we define the visualisation map

$$\text{Vis} : \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1] \times \Delta_X$$

by

$$\text{Vis}(\text{Bel}) = \left(\text{Bel}(X), \frac{\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\}) e_x}{\sum_{x \in X} \text{Pla}(\{x\})} \right) .$$

5.3 The meanings and visualisation of belief functions

We shall explain the use of the visualisation function in Definition 8 with the set $X = \{a, b, c\}$. The 2-simplex Δ_X is the filled in triangle in Figure 3, and the face Δ_Y for $Y = \{a, b\} \subset X$ is shown by the thickened line.

The first component of the visualisation function can be interpreted as the reliability of the whole procedure. For example, before engineers design a system, they may evaluate how much confidence they have in the methods and materials they are asked to use. This confidence level $\text{Bel}(X) \in [0, 1]$ affects the interpretation of everything which follows. It would be common to use a colour code where green would denote $\text{Bel}(X) \cong 1$, yellow an intermediate value and red for a low value of $\text{Bel}(X)$. An alternative would be to attach a numerical value to the point in the simplex given by the second component of the visualisation. Because of problems with colours and to give a more exact value we use both methods in Figure 3, where coloured dots give the positions in the simplex and in addition the value of $\text{Bel}(X)$ is given as a percentage.




Fig. 3: Values of the visualisation map for the set $X = \{a, b, c\}$

First, we consider the three green dots in Figure 3 with a belief value of $\text{Bel}(X) = 0 \cdot 95$. We suppose that this value is sufficiently high that we have reasonable confidence in the rest of the values. The point w is on the face $\Delta_{\{b,c\}}$ so according to Proposition 2, in this case

$$\text{Bel}(\{b, c\}) = \text{Bel}(X) \text{ and } \text{Bel}(\{a\}) = 0.$$

The point x is on the face $\Delta_{\{c\}}$ so according to Proposition 2, in this case

$$\text{Bel}(\{c\}) = \text{Bel}(X) \text{ and } \text{Bel}(\{a, b\}) = 0.$$

The point y is close to the face $\Delta_{\{b,c\}}$ so $\text{Bel}(\{a\})$ is small. In practice, we would decide that $a \in X$ was not needed if $\text{Bel}(\{a\})$ was sufficiently small, it would be almost impossible to obtain a value which was exactly zero.

The yellow point z corresponds to a belief function for which $\text{Bel}(X) = 0 \cdot 85$. At this level we suppose that there is significant concern that the model based on X is not sufficient, and may not be performing optimally. (Of course the threshold levels for concern would be set at different values for different models and problems.) Still, according to the position being not close to the faces, we see that there is no evidence that we can ignore any elements of X .

The red point u corresponds to a belief function for which $\text{Bel}(X) = 0 \cdot 65$. At this level we suppose that there is great concern that the model based on X is not sufficient, and may be giving dubious values.

6 Three socially-centred examples

So far we have mentioned physical control systems to illustrate the ideas surrounding modes. Here we give some social situations which can be modelled similarly.

6.1 Hospital admission




Fig. 4: Visualising unplanned admissions to hospital

In Figure 4 we consider an unplanned admission to hospital. In the mode ‘in ambulance’, the line between ‘take ambulance’ and ‘arrive’, the patient will be in the care of paramedics who may inform the hospital of an imminent arrival.

On arrival the patient enters the ‘triage’ mode, the filled in triangle with vertices ‘arrive’, ‘admit’ and ‘discharge’. The purpose of this mode is to sort patients into those who have to stay in hospital and those who can go home. As evidence is collected the state of the patient will move along the triangle until it reaches one of the vertices ‘admit’ or ‘discharge’. If the patient is known to be critical (e.g. by a report from the paramedics) then they may proceed along the line ‘emergency admission’ connection ‘arrive’ and ‘admit’. If the hospital is closed to admissions then the ‘compulsory discharge’ mode connecting ‘arrive’ and ‘discharge’ will be used. If the decision is made to discharge the patient may still receive treatment before leaving, indicated by the line leading to ‘leave’. Similarly being sent to surgery or a ward requires preparation. In principle, the state of the patient is represented by an as continuous as possible path through the diagram.

We may suppose that the triage process is performed by using a tree in an expert system. This will ask questions leading to possible diagnoses, but its aim is not an accurate diagnosis but rather ascertaining the belief that the patient has a serious enough condition to be admitted. Here the admit vertex consists of a set of more serious conditions (e.g. concussion, internal bleeding) and also includes ‘unknown’, and the discharge vertex consists of a set of less serious conditions. It is likely that notes on diagnosis are passed on when a patient is admitted, but any diagnosis in triage will be regarded as provisional.

As questions are asked or tests taken the path of the system moves from the vertex ‘arrive’ to the line between ‘admit’ and ‘discharge’. If there is evidence of a serious condition we move towards ‘admit’ and if there is only evidence of less serious conditions we move towards ‘discharge’. We assume that the tree of the expert system displays a set of possible diagnoses for a given set of answers. The belief in the arrive vertex is a measure of how many questions we have asked.

The belief in admission will be the greatest likelihood of a serious condition according to the expert system. A cut off likelihood will be used to separate out the two outcomes. At any stage the visualisation is given by three coordinates (arr, adm, dis) for the triage triangle, which are

$$arr = \frac{\text{questions remaining}}{\text{total question number}},$$

$$adm = (1 - arr)(\text{max likelihood of a serious condition})$$

$$dis = (1 - arr)(1 - \text{max likelihood of a serious condition})$$

and these numbers are all positive and add up to 1. In our case X is the set containing all the labels of the vertices in Fig. 4, and for the vertices of the triangle we simply assign a belief to be a probability distribution with the given probabilities, and in this case the plausibility is the same as the belief.

Remark 1. This example can be seen from two different points of view, and both are valid. It can be seen from the point of a patient in hospital, a plane in a crowded airspace or an iron ingot in a steel mill. It can also be seen from the point of a hospital containing many patients, an air traffic control system with many planes or a steel mill processing many iron ingots. In the first view we

focus on the response of a single item control system moving on a path through modes in a complex system. Alternatively, we take the part of the modes, passing many items between them. Of course, ingots in a steel mill have little choice in their fate, whereas aircraft and air traffic control form two control systems in communication.

6.2 Persons of interest

A person coming to the attention of the police as a potential security risk is entered into a triage (initial assessment) process, which is illustrated in Fig. 5. We begin at the ‘begin triage’ vertex of the blue tetrahedral mode ‘trriage’. After conducting an initial investigation ‘trriage’ outputs either a value along the edge from ‘opportunity’ (i.e. there is an opportunity to carry out an attack, e.g. the subject is in close proximity to potential targets) to ‘concern’ (i.e. there is evidence that the subject may be a security risk), or alternatively the vertex ‘neither’ of the above.




Fig. 5: Initial assessment for potential security risks

From ‘neither’ the investigation is cancelled, deleting as much material as procedures allow. From the vertex ‘opportunity’ on the edge (i.e. there is minimal concern about a security risk) the purple triangle ‘obtain security clearance’ mode is started. (This will get references from contacts of the subject etc.) From anywhere else on the edge (i.e. there is some concern about security risk) the red ‘consider further investigation’ mode is entered. It is possible to move between the ‘obtain security clearance’ and ‘consider further investigation’ modes if new evidence is uncovered. The end points are either being granted ‘security clearance’ or being entered for a full ‘further investigation’. To repeat, we can leave the triage mode at three vertices or *at one edge*.

We assign a belief, a function of the evidence available, to plot a position in the blue triage tetrahedron. We begin with positive numbers $(x_{\text{begin}}, x_{\text{con}}, x_{\text{opp}})$.

We take $x_{\text{con}} \geq 0$ to be a weighted sum of evidence from phone calls, emails and social media posts, divided by a preset ‘level of concern’ and capped at 1, so $x_{\text{con}} = 1$ is taken to be a significant concern and $x_{\text{con}} = 0$ is no concern.

We set x_{opp} to be a sum of events attended by the person, weighted by their profile or ease of attack, again divided by a preset level and capped at 1, so $x_{\text{opt}} = 1$ is taken to be a significant opportunity. Note that a large number of applications to certain events would also be treated as a cause for concern, so these numbers are not independent.

We might assign $x_{\text{begin}} \in [0, 1]$ is the fraction of the checks remaining, so if we had 54 checks we would begin at $54/54 = 1$ and then count down as tasks were completed. However, we may have to cut short the process if we already have enough evidence to escalate the investigation. We define

$$x_{\text{end}} = \max \{ 1 - x_{\text{begin}}, x_{\text{con}}, x_{\text{opp}} \} .$$

Consider the visualisation map from our space of evidence $(x_{\text{con}}, x_{\text{opp}}, x_{\text{end}}) \in [0, 1]^3$ in Figure 6, where the origin O is the most distant vertex from our point of view. We show the subsets where we believe that the various outcomes are true. Thus in the second diagram in Figure 6 in the red subset we have points in the neighbourhood of the region where $x_{\text{con}} = 1$, i.e. where we believe that we should be at the vertex *concern*. In the third diagram in Figure 6 in the red subset we have points in the neighbourhood of the region where $x_{\text{opp}} = 1$, i.e. where we believe that we should be at the vertex *opportunity*, and similarly for the leftmost diagram and the vertex *opportunity*. The vertex *begin* has a subset on the right given by a cube $[0, 1 - \epsilon]^3$ for some small $\epsilon > 0$. We now construct a partition of unity for the cube $[0, 1]^3$ as in Definition 2 for these subsets, and this gives the visualisation function. The subsets for *opportunity* and *concern*. intersect as we can have an output along the edge linking those vertices. However, we do not allow the subset for *end* intersect subsets for *opportunity* and *concern*. as those are not valid outputs on Figure 5. This is because making discrete decisions from continuous data requires some amount of discontinuity – made easier in our case as our data is actually rational numbers. Part of the choice of belief function is minimising the likelihood of discontinuity to make the system as transparent in real time (i.e. as predictable in the short term) as possible.




Fig. 6: The subsets for neither, concern, opportunity and begin respectively

6.3 State spaces: An offender monitoring problem

Consider an offender who has been sentenced for a crime committed under the influence of alcohol and who is being monitored for blood alcohol concentration and also tagged to limit how far they may go from home. For both alcohol and

position we can assign a number, x_{alc} and x_{tag} respectively, in $[0, 1]$ where 0 is clearly OK and 1 is clearly a problem. Given the context of this monitoring problem, the system state is an ordered pair $(x_{\text{alc}}, x_{\text{tag}}) \in [0, 1]^2$. This context deliberately omits much information, such as whether the offender is reading or sleeping, which if it was available is simply not recorded. If at any time the following conditions are satisfied, interventions are triggered:

- 1) If the position is out of the allowed area, the offender is asked to see their probation officer.
- 2) If alcohol is higher than a trigger amount, the offender is asked to see their counsellor.
- 3) If both the above, the police are called as an incident may occur.

For both x_{alc} and x_{tag} we assign a region of values which are not problematic, and a region of values which are a problem, say $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ and $[\frac{3}{4}, 1]$ respectively. The fact that there is a gap between these regions is important:

- a) It allows for error in a device or a difference in alcohol metabolism.
- b) It allows for a warning to be sent to the offender, so that action can be taken to avoid an intervention (e.g. going home or stopping drinking).

In Figure 7 we give a mode diagram for the actions, where we have used ovals to emphasise the points and lines where interventions occur. The filled in triangle (2-simplex) mode is responsible for monitoring the situation and issuing a warning to the offender if necessary. The point and line modes at the bottom are responsible for alerting the relevant services.




Fig. 7: Diagram describing interventions in the alcohol-tagging problem

To relate this to the monitoring data we use the square state space $[0, 1]^2$ and the cover given in Figure 8. There the first shaded region indicates an alcohol problem, the second a tagging problem, and the third the absence of a problem.




Fig. 8: A cover of $[0, 1]^2$ for the alcohol-tagging problem

7 A next level: frames of belief and theory change

So far we have been considering systems in which we suppose the modes are fixed and we move between them according to prescribed conditions and algorithms.




Fig. 9: Square mapping to a 2-simplex for the alcohol-tagging problem

Recalling the ideas of innovation, imagination and testing from our anthropomorphic platform in Section 2, we can ask how modes might be modified or even created in response to (unforseen) situations. This is an open problem but one worthy of some light speculation.

7.1 Frames of belief as modes

In so far as a scientific statement speaks about reality, it must be falsifiable: and in so far as it is not falsifiable, it does not speak about reality.

Karl R. Popper, The Logic of Scientific Discovery [15]

It is easy to see the ideas of innovation, imagination and testing as drivers of problem solving in science and engineering. So, for inspiration, let us turn to the history and philosophy of science and engineering, where we can find some suggestive bits and pieces to illustrate a high-level interpretation of modes and the simplicial data structures.

Definition 9. Suppose that \mathcal{M} is a list of scientific theories, laws, principles, axioms, theorems, models, formulae, experiments, tests, heuristics and guidelines etc. A subset $X \subset \mathcal{M}$ we will call a frame of belief. For modelling a particular problem we likely only have to consider a (small) subset $Y \subset X$ of the contents of \mathcal{M} .

Now, a frame of belief can be considered as a mode and a change of belief can be considered as a change of mode:

Example 3. Suppose that \mathcal{M} is a list of scientific theories, old and new, e.g., general relativity, quantum mechanics, atomic theory, Newtonian mechanics, thermodynamics, the luminiferous aether, the fluid theory of heat, the kinetic theory of heat, etc. At some period, we can say that human knowledge has frame of belief X – i.e., is in mode $X \subset \mathcal{M}$ – if the science in X is commonly applied to our understanding of (an aspect of) the natural world. We can take the abstract simplicial complex \mathcal{C} to be the set of subsets X which do not contain immediate contradictions (e.g., Flat Earth and Round Earth theories do not both belong to an element of \mathcal{C}). \square

Example 4. We can illustrate frames of belief by opening up a mode ‘atomic theory’ into various submodes, corresponding to different ideas of atomic structure [1,11]. From ideas by the classical Greeks (including the name *atom*), John

Dalton proposed an idea of atomic theory, but without any internal structure of the atoms. In 1867 William Thomson proposed that atoms were knots in the aether. This was followed in 1878 by Alfred Mayer's proposition of atoms as magnets arranging themselves into molecules. After the discovery of the electron William Thomson and J.J. Thompson (the discoverer of the electron) proposed the 'plum pudding' model for the atom. Rutherford proposed a nucleus surrounded by electrons. Niels Bohr introduced the quantisation of the orbits of the electrons, and Schrodinger gave the first modern treatment of atoms using wave functions, which has since been modified by the introduction of relativity and spin (the Klein-Gordon and Dirac equations). \square

Scientific examples, old and new, are readily available. A contemporary example would be the competing theories for explaining dark matter [9].

However, it is rather important to note that Definition 9 can also be formulated in terms of human concepts: sociological theories, social categories, economic models, cultural practices, regulations and laws, priorities and bias, political correctness tags, etc. The epistemic space of social science is more complicated, of course, as many working notions are imprecise, debated and are country specific. For our general speculative discussion here the social examples would contain too many distractions.

However, the attempt to define frames of belief for human and social contexts is directly relevant to our research agenda here, e.g., consider frames of belief as envelopes for the examples in Section 6.

7.2 Changing frames of belief

Now we need to understand how frames of belief change. Interpreted as modes, change is facilitated by transition functions. There is an interesting link between transition functions and information hiding.

We consider moving from a mode X to a subset mode $Y \subset X$ when we no longer believe that its complement $X \setminus Y$ in X is relevant and may be hidden or discarded. In agreement with William of Ockham, (Ockham's Razor 2, Section 2.2) we establish a principle to move to a simpler (subset) mode where possible.

Example 5. Phlogiston was a substance whose release was supposed to cause combustion [19]. Over time the existence of Phlogiston became simply not necessary to explain phenomena. In the notation above from mode X we have $X \setminus Y = \{\text{Phlogiston}\}$. \square

Alternately, consider moving from mode X to a superset mode $X \subset Z$. This is more difficult as we are moving into an unknown country where there are factors in mode Z that mode X was never designed to understand. Firstly, we would not want to move from mode X if we believe that it is doing well, there has to be a motivation to move, such as 'a state of growing crisis':

Thermodynamics was born from the collision of two existing nineteenth-century physical theories, and quantum mechanics from a variety of difficulties surrounding black-body radiation, specific heats, and the photoelectric effect. Furthermore, in all these cases except that of Newton the

awareness of anomaly had lasted so long and penetrated so deep that one can appropriately describe the fields affected by it as in a state of growing crisis.

Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions [20]

However, not so obviously, there is a problem when this crisis is too large. It is not that we cannot change mode in a time of great crisis (indeed there may be little alternative), it is rather that we would be so far into an unknown country that the result of doing so would not be predictable.

Example 6. Initially the experimental evidence for General Relativity was found in what seemed minor details, the precession of the orbit of Mercury and the bending of light around the sun. However, we might imagine a more drastic introduction where a space ship (taking the liberty of assuming that space travel came before General Relativity) found itself in the vicinity of a black hole. The astronauts now find themselves in a situation where almost every observation is altered by gravitational effects and time dilation - a truly unknown country. Their first guesses as to what is going on and extrapolations from previously known physics are likely to be wildly inaccurate. \square

Finally, recall Example 3 with visualisation in mind:

Example 7. For a philosophical example, we take \mathcal{M} to be the theories of the universe. A set of theories $X \subset \mathcal{M}$ will be a simplex if those theories could possibly co-exist simultaneously, i.e., are not contradictory. Introducing the geometry of simplicies, this means there is no edge between the vertices ‘flat Earth’ and ‘round Earth’, but there is an edge between ‘special relativity’ and ‘thermodynamics’. Further, being on that edge would allow more theory and predictions of observations than either theory could in isolation. Evidence from observations and experiments would be used to place our actual universe (from a hypothetical ‘state space’ of universes) at some point in the simplicial complex, or to show that our theories are faulty by awkwardly pointing at a state not compatible with our construction. \square

8 Concluding remarks

8.1 Reflections

We have introduced a data structure incorporating modes in which the position of the system in the geometric visualisation of the modes is governed by *belief*. The dynamics of the system is driven by Incompleteness and Occam’s Razor as described in Section 2. We move to a simpler system when possible, and to a more complicated system only when forced to do so. Some obvious questions arise:

Q: *Does the modes structure apply only to the highest level of the organisation of the system?* **A:** No, we can have a hierarchy where each of the modes in the top

level becomes, on closer examination, a simplicial complex of modes (we can call these modes sub-modes, but they have the same organising principles). From the system design point of view this is simply information hiding, e.g., a single mode labelled ‘court’ to a member of the police opens to a multitude of modes for those organising court proceedings. From a mathematical point of view, the relevant idea to preserve the structure is a simplicial map between simplicial complexes.

Q: *How do modes relate to the environment?* **A:** For dealing with the *real world* we use the formalism of *physical oracles* [2] that both gather information and affect the real world, and allows for errors and delays. Each mode has a list of such oracles which it can communicate with.

Q: *How does the geometry specify the algorithms?* **A:** There is a huge amount of information hiding in which the geometry of the modes specify which modes neighbour the current mode, and the algorithm only knows about those neighbouring modes.

Q: *Can a system of modes be retro-fitted to explain some system?* **A:** Perhaps: because modes combine objectives, specifications and implementations, this combination maps the scope and limits of components in a complex system.

Modes have a number of connections with general techniques and themes in computing:

Q: *How do modes relate to learning algorithms such as neural nets?* **A:** This oracle formalism can also be used for a potentially non-explainable algorithm (such as a neural net), where the possible error can be quantified and considered with other information. The output of a classification procedure, such as a neural net, can be taken as an element of a simplex spanned by the possible classifications, and thus naturally fits into a simplicial approach.

Q: *How do modes relate to security?* **A:** Modes can be allocated a security clearance (via a simplicial classification map to a simplicial complex of security classifications) and this can determine which oracles (and therefore what information) each mode has access to (see [8] for a formal study of security). All external computers and databases are treated as oracles, just as sensors and actuators are. Judgements can be made as to how reliable these oracles are.

Q: *How do modes relate to safety?* **A:** Only certain modes would have access to oracles allowing some possibly dangerous behaviour, regardless of programming other modes simply cannot access these oracles.

Q: *How do modes relate to privacy?* **A:** Similarly to safety, only certain modes could access or transmit certain information.

References

1. The History of the Atom: Theories and Models.
<https://www.compoundchem.com/2016/10/13/atomicmodels>

2. E.J. Beggs, J. F. Costa, and J. V. Tucker, Axiomatizing physical experiments as oracles to algorithms, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 28 370 (2012), 3359-3384.
3. E.J. Beggs & J.V. Tucker, A model of systems with modes and mode transitions, *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 127 (2022), 100774.
4. E.J. Beggs, J. F. Costa, and J. V. Tucker, The impact of models of a physical oracle on computational power, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 22 (2012), 853-879.
5. E.J. Beggs, J. F. Costa, and J. V. Tucker, Three forms of physical measurement and their computability, *Reviews of Symbolic Logic* 7 Issue 4 (2014), 618-646.
6. L. Bolc, & P. Borowik, *Many-Valued Logics. 1. Theoretical Foundations*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
7. P.R. Daugherty & H.J. Wilson, *Human + Machine: Reimagining Work in the Age of AI*, Harvard Business Review Press, 2018.
8. D. Denning, A lattice model for secure information flow, *Communications of the ACM*, 19 (5) (1976), 236-243.
9. M. Fore, What dark matter is (probably) not, *Symmetry Magazine*, 2020. <https://www.symmetrymagazine.org/article/what-dark-matter-is-probably-not>
10. S. Giedion, *Mechanization Takes Command: A Contribution to an Anonymous History*, Oxford University Press, 1948.
11. R. Justi and J. Gilbert, History and philosophy of science through models: some challenges in the case of 'the atom', *International Journal of Science Education*, 22 (9) (2000), 993-1009. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095006900416875>
12. H. Kissinger, E. Schmidt and D. Huttenlocher, *The Age of AI*, John Murray, 2021.
13. G. Shafer, Perspectives on the theory and practice of belief functions, *Int. Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 4, (5-6), (1990), 323-362.
14. H. A. Simon, The architecture of complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106 (6) (1962), 467-482.
15. K. Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Hutchinson & Co. 1959.
16. R.R. Yager & L. Liu (eds.), *Classic Works of the Dempster-Shafer Theory of Belief Functions*, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, Springer 2008.
17. A.M. Turing, On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem, *Proceedings London Mathematical Society* Vol. s2-42 issue 1, 1937.
18. N. Kogo & C. Trengove, Is predictive coding theory articulated enough to be testable?, *Frontiers in Computing Neuroscience*, 8 September 2015. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2015.00111>
19. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phlogiston_theory
20. T.S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, 1962.
21. P. J. Mosterman, and G. Biswas, A comprehensive methodology for building hybrid models of physical systems, *Artificial Intelligence* 121 (1-2) (2000), 171-209.
22. J.M. Lee, *Manifolds and differential geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 107, A.M.S., Providence RI, 2009.
23. B. Shneiderman, *Algorithmic Accountability*, Turing Lecture 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UWuDgY8aHmU>
24. F. W. Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management*, Harper and Bros. 1911. Reprinted Dover Publications, 1997.
25. A.M. Turing, Computing machinery and intelligence, *Mind*, 59, (1950), 433-460.
26. UN, Urgent action needed over artificial intelligence risks to human rights, *UN News*, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/09/1099972>
27. D. Wren, The centennial of Frederick W Taylor's 'The Principles of Scientific Management': A retrospective commentary, *Journal of Business and Management* 17 (1) (2011), 11-22.