

References

- Ackerman, R., Douven, I., Elqayam, S., & Teodorescu, K. (2020). Satisficing, meta-reasoning, and the rationality of further deliberation. In S. Elqayam, I. Douven, N. Cruz, & J. St. B. T. Evans (eds.), *Logic and uncertainty in the human mind* (pp. 10–26). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ackerman, R. & Thompson, V. A. (2015). Meta-reasoning: What we can learn from meta-memory. In A. Feeney & V. A. Thompson (eds.), *Reasoning as memory* (pp. 164–178). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Ackerman, R. & Thompson, V. A. (2017). Meta-reasoning: Monitoring and control of thinking and reasoning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 21: 607–617.
- Ackerman, R. & Thompson, V. A. (2018). Meta-reasoning: Shedding meta-cognitive light on reasoning research. In L. Ball & V. A. Thompson (eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of thinking and reasoning* (pp. 1–15). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Aczél, J. & Wagner, C. (1980). A characterization of weighted arithmetic means. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic and Discrete Methods* 1: 259–260.
- Adler, J. (1994). Testimony, trust, knowing. *Journal of Philosophy* 91: 264–275.
- Agresti, A. (2007). *An introduction to categorical data analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory as an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In B. Petrov & F. Csaki (eds.), *Second international symposium on information theory* (pp. 267–281). Budapest, Hungary: Akademiai Kiado.
- Ali, N., Chater, N., & Oaksford, M. (2011). The mental representation of causal conditional reasoning: Mental models or causal models. *Cognition* 119: 403–418.

- Ali, N., Schlottmann, A., Shaw, A., Chater, N., & Oaksford, M. (2010). Causal discounting and conditional reasoning in children. In M. Oaksford & N. Chater (eds.), *Cognition and conditionals: Probability and logic in human thinking* (pp. 117–134). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Aliseda, A. (2006). *Abductive reasoning: Logical investigations into discovery and explanation*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Anderson, J. R. (1990). *The adaptive character of thought*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, J. R. (1991). Is human cognition adaptive? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 14: 471–517.
- Arkes, H. R., Gigerenzer, G., & Hertwig, R. (2016). How bad is incoherence? *Decision* 3: 20–39.
- Atkinson, D. (2003). Experiments and thought experiments in natural science. In M. C. Galavotti (ed.), *Observation and experimentation in the natural and social sciences* (pp. 209–225). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Baayen, R. H. (2008). *Analyzing linguistic data*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bach, K. & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bacharach, M. (1979). Normal Bayesian dialogues. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 74: 837–846.
- Bäck, T. (1996). *Evolutionary algorithms in theory and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Baillargeon, R. & DeJong, G. F. (2017). Explanation-based learning in infancy. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 24: 1511–1526.
- Baker, J. E. (1985). Adaptive selection methods for genetic algorithms. In J. J. Grefenstette (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Genetic Algorithms and Their Applications* (pp. 100–111). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ballantyne, N. & Coffman, E. J. (2011). Uniqueness, evidence, and rationality. *Philosophers Imprint* 11: 1–13.
- Ballantyne, N. & Coffman, E. J. (2012). Conciliationism and uniqueness. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 90: 657–670.

- Baratgin, J. & Politzer, G. (2007). The psychology of dynamic probability judgment: Order effect, normative theories, and experimental methodology. *Mind & Society* 6: 53–66.
- Barbati, M., Bruno, G., & Genovese, A. (2012). Applications of agent-based models for optimization problems: A literature review. *Expert Systems with Applications* 39: 6020–6028.
- Bar-Hillel, M. (1980). The base-rate fallacy in probability judgments. *Acta Psychologica* 44: 211–233.
- Beach, L. R. & Swenson, R. G. (1966). Intuitive estimation of means. *Psychonomic Science* 5: 161–162.
- Berg, N., Biele, G., & Gigerenzer, G. (2016). Consistent Bayesians are no more accurate than non-Bayesians: Economists surveyed about PSA. *Review of Behavioral Economics* 3: 189–219.
- Bernardo, J. M. (1979). Expected information as expected utility. *Annals of Statistics* 7: 686–690.
- Bernardo, J. M. & Smith, A. F. M. (2000). *Bayesian theory*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Bes, B., Sloman, S., Lucas, C. G., & Raufaste, E. (2012). Non-Bayesian inference: Causal structure trumps correlation. *Cognitive Science* 36: 1178–1203.
- Bezanson, J., Edelman, A., Karpinski, S., & Shah, V. B. (2017). Julia: A fresh approach to numerical computing. *SIAM Review* 59: 65–98.
- Bickel, J. E. (2007). Some comparisons between quadratic, spherical, and logarithmic scoring rules. *Decision Analysis* 4: 49–65.
- Bickel, J. E. (2010). Scoring rules and decision analysis education. *Decision Analysis* 7: 346–357.
- Biggs, S. & Wilson, J. (2017). The a priority of abduction. *Philosophical Studies* 174: 735–758.
- Bird, A. (1998). *Philosophy of science*. Montreal, Canada: McGill–Queen’s University Press.
- Bird, A. (2010). Eliminative abduction: Examples from medicine. *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 41: 345–352.
- BonJour, L. (1985). *The structure of empirical knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- BonJour, L. & Sosa, E. (2003). *Epistemic justification*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Borsboom, D. & Haig, B. D. (2013). How to practice Bayesian statistics outside the Bayesian church: What philosophy for Bayesian modeling? *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 66: 39–44.
- Bovens, L. & Hartmann, S. (2003). *Bayesian epistemology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, R. N. (1984). On the current status of scientific realism. *Erkenntnis* 19: 45–90.
- Boyd, R. N. (1985). Lex orandi est lex credendi. In P. Churchland & C. Hooker (eds.), *Images of science* (pp. 3–34). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyd, R. N. (1990). Realism, approximate truth, and philosophical method. In C. Wade Savage (ed.), *Scientific theories* (pp. 355–391). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. (1985). *Culture and the evolutionary process*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyd, R., Richerson, P. J., & Henrich, J. (2011). The cultural niche: Why social learning is essential for human adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108: 10918–10925.
- Brewer, M. B. (2004). Taking the origins of human nature seriously: Toward a more imperialist social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 8: 107–113.
- Brier, G. W. (1950). Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Monthly Weather Review* 78: 1–3.
- Briggs, R. A. & Pettigrew, R. (2020). An accuracy-dominance argument for conditionalization. *Notus* 54: 162–181.
- Brössel, P. (2013). The problem of measure sensitivity redux. *Philosophy of Science* 80: 378–397.
- Brössel, P. (2015). On the role of explanatory and systematic power in scientific reasoning. *Synthese* 192: 3877–3913.
- Brouwer, L. E. J. (1911). Über Abbildungen von Mannigfaltigkeiten. *Mathematische Annalen* 71: 97–115.
- Bulger, P. M. J., Hiles, D. R., & Lowe, G. (1969). Presentation time and the intuitive estimation of means. *Psychonomic Science* 15: 191–192.
- Bunt, H. C. & Black, W. J. (2000). *Abduction, belief, and context in dialogue: Studies in computational pragmatics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Burnham, K. P. & Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model selection and multi-model inference: A practical information-theoretic approach* (2nd ed.). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Byerly, T. R. (2013). Explanationism and justified beliefs about the future. *Erkenntnis* 78: 229–243.
- Byrne, A. (2004). How hard are the sceptical paradoxes? *Noûs* 38: 299–325.
- Cabrera, F. (2017). Can there be a Bayesian explanationism? On the prospects of a productive partnership. *Synthese* 194: 1245–1272.
- Callebaut, W. (1993). *Taking the naturalistic turn*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Campos, D. (2011). On the distinction between Peirce's abduction and Lipton's inference to the best explanation. *Synthese* 180: 419–442.
- Caporael, L. R. (2001). Evolutionary psychology: Toward a unifying theory and a hybrid science. *Annual Review of Psychology* 52: 607–628.
- Carnap, R. (1945). On inductive logic. *Philosophy of Science* 12: 72–97.
- Carnap, R. (1947a). *Meaning and necessity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Carnap, R. (1947b). On the application of inductive logic. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 8: 133–148.
- Carnap, R. (1950). *Logical foundations of probability*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Carnap, R. (1952). Meaning postulates. *Philosophical Studies* 3: 65–73.
- Carnap, R. (1980). A basic system of inductive logic II. In R. C. Jeffrey (ed.), *Studies in inductive logic and probability* (vol. 2, pp. 7–155). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cesa-Bianchi, N. & Lugosi, G. (2006). *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cevolani, G., Festa, R., & Kuipers, T. A. F. (2013). Verisimilitude and belief change for nomic conjunctive theories. *Synthese* 190: 3307–3324.
- Chabris, C. F. & Simons, D. J. (2010). *The invisible gorilla*. New York, NY: Crown.
- Chaitin, G. (2006). *Meta math! The quest for omega*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Chandler, J. (2013). Acceptance, aggregation and scoring rules. *Erkenntnis* 78: 201–217.
- Chater, N. & Oaksford, M. (1999). The probability heuristics model of syllogistic reasoning. *Cognitive Psychology* 38: 191–258.

- Chi, M. T. H., de Leeuw, N., Chiu, M.-H., & LaVancher, C. (1994). Eliciting self-explanations improves understanding. *Cognitive Science* 18: 439–477.
- Chien, A. (2008). Scalar implicature and contrastive explanation. *Synthese* 161: 47–66.
- Christensen, D. (1983). Glymour on evidential relevance. *Philosophy of Science* 50: 471–481.
- Christensen, D. (1994). Conservatism in epistemology. *Noûs* 28: 69–89.
- Christensen, D. (1997). What is relative confirmation? *Noûs* 31: 370–384.
- Christensen, D. (2007). Epistemology of disagreement: The good news. *Philosophical Review* 116: 187–218.
- Christensen, D. (2011). Disagreement, question-begging and epistemic self-criticism. *Philosophers Imprint* 11: 1–22.
- Christensen, D. (2016). Uniqueness and rational toxicity. *Noûs* 50: 584–603.
- Climenhaga, N. (2017a). How explanation guides confirmation. *Philosophy of Science* 84: 359–368.
- Climenhaga, N. (2017b). Inference to the best explanation made incoherent. *Journal of Philosophy* 114: 251–273.
- Coello Coello, C. A., Lamont, G. B., & Van Veldhuizen, D. A. (2007). *Evolutionary algorithms for solving multi-objective problems* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Cohen, M. P. (2016). On three measures of explanatory power with axiomatic representations. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 67: 1077–1089.
- Colombo, M. (2017). Experimental philosophy of explanation rising: The case for a plurality of concepts of explanation. *Cognitive Science* 41: 503–517.
- Colombo, M., Bucher, L., & Sprenger, J. (2017). Determinants of judgments of explanatory power: Credibility, generality, and statistical relevance. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8, [https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01430](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01430).
- Colombo, M., Elkin, L., & Hartmann, S. (2021). Being realist about Bayes, and the predictive processing theory of mind. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 72: 185–220.
- Conee, E. & Feldman, R. (2004). *Evidentialism: Essays in epistemology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Conee, E. & Feldman, R. (2008). Evidence. In Q. Smith (ed.), *Epistemology: New essays* (pp. 83–104). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Cooke, R. M. (1991). *Experts in uncertainty*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Costello, F. & Watts, P. (2016). People's conditional probability judgments follow probability theory (plus noise). *Cognitive Psychology* 89: 106–133.
- Costello, F. & Watts, P. (2018). Invariants in probabilistic reasoning. *Cognitive Psychology* 100: 1–16.
- Crosscombe, M. & Lawry, J. (2016). A model of multi-agent consensus for vague and uncertain beliefs. *Adaptive Behavior* 24: 249–260.
- Crupi, V. & Tentori, K. (2012). A second look at the logic of explanatory power (with two novel representation theorems). *Philosophy of Science* 79: 365–385.
- Crupi, V., Tentori, K., & Gonzalez, M. (2007). On Bayesian measures of evidential support: Theoretical and empirical issues. *Philosophy of Science* 74: 229–252.
- Czarnowski, I., Jędrzejowicz, P., & Kacprzyk, J. (2013). *Agent-based optimization*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection*. London, UK: John Murray.
- Darwin, C. (1876). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection* (6th ed.). London, UK: John Murray.
- Dascal, M. (1979). Conversational relevance. In A. Margalit (ed.), *Meaning and use* (pp. 153–174). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Davidson, D. (1996). The folly of trying to define truth. *Journal of Philosophy* 93: 263–278.
- Day, T. & Kincaid, H. (1994). Putting inference to the best explanation in its place. *Synthese* 98: 271–295.
- Deb, K. (2001). *Multi-objective optimization using evolutionary algorithms*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Decock, L. & Douven, I. (2012). Putnam's internal realism: A radical restatement. *Topoi* 31: 111–120.
- Decock, L., Douven, I., & Sznajder, M. (2016). A geometric principle of indifference. *Journal of Applied Logic* 19: 54–70.
- De Cruz, H. (2017). Religious disagreement: An empirical study among academic philosophers. *Episteme* 14: 71–87.
- De Cruz, H. & De Smedt, J. (2013). The value of epistemic disagreement in scientific practice: The case of Homo floresiensis. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 44: 169–177.

- De Cruz, H. & De Smedt, J. (2015). *A natural history of natural theology: The cognitive science of theology and philosophy of religion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Deffuant, G., Neau, D., Amblard, F., & Weisbuch, G. (2000). Mixing beliefs among interacting agents. *Advances in Complex Systems* 3: 87–98.
- de Finetti, B. (1937). Foresight: Its logical laws, its subjective sources. In H. Kyburg & H. Smokler (eds.), *Studies in subjective probability* (1980, 2nd ed., pp. 53–118). New York, NY: Krieger.
- de Finetti, B. (1962). Does it make sense to speak of “good probability appraisers”? In I. J. Good (ed.), *The scientist speculates: An anthology of partly-baked ideas* (pp. 357–364). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- De Langhe, R. (2013). Peer disagreement under multiple epistemic constraints. *Synthese* 190: 2547–2556.
- De Langhe, R. & Greiff, M. (2010). Standards and the distribution of cognitive labour: A model of the dynamics of scientific activity. *Logic Journal of the IGPL* 18: 278–294.
- Dellsén, F. (2017). Reactionary responses to the bad lot objection. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 61: 32–40.
- Dellsén, F. (2018). The heuristic conception of inference to the best explanation. *Philosophical Studies* 175: 1745–1766.
- Dellsén, F. (2021). Explanatory consolidation: From “best” to “good enough.” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 103: 157–177.
- de Regt, H. W. (2017). *Understanding scientific understanding*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- de Regt, H. W. & Dieks, D. (2005). A contextual approach to scientific understanding. *Synthese* 144: 137–170.
- de Ridder, J. (2014). Epistemic dependence and collective scientific knowledge. *Synthese* 191: 37–53.
- Devitt, M. (1991). *Realism and truth* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Dhanalakshmi, S., Kanna, S., Mahadevan, K., & Baskar, S. (2011). Application of modified NSGA-II algorithm to combined economic and emission dispatch problem. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 33: 992–1002.
- Dietz, R. (2010). On generalizing Kolmogorov. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 51: 323–335.
- Dittmer, J. C. (2001). Consensus formation under bounded confidence. *Nonlinear Analysis* 7: 4615–4621.

- Djulgovic, B. & Elqayam, S. (2017). Many faces of rationality: Implications of the great rationality debate for clinical decision-making. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 23: 915–922.
- Djulgovic, B., Elqayam, S., Reljic, T., Hozo, I., Miladinovic, B., Tsalatsanis, A., Kumar, A., Beckstead, J., Taylor, S., & Cannon-Bowers, J. (2014). How do physicians decide to treat: An empirical evaluation of the threshold model. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 14: 47, <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6947/14/47>.
- Douven, I. (1995). Boyd's miraculous no miracle argument. In P. Cortois (ed.), *The many problems of realism* (pp. 89–116). Tilburg, Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Douven, I. (1999). Inference to the best explanation made coherent. *Philosophy of Science* 66: S424–S435.
- Douven, I. (2000). The antirealist argument for underdetermination. *Philosophical Quarterly* 50: 371–375.
- Douven, I. (2002a). Testing inference to the best explanation. *Synthese* 130: 355–377.
- Douven, I. (2002b). A new solution to the paradoxes of rational acceptability. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 53: 391–410.
- Douven, I. (2005). Evidence, explanation, and the empirical status of scientific realism. *Erkenntnis* 63: 253–291.
- Douven, I. (2006). Assertion, knowledge, and rational credibility. *Philosophical Review* 115: 449–485.
- Douven, I. (2008). Underdetermination. In S. Psillos & M. Curd (eds.), *The Routledge companion to philosophy of science* (pp. 292–301). London, UK: Routledge.
- Douven, I. (2009). Assertion, Moore, and Bayes. *Philosophical Studies* 144: 361–375.
- Douven, I. (2010). Simulating peer disagreements. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 41: 148–157.
- Douven, I. (2012a). The lottery paradox and the pragmatics of belief. *Dialectica* 66: 351–373.
- Douven, I. (2012b). Learning conditional information. *Mind & Language* 27: 239–263.
- Douven, I. (2013). Inference to the best explanation, Dutch books, and inaccuracy minimisation. *Philosophical Quarterly* 69: 428–444.

- Douven, I. (2016a). *The epistemology of indicative conditionals*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Douven, I. (2016b). Explanation, updating, and accuracy. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 28: 1004–1012.
- Douven, I. (2017a). Abduction. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/abduction/>.
- Douven, I. (2017b). Inference to the best explanation: What is it? And why should we care? In K. McCain & T. Poston (eds.), *Best explanations: New essays on inference to the best explanation* (pp. 4–22). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Douven, I. (2018). A Bayesian perspective on Likert scales and central tendency. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 25: 1203–1211.
- Douven, I. (2019a). Optimizing group learning: An evolutionary computing approach. *Artificial Intelligence* 275: 235–251.
- Douven, I. (2019b). Putting prototypes in place. *Cognition* 193: 104007, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.104007>.
- Douven, I. (2019c). Computational models in social epistemology. In M. Fricker, P. Graham, D. Henderson, N. J. Pedersen, & J. Wyatt (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of social epistemology* (pp. 457–465). London, UK: Routledge.
- Douven, I. (2020a). Can the evidence for explanatory reasoning be explained away? *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems* 12: 12–17.
- Douven, I. (2020b). Scoring in context. *Synthese* 197: 1565–1580.
- Douven, I. (2020c). The ecological rationality of explanatory reasoning. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 79: 1–14.
- Douven, I. (2020d). The rationality of vagueness. In R. Dietz (ed.), *Vagueness and rationality in language use and cognition* (pp. 115–134). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Douven, I. (2021). Tracking confirmation. *Philosophy of Science* 88: 398–414.
- Douven, I. (in press). Explaining the success of induction. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*.
- Douven, I. & Dietz, R. (2011). A puzzle about Stalnaker's hypothesis. *Topoi* 30: 31–37.
- Douven, I. & Elqayam, S. (2021). Rethinking the lottery paradox: A dual processing perspective. In I. Douven (ed.), *Lotteries, knowledge, and*

- rational belief: Essays on the lottery paradox* (pp. 110–127). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Douven, I., Elqayam, S., & Mirabile, P. (in press). Inference strength predicts the probability of conditionals better than conditional probability does. *Journal of Memory and Language*, in press.
- Douven, I., Elqayam, S., Singmann, H., & van Wijnbergen-Huitink, J. (2018). Conditionals and inferential connections: A hypothetical inferential theory. *Cognitive Psychology* 101: 50–81.
- Douven, I., Elqayam, S., Singmann, H., & van Wijnbergen-Huitink, J. (2020). Conditionals and inferential connections: Toward a new semantics. *Thinking & Reasoning* 26: 311–351.
- Douven, I. & Gärdenfors, P. (2020). What are natural concepts? A design perspective. *Mind & Language* 35: 313–334.
- Douven, I. & Hegselmann, R. (2021). Mis- and disinformation in a bounded confidence model. *Artificial Intelligence* 291: 103415, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2020.103415>.
- Douven, I. & Horsten, L. (1998). Earman on underdetermination and empirical indistinguishability. *Erkenntnis* 49: 303–320.
- Douven, I. & Kelp, C. (2011). Truth approximation, social epistemology, and opinion dynamics. *Erkenntnis* 75: 271–283.
- Douven, I. & Kelp, C. (2013). Proper bootstrapping. *Synthese* 190: 171–185.
- Douven, I. & Krzyżanowska, K. H. (2019). The semantics–pragmatics divide: An empirical perspective. In A. Capone, M. Carapezza, & F. Lo Piparo (eds.), *Further advances in pragmatics and philosophy: Theories and applications* (pp. 81–100). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Douven, I. & Meijs, W. (2006). Bootstrap confirmation made quantitative. *Synthese* 49: 97–132.
- Douven, I. & Meijs, W. (2007). Measuring coherence. *Synthese* 156: 405–425.
- Douven, I. & Mirabile, P. (2018). Best, second-best, and good-enough explanations: How they matter to reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Language, Memory, and Cognition* 44: 1792–1813.
- Douven, I. & Riegler, A. (2010). Extending the Hegselmann–Krause model I. *Logic Journal of the IGPL* 18: 323–335.
- Douven, I. & Rott, H. (2018). From probabilities to categorical beliefs: Going beyond toy models. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 28: 1099–1124.

- Douven, I. & Schupbach, J. N. (2015a). The role of explanatory considerations in updating. *Cognition* 142: 299–311.
- Douven, I. & Schupbach, J. N. (2015b). Probabilistic alternatives to Bayesianism: The case of explanationism. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00459>.
- Douven, I. & Uffink, J. B. M. (2003). The preface paradox revisited. *Erkenntnis* 59: 389–420.
- Douven, I. & Wenmackers, S. (2017). Inference to the best explanation versus Bayes' rule in a social setting. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 68: 535–570.
- Douven, I. & Williamson, T. (2006). Generalizing the lottery paradox. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 57: 755–779.
- Dragulinescu, S. (2016). Inference to the best explanation and mechanisms in medicine. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 37: 211–232.
- Dyke, M. M. (in press). Could our epistemic reasons be *collective* practical reasons? *Noûs*.
- Earman, J. (1992). *Bayes or bust?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Earman, J. (1993). Underdetermination, realism, and reason. In P. French, T. Uehling, Jr., & H. Wettstein (eds.), *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* (vol. 18, pp. 19–38). Notre Dame, IL: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Edgington, D. (1995). On conditionals. *Mind* 104: 235–329.
- Edwards, B. J., Williams, J. J., Gentner, D. & Lombrozo, T. (2019). Explanation recruits comparison in a category-learning task. *Cognition* 185: 21–38.
- Edwards, W. (1968). Conservatism in human information processing. In B. Kleinmuntz (ed.), *Formal representation of human judgment* (pp. 17–52). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Eells, E. & Fitelson, B. (2002). Symmetries and asymmetries in evidential support. *Philosophical Studies* 107: 129–142.
- Einstein, A. (1915). Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. *Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte* 2: 831–839.
- Einstein, A. (1950). *Out of my later years*. New York, NY: Philosophical Library.
- Elqayam, S. (2011). Grounded rationality: A relativist framework for normative rationality. In K. I. Manktelow, D. E. Over, & S. Elqayam (eds.), *The science of reason* (pp. 397–420). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

- Elqayam, S. (2012). Grounded rationality: Descriptivism in epistemic context. *Synthese* 189: 39–49.
- Elqayam, S. (2018). New psychology of reasoning. In L. J. Ball & V. A. Thompson (eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of thinking and reasoning* (pp. 130–150). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Elqayam, S. & Evans, J. St. B. T. (2011). Subtracting “ought” from “is”: Descriptivism versus normativism in the study of human thinking. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 34: 233–248.
- Elqayam, S. & Evans, J. St. B. T. (2013). Rationality in the new paradigm: Strict versus soft Bayesian approaches. *Thinking & Reasoning* 19: 453–470.
- Elqayam, S. & Over, D. E. (2012). Probabilities, beliefs, and dual processing: The paradigm shift in the psychology of reasoning. *Mind & Society* 11: 27–40.
- Epstein, E. S. (1969). A scoring system for probability forecasts of ranked categories. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 8: 985–987.
- Eva, B., Hartmann, S., & Rafiee Rad, S. (2020). Learning from conditionals. *Mind* 129: 461–508.
- Evans, J. St. B. T. (2007a). *Hypothetical thinking: Dual processes in reasoning and judgement*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Evans, J. St. B. T. (2007b). On the resolution of conflict in dual process theories of reasoning. *Thinking & Reasoning* 13: 321–339.
- Evans, J. St. B. T. (2008). Dual-processing accounts of reasoning, judgment, and social cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology* 59: 255–278.
- Evans, J. St. B. T. (2010a). *Thinking twice: Two minds in one brain*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, J. St. B. T. (2010b). Intuition and reasoning: A dual-process perspective. *Psychological Inquiry* 21: 313–326.
- Evans, J. St. B. T., Barston, J. L., & Pollard, P. (1983). On the conflict between logic and belief in syllogistic reasoning. *Memory & Cognition* 11: 295–306.
- Evans, J. St. B. T. & Over, D. E. (1996). *Rationality and reasoning*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Fairchild, M. D. (2013). *Color appearance models*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Faisal, A. A., Selen, L. P. J., & Wolpert, D. M. (2008). Noise in the nervous system. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 9: 292–303.

- Fann, K. T. (1970). *Peirce's theory of abduction*. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Fantl, J. & McGrath, M. (2009). *Knowledge in an uncertain world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fernbach, P. M. & Erb, C. D. (2013). A quantitative causal model theory of conditional reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 39: 1327–1343.
- Fine, A. I. (1984). The natural ontological attitude. In J. Leplin (ed.), *Scientific realism* (pp. 261–277). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fischhoff, B. & Lichtenstein, S. (1978). Don't attribute this to Reverend Bayes. *Psychological Bulletin* 85: 239–243.
- Fitelson, B. (1999). The plurality of Bayesian measures of confirmation and the problem of measure sensitivity. *Philosophy of Science* 66: S362–S378.
- Fitelson, B. (2001). *Studies in Bayesian confirmation theory*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Fitelson, B. (2003). A probabilistic theory of coherence. *Analysis* 63: 194–199.
- Fitelson, B. & Eells, E. (2000). Measuring confirmation and evidence. *Journal of Philosophy* 97: 663–672.
- Fodor, J. A. (2001). *The mind doesn't work that way*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fodor, J. A. & Lepore, E. (1992). *Holism: A shopper's guide*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Foley, R. (1987). *The theory of epistemic rationality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Foley, R. (1992). The epistemology of belief and the epistemology of degrees of belief. *American Philosophical Quarterly* 29: 111–124.
- Foley, R. (1993). *Working without a net*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Frankfurt, H. (1958). Peirce's notion of abduction. *Journal of Philosophy* 55: 593–596.
- Fricker, E. (1994). Against gullibility. In B. K. Matilal & A. Chakrabarti (eds.), *Knowing from words* (pp. 125–161). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Fricker, E. (2017). Inference to the best explanation and the receipt of testimony: Testimonial reductionism vindicated. In K. McCain & T. Pos-

- ton (eds.), *Best explanations: New essays on inference to the best explanation* (pp. 262–294). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Friedman, M. (1974). Explanation and scientific understanding. *Journal of Philosophy* 71: 5–19.
- Fumerton, R. A. (1980). Induction and reasoning to the best explanation. *Philosophy of Science* 47: 589–600.
- Fumerton, R. A. (2017). Reasoning to the best explanation. In K. McCain & T. Poston (eds.), *Best explanations: New essays on inference to the best explanation* (pp. 65–79). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gabbay, D. M. & Woods, J. (2005). *The reach of abduction: Insight and trial*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland.
- Gaifman, H. (1986). A theory of higher order probabilities. In J. Halpern (ed.), *Theoretical aspects of reasoning about knowledge: Proceedings of the 1986 conference* (pp. 275–292). Los Altos, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Gaifman, H. & Snir, M. (1982). Probabilities over rich languages. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 47: 495–548.
- Galison, P. (1997). *Image and logic: A material culture of microphysics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gärdenfors, P. (2000). *Conceptual spaces: The geometry of thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gärdenfors, P. (2014). *Geometry of meaning: Semantics based on conceptual spaces*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., Dunson, D. B., Vehtari, A., & Rubin, D. B. (2013). *Bayesian data analysis* (3rd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Gelman, A. & Hill, J. (2009). *Data analysis using regression and multi-level/hierarchical models*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gelman, A. & Shalizi, C. R. (2012). Philosophy and the practice of Bayesian statistics in the social sciences. In H. Kincaid (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of philosophy of social science* (pp. 259–273). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gelman, A. & Shalizi, C. R. (2013). Philosophy and the practice of Bayesian statistics. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 66: 8–38.
- Genest, C. (1984). A characterization theorem for externally Bayesian groups. *Annals of Statistics* 12: 1100–1105.

- Genest, C. & Zidek, J. V. (1986). Combining probability distributions: A critique and an annotated bibliography. *Statistical Science* 1: 114–148.
- Giere, R. N. (1988). *Explaining science: A cognitive approach*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gigerenzer, G. (2000). *Adaptive thinking: Rationality in the real world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gigerenzer, G. (2001). The adaptive toolbox. In G. Gigerenzer & R. Selten (eds.), *Bounded rationality: The adaptive toolbox* (pp. 37–50). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gigerenzer, G. & Goldstein, D. G. (1996). Reasoning the fast and frugal way: Models of bounded rationality. *Psychological Review* 103: 650–669.
- Gigerenzer, G., Hertwig, R., & Pachur, T. (2011). *Heuristics: The foundations of adaptive behavior*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gigerenzer, G., Todd, P. M., & ABC Research Group (1999). *Simple heuristics that make us smart*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gillies, D. (2000). *Philosophical theories of probability*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Glass, D. H. (2007). Coherence measures and inference to the best explanation. *Synthese* 157: 275–296.
- Glass, D. H. (2012). Inference to the best explanation: Does it track truth? *Synthese* 185: 411–427.
- Glass, D. H. (2018a). An evaluation of probabilistic approaches to inference to the best explanation. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 103: 184–194.
- Glass, D. H. (2021a). Coherence, explanation, and hypothesis selection. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 72: 1–26.
- Glass, D. H. (2021b). Competing hypotheses and abductive inference. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 89: 161–178.
- Glass, C. A. & Glass, D. H. (2021). Opinion dynamics of social learning with a conflicting source. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 563: 125480.
- Glymour, C. (1980). *Theory and evidence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Goldberg, D. (1991). What every computer scientist should know about floating-point arithmetic. *ACM Computing Surveys* 23: 5–48.

- Goldberg, S. C. (2015). *Assertion: On the philosophical significance of assertoric speech*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goldman, A. H. (1988). *Empirical knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goldman, A. I. (1999). *Knowledge in a social world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goldman, A. I. (2010). Epistemic relativism and reasonable disagreement. In R. Feldman & T. Warfield (eds.), *Disagreement* (pp. 187–215). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goldstein, D. G. & Gigerenzer, G. (2002). Models of ecological rationality: The recognition heuristic. *Psychological Review* 109: 75–90.
- Good, I. J. (1952). Rational decisions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 14: 107–114.
- Good, I. J. (1960). Weight of evidence, corroboration, explanatory power, information and the utility of experiment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 22: 319–331.
- Good, I. J. (1967). On the principle of total evidence. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 17: 319–321.
- Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gopnik, A. & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2007). Bayesian networks, Bayesian learning and cognitive development. *Developmental Science* 10: 281–287.
- Gottifredi, S., Tamargo, L. H., García, A. J., & Simari, G. R. (2018). Arguing about informant credibility in open multi-agent systems. *Artificial Intelligence* 259: 91–109.
- Greaves, H. & Wallace, D. (2006). Justifying conditionalization: Conditionalization maximizes expected epistemic utility. *Mind* 115: 607–632.
- Greco, J. (2015). Inference to the best explanation. In R. Audi (ed.), *The Cambridge dictionary of philosophy* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gribbin, J. (2002). *Science: A history*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Griffiths, T. L., Lieder, F., & Goodman, N. D. (2015). Rational use of cognitive resources: Levels of analysis between the computational and the algorithmic. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 7: 217–229.

- Griffiths, T. L. & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2006). Optimal predictions in everyday cognition. *Psychological Science* 17: 767–773.
- Günther, M. (2018). Learning conditional information by Jeffrey imaging on Stalnaker conditionals. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 47: 851–876.
- Haack, S. (1976). The justification of deduction. *Mind* 85: 112–119.
- Hacking, I. (1967). Slightly more realistic personal probability. *Philosophy of Science* 34: 311–325.
- Hacking, I. (1981). Do we see through a microscope? *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 62: 305–322. (Reprinted in P. Churchland & C. Hooker (eds.), *Images of science* (pp. 132–152). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1985; the page reference is to the reprint.)
- Hacking, I. (1984). Trial by number. *Science* 84: 69–70.
- Hahn, U., Hansen, J. U., & Olsson, E. J. (2020). Truth tracking performance of social networks: How connectivity and clustering can make groups less competent. *Synthese* 197: 1511–1541.
- Haig, B. D. (2005a). An abductive theory of scientific method. *Psychological Methods* 10: 371–388.
- Haig, B. D. (2005b). Exploratory factor analysis, theory generation, and scientific method. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 40: 303–329.
- Harman, G. H. (1965). The inference to the best explanation. *Philosophical Review* 74: 88–95.
- Harman, G. H. (1968). Enumerative induction as inference to the best explanation. *Journal of Philosophy* 65: 529–533.
- Harman, G. H. (1973). *Thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Harré, R. (1986). *Varieties of realism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Harré, R. (1988). Realism and ontology. *Philosophia Naturalis* 25: 386–398.
- Hartmann, S. (in press). Bayes nets and rationality. In M. Knauff & W. Spohn (eds.), *Handbook of rationality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Hawley, K. (2006). Science as a guide to metaphysics? *Synthese* 149: 451–470.
- Hegselmann, R. & Krause, U. (2002). Opinion dynamics and bounded confidence: Models, analysis, and simulations. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 5, <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/5/3/2.html>.
- Hegselmann, R. & Krause, U. (2005). Opinion dynamics driven by various ways of averaging. *Computational Economics* 25: 381–405.

- Hegselmann, R. & Krause, U. (2006). Truth and cognitive division of labor: First steps towards a computer aided social epistemology. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 9, <http://jasss.soc.surrey.ac.uk/9/3/10.html>.
- Hegselmann, R. & Krause, U. (2009). Deliberative exchange, truth, and cognitive division of labour: A low-resolution modeling approach. *Episteme* 6: 130–144.
- Hegselmann, R. & Krause, U. (2015). Opinion dynamics under the influence of radical groups, charismatic leaders, and other constant signals: A simple unifying model. *Networks and Heterogeneous Media* 10: 477–509.
- Hempel, C. G. (1965). *Aspects of scientific explanation and other essays in the philosophy of science*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Heris, S. M. K. & Khaloozadeh, H. (2011). Open- and closed-loop multiobjective optimal strategies for HIV therapy using NSGA-II. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 58: 1678–1685.
- Hildebrand, T. & Metcalf, T. (in press). The nomological argument for the existence of God. *Nous*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12364>.
- Hill, A. & Paris, J. B. (2013). The counterpart principle of analogical support by structural similarity. *Erkenntnis* 79: 1–16.
- Hjortland, O. (2019). What counts as evidence for a logical theory? *Australasian Journal of Logic* 16: 250–282.
- Hobbs, J. R. (2004). Abduction in natural language understanding. In L. Horn & G. Ward (eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 724–741). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hofer, C. & Martí, G. (2020). Realism, reference and perspective. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science* 10: 38.
- Hohwy, J. (2013). *The predictive mind*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Holland, J. (1975). *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Horry, R. & Brewer, N. (2016). How target–lure similarity shapes confidence judgments in multiple-alternative decision tasks. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 145: 1615–1634.
- Horsten, L. (2011). *The Tarskian turn*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Horwich, P. (1982). *Probability and evidence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Horwich, P. (1990). *Truth*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Howson, C. (1984). Bayesianism and support by novel facts. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 35: 245–251.
- Howson, C. & Oddie, G. (1979). Miller’s so-called paradox of information. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 30: 253–261.
- Howson, C. & Urbach, P. (1993). *Scientific reasoning* (2nd ed.). La Salle, IL: Open Court.
- Huang, Y. (1994). *The syntax and pragmatics of anaphora*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hume, D. (1748/2006). *An inquiry concerning human understanding*. Fairford, UK: Echo Library.
- Inhelder, B. & Piaget, J. (1958). *The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Jackson, F. (1979). On assertion and indicative conditionals. *Philosophical Review* 88: 565–589.
- Jeffrey, R. C. (1983). *The logic of decision* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jeffrey, R. C. (1992). *Probability and the art of judgment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jern, A., Derrow-Pinion, A., & Piergiovanni, A. J. (2021). A computational framework for understanding the roles of simplicity and rational support in people’s behavior explanations. *Cognition* 210: 104606, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2021.104606>.
- Johnson, S. G. B., Rajeev-Kumar, G., & Keil, F. C. (2016). Sense-making under ignorance. *Cognitive Psychology* 89: 39–70.
- Johnson, S. G. B., Valenti, J. J., & Keil, F. C. (2019). Simplicity and complexity preferences in causal explanation: An opponent heuristic account. *Cognitive Psychology* 113: 101222.
- Johnston, A. M., Johnson, S. G. B., Koven, M. L., & Keil, F. C. (2017). Little Bayesians or little Einsteins? Probability and explanatory virtue in children’s inferences. *Developmental Science* 20: e12483, <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12483>.
- Josephson, J. R. & Josephson, S. G. (1994). *Abductive inference*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Joyce, J. (1998). A nonpragmatic vindication of probabilism. *Philosophy of Science* 65: 575–603.

- Joyce, J. (1999). *The foundations of causal decision theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Joyce, J. (2009). Accuracy and coherence: Prospects for an alethic epistemology of partial belief. In F. Huber & C. Schmidt-Petri (eds.), *Degrees of belief* (pp. 263–297). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Judd, C. M., Westfall, J., & Kenny, D. A. (2012). Treating stimuli as a random factor in social psychology: A new and comprehensive solution to a pervasive but largely ignored problem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 103: 54–69.
- Kagehiro, D. & Stanton, W. (1985). Legal vs. quantified definitions of standards of proof. *Law and Human Behavior* 9: 159–178.
- Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (1982). *Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaplan, M. (1981). A Bayesian theory of rational acceptance. *Journal of Philosophy* 78: 305–330.
- Kasirzadeh, A. (in press). A new role for mathematics in empirical sciences. *Philosophy of Science*.
- Keeney, R. L. & Raiffa, H. (1976). *Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value tradeoffs*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Keil, F. C. (2006). Explanation and understanding. *Annual Review of Psychology* 57: 227–254.
- Kelp, C. (2016). Assertion: A function first account. *Noûs* 50: 411–442.
- Keynes, J. M. (1921) *A treatise on probability*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Khalifa, K., Doble, G., & Millson, J. (2020). Counterfactuals and explanatory pluralism. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 71: 1439–1460.
- Khemlani, S. S., Sussman, A. B., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2011). Harry Potter and the sorcerer’s scope: Latent scope biases in explanatory reasoning. *Memory & Cognition* 39: 527–535.
- Kitcher, P. (1981). Explanatory unification. *Philosophy of Science* 48: 507–531.
- Kitcher, P. (1993). *The advancement of science*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kitcher, P. (2001). Real realism: The Galilean strategy. *Philosophical Review* 110: 151–197.
- Klein, P. (1985). The virtues of inconsistency. *Monist* 68: 105–135.
- Kneer, M. (2018). The norm of assertion: Empirical data. *Cognition* 177: 165–171.

- Kneer, M. (2021). Norms of assertion in the US, Germany, and Japan: A cross-cultural exploration of what we expect of each other in linguistic communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 118: e2105365118, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2105365118>.
- Kochenderfer, M. J. & Wheeler, T. A. (2019). *Algorithms for optimization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koehler, D. J. (1991). Explanation, imagination, and confidence in judgment. *Psychological Bulletin* 110: 499–519.
- Konek, J. (2016). Probabilistic knowledge and cognitive ability. *Philosophical Review* 125: 509–587.
- Korb, K. (1992). The collapse of collective defeat: Lessons from the lottery paradox. *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association I*: 230–236.
- Kornblith, H. (1993). *Inductive inference and its natural ground: An essay in naturalistic epistemology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Koscholke, J. (2016). Evaluating test cases for probabilistic measures of coherence. *Erkenntnis* 81: 155–181.
- Koscholke, J. & Jekel, M. (2017). Probabilistic coherence measures: A psychological study of coherence assessment. *Synthese* 194: 1303–1322.
- Koscholke, J. & Schippers, M. (2019). Coherence and common causes: Against relevance-sensitive measures of coherence. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 70: 771–785.
- Koscholke, J., Schippers, M., & Stegmann, A. (2019). New hope for relative overlap measures of coherence. *Mind* 128: 1261–1284.
- Koza, J. (1992). *Genetic programming: On the programming of computers by means of natural selection*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kreisel, G. (1980). Kurt Gödel. *Biographical Memoirs of the Fellows of the Royal Society* 26: 149–224.
- Kruschke, J. K. (2011). *Doing Bayesian data analysis*. Burlington, MA: Academic Press.
- Kruschke, J. K. (2013a). Bayesian estimation supersedes the *t* test. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 142: 573–603.
- Kruschke, J. K. (2013b). Posterior predictive checks can and should be Bayesian. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 66: 45–56.

- Krzyżanowska, K. H. (2015). *Between “if” and “then.”* Doctoral dissertation. University of Groningen, Netherlands.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (1984). Approaching the truth with the rule of success. *Philosophia Naturalis* 21: 244–253.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (1992). Naive and refined truth approximation. *Synthese* 93: 299–341.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (2000). *From instrumentalism to constructive realism*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (2001). *Structures in science*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (2014). Empirical progress and nomic truth approximation revisited. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 46: 64–72.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (2019). *Nomic truth approximation revisited*. Basel, Switzerland: Springer.
- Kuipers, T. A. F. (2020). Refined nomic truth approximation by revising models and postulates. *Synthese* 197: 1601–1625.
- Kummerfeld, E. & Zollman, K. J. S. (2016). Conservatism and the scientific state of nature. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 82: 956–968.
- Kyburg, H. E. (1961). *Probability and the logic of rational belief*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Kyburg, H. E. (1990). *Science and reason*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lange, M. (2000). Is Jeffrey conditionalization defective by virtue of being non-commutative? Remarks on the sameness of sensory experiences. *Synthese* 123: 393–403.
- Lange, M. (2016). *Because without cause: Non-causal explanation in science and mathematics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lange, M. (2017). The evidential relevance of explanatoriness. *Analysis* 77: 303–312.
- Latus, A. (2000). Our epistemic goal. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 78: 28–39.
- Laudan, L. (1981). A confutation of convergent realism. *Philosophy of Science* 48: 19–49.
- Laudan, L. & Leplin, J. (1991). Empirical equivalence and underdetermination. *Journal of Philosophy* 88: 449–472.

- Lawry, J. & Lee, C. (2020). Probability pooling for dependent agents in collective learning. *Artificial Intelligence* 288: 103371.
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature* 521: 436.
- Lee, C. (2020). *Decision making and consensus in multi-agent systems*. Doctoral dissertation. Bristol Robotics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.
- Leeds, S. (1994). Constructive empiricism. *Synthese* 101: 187–221.
- Legare, C. H. & Lombrozo, T. (2014). Selective effects of explanation on learning during early childhood. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 126: 198–212.
- Lehrer, K. (1974). *Knowledge*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lehrer, K. & Wagner, C. (1981). *Rational consensus in science and society*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Leitgeb, H. (2017). *The stability of belief*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Leitgeb, H. & Pettigrew, R. (2010a). An objective justification of Bayesianism I: Measuring inaccuracy. *Philosophy of Science* 77: 201–235.
- Leitgeb, H. & Pettigrew, R. (2010b). An objective justification of Bayesianism II: The consequences of minimizing inaccuracy. *Philosophy of Science* 77: 236–272.
- Leplin, J. (1997). *A novel defense of scientific realism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Levenson, T. (2015). *The hunt for Vulcan*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Levinstein, B. A. (2012). Leitgeb and Pettigrew on accuracy and updating. *Philosophy of Science* 79: 413–424.
- Levinstein, B. A. (2017). A pragmatist's guide to epistemic utility. *Philosophy of Science* 84: 613–638.
- Lewis, D. K. (1973). *Counterfactuals*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Lewis, D. K. (1980). A subjectivist's guide to objective chance. In R. C. Jeffrey (ed.), *Studies in inductive logic and probability* (vol. 2, pp. 263–293). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lewis, D. K. (1986). *On the plurality of worlds*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Lewis, D. K. (1999). Why conditionalize? In his *Papers in metaphysics and epistemology* (pp. 403–407). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindenbaum-Hosiasson, J. (1941). Induction et analogie: Comparaison de leur fondement. *Mind* 50: 351–365.

- Lindley, D. V. (1972). *Bayesian statistics, a review*. Philadelphia, PA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Lindley, D. V. (1976). Bayesian statistics. In W. Harper & C. Hooker (eds.), *Foundations of probability theory, statistical inference and statistical theories of science* (Vol. 2, pp. 353–362). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Lindskog, M., Winman, A., & Juslin, P. (2013a). Naïve point estimation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 39: 782–800.
- Lindskog, M., Winman, A., & Juslin, P. (2013b). Calculate or wait: Is man an eager or a lazy intuitive statistician? *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 25: 994–1014.
- Lipton, P. (1993). Is the best good enough? *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 93: 89–104.
- Lipton, P. (1998). The epistemology of testimony. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 29: 1–31.
- Lipton, P. (2004). *Inference to the best explanation* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Lombrozo, T. (2007). Simplicity and probability in causal explanation. *Cognitive Psychology* 55: 232–257.
- Lombrozo, T. (2020). “Learning by thinking” in science and in everyday life. In P. Godfrey-Smith & A. Levy (eds.), *The scientific imagination: Philosophical and psychological perspectives* (pp. 230–249). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lombrozo, T. & Gwynne, N. Z. (2014). Explanation and inference: Mechanistic and functional explanations guide property generalization. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 8, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00700>.
- Longino, H. (1995). Gender, politics and theoretical virtues. *Synthese* 104: 383–397.
- Lorenz, J. (2003). *Mehrdimensionale Meinungsdynamik bei wechselndem Vertrauen*. Diploma thesis. University of Bremen, Germany, available at <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:gbv:46-dipl000000564>.
- Lorenz, J. (2008). Fostering consensus in multidimensional continuous opinion dynamics under bounded confidence. In D. Helbing (ed.), *Managing complexity: Insights, concepts, applications* (pp. 321–334). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

- Lorenz, J., Rauhut, H., Schweitzer, F., & Helbing, D. (2011). How social influence can undermine the wisdom of crowd effect. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108: 9020–9025.
- Lovie, P. & Lovie, A. D. (1976). Teaching intuitive statistics I: Estimating means and variances. *International Journal of Mathematical, Educational, and Scientific Technology* 7: 29–39.
- Lycan, W. G. (1988). *Judgement and justification*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lycan, W. G. (2002). Explanation and epistemology. In P. Moser (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of epistemology* (pp. 408–433). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Machery, E., Mallon, R., Nichols, S., & Stich, S. P. (2004). Semantics, cross-cultural style. *Cognition* 92: B1–12.
- Maher, P. (1992). Diachronic rationality. *Philosophy of Science* 59: 120–141.
- Maher, P. (1993). *Betting on theories*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Malmi, R. A. & Samson, D. J. (1983). Intuitive averaging of categorized numerical stimuli. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 22: 547–559.
- Mancosu, P. (2015). Explanation in mathematics. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/mathematics-explanation/>.
- Marks, D. F. & Clarkson, J. K. (1972). An explanation of conservatism in the bookbag-and-pokerchips situation. *Acta Psychologica* 36: 145–160.
- Marsili, N. & Wiegmann, A. (2021). Should I say that? An experimental investigation of the norm of assertion. *Cognition* 212: 104657, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2021.104657>.
- Mason, W. A. & Watts, D. J. (2012). Collaborative learning in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109: 764–769.
- McAuliffe, W. (2015). How did abduction get confused with inference to the best explanation? *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 51: 300–319.
- McCain, K. & Poston, T. (2014). Why explanatoriness is evidentially relevant. *Thought* 3: 145–153.

- McCain, K. & Poston, T. (2019). Dispelling the disjunction objection to explanatory inference. *Philosophers' Imprint* 19: 36, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3521354.0019.036>.
- McCarthy, J. (1956). Measures of the value of information. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 42: 654–655.
- McCutcheon, R. G. (2019). In favor of logarithmic scoring. *Philosophy of Science* 86: 286–303.
- McElreath, R. (2020). *Statistical rethinking*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- McGrew, T. (2003). Confirmation, heuristics, and explanatory reasoning. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 54: 553–567.
- McMullin, E. (1985). Galilean idealization. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 16: 247–273.
- McMullin, E. (1992). *The inference that makes science*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.
- McMullin, E. (1996). Epistemic virtue and theory appraisal. In I. Douven & L. Horsten (eds.), *Realism in the sciences* (pp. 13–34). Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.
- Meheus, J. & Batens, D. (2006). A formal logic for abductive reasoning. *Logic Journal of the IGPL* 14: 221–236.
- Meijs, W. (2005). *Probabilistic measures of coherence*. Doctoral dissertation. Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands.
- Meijs, W. & Douven, I. (2007). On the alleged impossibility of coherence. *Synthese* 157: 347–360.
- Mellers, B., Stone, E., Murray, T., Minster, A., Rohrbaugh, N., Bishop, M., Chen, E., Baker, J., Hou, Y., Horowitz, M., Ungar, L., & Tetlock, P. (2015). Identifying and cultivating superforecasters as a method of improving probabilistic predictions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10: 267–281.
- Merton, R. K. (1973). *The sociology of science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Michelon, C. (2019). The inference to the best legal explanation. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 39: 878–900.
- Miller, D. (1966). A paradox of information. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 17: 59–61.

- Mirabile, P. (2020). *How we reason about explanations: Philosophy and psychology of explanatory reasoning*. Doctoral dissertation. Sorbonne University, Paris.
- Mirabile, P. & Douven, I. (2020). Abductive conditionals as a test case for inferentialism. *Cognition* 200: 104232, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104232>.
- Mirabile, P. & Horne, Z. (2019). Explanatory virtues and belief in conspiracy theories. *Proceedings of the 41st annual meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, <https://cogsci.mindmodeling.org/2019/papers/0410/index.html>.
- Moore, G. E. (1962). Proof of an external world. In his *Philosophical Papers* (pp. 126–149). New York, NY: Collier Books.
- Morgenstern, Y., Murray, R. F., & Harris, L. R. (2011). The human visual system’s assumption that light comes from above is weak. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108: 12551–12553.
- Moser, P. K. (1990). Rationality in action. In P. Moser (ed.), *Rationality in action* (pp. 1–16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Moser, P. K. & Tlumak, J. (1985). Two paradoxes of rational acceptance. *Erkenntnis* 23: 127–141.
- Moss, S. (2011). Scoring rules and epistemic compromise. *Mind* 120: 1053–1069.
- Murphy, A. H. (1969). On the “ranked probability score.” *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 8: 988–989.
- Musgrave, A. (1988). The ultimate argument for scientific realism. In R. Nola (ed.), *Relativism and realism in science* (pp. 229–252). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Nagel, J. (2014). *Knowledge: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nagel, J. (2021). The psychological dimension of the lottery paradox. In I. Douven (ed.), *Lotteries, knowledge, and rational belief: Essays on the lottery paradox* (pp. 48–73). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nazarathy, Y. & Klok, H. (2021). *Statistics with Julia*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

- Nickerson, R. S., Butler, S. F., & Barch, D. H. (in press). Looking behind: Turning cards in the selection task. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/17470218211001293>.
- Niiniluoto, I. (1984). *Is science progressive?* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Niiniluoto, I. (1987). *Truthlikeness*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Niiniluoto, I. (1998). Verisimilitude: The third period. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 49: 1–29.
- Niiniluoto, I. (1999a). Defending abduction. *Philosophy of Science* 66: 436–451.
- Niiniluoto, I. (1999b). *Critical scientific realism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Niiniluoto, I. (2018). *Truth-seeking by abduction*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Niiniluoto, I. (2020). Truthlikeness: Old and new debates. *Synthese* 197: 1581–1599.
- Nowak, L. (1980). *The structure of idealization*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (1994). A rational analysis of the selection task as optimal data selection. *Psychological Review* 101: 608–631.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (1996). Rational explanation of the selection task. *Psychological Review* 103: 381–391.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2001). The probabilistic approach to human reasoning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 5: 349–357.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2003). Conditional probability and the cognitive science of conditional reasoning. *Mind & Language* 18: 359–379.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2007). *Bayesian rationality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2013). Dynamic inference and everyday conditional reasoning in the new paradigm. *Thinking & Reasoning* 19: 346–379.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2014). Probabilistic single function dual process theory and logic programming as approaches to non-monotonicity in human vs. artificial reasoning. *Thinking & Reasoning* 20: 269–295.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2017). Causal models and conditional reasoning. In M. R. Waldmann (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of causal reasoning* (pp. 327–346). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2020a). Integrating causal Bayes nets and inferentialism in conditional inference. In S. Elqayam, I. Douven, J. St. B. T. Evans, & N. Cruz (eds.), *Logic and uncertainty in the human mind* (pp. 116–132). London, UK: Routledge.
- Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2020b). New paradigms in the psychology of reasoning. *Annual Review of Psychology* 71: 1–26.
- Oaksford, M. & Hall, S. (2016). On the source of human irrationality. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 20: 336–344.
- O’Hagan, A., Buck, C. E., Daneshkhah, A., Eiser, J. R., Garthwaite, P. H., Jenkinson, D. J., Oakley, J. E., & Rakow, T. (2006). *Uncertain judgments: Eliciting experts’ probabilities*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Okasha, S. (2000). Van Fraassen’s critique of inference to the best explanation. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 31: 691–710.
- Olin, D. (2003). *Paradox*. Chesham, UK: Acumen.
- Olsson, E. J. (2002). What is the problem of coherence and truth? *Journal of Philosophy* 99: 246–272.
- Olsson, E. J. (2005). *Against coherence: Truth, probability, and justification*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Olsson, E. J. (2008). Knowledge, truth, and bullshit: Reflections on Frankfurt. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 32: 94–110.
- Over, D. E. (2009). New paradigm psychology of reasoning. *Thinking & Reasoning* 15: 431–438.
- Overton, M. L. (2001). *Numerical computing with IEEE floating point arithmetic*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM.
- Page, S. E. (2007). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Papineau, D. (1997). *The philosophy of science*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Paris, J. B. & Vencovská, A. (2017). Combining analogical support in pure inductive logic. *Erkenntnis* 82: 401–419.
- Patel, V. L. & Groen, G. J. (1986). Knowledge-based solution strategies in medical reasoning. *Cognitive Science* 10: 91–116.
- Patel, V. L. & Groen, G. J. (1991). Developmental accounts of the transition from medical student to doctor: Some problems and suggestions. *Medical Education* 25: 527–535.

- Patel, V. L., Groen, G. J., & Arocha, J. F. (1990). Medical expertise as a function of task difficulty. *Memory & Cognition* 18: 394–406.
- Pauker, S. G. & Kassirer, J. P. (1980). The threshold approach to clinical decision making. *New England Journal of Medicine* 302: 1109–1117.
- Pearl, J. (1988). *Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems: Networks of plausible inference*. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Pearl, J. (2000). *Causality: Models, reasoning, and inference*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Peirce, C. S. (1934). *The collected papers of Charles S. Peirce, vol. V: Pragmatism and pragmatism* (edited by C. Hartshorne & P. Weiss). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pennington, N. & Hastie, R. (1988). Explanation-based decision making: The effects of memory structure on judgment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 14: 521–533.
- Pennington, N. & Hastie, R. (1992). Explaining the evidence: Tests of the story-model for juror decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 62: 189–206.
- Pennington, N. & Hastie, R. (1993). Reasoning in explanation-based decision making. *Cognition* 49: 123–163.
- Pettigrew, R. (2016). *Accuracy and the laws of credence*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, L. D. & Edwards, W. (1966). Conservatism in a simple probability inference task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 72: 346–354.
- Pluchino, A., Latora, V., & Rapisarda, A. (2006). Compromise and synchronization in opinion dynamics. *European Physical Journal B* 50: 169–176.
- Pollock, J. (1995). *Cognitive carpentry*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Poore, G. (2015). Python_TE_X: Reproducible documents with L^AT_EX, Python, and more. *Computational Science & Discovery* 8: 014010.
- Popper, K. R. (1959). *The logic of scientific discovery*. London, UK: Hutchinson.
- Popper, K. R. (1963). *Conjectures and refutations*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Poston, T. (2014). *Reason and explanation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasetya, Y. (in press). Which models of scientific explanation are (in)compatible with IBE? *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*.

- Priest, G. (2005). *Doubt truth to be a liar*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pryor, J. (2000). The skeptic and the dogmatist. *Noûs* 34: 517–549.
- Pryor, J. (2004). What's wrong with Moore's argument? *Philosophical Issues* 14: 349–378.
- Psillos, S. (1996). On van Fraassen's critique of abductive reasoning. *Philosophical Quarterly* 46: 31–47.
- Psillos, S. (1999). *Scientific realism: How science tracks truth*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Psillos, S. (2000). Abduction: Between conceptual richness and computational complexity. In A. K. Kakas & P. Flach (eds.), *Abduction and induction: Essays on their relation and integration* (pp. 59–74). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Psillos, S. (2004). Inference to the best explanation and Bayesianism. In F. Stadler (ed.), *Induction and deduction in the sciences* (pp. 83–91). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Psillos, S. (2007). The fine structure of inference to the best explanation. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 74: 441–448.
- Putnam, H. (1981). *Reason, truth and history*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, H. (1994). Sense, nonsense, and the senses: An inquiry into the powers of the human mind. *Journal of Philosophy* 91: 445–517.
- Qian, C., Yang, Y., & Zhou, Z.-H. (2013). An analysis on recombination in multi-objective evolutionary optimization. *Artificial Intelligence* 204: 99–119.
- Quine, W. V. O. (1992). *Pursuit of truth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rakshit, P. & Konar, A. (2015). Differential evolution for noisy multiobjective optimization. *Artificial Intelligence* 227: 165–189.
- Ramsey, F. P. (1926). Truth and probability. In his *The foundations of mathematics* (pp. 156–198). London, UK: Routledge, 1931.
- Ramsey, F. P. (1929). General propositions and causality. In his *The foundations of mathematics* (pp. 237–255). London, UK: Routledge, 1931.
- Rastogi, V., Puri, N., Arora, S., Kaur, G., Yadav, L., & Sharma, R. (2013). Artefacts: A diagnostic dilemma. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* 7: 2408–2413.

- Reichenbach, H. (1938). *Experience and prediction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Rellihaan, M. J. (2009). Fodor's riddle of abduction. *Philosophical Studies* 144: 313–338.
- Reuter, K. & Brössel, P. (2018). No knowledge required. *Episteme* 16: 303–321.
- Reutlinger, A., Colyvan, M., & Krzyzanowska, K. H. (in press). The prospects for a monist theory of non-causal explanation in science and mathematics. *Erkenntnis*.
- Riegler, A. & Douven, I. (2009). Extending the Heggelmann–Krause model III: From single beliefs to complex belief states. *Episteme* 6: 145–163.
- Rinard, S. (2017). No exception for belief. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 94: 121–143.
- Rittle-Johnson, B. & Loehr, A. M. (2017). Eliciting explanations: Constraints on when self-explanation aids learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 24: 1501–1510.
- Robbins Landon, H. C. (1999). *1791: Mozart's last year*. New York, NY: Schirmer Books.
- Roche, W. & Shogenji, T. (2018). Information and inaccuracy. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 69: 577–604.
- Roche, W. & Sober, E. (2013). Explanatoriness is evidentially irrelevant, or inference to the best explanation meets Bayesian confirmation theory. *Analysis* 73: 659–668.
- Rock, I. (1983). *The logic of perception*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rock, I. & Ebenholtz, S. (1962). Stroboscopic movement based on change of phenomenal rather than retinal location. *American Journal of Psychology* 75: 193–207.
- Rock, I. & Gilchrist, A. (1975). The conditions for the perception of the covering and uncovering of a line. *American Journal of Psychology* 88: 571–582.
- Rock, I. & Halper, F. (1969). Form perception without a retinal image. *American Journal of Psychology* 82: 425–440.
- Rock, I. & Smith, D. (1981). Alternative solutions to kinetic stimulus transformations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 7: 19–29.
- Rosenkrantz, R. D. (1981). *Foundations and applications of inductive probability*. Atascadero, CA: Ridgeview.

- Rosenkrantz, R. D. (1992). The justification of induction. *Philosophy of Science* 59: 527–539.
- Rosenstock, S., Bruner, J., & O'Connor, C. (2017). In epistemic networks, is less really more? *Philosophy of Science* 84: 234–252.
- Rostworowski, W., Pietrulewicz, N., & Będkowski, M. (in press). Conditionals and specific links—an experimental study. *Synthese*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-021-03119-2>.
- Ruggeri, A., Xu, F., & Lombrozo, T. (2019). Effects of explanation on children's question asking. *Cognition* 186: 82–94.
- Ruse, M. (1975). Darwin's debt to philosophy: An examination of the influence of the philosophical ideas of John F. W. Herschel and William Whewell on the development of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution. *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 6: 159–181.
- Ruse, M. (1995). *Evolutionary naturalism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Russell, B. (1912). *The problems of philosophy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Russell, G. (2015). The justification of the basic laws of logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 44: 793–803.
- Russell, G. (2019). Deviance and vice: Strength as a theoretical virtue in the epistemology of logic. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 99: 548–563.
- Ryan, S. (1996). The epistemic virtues of consistency. *Synthese* 109: 121–141.
- Saatsi, J. (in press). Non-causal explanations in physics. In E. Knox & A. Wilson (eds.), *The Routledge companion to the philosophy of physics*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Salmon, W. C. (1963). On vindicating induction. *Philosophy of Science* 30: 252–261.
- Salmon, W. C. (1984). *Scientific explanation and the causal structure of the world*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sarkar, D. & Modak, J. M. (2005). Pareto-optimal solutions for multi-objective optimization of fed-batch bioreactors using nondominated sorting genetic algorithm. *Chemical Engineering Science* 60: 481–492.
- Schippers, M. (2014). Probabilistic measures of coherence: From adequacy constraints towards pluralism. *Synthese* 191: 3821–3845.
- Schippers, M. & Schurz, G. (2017). Genuine coherence as mutual confirmation between content elements. *Studia Logica* 105: 299–329.
- Schmitt, F. (1995). *Truth: A primer*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Schum, D. A. & Martin, A. W. (1982). Formal and empirical research on cascaded inference in jurisprudence. *Law and Society Review* 17: 105–151.
- Schupbach, J. N. (2005). Paley’s inductive inference to design. *Philosophia Christi* 7: 491–502.
- Schupbach, J. N. (2011a). Comparing probabilistic measures of explanatory power. *Philosophy of Science* 78: 813–829.
- Schupbach, J. N. (2011b). New hope for Shogenji’s coherence measure. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 62: 125–142.
- Schupbach, J. N. (2014). Is the bad lot objection just misguided? *Erkenntnis* 79: 55–64.
- Schupbach, J. N. (2017). Inference to the best explanation, cleaned up and made respectable. In T. Poston & K. McCain (eds.), *Best explanations: New essays on inference to the best explanation* (pp. 39–61). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schupbach, J. N. & Glass, D. H. (2017). Hypothesis competition beyond mutual exclusivity. *Philosophy of Science* 84: 810–824.
- Schupbach, J. N. & Sprenger, J. (2011). The logic of explanatory power. *Philosophy of Science* 78: 105–127.
- Schurz, G. (1987). A new definition of verisimilitude and its applications. In P. Weingartner & G. Schurz (eds.), *Logic, Philosophy of Science and Epistemology* (pp. 177–184). Vienna, Austria: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Schurz, G. (1991). Relevant deduction. *Erkenntnis* 35: 391–437.
- Schurz, G. (2008a). Patterns of abduction. *Synthese* 164: 201–234.
- Schurz, G. (2008b). The meta-inductivist’s winning strategy in the prediction game: A new approach to Hume’s problem. *Philosophy of Science* 75: 278–305.
- Schurz, G. (2009). Meta-induction and social epistemology. *Episteme* 6: 200–220.
- Schurz, G. (2011). Verisimilitude and belief revision. *Erkenntnis* 75: 203–221.
- Schurz, G. (2012). Meta-induction in epistemic networks and the social spread of knowledge. *Episteme* 9: 151–170.
- Schurz, G. (2014). *Philosophy of science: A unified approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schurz, G. (2017). No free lunch theorem, inductive skepticism, and the optimality of meta-induction. *Philosophy of Science* 84: 825–839.
- Schurz, G. (2019). *Hume’s problem solved: The optimality of meta-induction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Schurz, G. (2021). Abduction as a method of inductive metaphysics. *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 98: 50–74.
- Schurz, G. (in press). Meta-induction over unboundedly many prediction methods: A reply to Arnold and Sterkenburg. *Philosophy of Science*.
- Schurz, G. & Hertwig, R. (2019). Cognitive success: A consequentialist account of rationality and cognition. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 11: 7–36.
- Schurz, G. & Thorn, P. D. (2016). The revenge of ecological rationality: Strategy-selection by meta-induction within changing environments. *Minds and Machines* 26: 31–59.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics* 6: 461–465.
- Schwitzgebel, E. (2008). The unreliability of naive introspection. *Philosophical Review* 117: 245–273.
- Selten, R. (1998). Axiomatic characterization of the quadratic scoring rule. *Experimental Economics* 1: 43–62.
- Semeshenko, V., Gordon, M. B., & Nadal, J.-P. (2008). Collective states in social systems with interacting learning agents. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 387: 4903–4916.
- Shafer, G. (1985). Conditional probability. *International Statistical Review* 85: 261–277.
- Shepard, R. N. (1987). Toward a universal law for psychological science. *Science* 237: 1317–1323.
- Sheredos, B., Burnston, D., Abrahamsen, A., & Bechtel, W. (2013). Why do biologists use so many diagrams? *Philosophy of Science* 80: 931–944.
- Shimojo, A., Miwa, K., & Terai, H. (2020). How does explanatory virtue determine probability estimation?—Empirical discussion on effect of instruction. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.575746>.
- Shogenji, T. (1999). Is coherence truth-conducive? *Analysis* 59: 338–345.
- Shoots-Reinhard, B. L., Rucker, D. D., Petty, R. E., & Shakarchi, R. (2014). Not all contrast effects are created equal: Extent of processing affects contrast strength. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 44: 523–535.
- Sider, T. (2009). Ontological antirealism. In D. Chalmers, D. Manley, & R. Wasserman (eds.), *Metametaphysics: New essays on the foundations of ontology* (pp. 384–421). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Sidney, P. G., Hattikudur, S., & Alibali, M. W. (2015). How do contrasting cases and self-explanation promote learning? Evidence from fraction division. *Learning and Instruction* 40: 29–38.
- Siebel, M. & Wolff, W. (2008). Equivalent testimonies as a touchstone of coherence measures. *Synthese* 161: 167–182.
- Sigman, E. & Rock, I. (1974). Stroboscopic movement based on perceptual intelligence. *Perception* 3: 9–28.
- Simon, H. A. (1982). *Models of bounded rationality* (vol. 1). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Singmann, H. & Kellen, D. (2020). An introduction to mixed models for experimental psychology. In D. Spiler & E. Schumacher (eds.), *New methods in cognitive psychology* (pp. 4–31). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Skyrms, B. (1987). Coherence. In N. Rescher (ed.), *Scientific inquiry in philosophical perspective* (pp. 225–241). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Skyrms, B. (1993a). Analogy by similarity in hyper-carnapian inductive logic. In J. Earman, A. I. Janis, J. Massey, & N. Rescher (eds.), *Philosophical problems of the internal and external worlds* (pp. 273–282). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Skyrms, B. (1993b). A mistake in dynamic coherence arguments? *Philosophy of Science* 60: 320–328.
- Slooman, S. A. (2005). *Causal models: How people think about the world and its alternatives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Sober, E. (2002). Instrumentalism, parsimony, and the Akaike framework. *Philosophy of Science* 69: S112–S123.
- Sosa, E. (1997). Reflective knowledge in the best circles. *Journal of Philosophy* 94: 410–430.
- Spencer, J. (1961). Estimating averages. *Ergonomics* 4: 317–328.
- Spencer, J. (1963). A further study of estimating averages. *Ergonomics* 6: 255–265.
- Sprengrer, J. (2018). Foundations of a probabilistic theory of causal strength. *Philosophical Review* 127: 371–398.
- Sprengrer, J. (2020). Conditional degree of belief and Bayesian inference. *Philosophy of Science* 87: 319–335.
- Sprengrer, J. & Hartmann, S. (2019). *Bayesian philosophy of science*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Stegenga, J. (2018). *Medical nihilism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Steglich-Petersen, A. & Skipper, M. (2019). An instrumentalist account of how to weigh epistemic and practical reasons for belief. *Mind* 129: 1071–1094.
- Sterkenburg, T. F. (2019). The meta-inductive justification of induction: The pool of strategies. *Philosophy of Science* 86: 981–992.
- Sterkenburg, T. F. (2020). The meta-inductive justification of induction. *Episteme* 17: 519–541.
- Stevens, S. S. (1971). Issues in psychophysical measurement. *Psychological Review* 78: 426–450.
- Stewart, A. J., Singmann, H., Haigh, M., Wood, J. S., & Douven, I. (2021). Tracking the eye of the beholder: Is explanation subjective? *Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 33: 199–206.
- Stilgenbauer, J.-L. & Baratgin, J. (2018). Étude des stratégies de raisonnement causal dans l'estimation de la probabilité diagnostique à travers un paradigme expérimental de production de règle. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale* 72: 58–70.
- Stone, M. (1961). The opinion pool. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 32: 1339–1342.
- Strevens, M. (2013). No understanding without explanation. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 44: 510–515.
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Swami, V., Coles, R., Stieger, S., Pietschnig, J., Furnham, A., Rehim, S., & Voracek, M. (2011). Conspiracist ideation in Britain and Austria: Evidence of a monological belief system and associations between individual psychological differences and real-world and fictitious conspiracy theories. *British Journal of Psychology* 102: 443–463.
- Tamargo, L. H., Garcia, A. J., Falappa, M. A., & Simari, G. R. (2014). On the revision of informant credibility orders. *Artificial Intelligence* 212: 36–58.
- Teller, P. (1973). Conditionalization and observation. *Synthese* 26: 218–258.
- Tenenbaum, J. B., Griffiths, T. L., & Kemp, C. (2006). Theory-based Bayesian models of inductive learning and reasoning. *Trends in Cognitive Science* 10: 304–318.
- Tenenbaum, J. B., Kemp, C., Griffiths, T. L., & Goodman, N. D. (2011). How to grow a mind: Statistics, structure, and abstraction. *Science* 331: 1279–1285.

- Tenney, E. R., Cleary, H. M. D., & Spellman, B. A. (2009). Unpacking the doubt in “beyond a reasonable doubt”: Plausible alternative stories increase not guilty verdicts. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 31: 1–8.
- Tentori, K., Crupi, V., Bonini, N., & Osherson, D. (2007). Comparison of confirmation measures. *Cognition* 103: 107–119.
- Tentori, K., Crupi, V., & Russo, S. (2013). On the determinants of the conjunction fallacy: Probability versus inductive confirmation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 142: 235–255.
- Tetlock, P. & Gardner, D. (2015). *Superforecasting: The art and science of prediction*. London, UK: Penguin Random House.
- Thagard, P. R. (1977). Discussion: Darwin and Whewell. *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science* 8: 353–356.
- Thagard, P. R. (1978). The best explanation: Criteria for theory choice. *Journal of Philosophy* 75: 76–92.
- Thagard, P. R. (1989). Explanatory coherence. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 12: 435–502.
- Thagard, P. R. (2000). *Coherence in thought and action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Thompson, V. A., Prowse Turner, J. A., & Pennycook, G. (2011). Intuition, reason, and metacognition. *Cognitive Psychology* 63: 107–140.
- Thomson, J. J. (1897). Cathode rays. *Philosophical Magazine* 44: 303–326.
- ’t Hooft, G. (1994). Questioning the answers or stumbling upon good and bad theories of everything. In J. Hilgevoord (ed.), *Physics and our view of the world* (pp. 16–37). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Thorn, P. & Schurz, G. (2019). Meta-inductive prediction based on attractiveness weighting: Mathematical and empirical performance evaluation. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 89: 13–30.
- Tichý, P. (1974). On Popper’s definition of verisimilitude. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 25: 155–160.
- Todd, P. M. & Brighton, H. (2016). Building the theory of ecological rationality. *Minds and Machines* 26: 9–30.
- Todd, P. M. & Gigerenzer, G. (2012). *Ecological rationality: Intelligence in the world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tregear, M. (2004). Utilising explanatory factors in induction? *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 55: 505–519.

- Trpin, B. & Pellert, M. (2019). Inference to the best explanation in uncertain evidential situations. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 70: 977–1001.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1983). Extensional versus intuitive reasoning: The conjunction fallacy in probability judgment. *Psychological Review* 90: 293–315.
- Uffink, J. B. M. (1995). Can the maximum entropy principle be explained as a consistency requirement? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* 26: 223–261.
- Vahdati, A. R. (2019). Agents.jl: Agent-based modeling framework in Julia. *Journal of Open Source Software* 4: 1611, <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01611>.
- Vahid, H. (2004). Varieties of epistemic conservatism. *Synthese* 141: 97–122.
- Vallinder, A. & Olsson, E. J. (2013). Do computer simulations support the argument from disagreement? *Synthese* 190: 1437–1454.
- van Elswyk, P. (2019). Propositional anaphors. *Philosophical Studies* 176: 1055–1075.
- van Fraassen, B. C. (1977). The only necessity is verbal necessity. *Journal of Philosophy* 74: 71–85.
- van Fraassen, B. C. (1980). *The scientific image*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- van Fraassen, B. C. (1983). Theory comparison and relevant evidence. In J. Earman (ed.), *Testing scientific theories* (pp. 27–42). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- van Fraassen, B. C. (1985). Empiricism in the philosophy of science. In P. Churchland & C. Hooker (eds.), *Images of science* (pp. 245–308). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- van Fraassen, B. C. (1989). *Laws and symmetry*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Vasilyeva, N. & Lombrozo, T. (2020). Structural thinking about social categories: Evidence from formal explanations, generics, and generalization. *Cognition* 204: 104383.
- Vassend, O. B. (2019). New semantics for Bayesian inference: The interpretive problem and its solutions. *Philosophy of Science* 86: 696–718.
- Vassend, O. B. (in press). Justifying the norms of inductive inference. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*.

- Vehtari, A., Gelman, A., & Gabry, J. (2017). Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing* 27: 1413–1432
- Vineberg, S. (2016). Dutch book arguments. In E. N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/dutch-book/>.
- Vogel, J. (1990). Cartesian skepticism and inference to the best explanation. *Journal of Philosophy* 87: 658–666.
- Vogel, J. (2005). The refutation of skepticism. In M. Steup & E. Sosa (eds.), *Contemporary debates in epistemology* (pp. 72–84). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Vogel, J. (2008). Epistemic bootstrapping. *Journal of Philosophy* 105: 518–539.
- von Helmholtz, H. (1867). *Handbuch der physiologischen Optik*. Leipzig, Germany: Leopold Voss.
- Walker, C. M. & Lombrozo, T. (2017). Explaining the moral of the story. *Cognition* 167: 266–281.
- Walker, C. M., Lombrozo, T., Williams, J. J., Rafferty, A., & Gopnik, A. (2017). Explaining constrains causal learning in childhood. *Child Development* 88: 229–246.
- Walton, D. N. (2005). *Abductive reasoning*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Wang, H. (1996). *A logical journey: From Gödel to philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wason, P. C. (1968). Reasoning about a rule. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 20: 273–281.
- Weatherson, B. (2003). From classical to intuitionistic probability. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 44: 111–123.
- Weinberg, J. M., Gonnerman, C., Buckner, C., & Alexander, J. (2010). Are philosophers expert intuiters? *Philosophical Psychology* 23: 331–355.
- Weinstein, J. (2008). A postgenomic visual icon. *Science* 319: 1772–1773.
- Weintraub, R. (2013). Induction and inference to the best explanation. *Philosophical Studies* 166: 203–216.
- Weintraub, R. (2017). Scepticism about inference to the best explanation. In K. McCain & T. Poston (eds.), *Best explanations: New essays on inference to the best explanation* (pp. 188–202). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Weisberg, J. (2009). Locating IBE in the Bayesian framework. *Synthese* 167: 125–143.
- Weisberg, J. (2011). Varieties of Bayesianism. In D. M. Gabbay, S. Hartmann, & J. Woods (eds.), *Handbook of the history of logic, vol. 10: Inductive logic* (pp. 477–551). Amsterdam, Netherlands: North-Holland.
- Weisberg, J. (2020). Belief in psyontology. *Philosophers' Imprint* 20: 1–27.
- Weisbuch, G., Deffuant, G., Amblard, F., & Nadal, J.-P. (2002). Meet, discuss and segregate! *Complexity* 7: 55–63.
- Wenmackers, S. (2013). Ultralarge lotteries: Analyzing the lottery paradox using non-standard analysis. *Journal of Applied Logic* 11: 452–467.
- Wenmackers, S., Vanpoucke, D., & Douven, I. (2012). Probability of inconsistencies in theory revision: A multi-agent model for updating logically interconnected beliefs under bounded confidence. *European Physical Journal B* 85, <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2011-20617-8>.
- Wenmackers, S., Vanpoucke, D., & Douven, I. (2014). Rationality: A social-epistemology perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology* 5: 581, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00581>.
- Westfall, R. S. (1980). *Never at rest*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Whewell, W. (1847). *The philosophy of the inductive sciences, founded upon their history* (2 vols., 2nd ed.). London, UK: John W. Parker.
- Wilenski, U. & Rand, W. (2015). *An introduction to agent-based modeling: Modeling natural, social, and engineered complex systems with NetLogo*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Williams, J. J. & Lombrozo, T. (2010). The role of explanation in discovery and generalization: Evidence from category learning. *Cognitive Science* 34: 776–806.
- Williams, J. J. & Lombrozo, T. (2013). Explanation and prior knowledge interact to guide learning. *Cognitive Psychology* 66: 55–84.
- Williams, J. R. G. (2012). Generalized probabilism: Dutch books and accuracy domination. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 41, 811–840.
- Williamson, T. (1998). Conditionalizing on knowledge. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 49: 89–121.
- Williamson, T. (2000). *Knowledge and its limits*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, T. (2007). *The philosophy of philosophy*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Williamson, T. (2016). Modal science. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 46: 453–492.
- Williamson, T. (2017). Semantic paradoxes and abductive methodology. In B. Armour-Garb (ed.), *Reflections on the liar* (pp. 325–346). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Williamson, T. (2018). *Doing philosophy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, E. O. (2009). Foreword. In M. Ruse & R. J. Richards (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to the “Origin of Species”* (pp. xv–xvi). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, N. L. (1959). Substances without substrata. *Review of Metaphysics* 12: 521–539.
- Winkler, R. L. (1969). Scoring rules and the evaluation of probability assessors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 64: 1073–1078.
- Winkler, R. L. (1996). Scoring rules and the evaluation of probabilities. *Test* 5: 1–60.
- Winkler, R. L. & Murphy, A. H. (1968). “Good” probability assessors. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 7: 751–758.
- Woody, A. I. (2004). More telltale signs: What attention to representation reveals about scientific explanation. *Philosophy of Science* 71: 780–793.
- Woody, A. I. (2015). Re-orienting discussions of scientific explanation: A functional perspective. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 52: 79–87.
- Wouters, A. (1995). Viability explanation. *Biology & Philosophy* 10: 435–457.
- Wouters, A. (2007). Design explanation: Determining the constraints on what can be alive. *Erkenntnis* 67: 65–80.
- Wright, C. (1985). Facts and certainty. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71: 429–472.
- Wright, C. (1991). Scepticism and dreaming: Imploding the demon. *Mind* 100: 87–116.
- Yu, S. & Zenker, F. (2018). Peirce knew why abduction isn’t IBE—A scheme and critical questions for abductive argument. *Argumentation* 32: 569–587.
- Yu, Y., Yao, X., & Zhou, Z.-H. (2012). On the approximation ability of evolutionary optimization with application to minimum set cover. *Artificial Intelligence* 180–181: 20–33.

- Zahar, E. (1973). Why did Einstein's programme supersede Lorentz's? (II). *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 24: 223–262.
- Zegers, R. H. C., Weigl, A., & Steptoe, A. (2009). The death of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart: An epidemiological perspective. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 151: 274–278.
- Zhao, J., Shah, A., & Osherson, D. (2009). On the provenance of judgments of conditional probability. *Cognition* 113: 26–36.
- Zollman, K. J. S. (2007). The communication structure of epistemic communities. *Philosophy of Science* 74: 574–587.
- Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N. J., Saveliev, A. A., & Smith, G. M. (2009). *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Zwart, S. D. (2001). *Refined verisimilitude*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/14179.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14179.001.0001)

The Art of Abduction

By: Igor Douven

Citation:

The Art of Abduction

By: Igor Douven


DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/14179.001.0001

ISBN (electronic): 9780262369923

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2022

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from MIT Press Direct to Open



The MIT Press

© 2022 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND license. Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in EB Garamond by the author in Lua^AT_EX.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Douven, Igor, author.

Title: The art of abduction / Igor Douven.

Description: [Cambridge, Massachusetts] : Massachusetts Institute of Technology, [2022] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2021031324 | ISBN 9780262046701 (paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Abduction (Logic) | Reasoning. | Practical reason. | Bayesian statistical decision theory.

Classification: LCC BC199.A26 D68 2022 | DDC 160—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021031324>