

## 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.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 $\TeX$ : Reproducible documents with  $\LaTeX$ , 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.