1. Start to lay out the assumptions of taking a high dimensional data to going to a simple distribution
2. TH – thinks that one of the big review flaws will be, “what is the purpose of us making inference from deterministic systems?”
3. The point of the paper is we have all this great data in high dimensions
4. There is a series of steps of ad-hoc dimension reduction
5. There might be an issue is that the assumtions that we lay out when you have to **assume a determinisitic system** (not just the problems in the calculation or concept of Fisher Information)

Notes

1. Have a second paper that does lay out all of the
2. Wickle, Chris University of Missouri (spatial stats) – the stats
3. Sugihara’s work:
   1. The problem is that they assume a deterministic system.
   2. So that there is no noise in the system
4. Trevor gave the example of Legendre people are mainstream, but still made up ecology
5. CCM is data hungry:
6. They gave the telemetry problem – you have a lat long
7. ? Is everyone consistently using phase space ?
   1. A table of definitions of the concepts
8. And what are the assumptions for the phase space
9. There are three papers in stats on how to calculate
10. *The equilibrium disappears at the critical bifurcation*
11. Broad scale approach of how does the FI relate to state space modeling and also utilization distributions
12. Even if we do this, and fit 100 coefficients to the system, how do we interpret this?

In STaTS:

1. “Common task framework”

Idea:

* Do not include the real data to bait them in

Take the approach of the idea that the Fisher is first (1) describing the phase space and then (2) if there is a regime shift, it will identify the regime shift.

CCM== analog forecasting.

* EEven if something is model free – the problem runs into the fact that

For the introduction//

* Using robust and model-free analysis is the goal of ecology