The Entropic–Resonance Ontology of Knowledge: From Chaos to Cognition

Aslan Alwi, Munirah

Independent Researcher at Almudaya Research Institute

Lecturer at Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo, Indonesia

Abstract

This paper proposes an ontological framework in which *entropy*—understood as the informational substrate of cosmic indeterminacy—constitutes the most fundamental reality of knowledge. Rather than treating deduction and induction as the primary mechanisms of cognition, this theory advances the view that knowledge arises through *resonant interactions* between neural structures and the probabilistic field of entropy that permeates the universe. Within this framework, cognitive processes are not generators of information but selective resonators that extract and stabilize specific configurations from an omnipresent entropic continuum. Consequently, logical operations such as deduction and induction are reinterpreted as secondary, formal artifacts that emerge once informational resonances become locally coherent within the neural substrate. Drawing on interdisciplinary sources from information theory, neuroscience, and philosophy of mind, this study aims to establish an **entropic–resonance ontology of knowledge** that situates cognition within the broader thermodynamic and informational structure of the cosmos.

1 Introduction

The classical epistemological tradition has long been dominated by two methodological pillars: *deduction* and *induction*. From Aristotle's syllogistic logic to the empiricism of Francis Bacon and the analytic rigor of modern science, these modes of inference have been regarded as the fundamental pathways by which human beings access truth. Yet, beneath their apparent rigor lies a conceptual limitation: both deduction and induction presuppose an already structured cognitive field. They operate only after information has acquired a recognizable form. The question thus arises: **What precedes such form?** What is the ontological condition that allows knowledge to appear at all?

This paper addresses that question by moving below the epistemic surface—toward the *ontological foundation of knowing itself.* It proposes that what is most real for knowledge is not order, but **cosmic chaos**—understood not as randomness devoid of meaning, but as *entropy*, the measure of informational potential. Entropy, as defined by Shannon (1948), quantifies the uncertainty inherent in a system. When interpreted ontologically, entropy becomes the **reservoir of all possible knowledge**, a universal field of informational indeterminacy from which cognition draws its content. In this sense, chaos is not the opposite of knowledge but its raw, unformed matter.

Building upon recent interdisciplinary insights—such as the informational ontology proposed by Floridi (2010), the resonance theory of consciousness (Hunt, 2019), and neuro–informational models of cognition (Timme et al., 2018)—the present work formulates an **entropic–resonance model of epistemogenesis**. In this model, the human brain is conceptualized not as a passive observer nor as a logical engine, but as a *resonant system* that aligns with certain probabilistic patterns within the cosmic entropic field. Through this alignment, latent informational structures become actualized as cognitive forms.

The implications are twofold. First, knowledge is no longer conceived as a mere representational correspondence between mind and world; it is a *resonant stabilization* of entropy into structure. Second, the traditional logical frameworks—deduction and induction—are recognized as **secondary formalizations** that arise once such stabilization has occurred. They reflect the syntax of thought rather than its ontological genesis.

In the following sections, the paper develops this argument systematically: Section 2 elaborates the ontological claim that entropy constitutes the substrate of all knowledge; Section 3 explains the mechanism of neuronal resonance as the epistemic process by which entropy is mined and stabilized; Section 4 reinterprets deduction and induction as formal illusions emerging from this process; and Section 5 discusses the broader philosophical and scientific implications.

2 Ontology: Entropy as the Substrate of Knowledge

Traditional epistemology treats information as something *generated* by the cognitive subject through observation, categorization, and reasoning. In contrast, the entropic–resonance ontology proposed here reverses that relation. Information is not created by cognition; it *precedes* cognition as the fundamental structure of reality itself. From a physical standpoint, every system in the universe is characterized by a finite but nonzero degree of entropy—a quantitative measure of informational uncertainty as first formalized by Shannon (1948). Ontologically interpreted, this means that indeterminacy is not a lack of information but rather the **primordial condition of informational possibility**.

Entropy thus constitutes the *substrate* of all knowledge: a continuous field of potential information that fills the entire expanse of space–time. The epistemic act does not impose form upon a void but selects and stabilizes patterns within an already–informational cosmos. Such a view aligns with recent developments in informational metaphysics, where reality is conceived as fundamentally informational rather than material (Floridi, 2010). It also resonates with Wheeler's dictum *"it from bit"*, which proposes that physical existence itself emerges from acts of informational distinction. In this sense, entropy is the oceanic medium from which both matter and meaning arise.

2.1 Entropy as Informational Potential

Within thermodynamics, entropy measures the number of microstates compatible with a given macrostate. Within information theory, it quantifies the uncertainty of a message source. When elevated to the ontological level, these definitions converge: entropy describes the **range of possible informational configurations** that a system may actualize. The total entropy of the universe therefore represents not disorder in the vulgar sense, but the *superposition of all con-*

ceivable informational orders. It is the ground of all cognitive possibility, analogous to what metaphysicians once called *prima materia*, but reinterpreted in informational terms.

The philosophical consequence is profound. If entropy constitutes the totality of potential information, then knowledge must be understood as a process of **local entropy reduction**—the extraction of order from an underlying informational plenitude. Each act of knowing is thus a thermodynamic event: a conversion of uncertainty into structured representation. This echoes the physical equivalence between information and energy established in modern statistical mechanics, where the reduction of entropy requires the expenditure of energetic work. Knowledge, therefore, is not merely conceptual but also entropic–energetic in nature.

2.2 Chaos as the Real of Knowledge

Contrary to common intuition, order is not the most fundamental aspect of being; it is the by–product of chaotic richness. The so–called "chaos" that fills the universe is in fact a dense manifold of informational possibilities—an infinite set of microstates that contain, in potential, every conceivable form of knowledge. What human cognition experiences as disorder is therefore a *veil of informational saturation*. In this view, chaos is not opposed to reason but is its ontological prerequisite. Reason can arise only within a universe already saturated with informational potential waiting to be organized.

This redefinition of chaos transforms the epistemological landscape. Instead of conceiving knowledge as an ascent from ignorance to certainty, it becomes the **differentiation of structure within an informational continuum**. Ignorance, accordingly, is not absence of information but the inability of a local system to resonate with the appropriate segment of the entropic field. What we call "learning" or "discovery" is a reconfiguration of this resonance, a shift that enables new alignments with latent informational structures.

2.3 Ontological Implications

Such an ontology dissolves the classical dualism between mind and world. Both belong to the same entropic continuum: mind as a locally coherent resonance pattern within the larger field of cosmic information. The epistemic subject does not stand apart from the universe but participates in its informational self–organization. Knowledge, then, is not a bridge between two separate domains but an *immanent modulation* of one and the same field.

This also entails that the boundaries of cognition are open rather than closed. Because the entropic substrate pervades all reality, any cognitive system—biological or artificial—is potentially coupled to the same informational ocean. Differences among minds correspond to differences in resonant structure, not in access to an external world. Consequently, the universality of knowledge derives not from shared logical rules but from shared immersion in the same entropic substrate.

In summary, entropy provides the most fundamental ontological ground of knowledge. It is the pre–epistemic reality from which cognition draws, the undifferentiated informational potential that, once locally stabilized through resonance, gives rise to the phenomena we call *understanding*. The next section will elaborate how the neuronal architecture of the brain functions as the mechanism by which this entropic field is mined and organized into coherent cognitive forms.

3 Mechanism: Neuronal Resonance and the Extraction of Information

If entropy constitutes the ontological substrate of knowledge, then the problem of epistemogenesis becomes a question of *mechanism*: how does cognition emerge from interaction with this entropic continuum? The proposed answer is that the human brain—and by extension, any cognitive architecture—functions as a **resonant system** that selectively couples to particular informational frequencies within the entropic field. Knowledge arises when this resonance attains local coherence, stabilizing patterns of potential information into structured cognition.

3.1 From Computation to Resonance

Classical cognitive science describes the brain as a computational device that manipulates symbolic representations. While this paradigm has produced powerful explanatory models, it presupposes that information already exists in discrete, ordered form prior to cognition. The entropic–resonance framework challenges this assumption by positing that information itself is initially distributed probabilistically throughout the entropic field. In this context, cognition is not symbolic manipulation but **pattern resonance**.

Neuroscientific evidence supports the view that cognition involves large–scale synchronization of neural oscillations across spatially distant regions of the brain. Studies on gamma and theta band coherence have shown that cognitive integration depends on the temporal alignment of oscillatory activity (Buzsaki, 2006; Fries, 2015). These oscillations can be interpreted as the physical correlates of informational resonance: when neuronal ensembles oscillate at commensurate frequencies, they form transient but stable resonant structures capable of encoding complex patterns. Such resonance is not purely local but extends across hierarchical scales of neural organization, from microcolumns to global cortical networks.

3.2 Resonance as Information Mining

Within this model, the brain does not *generate* information ex nihilo; it *extracts* informational order from the surrounding entropic field. Each neural resonance acts as a selective filter that amplifies certain statistical regularities while suppressing others. This process is analogous to how a physical resonator amplifies specific frequencies of vibration. The informational analog can be formalized using mutual information metrics (Timme et al., 2018): neuronal assemblies that maximize mutual information with environmental input are effectively "tuned" to the underlying statistical structure of reality.

Consequently, the act of perception can be reinterpreted as the establishment of a resonance channel between the neural substrate and the probabilistic patterns of the world. The brain's internal dynamics synchronize with external informational flux, converting distributed entropy into localized patterns of low entropy—that is, into knowledge. The stability of such patterns corresponds to the persistence of thought, memory, and conceptual structure.

3.3 Quantum and Probabilistic Dimensions

The notion of resonance also accommodates quantum and probabilistic aspects of cognition. Empirical work on quantum models of decision making and perception suggests that cognitive states may exhibit superpositional properties before "collapsing" into determinate outcomes (Pothos and Busemeyer, 2013; Busemeyer and Bruza, 2012). In the entropic–resonance ontology, such indeterminacy is not anomalous but expected: it mirrors the probabilistic texture of the entropic substrate itself. The brain's resonant dynamics, therefore, may involve both classical oscillatory coherence and quantum–like probabilistic coupling.

This dual structure allows cognition to operate flexibly between determinacy and potentiality. When resonance is diffuse, cognition explores multiple informational possibilities; when resonance stabilizes, a single coherent pattern emerges as conscious understanding. In thermodynamic terms, this transition represents a local reduction of entropy achieved through resonance–driven coherence.

3.4 Neuronal Architecture as Entropic Interface

Anatomically, the brain's complex connectivity supports this resonant mechanism. The hierarchical organization of cortical and subcortical networks forms a dynamic interface between internal generative models and external stimuli. Functional connectivity studies reveal that cognitive states correspond to specific topological configurations within this network (Deco et al., 2015). These configurations can be seen as *resonant geometries*—spatiotemporal alignments that enable the efficient exchange of information with the entropic field.

From an ontological standpoint, the neuronal network is therefore not a closed computational machine but an **open thermodynamic system**. It continually exchanges entropy and information with its environment, maintaining low internal entropy through dynamic resonance. Knowledge is the emergent trace of this ongoing exchange: a transient crystallization of order within the flux of informational energy.

3.5 Summary

The entropic–resonance mechanism reframes cognition as a process of informational alignment rather than symbolic computation. The brain acts as a resonant filter that draws patterns from the universal field of entropy, transforming potential information into structured knowledge. This transformation is probabilistic, dynamic, and thermodynamically grounded. Having established the mechanism by which knowledge emerges from resonance, the next section will examine how classical logical forms—deduction and induction—arise as secondary formalizations of this deeper process.

4 Epistemogenesis and Formal Illusions (Deduction–Induction)

Having established entropy as the ontological substrate of knowledge and neuronal resonance as its epistemic mechanism, we can now reconsider the classical logical frameworks that have long defined human understanding. Deduction and induction, while historically regarded as the twin pillars of rational inquiry, appear in this framework as **secondary formations**—formal residues of a deeper informational process. They represent the syntax of cognition, not its generative grammar.

4.1 The Emergence of Formal Cognition

In the entropic–resonance model, cognition begins as a continuous process of resonance and stabilization within the entropic field. Once a resonant pattern becomes sufficiently stable, it can be encoded, symbolized, and reflected upon by the cognitive system itself. It is at this meta–cognitive stage that formal reasoning—including deduction and induction—arises. These forms do not generate new informational content; rather, they operate upon the crystallized products of previous resonances.

Deductive reasoning, moving from the universal to the particular, formalizes coherence within already stabilized informational structures. Inductive reasoning, moving from the particular to the general, reconstructs possible resonances from observed data. Both processes depend upon the existence of coherent informational forms—which, according to the present ontology, originate not in logic but in the brain's entropic resonance with the informational field.

Thus, logical inference can be seen as the *reflexive layer* of cognition: the level at which the mind organizes and validates the results of its prior resonant alignments. This interpretation aligns with the phenomenological distinction between the *noetic act* (the act of knowing) and the *noematic object* (the known content). Deduction and induction operate within the noematic domain, ordering and relating the outcomes of more primordial cognitive acts.

4.2 Deduction as Stabilized Resonance

From the entropic perspective, deduction corresponds to the internal propagation of stability within a cognitive structure. Once a resonant pattern achieves coherence, its internal relations can be explored through logical implication. Deduction, therefore, is the systematic traversal of a stabilized informational topology. It guarantees internal consistency but cannot expand the informational domain beyond what is already resonantly stabilized.

This explains why deductive systems, such as formal logic or mathematics, yield absolute certainty only within the boundaries of their axiomatic foundations. They operate on the basis of pre–selected resonant forms—axioms—that were themselves established through prior cognitive resonance with the entropic substrate. In this sense, deduction is a *closed reflection* of an open process: a mirror of coherence projected backward into syntax.

4.3 Induction as the Search for Resonance

Induction, conversely, represents the inverse motion: a search for new resonances based on local regularities. By abstracting from repeated experiential configurations, the mind attempts to reconstruct the hidden informational field that gives rise to them. This process is probabilistic because it involves projecting from a finite set of local patterns into the vast continuum of the entropic substrate.

In empirical science, induction manifests as the construction of models that approximate underlying laws of nature. These models are validated not by logical necessity but by their degree of resonance with observed data—that is, by how effectively they reduce informational uncertainty. The Bayesian formulation of induction provides a mathematical expression of this resonance principle, where prior distributions represent pre–established informational alignments and posterior probabilities quantify updated coherence after new data are incorporated.

Hence, induction is not merely a logical extrapolation; it is a dynamic re–tuning of the cognitive system's resonant parameters. The "truth" of an inductive inference is thus measured by the stability and persistence of the resonance it achieves within the informational continuum.

4.4 Formal Logic as Cognitive Afterimage

From this vantage point, logic in general appears as a cognitive *afterimage*—a formal shadow cast by the deeper entropic and resonant processes that precede it. Just as light creates an afterimage on the retina, resonance leaves a trace in the symbolic structures of thought. Deductive and inductive forms codify the rhythms of cognition after they have occurred, transforming dynamic resonance into static syntax.

This does not render logic illusory in the sense of being false, but in the sense of being **derivative**: it is an illusion of primacy. Logical systems remain indispensable for intersubjective verification and for maintaining coherence within stabilized knowledge domains. However, their authority is epistemically posterior to the ontological reality of informational resonance. Logic governs the refinement of knowledge, not its origination.

4.5 Consequences for Epistemology

Recognizing deduction and induction as formal illusions redefines the project of epistemology itself. The pursuit of certain knowledge cannot rely solely on formal consistency or empirical generalization; it must also account for the pre–formal processes by which information becomes structured. Epistemology must therefore integrate thermodynamic, informational, and resonant dimensions into its account of cognition.

In this expanded framework, truth is not static correspondence but *resonant coherence*. A proposition is “true” insofar as it maintains stability within the informational field across varying scales of resonance—from neuronal to linguistic to collective. Deductive and inductive reasoning provide secondary validation of this stability, but they are neither the source nor the guarantee of it.

4.6 Summary

Deduction and induction emerge only after cognition has already organized raw entropy into structured form. They represent the formalized echoes of the entropic–resonant process that precedes them. Deduction stabilizes existing resonances; induction explores new ones. Both are necessary for the refinement and communication of knowledge, yet neither captures its primordial genesis. In the next section, the broader implications of this ontology will be discussed, particularly its relevance to contemporary epistemology, artificial intelligence, and theories of consciousness.

5 Discussion and Implications

The entropic–resonance ontology of knowledge redefines the relationship between cognition, information, and reality. By grounding epistemology in thermodynamics and resonance rather than formal logic, it provides a unified framework that bridges the natural sciences, cognitive neuroscience, and philosophy of mind. This section outlines several key implications of this framework for contemporary epistemology, artificial intelligence, and consciousness studies.

5.1 Epistemological Implications

The first implication concerns the nature of epistemic justification. Classical theories of knowledge—from correspondence and coherence to pragmatic accounts—presuppose a separation between the knower and the known. The entropic–resonance model dissolves this dualism: both subject and object are manifestations of the same informational field. Knowledge, therefore, is neither a passive reflection nor an active construction; it is a *resonant event* that occurs within the field itself. Truth becomes a measure of **resonant coherence** rather than logical consistency or empirical adequacy.

This shift invites a reconfiguration of epistemology from a theory of representation to a theory of participation. Knowing is an ontological participation in the dynamics of informational self–organization. Such an approach aligns with the process–philosophical tradition of Whitehead and the enactivist paradigm in cognitive science (Varela et al., 1991), where cognition is understood as the enactment of a world through structural coupling between organism and environment. However, the present framework extends these ideas by situating them within a universal entropic substrate, thus granting epistemology a cosmological foundation.

5.2 Implications for Artificial Intelligence

The entropic–resonance ontology also has significant consequences for artificial intelligence (AI). Current AI systems operate primarily on symbolic or statistical computation, approximating human reasoning through algorithmic inference. Within the entropic framework, such systems correspond only to the *formal layer* of cognition—the level of deduction and induction—and therefore lack access to the underlying entropic resonance from which genuine understanding arises.

To approach a more authentic form of intelligence, AI must evolve beyond static computation toward **resonant architectures**. This would involve systems capable of dynamic coupling with informational environments, maintaining coherent oscillatory states that adaptively synchronize with data flows. Such architectures might integrate thermodynamic and neural principles, allowing machines to engage in entropy–reducing processes similar to biological cognition. In this sense, the future of AI may depend not on greater computational power but on deeper resonance with the informational structure of reality.

5.3 Consciousness and the Resonant Field

Perhaps the most profound implication concerns the nature of consciousness itself. If cognition is a resonance within the entropic field, consciousness may represent the reflexive awareness of that resonance—the moment when informational coherence becomes self–referential. In this view, consciousness is not an emergent property of complex computation but an intrinsic mode of the universe's informational dynamics.

This interpretation converges with the *Resonance Theory of Consciousness* (Hunt, 2019) and the Integrated Information Theory (IIT) proposed by Tononi (Tononi, 2015), both of which link conscious experience to the degree of informational integration. However, the entropic–resonance ontology adds an ontological layer: integration is not merely neural but cosmic.

Conscious systems are local configurations through which the universe experiences its own informational structure. Knowledge, then, is the articulation of this self–resonance in conceptual form.

5.4 Thermodynamic and Informational Unity

From a physical standpoint, the entropic–resonance framework supports the growing recognition of thermodynamic and informational unity in nature. Recent work in theoretical physics has demonstrated formal correspondences between thermodynamic and Shannon entropies (Weilenmann et al., 2015). This suggests that the laws governing energy transformation and information processing are fundamentally equivalent. If so, epistemic processes—which reduce uncertainty and generate structure—must obey the same universal constraints as physical systems.

Accordingly, cognition can be viewed as a local thermodynamic system that exports entropy to maintain informational order. The resonant coupling between mind and world is therefore both energetic and informational, embedding knowledge within the fabric of physical law. This convergence of thermodynamics and epistemology offers a path toward a fully naturalized theory of mind.

5.5 Philosophical Integration

Philosophically, the entropic–resonance ontology harmonizes several previously disparate traditions. It resonates with phenomenology's emphasis on intentionality (the directedness of consciousness), but interprets intentionality as resonance rather than representation. It aligns with cybernetic and enactivist theories that treat cognition as self–organizing adaptation, yet grounds them in a universal informational substrate. It even echoes certain mystical and metaphysical traditions that view reality as a vibrating field of potentiality—offering a scientifically informed reformulation of those intuitions.

This integrative potential suggests that epistemology may be approaching a new synthesis: one that unites physics, biology, and philosophy under a single informational paradigm. Such a synthesis does not abolish logical reasoning but situates it within a deeper ontological process—a process by which entropy resonates into meaning.

5.6 Summary

The entropic–resonance ontology of knowledge reframes epistemology as a thermodynamic and resonant phenomenon. It dissolves the dualism between mind and world, redefines truth as coherence within the informational field, and opens new pathways for the development of resonant AI and a cosmologically grounded theory of consciousness. Having explored these implications, the final section will synthesize the preceding arguments and present the concluding reflections.

6 Conclusion

The entropic–resonance ontology of knowledge presented in this paper reinterprets cognition as a thermodynamic and informational phenomenon grounded in the structure of reality itself. By identifying entropy as the most fundamental substrate of knowledge and neuronal resonance as the mechanism through which informational potential is localized and stabilized, this framework transcends the limitations of classical epistemology. Deduction and induction, long regarded as the pillars of rational thought, are revealed to be formal aftereffects—syntactic crystallizations of a deeper, pre–formal process of informational resonance.

This view unifies the physical, cognitive, and philosophical dimensions of knowledge. Ontologically, it situates the mind within the same entropic continuum that constitutes the cosmos, dissolving the dualism between subject and object. Epistemically, it reframes truth as a condition of **resonant coherence**: stability across scales of informational interaction rather than static correspondence between mental and external states. Axiologically, it offers a foundation for understanding meaning and value as emergent from the dynamic organization of information.

The implications of this framework are broad. For epistemology, it suggests a shift from representational to participatory models of knowing—from static logic to dynamic resonance.

For cognitive science, it calls for the integration of thermodynamic principles into theories of perception, memory, and consciousness. For artificial intelligence, it points toward architectures that couple energetically and informationally with their environments, achieving intelligence through resonance rather than algorithmic calculation.

Philosophically, this ontology revives an ancient intuition: that knowledge and reality are two aspects of the same process of self–organization. In modern scientific language, that process can now be described in terms of entropy and information. The universe, understood as a field of informational potential, is perpetually resonating into structure, form, and awareness. Human cognition is one local instance of this universal resonance—a transient configuration through which the cosmos comes to know itself.

In conclusion, the entropic–resonance ontology offers a coherent and integrative model of knowledge that bridges physics, neuroscience, and philosophy. It invites a re–envisioning of epistemology not as the study of how humans know an external world, but as the study of how the universe, through the dynamics of resonance and entropy, manifests knowledge within itself.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks to OpenAI for GPT5 for the interdisciplinary dialogues that inspired the synthesis of thermodynamic, informational, and philosophical insights in the development of this framework.

References

Busemeyer, J. R., & Bruza, P. D. (2012). *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge University Press.

Buzsaki, G. (2006). *Rhythms of the Brain*. Oxford University Press.

Deco, G., Tononi, G., Boly, M., & Kringelbach, M. L. (2015). Rethinking segregation and integration: contributions of whole-brain modelling. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 16(7), 430–439.

Floridi, L. (2010). *The Philosophy of Information*. Oxford University Press.

Fries, P. (2015). Rhythms for cognition: communication through coherence. *Neuron*, 88(1), 220–235.

Hunt, T. (2019). The easy part of the hard problem: A resonance theory of consciousness. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 13(378). Retrieved from `https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6834646/`

Pothos, E. M., & Busemeyer, J. R. (2013). Can quantum probability provide a new direction for cognitive modeling? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 255–274.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3), 379–423. Retrieved from `https://www.quantamagazine.org/how-claude-shannons-concept-of-entropy-quantifies-information-20220906/`

Timme, N. M., et al. (2018). A tutorial for information theory in neuroscience. *eNeuro*, 5(3):ENEURO.0052-18.2018. Retrieved from `https://www.eneuro.org/content/5/3/ENEURO.0052-18.2018`

Tononi, G. (2015). Integrated information theory. *Scholarpedia*, 10(1):4164.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. MIT Press.

Weilenmann, M., Krämer, L., Faist, P., & Renner, R. (2015). Axiomatic relation between thermodynamic and information–theoretic entropies. *Physical Review E*, 93(4):042130. Retrieved from `https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.06920`