One of the most interesting parts on the research paper is solely on the glass box approach method which consists of both interpretation and observation with the aim at translating values into specific design requirements as per the documentation.

Its worthy noticing also how on every requirement identified within the interpretation stage, few or rather several tests will be assigned for verification during the observation stage. And all these processes are aimed to work without the knowhow of the internal workings of the system.

How the two stages work in unison with each other is key to producing a more desirable output, thus one of the reasons why this is more interesting to me is to learn further how this glass box approach method can be incorporated in most real-life systems in order to test their transparency.

Another key concept of interest is during the verification approach where the observation stage involves checking the adherence of the lower-level norms which have been already devised within the interpretation stage.

Based on the set of propositional atoms as per the given definition 5, this dictates how to represent the hierarchy of all concepts from abstract to the most concrete ones. Thus, I would like to explore a bit more on how this logic is applied to the verification and the transparency evaluation of the system.

Cxt is one of the logics which have been applied during the count-as stage, having been extended with the universal and negation contexts to denote states in the semantics. There are several axioms and rules which define Logic Cxt, this remains a concept of key interest to me to learn how all these tautologies of propositional calculus and all the mentioned rules have been arrived at and how they influence these glass box approach stages.

Theorems and definitions explained in this research paper forms an integral part for this approach used for verification of systems, thus exploring the in-depth meaning and work-around of these definitions remains key to me. In addition, each stage uses certain definitions and theorems for its execution, their choice on every stage, how they impact each stage and how possibly this could be improved for better unbiased results is something to explore a little more.

The number of tests performed is mentioned to be kept relatively small for computational reasons when dealing with satisfiability problems in propositional logic that has finite number of propositions. Could this also be applicable when dealing with large volume of tests? This is something I would like to dig deeper into thus highlighting the consequences of such an approach.