

PLN and NARS

Often Yield Similar *strength* \times *confidence* Given Highly Uncertain Term Probabilities

Ben Goertzel *

Abstract

We provide a comparative analysis of the deduction, induction, and abduction formulas used in Probabilistic Logic Networks (PLN) and the Non-Axiomatic Reasoning System (NARS), two uncertain reasoning frameworks aimed at AGI.

One difference between the two systems is that, at the level of individual inference rules, PLN directly leverages both term and relationship probabilities, whereas NARS only leverages relationship frequencies and has no simple analogue of term probabilities. Thus we focus here on scenarios where there is high uncertainty about term probabilities, and explore how this uncertainty influences the comparative inferential conclusions of the two systems. We compare the product of strength and confidence ($s \times c$) in PLN against the product of frequency and confidence ($f \times c$) in NARS (quantities we refer to as measuring the "power" of an uncertain statement) in cases of high term probability uncertainty, using heuristic analyses and elementary numerical computations.

We find that in many practical situations with high term probability uncertainty, PLN and NARS formulas give very similar results for the power of an inference conclusion, even though they sometimes come to these similar numbers in quite different ways.

1 Introduction

Reasoning under uncertainty is a central challenge in artificial intelligence, and arguably critical to achieving AGI. However, standard methodologies from the AI literature meet this challenge only partially. Classical probabilistic and statistical reasoning frameworks like Bayes Nets and Markov Logic Networks don't effectively encompass advanced logical knowledge representation features like quantifiers or higher order expressions. Statistical approaches like LLMs fail at

*SingularityNET, TrueAGI

logical reasoning in glaring and well-documented ways, in spite of their often remarkable inferential achievements (Goertzel, 2023).

Two prominent frameworks aiming to address these shortcomings are:

1. Probabilistic Logic Networks (PLN), developed by Ben Goertzel and colleagues, which combines probabilistic reasoning with a mix of higher-order predicate logic and term logic, driven by an observation-grounded semantics (Goertzel, 2009)
2. Non-Axiomatic Reasoning System (NARS), developed by Pei Wang, which provides an uncertain term logic for evidence-based reasoning without relying on probabilistic assumptions. (Wang, 1994)

Both of these systems provide inference rules for deduction, induction, and abduction, and then contain systems for extrapolating these basic rules to handle more advanced inference scenarios involving quantifiers, causal and temporal reasoning, and so forth. Further, the two systems have in common that they assign both *strength* and *confidence* values to logical statements and relationships.

However, the two systems differ fundamentally in their semantics of uncertainty and their use of term probabilities. As one important aspect of this foundational semantic difference, PLN assigns probabilities to both terms and relationships, whereas NARS assigns uncertainties only to relationships but not terms.

This paper compares the basic truth value formulas of PLN and NARS (across the deduction, induction and abduction inference rules), focusing in particular on the scenario where there is high uncertainty about term probabilities in PLN. Our main result is if one compares the product $strength \times confidence$ (which we call the "power") across PLN and NARS, then in situations of high term probability uncertainty, we find the two systems often give very nearly the same evaluation of the power to be associated to the result of an inference.

What is interesting is that the two systems often come to almost the same number but by different routes: i.e. the strong alignment we observe in the high-term-probability-uncertainty case does not occur if one looks at *strength* alone or *confidence* alone, only if one looks at the product.

No similar, inference-rule-level alignment between the two systems occurs in the case of higher term probability confidence, as in these cases PLN's inductive and abductive conclusions become strongly Bayesian, which is a quite different direction from NARS.

2 Background

2.1 Non-Axiomatic Reasoning System (NARS)

The cognitive and philosophical theory underlying NARS is quite deep and involved and we will not attempt to summarize it here, referring the reader to

(Wang, 2006). Operationally, the core of the theory includes a set of term logic inference rules, and then uncertain truth value formulas mapping the uncertainties of the premises into the uncertainty of the conclusion. Uncertainties are represented using $(f, c) = (\text{frequency}, \text{confidence})$ pairs with a particular semantics. The truth value formulas are obtained leveraging certain axiomatic assumptions that are adopted based on conceptual considerations. The rules and formulas are viewed as allowing a reasoning system to adaptively generalize from experiential evidence using limited resources without making unwarranted assumptions such as prior probability distributions.

The rough semantics of the uncertain truth value components is,

- Frequency (f) : The proportion of positive evidence supporting a statement.
- Confidence (c): Reflects the amount of evidence relative to an experience parameter k , calculated via

$$c = \frac{n}{n + k}$$

where n is the number of evidential observations supporting the statement

NARS also include the concept of

- Expectation = $f * c$

This quantity occurs here and there in work with NARS, where it is considered as an estimation of the overall reliability or utility of a statement in terms of how frequently it is observed (frequency) and how much evidence there is supporting it (confidence). It is *not* conceptually the same or closely related to the probabilistic concept of expectation (meaning expected value).

For purposes of comparison of NARS with PLN, the term "expectation" here is confusing and we will use instead the term

- Power = $f * c$

with a similar meaning for PLN (where "expectation" has its usual probabilistic meaning). This quantity is important here because our core finding is that under assumptions of highly uncertain term probabilities, PLN and NARS often associate rather similar power values to the conclusions of inferences.

We now summarize the quantitative truth value formulas associated with the three "first order term logic" rules of NARS logic. NARS contains a number of other inference rules handling matters such as quantifiers, temporal and causal reasoning, but we will restrict attention here to these three basic rules, as they exemplify the core conceptual issues behind NARS truth value formulas and the crux of the similarities and differences with PLN.

Deduction . Term logic deduction is basically transitive inference. Given:

- $A \rightarrow B$ with (f_1, c_1)
- $B \rightarrow C$ with (f_2, c_2)

one infers

- $A \rightarrow C$ with (f, c)

obtaining the conclusion truth value via

- Frequency:

$$f = \frac{f_1 f_2}{f_1 + f_2 - f_1 f_2}$$

- Confidence:

$$c = c_1 c_2 (f_1 + f_2 - f_1 f_2)$$

- Power: $f \times c$:

$$f \times c = f_1 f_2 c_1 c_2$$

Note that here the uncertainty values are associated with inheritance relationships \rightarrow , and there are no uncertainty values or evidence counts associated with the individual terms such as A , B , etc. This minimalism in allocation of uncertainty and attestation of evidence is a key part of the conceptual foundations of NARS.

Induction Inductive inference in NARS has a unique and interesting semantics, similar to yet different from statistical perspectives on induction. Operationally, given

- $B \rightarrow A$ with (f_1, c_1)
- B with (f_2, c_2)

one infers

- A with (f, c)

via

- Frequency:

$$f = f_1$$

- Confidence:

$$c = \frac{f_2 c_2 c_1}{f_2 c_2 c_1 + k}$$

- Power ($f \times c$)

$$f \times c = \frac{f_1 f_2 c_2 c_1}{f_2 c_2 c_1 + k}$$

The $f = f_1$ formula for conclusion frequency obviously differs drastically from anything one would obtain from Bayesian or other forms of statistical reasoning. However, doing statistical inductive reasoning without term probabilities presents significant challenges, and because NARS eschews term probabilities it takes a different approach.

Abduction NARS abduction bears a symmetric relationship with induction. Given

- $A \rightarrow B$ with (f_1, c_1)
- B with (f_2, c_2)

one obtains

- A with (f, c)

via

- Frequency:

$$f = f_2$$

- Confidence:

$$c = \frac{f_1 c_1 c_2}{f_1 c_1 c_2 + k}$$

- Power ($f \times c$)

$$f \times c = \frac{f_2 f_1 c_1 c_2}{f_1 c_1 c_2 + k}$$

The same conceptual divergence with statistical methods occurs here as in the case of induction.

2.2 Probabilistic Logic Networks (PLN)

PLN, Probabilistic Logic Networks (Goertzel et al, 2008), was originally inspired by a desire to capture key aspects of NARS but within a framework compatible with probability theory. The idea was, roughly, to be somewhat NARS-like in cases where evidence was scant, and then to resemble Bayesian statistical reasoning more closely in cases where evidence was more abundant. Over time the theory and practice of PLN diverged further from NARS, and now PLN combines aspects of term logic with aspects of higher-order predicate logic, and embraces a variety of truth value representations going beyond the NARS-like $(s, c) = (\textit{strength}, \textit{confidence})$ pairs with which it began. In OpenCog Hyperon (Goertzel et al, 2023), PLN semantics is being formalized using categorial and type-theoretic methods, and connected with paraconsistent logic (Goertzel, 2020).

Here, as with NARS, we will stick to a simple subset of PLN, and focus only on the uncertain truth value formulas associated with the three first-order term logic reasoning rules for deduction, induction and abduction. Setting aside uncertain truth value formulas, the structure of these rules looks the same for PLN as for NARS.

We will deal here only with what in PLN are called "simple truth values", which consist of strength (s) and confidence (c) defined via

- For statements:
 - Strength (s): Estimated probability that a statement is true.
 - Confidence (c): Reflects the certainty of the strength estimate. This can be formulated in a number of ways, e.g. using imprecise probability or its variant, e.g.: The width of an $x\%$ confidence interval around the mean of a second-order distribution of which s is the mean. The more evidence that has been gathered about the statement, roughly speaking, the more peaked and less flat this second-order distribution will be.
- For terms
 - Strength (s): Estimated probability that a randomly selected object in the pertinent context, is an instance of that term
 - Confidence (c): Reflects the certainty of the strength estimate, defined similarly to statement confidence.

A relevant subtlety here is that, in PLN, it generally doesn't make sense to do an inference without explicitly defining the inference context, so that (among other uses) one can effectively estimate term probabilities. One can of course define a "default context" associated with a given reasoning system, but this turns out to be a fairly arbitrary and not that commonly useful thing to do. For instance, what is the term probability of the concept "hydrogen atom" versus the concept "cat"? In a human everyday life context the term probability of

"cat" is higher; in a cosmic physics context the term probability of "hydrogen atom" is higher. In most contexts, for most human-level or more generally intelligent minds, most term probabilities will end up being assigned based on inference rather than direct observations.

NARS of course can be used to represent contexts as well; one could make terms for "everyday life context" and "cosmic physics context" and explicitly construct inheritance relations to them and manipulate these. However it is less critical to do this in NARS than in PLN, because in NARS one doesn't have to deal with term probabilities.

There is a fascinating connection between probabilistic mathematics and postmodern philosophy here, in that according to the latter, it is important to consider all inferences as occurring within particular contexts, for conceptual rather than technical reasons. For our present purposes, though, we will set such depths aside and focus on truth value arithmetic!

2.2.1 Basic PLN Truth Value Formulas

We now review the PLN truth value formulas comparable to the NARS formulas given above.

Deduction Rather than providing single all-purpose truth value formulas corresponding to inference rules, PLN gives a methodology for deriving truth value formulas corresponding to rules. Depending on how one wants to represent uncertainty (e.g. with first or higher order probabilities or various parametrizations or approximations thereof), and what heuristic or data-driven assumptions one wants to make, one may obtain different formulas. For the simple (transitive inference) deduction rule, we will look here at two truth value formulas working with (s, c) truth values, but founded on different assumptions otherwise.

The most standard PLN deduction truth value formula is the "independence-based" formula, which is derived using an assumption that A and C are probabilistically independent within B. In this case, given

- $A \rightarrow B$ with s_{AB}, c_{AB}
- $B \rightarrow C$ with s_{BC}, c_{BC}
- term probabilities s_A, s_B, s_C

one infers

- $A \rightarrow C$ with s_{AC}, c_{AC}

via

$$s_{AC} = s_{AB}s_{BC} + \frac{(1 - s_{AB})(s_C - s_Bs_{BC})}{1 - s_B}$$

An alternative is the "concept geometry" based deduction formula, which replaces the independence assumption with an alternative assumption that terms

have spherical (most simply, circular) shape in some feature space. This is a crude assumption, however, the assumption underlying the independence based rule is arguably even more crude: Basically, the latter implicitly assumes terms represent random combinations of features within some feature space, with the randomness minimally constrained by any known information. When there is data or intuitive reason to make more refined assumptions, the PLN framework can support this also.

It should be noted that other probabilistic inference methods make similar or worse crude independence assumptions, e.g. Bayes Nets assume each node is independent of its parents conditional on its ancestors; the network discovery algorithms try to make this as true as possible, but in real cases it's always a crude approximation to reality. NARS avoids this sort of assumption but this doesn't rule out the possibility that it implicitly makes similar assumptions – at times its results are closer to those of the independence-based than concept-geometry-based PLN formulas, suggesting it could be cryptically relying on its own independence-like assumptions.

In the concept geometry approach, given the same premises as above, one arrives at the formula:

$$s_{AC} = \frac{s_{AB}s_{BC}}{\min(1, s_{AB} + s_{BC})}$$

Induction: The induction rule in PLN takes inputs

- $B \rightarrow A$ with s_{BA}, c_{BA}
- $B \rightarrow C$ with s_{BC}, c_{BC}
- term probabilities s_A, s_B, s_C

and infers

- $A \rightarrow C$ with s_{AC}, c_{AC}

The general approach to induction truth value formulas in PLN is to treat induction as a chaining of deduction with Bayes rule. That is, from

- $B \rightarrow A$ with s_{BA}, c_{BA}

one can derive

- $A \rightarrow B$ with s_{AB}, c_{AB}

using

$$s_{AB} = \frac{s_{BA}s_B}{s_A}$$

and then proceed with the deduction (assuming for simplicity the independence-based deduction formula)

- $A \rightarrow B$ with s_{AB}, c_{AB}
- $B \rightarrow C$ with s_{BC}, c_{BC}

obtaining

$$s_{AC} = s_{BA}s_{BC} \frac{s_B}{s_A} + \frac{s_B(1 - s_{BA})(s_C - s_B s_{BC})}{s_A(1 - s_B)}$$

Abduction: PLN abduction, symmetrically to induction, takes

- $A \rightarrow B$ with s_{AB}, c_{AB}
- $C \rightarrow B$ with s_{CB}, c_{CB}
- term probabilities s_A, s_B, s_C

and infers

- $A \rightarrow C$ with s_{AC}, c_{AC}

and then proceeds via Bayes' rule.

3 Differences Between NARS and PLN As Regards Basic Truth Value Formulae

Let's now qualitatively compare the NARS truth value formulas with the simplified, high term probability uncertainty forms of the PLN truth value formulas.

The core intuition motivating this investigation is:

Hypothesis Under certain assumptions – specifically, when term probabilities in PLN are highly uncertain – the inference mechanisms of PLN may exhibit behaviors that resemble those of NARS.

When term probabilities (s_A, s_B, s_C) in PLN are highly uncertain, they can be thought of as having wide variance or being imprecisely known. This uncertainty diminishes the influence of term probabilities in PLN's inference formulas, causing the system to rely more on the strengths and confidences of the relationships between terms, resulting in the simplified formulas given above.

Challenges in Precise Probabilistic Calculations One could envision a highly in-depth and rigorous approach to this sort of comparison, involving statistically studying the behavior of PLN across a variety of different configurations with different term value uncertainties. This is a viable thing to do but seems to require either extensive numerical integration work, or extensive simulation modeling and analysis. So we have decided to start out with the more qualitative and approximative approach as reported here.

3.1 Heuristic Analysis for Deduction, Induction and Abduction

For each of the three core varieties of first-order PLN and NARS inference, we want to compare $s \times c$ in PLN and $f \times c$ in NARS.

3.1.1 Deduction

In PLN (Independence-Based), under high uncertainty of term probabilities:

$$s_{AC} \approx s_{AB}s_{BC}$$

This simplification occurs because the terms involving term probabilities become less significant.

We then find:

- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{ABCBC}$ (making a simple independence assumption on confidences).
- Product:

$$s_{AC} \times c_{AC} \approx s_{AB}s_{BC} \times c_{ABCBC}$$

In PLN (Concept Geometry-Based), we have

$$s_{AC} = \frac{s_{AB}s_{BC}}{\min(1, s_{AB} + s_{BC})}$$

Under high uncertainty of term probabilities, and when $s_{AB} + s_{BC} \leq 1$, this simplifies to:

$$s_{AC} = \frac{s_{AB}s_{BC}}{s_{AB} + s_{BC}}$$

We have

- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{ABCBC}$.
- Power:

$$s_{AC} \times c_{AC} = \frac{s_{AB}s_{BC}}{s_{AB} + s_{BC}} \times c_{ABCBC}$$

In NARS, comparatively, we have for strength:

$$f = \frac{f_1 f_2}{f_1 + f_2 - f_1 f_2} \approx \frac{f_1 f_2}{f_1 + f_2} \quad (\text{for low } f_1, f_2)$$

and confidence:

$$c = c_1 c_2 (f_1 + f_2 - f_1 f_2) \approx c_1 c_2 (f_1 + f_2)$$

Product:

$$f \times c \approx \frac{f_1 f_2}{f_1 + f_2} \times c_1 c_2 (f_1 + f_2) = f_1 f_2 c_1 c_2$$

Heuristic Comparison: What we can see looking at these formulas is:

- Similarity: Both $s \times c$ in (the independence assumption version of) PLN and $f \times c$ in NARS involve the product of the strengths/frequencies and confidences of the premises. That is, we literally get the same formula for the power here, though the contributions from s/f versus c are different in PLN vs. NARS.
- Difference: PLN's concept geometry-based deduction includes a normalization factor $\frac{1}{s_{AB} + s_{BC}}$, which is absent in NARS. This means that while both products involve similar multiplicative components, the scaling differs.

3.1.2 Induction

In the case of high uncertainty of term probabilities, the independence-based PLN induction formula

$$s_{AC} = s_{BA} s_{BC} \frac{s_B}{s_A} + \frac{s_B (1 - s_{BA}) (s_C - s_B s_{BC})}{s_A (1 - s_B)}$$

can be simplified considerably. Bayes' rule is less useful and the best approximation one can form is generally the simple form

$$s_{AC} \approx s_{BA} s_{BC}$$

Basically, what we are saying here is: if the term probabilities are all wildly uncertain, then heuristically speaking

- the best we can do as regards the first term is assume that on average the ratio of two unknown things is 1
- since the second term has a product of two ratios of term probabilities, if term probabilities are highly uncertain then it's going to be even more wildly uncertain than the first term, and its contribution will end up negligible once confidence is incorporated

In this case PLN's default confidence formulas also reduce to a simple form

$$c_{AC} \approx c_{BA} c_{BC}$$

so the power $s \times c$ comes out to:

$$s_{AC} \times c_{AC} \approx s_{BA} s_{BC} \times c_{BA} c_{BC}$$

In NARS, we have for strength:

$$f = f_1$$

and for confidence:

$$c = \frac{f_2 c_2 c_1}{f_2 c_2 c_1 + k}$$

so for the power:

$$f \times c = \frac{f_1 f_2 c_2 c_1}{f_2 c_2 c_1 + k}$$

We see that the product depends on the frequencies and confidences of the premises, adjusted by the experience parameter k .

Heuristic Comparison:

- Similarity: Both $s_{AC} \times c_{AC}$ in PLN and $f \times c$ in NARS rely on the products of the strengths/frequencies and confidences of the premises.
- Difference: NARS's formula includes an additional denominator term k , which modulates the confidence based on the experience parameter, a concept absent in PLN.

3.2 Abduction

In PLN, similarly to the induction case, under high uncertainty of term probabilities we find:

$$s_{AC} \approx s_{AB} s_{CB}$$

yielding

- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{AB} c_{CB}$.
- Power:

$$s_{AC} \times c_{AC} \approx s_{AB} s_{CB} \times c_{AB} c_{CB}$$

In NARS, we have for strength

$$f = f_2$$

and for confidence:

$$c = \frac{f_1 c_1 c_2}{f_1 c_1 c_2 + k}$$

thus the product:

$$f \times c = \frac{f_2 f_1 c_1 c_2}{f_1 c_1 c_2 + k}$$

Similar to induction, here the product depends on the frequencies and confidences of the premises, adjusted by the experience parameter k .

Heuristic Comparison :

- Similarity: Both systems' products involve the multiplication of strengths/frequencies and confidences.
- Difference: NARS includes an experience parameter k in the denominator, which affects the confidence based on accumulated experience, unlike PLN.

4 Concrete Numerical Examples

Following on the qualitative analysis from the previous section, to illustrate the similarities and differences between PLN and NARS under high uncertainty of term probabilities, we present three numerical examples: one for deduction, one for induction, and one for abduction. These examples demonstrate how the products $s \times c$ in PLN and $f \times c$ in NARS compare under specific conditions.

4.1 Example 1: Deduction

Given:

- PLN:
 - $A \rightarrow B$ with $s_{AB} = 0.6, c_{AB} = 0.8$
 - $B \rightarrow C$ with $s_{BC} = 0.7, c_{BC} = 0.9$
 - High uncertainty in term probabilities
- NARS:
 - $A \rightarrow B$ with $f_1 = 0.6, c_1 = 0.8$
 - $B \rightarrow C$ with $f_2 = 0.7, c_2 = 0.9$
 - Experience parameter $k = 0.5$

PLN Induction (Independence-Based): We have a simplified s_{AC} formula:

$$s_{AC} \approx s_{AB}s_{BC} = 0.6 \times 0.7 = 0.42$$

and

- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{AB}c_{BC} = 0.8 \times 0.9 = 0.72$
- Product: $s_{AC} \times c_{AC} = 0.42 \times 0.72 = 0.3024$

PLN Deduction (Concept Geometry-Based): We have a simplified strength

$$s_{AC} = \frac{s_{AB}s_{BC}}{s_{AB} + s_{BC}} = \frac{0.6 \times 0.7}{0.6 + 0.7} = \frac{0.42}{1.3} \approx 0.3231$$

yielding

- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{ABCBC} = 0.8 \times 0.9 = 0.72$
- Product: $s_{AC} \times c_{AC} = 0.3231 \times 0.72 \approx 0.2323$

NARS Deduction: Frequency:

$$f = \frac{f_1 f_2}{f_1 + f_2 - f_1 f_2} = \frac{0.6 \times 0.7}{0.6 + 0.7 - 0.6 \times 0.7} = \frac{0.42}{1.3 - 0.42} = \frac{0.42}{0.88} \approx 0.4773$$

Confidence:

$$c = c_1 c_2 (f_1 + f_2 - f_1 f_2) = 0.8 \times 0.9 \times (0.6 + 0.7 - 0.42) = 0.72 \times (1.3 - 0.42) = 0.72 \times 0.88 = 0.6336$$

Product:

$$f \times c = 0.4773 \times 0.6336 \approx 0.3024$$

4.1.1 Analysis:

- PLN with Independence-Based Deduction:: Product $s \times c \approx 0.3024$
- PLN with Concept Geometry Based Deduction: Product $s \times c \approx 0.2323$
- NARS: Product $f \times c \approx 0.3024$

We see that under the given simplifying assumptions, the independence-based PLN system and the NARS system yield actually identical products, indicating a strong alignment under high uncertainty of term probabilities.

On the other hand, the normalization factor in PLN's concept geometry-based deduction results in a lower product compared to NARS.

4.2 Example 2: Induction

Given:

- PLN:
 - $B \rightarrow A$ with $s_{BA} = 0.6, c_{BA} = 0.8$
 - $B \rightarrow C$ with $s_{BC} = 0.7, c_{BC} = 0.9$
 - High uncertainty in term probabilities

- NARS:
 - $B \rightarrow A$ with $f_1 = 0.6, c_1 = 0.8$
 - B with $f_2 = 0.7, c_2 = 0.9$
 - Experience parameter $k = 0.5$

PLN Induction: Using the simplifications introduced above we have

- Simplified $s_{AC} \approx s_{BASBC} = 0.6 \times 0.7 = 0.42$
- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{BACBC} = 0.8 \times 0.9 = 0.72$
- Product: $s_{AC} \times c_{AC} = 0.42 \times 0.72 = 0.3024$

NARS Induction: . Here we obtain

- Frequency: $f = f_1 = 0.6$
- Confidence:

$$c = \frac{f_2 c_2 c_1}{f_2 c_2 c_1 + k} = \frac{0.7 \times 0.9 \times 0.8}{0.7 \times 0.9 \times 0.8 + 0.5} = \frac{0.504}{0.504 + 0.5} = \frac{0.504}{1.004} \approx 0.5024$$

- Product: $f \times c = 0.6 \times 0.5024 \approx 0.3014$

4.2.1 Analysis:

- (Independence based) PLN Induction: $s \times c \approx 0.3024$
- NARS Induction: $f \times c \approx 0.3014$
- Similarity: Both systems yield nearly identical products, indicating alignment under high uncertainty of term probabilities.

The heuristic simplification in PLN's induction aligns closely with NARS's induction output, showcasing similar reliance on premise strengths and confidences when term probabilities are highly uncertain.

4.3 Example 3: Abduction

Given:

- PLN:
 - $A \rightarrow B$ with $s_{AB} = 0.5, c_{AB} = 0.7$
 - $C \rightarrow B$ with $s_{CB} = 0.4, c_{CB} = 0.6$
 - High uncertainty in term probabilities

- NARS:
 - $A \rightarrow B$ with $f_1 = 0.5, c_1 = 0.7$
 - B with $f_2 = 0.4, c_2 = 0.6$
 - Experience parameter $k = 0.5$

PLN Abduction:

- Simplified $s_{AC} \approx s_{AB}s_{CB} = 0.5 \times 0.4 = 0.2$
- Confidence $c_{AC} \approx c_{AB}c_{CB} = 0.7 \times 0.6 = 0.42$
- Product: $s_{AC} \times c_{AC} = 0.2 \times 0.42 = 0.084$

NARS Abduction:

- Frequency: $f = f_2 = 0.4$
- Confidence:

$$c = \frac{f_1 c_1 c_2}{f_1 c_1 c_2 + k} = \frac{0.5 \times 0.7 \times 0.6}{0.5 \times 0.7 \times 0.6 + 0.5} = \frac{0.21}{0.21 + 0.5} = \frac{0.21}{0.71} \approx 0.2958$$

- Product: $f \times c = 0.4 \times 0.2958 \approx 0.1183$

4.3.1 Analysis:

- PLN Abduction: $s \times c \approx 0.084$
- NARS Abduction: $f \times c \approx 0.1183$

Here we see PLN yields a lower product compared to NARS, highlighting differences in how confidence is handled.

While both systems rely on the multiplicative combination of strengths/frequencies and confidences, the absence of normalization and the differing treatment of confidence in PLN lead to discrepancies in the inferred products.

4.4 Summary of Results from Exploratory Examples

Specifically, what we have seen here results-wise in our handful of illustrative examples is:

Deduction:

- Independence-Based Deduction: Demonstrates a high degree of similarity between PLN and NARS, as the simplified $s \times c$ in PLN matches $f \times c$ in NARS.
- Concept Geometry-Based Deduction: Shows differences due to the normalization factor, which scales the strength differently compared to NARS.

Induction: The heuristic simplification in PLN's induction aligns closely with NARS's induction output, showcasing similar reliance on premise strengths and confidences when term probabilities are highly uncertain.

Abduction: While PLN and NARS both rely on the multiplicative combination of strengths/frequencies and confidences, differences emerge due to PLN's lack of normalization and NARS's inclusion of an experience parameter k . The numerical example showed modest discrepancies in the inferred products, highlighting inherent differences.

5 Implications and Observations

We have shown here, through fairly simplified heuristic analyses and corresponding elementary computations, that under conditions of high uncertainty about term probabilities, the inference outputs of PLN and NARS exhibit certain converging tendencies, particularly when considering the products $s \times c$ in PLN and $f \times c$ in NARS.

The conceptual reason for this convergence is clear: High uncertainty in term probabilities leads PLN to rely more on the strengths and confidences of relationships. The core aim here has been to do a little specific analysis to see how this notion pans out in practice.

The primary insight underlying the analysis here has simply been to focus on the power $s \times c$, because if one focuses on s alone or c alone the two systems do not look so similar ... sometimes what one system puts into the strength, the other system puts into the confidence, but when one takes the product it evens out.

5.1 Similar Though Not Identical

Overall, despite the striking parallels, we cannot say that PLN quite "reduces to" NARS when term probabilities are highly uncertain. While strong similarities between the two sets of uncertain inference rules exist under high uncertainty of term probabilities, fundamental distinctions between the frameworks – such as normalization factors in PLN and the experience parameter in NARS – do lead to nontrivial differences in their reasoning outputs even in these circumstances, especially regarding non-deductive reasoning. These differences seem generally not huge (we have looked at more examples than the 3 given here), but modest-sized systematic differences could still have a meaningful impact on AI system behavior.

However, it is still quite interesting how, when term probabilities are uncertain, these two inference approaches with very different conceptual and formal underpinnings come quite close to saying the same thing about practical situations – at least if one focuses on the "power" obtained by multiplying $s \times c$. This may be taken as a bit of evidence that $s \times c$ is an interesting thing to look at, as well.

The divergence of the results from the PLN concept-geometry based deduction formula is also interesting and perhaps merits further thought and study. One hypothesis would be that what the concept geometry approach is attempting to do simply has no cognate in the NARS world. Perhaps the insights and results-biasing obtained if one assumes the concepts involved in an inference have a certain natural shape in concept space, are not reflected in the NARS rules and the axioms underlying them. On the other hand, it might be that this sort of assumption about concept shape could be reflected in NARS reasoning in some other way, perhaps at the level of the overall knowledge base rather than individual inference rules.

5.2 The Case of Confident Term Probabilities

When term probabilities are confidently known, the situation is generally quite different, and the role of term probabilities in PLN often leads it to very divergent conclusions from NARS. This is very much the case for induction and abduction, where PLN's approach leans heavily on Bayes rule, which normalizes by term probabilities in a foundational and impactful way.

In the case of reasonably confidently known term probabilities, the outputs of NARS and PLN are generally extremely different on the level of individual inference rules, and if one were to interestingly compare the two systems, it would need to be done at the level of the holistic conclusions drawn by inference networks based on a large amount of data and the combination of a large number of inferences (because in these cases, the two systems draw different conclusions on the individual-rule level, but also combine the outcomes of these individual inferences in different ways).

A more in-depth analysis could explore how rapidly and with what specificities PLN's conclusions become decreasingly NARS-ian as the confidence of term probabilities increases.

5.3 Future Work

To further pursue the research direction indicated here, natural avenues would be:

- **Numerical Simulations:** Performing intensive numerical simulations to provide more detailed quantitative comparisons, particularly in scenarios with varying levels of uncertainty.
- **Practical Results Comparison:** Model practical examples in several domains with both systems, and assess the impact of the differences that do exist between the output values of the system, in cases of highly uncertain term probabilities and otherwise
- **Confidence Metrics:** Explore alternative methods for calculating and interpreting PLN confidence in the presence of high uncertainty about term probabilities.

References

- Wang, Pei (1994). From Inference to Intelligence: The Non-Axiomatic Reasoning System. PhD Thesis, Indiana University.
- Wang, Pei (2006). Rigid Flexibility. Springer.
- Goertzel, Ben et al (2009). Probabilistic Logic Networks: A Comprehensive Framework for Uncertain Inference. Springer.
- Goertzel, B. (2020). Paraconsistent foundations for probabilistic reasoning, programming and concept formation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14474.
- Goertzel, B. (2023). Generative ai vs. agi: The cognitive strengths and weaknesses of modern llms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10371.
- Goertzel, B., Bogdanov, V., Duncan, M., Duong, D., Goertzel, Z., Horlings, J., ... & Werko, R. (2023). OpenCog Hyperon: A Framework for AGI at the Human Level and Beyond. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18318.