Review of: "A Challenge in A(G)I: Cybernetics Revived in the Ouroboros Model as One Algorithm for All Thinking"

Hamza Abubakar[1]

1 Universiti Utara Malaysia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

"A Challenge in A(G)I: Cybernetics Revived in the Ouroboros Model as One Algorithm for All Thinking" seems to be focused on a specific area within Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) and cybernetics. It suggests exploring the concept of the Ouroboros Model as a potential solution or approach in AGI, which could involve integrating cybernetics principles into AI systems. This topic can lead to a detailed discussion on the challenges, advancements, and potential implications of such an approach in the field of AGI.

The study highlights several problems and proposes solutions related to algorithms in the context of artificial intelligence (AI) and image categorization/generation. Here are the identified problems summarized. It points out a general deficiency in current AI approaches, specifically in terms of symbol embedding and grounding in physical or bodily experiences. This lack is seen as a major contributing factor to the shortcomings in AI capabilities. Another problem highlighted is the absence of a hierarchical organization of concepts within AI systems. This hierarchical structure is essential for complex reasoning and understanding, which is currently lacking in AI algorithms. The need for incorporating cybernetics and analog control processes: The abstract suggests that to address these deficiencies, it is necessary to integrate aspects of cybernetics and analog control processes into AI systems. This integration is proposed as a remedy to enhance AI capabilities and improve overall performance. However, the following observations were put forward in writing style and structure:

1. The introduction starts with a general statement about algorithms without clearly defining the specific problem or focus of the paper. It introduces the concept of AI advancements but transitions abruptly to mentioning fundamental shortcomings without providing context or examples.
2. The study contains long and convoluted sentences that make it challenging to follow the main points. This complexity can hinder understanding and readability for readers.
3. Lacks smooth transitions between sections, making it difficult to follow the logical flow of ideas. Clear transitions would help readers navigate through the different topics and arguments presented.
4. The study covers a wide range of topics, from AI limitations to the Ouroboros Model, without establishing a clear focus or central thesis. This unfocused discussion can lead to confusion and dilution of key points.
5. While the study mentions challenges and proposed solutions, it lacks concrete examples or evidence to support these claims. Providing specific examples or case studies would strengthen the argumentation and make the abstract more convincing.

6. The study includes technical terms and concepts without sufficient explanation or contextualization, assuming a high level of familiarity from the readers. This can alienate readers who are not experts in the field.
7. The study is verbose and lacks clarity in presenting its ideas. It would benefit from a more concise and straightforward presentation of concepts.
8. Some points are repeated or reiterated in different ways, leading to redundancy. Removing redundant information and focusing on key points would improve the effectiveness of the text.

This study would benefit from clearer organization, simpler language, and more focused discussion on specific problems and proposed solutions. Providing concrete examples and ensuring smooth transitions between sections would also improve readability and comprehension. Restructuring the text to improve clarity, coherence, and focus while providing concrete examples and avoiding unnecessary technical jargon would enhance its readability and effectiveness in conveying ideas.