



Philosophical Foundations of Hydrologic Uncertainty

Grey Nearing (1) and Hoshin Gupta (2)

(1) University of Alabama; Geological Sciences; Tuscaloosa, AL, United States (gsnearing@ua.edu), (2) University of Arizona; Hydrology & Atmospheric Sciences; Tucson, AZ, United States (hoshin.gupta@hwr.arizona.edu)

There is significant discussion and disagreement about the role of hypothesis testing in Hydrology (e.g., Blöschl, 2017). Hydrologic modeling, as a discipline has reached a point where certain fundamental problems at foundations of the philosophy of science represent major obstacles to improved hydrologic modeling and uncertainty quantification (Nearing et al., 2017). I propose that we might accelerate progress against some of the "hard" problems in the discipline by doing a better job of connecting those problems with their epistemological foundations.

In this work, I do three things. First, I propose that hypothesis testing is tautologically unrelated with any meaningful concept of uncertainty. Second, I propose that certain logical inconsistencies inherent in uncertainty-based philosophies of science (e.g., Popper, Neyman, Savage, Jaynes, etc.) are naturally remedied by an information-based philosophy of science. Third, I develop an information-theoretic[1] hypothesis testing framework, and prove that it is robust (in the sense that it admits zero potential for Type I error) to arbitrary errors in empirical data.

From a practical perspective, this offers solutions to two problems that are typically considered intractable:

- It alleviates the need for any type of likelihood function, including any data-error model or data-error distribution.
- It allows for the derivation of purely objective falsification criteria; contrary to Neyman's (1957) proposal that falsification is fundamentally subjective.

In addition, this information-theoretic philosophy of science provides a foundation for quantitative process-level model diagnostics.

[1] Information theory here refers to the branch of logic that describes how rational (i.e. consistent with Aristotelian logic) doxastic states evolve in the presence of empirical data (Knuth, 2005).

Blöschl, Günter. "Debates—Hypothesis testing in hydrology: Introduction." *Water Resources Research* 53.3 (2017): 1767-1769.

Knuth, Kevin H. "Lattice duality: The origin of probability and entropy." *Neurocomputing* 67 (2005): 245-274.

Nearing, Grey S., et al. "A philosophical basis for hydrological uncertainty." *Hydrological Sciences Journal* 61.9 (2016): 1666-1678.

Neyman, Jerzy. "' Inductive Behavior" as a Basic Concept of Philosophy of Science." *Revue de l'Institut International de Statistique* (1957): 7-22