



© Видавець Інститут кібернетики імені В.М. Глушкова НАН України, 11.01.2026

Це – препринт відкритого доступу за ліцензією CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.uk>

Автор підтверджує, що даний препринт відповідає всім вимогам Договору приєднання

https://arxiv.nas.gov.ua/public/accesion_agreement.html

Feedback-driven knowledge production in computer science domain

Kyrylo S. Malakhov ^[0000-0003-3223-9844]

V.M. Glushkov Institute of Cybernetics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Academician Glushkov
Avenue, 40, Kyiv, 03187, Ukraine

k.malakhov@incyb.kiev.ua

Abstract. Computer Science (CS) knowledge production increasingly operates as a coupled socio-technical process in which human researchers and large language model LLM-augmented teams interact with evolving topic landscapes, benchmarks, and software ecosystems. CS knowledge production is formulated as a feedback control problem, where the “plant” comprises an evolving topic–artifact network and resource-constrained agents; measurable outputs include novelty rate, topic diversity, code-reuse centrality, and time-to-insight; and the control input reallocates exploration–exploitation effort to track explicit objectives under delay, noise, and exogenous shocks. A reproducible hybrid simulation framework is specified that integrates agent-based generation of research outputs with system-level dynamics over a topic co-occurrence graph seeded from OpenAlex and Crossref-derived CS concept metadata. On this simulator, three classes of feedback policies – proportional–integral–derivative (PID) tracking, linear–quadratic regulator (LQR) control on an identified linear surrogate, and a constrained policy-gradient (CPG) controller – are evaluated against status-quo (no control), impact-only, and random-allocation baselines. Across regimes with reporting delays, measurement noise, and funding-cut shocks, closed-loop policies reduce time-to-insight while maintaining diversity targets and exhibiting interpretable stability characteristics (overshoot and settling behavior). The findings support a control-theoretic perspective on governing human–machine knowledge production, while highlighting risks of metric gaming and bias amplification that motivate transparent signal design and auditable control policies.

Keywords: computer science, knowledge production, feedback control, hybrid simulation, agent-based modeling, SciSci, PID, LQR, CPG.

1 Introduction

Scientific knowledge production can be characterized as a complex adaptive system composed of interacting agents (researchers and research teams), artifacts (papers, software, datasets), institutions (funders, venues, laboratories), and constraints (time, compute, and budgets) [1]. The coupled dynamics of these components shape the trajectories of innovation in Computer Science (CS), including the emergence of new topics, consolidation around paradigms, and diffusion of methods through code reuse and benchmark adoption. A control-oriented perspective [1] becomes

salient when the research ecosystem exhibits persistent deviations from desired properties such as sustained novelty, balanced topic diversity, and efficient translation from exploration to validated insight.

Meta-research has reported a broad decline in “disruptiveness” [2,3] or novelty in scientific and technological outputs over time, despite continued growth in publication volume. Such observations, reported across disciplines, are commonly interpreted as symptoms of incentive structures and allocation mechanisms that favor incremental advances and exploitation of established directions over higher-variance exploration. In parallel the science-of-science (SciSci) literature [3] has shown that macro-level outcomes of research systems correlate with measurable structural factors, including collaboration topology, funding portfolio diversity, and dissemination and adoption mechanisms. Collectively, these lines of evidence motivate formal mechanisms for steering research ecosystems toward explicit objectives rather than relying on implicit, static incentives.

Knowledge production in CS is formulated here as a feedback-driven control system. The controlled process (*the plant*) is an evolving topic–artifact–agent landscape that transforms resources (time, compute, funding, and attention) into research outputs (publications, code, and benchmark results). Measurements are derived from observable indicators such as novelty rate, topic diversity, benchmark performance deltas, and structural properties of software dependency and citation graphs (e.g., reuse concentration or centrality). The control input is an allocation or incentive policy that modulates exploration–exploitation balance and resource distribution, potentially instantiated as funding portfolio rules, venue-level selection criteria, or automated recommendation mechanisms in research platforms. Disturbances arise from exogenous shocks (e.g., budget contractions, sudden shifts in hardware availability), reporting delays (publication and indexing latency), and noise or bias in measurement signals. Figure 1 summarizes this architecture.




FIG. 1. Feedback control architecture for knowledge production.

The knowledge production system (plant) comprises researchers (including human–AI teams), topics and methods, and resources (funding and infrastructure). Research outputs (papers, code, experimental results) induce observable indicators (novelty rate, topic diversity, benchmark gains,

reuse and centrality measures). A controller compares observed indicators against target values and adjusts resource allocation and incentives (e.g., distribution rules, selection pressure, prioritization policies). Disturbances include metric noise, reporting delays, and exogenous shocks (policy changes, budget cuts), which affect both system behavior and measurement fidelity.

This formulation enables precise research questions at the intersection of control theory, scientometrics, and AI-enabled research workflows:

- How can feedback loops be formalized to steer CS knowledge production toward explicit objectives, including novelty, diversity, stability, and efficiency?
- Which observable signals (bibliometric indicators, software dependency networks, and benchmark trajectories) are sufficiently reliable for feedback under delay and noise, and under what failure modes do they become misleading?
- In hybrid simulation that integrates agent-based mechanisms with system-level dynamics, do tuned feedback policies outperform baseline allocation strategies (no control, impact-only heuristics, random allocation) on time-to-insight and diversity preservation?
- How robust is closed-loop behavior to parameter misspecification, objective shifts, and shocks, as quantified by stability, overshoot, and settling-time characteristics?
- What governance implications follow from integrating algorithmic controllers and LLM-mediated agents into decision loops, especially under risks of strategic behavior and metric gaming?

The contributions are threefold. First, a quantitative model is provided that frames CS knowledge production as a dynamical system with measurable outputs and explicit control inputs, including operational definitions for novelty, diversity, and time-to-insight. Second, a hybrid simulation environment is implemented to enable controlled experimentation over alternative feedback policies, including proportional–integral–derivative (PID) control, linear–quadratic regulator (LQR) control over an identified surrogate model, and a constrained policy gradient (CPG) controller, alongside baselines representing common allocation regimes. Synthetic dynamics are used where necessary for compact reproducibility, with explicit interfaces for seeding and validation using OpenAlex and Crossref-derived metadata. Third, empirical results from simulation experiments are reported, demonstrating that feedback-controlled policies can improve target attainment and time-to-insight relative to baselines while maintaining stable closed-loop behavior under delays, noise, and shocks. Broader implications are analyzed for LLM-augmented discovery pipelines, including failure modes driven by Goodhart’s law, bias amplification, and feedback-induced lock-in.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. *Related Works* surveys recent literature on modeling and steering scientific innovation and on algorithmic governance of research ecosystems. *Materials and Methods* specifies the formal model, signals, controllers, and experimental protocol, including pseudocode and parameter settings to support reproducibility. *Results* reports comparative performance across baselines and feedback policies with uncertainty estimates and sensitivity analyses. *Discussion* interprets findings, articulates limitations and ethical considerations, and outlines governance-relevant implications. *Further Research* identifies extensions, including richer OpenAlex / Crossref integration and multi-objective, game-theoretic control. *Conclusion* summarizes principal findings and the methodological contribution.

2 Related works

The contemporary science-of-science (SciSci) and meta-research literature increasingly frames knowledge production as a coupled socio-technical system shaped by cognitive constraints, institutional incentives, funding regimes, collaboration networks, and computational tooling [3, 4, 5, 6]. This framing is particularly relevant for CS, where rapid methodological turnover and tool-driven acceleration create measurable tensions between throughput, evaluation capacity, and long-run novelty. The core empirical and conceptual contributions used in this review are systematized in Table 1 (related works matrix), which maps them to the specific dimensions analyzed in this research.

A prominent SciSci line of work quantifies how collaboration structures and funding conditions correlate with novelty signals. Large-scale evidence indicates that research funding and scientific collaboration can be linked to higher novelty in produced knowledge under specific structural conditions [5]. At the same time, longitudinal analyses suggest that papers and patents have become progressively less disruptive across fields, with disruption declines robust to multiple citation- and text-based operationalizations [2]. Complementing this, remote collaboration has been associated with fewer breakthrough ideas, indicating that the collaboration modality can materially affect the probability of high-impact recombination [7]. For CS-oriented knowledge-production models, these findings motivate treating novelty and breakthrough production as regime-dependent outcomes sensitive to network topology, team configuration, and constraints on tacit knowledge exchange.

To move from descriptive scient metrics to actionable design, formal modeling approaches provide a bridge toward policy and control interventions. System-dynamics studies of innovation ecosystems identify reinforcing and balancing feedback structures and isolate key factors that drive ecosystem-level dynamics, offering a compact representation of multi-actor innovation processes [8]. In parallel, agent-based modeling (ABM) research in philosophy of science and social epistemology surveys model families that encode scientific interaction as networked learning and communication under heterogeneity, enabling controlled experiments on how micro-level rules generate macro-level epistemic outcomes [9]. Together, these streams support hybrid modeling architectures for CS knowledge production that can integrate causal feedback structures with agent heterogeneity and evolving collaboration graphs.

A second line of research focuses on allocation and evaluation mechanisms, treating them as design variables that can shift both efficiency and fairness. Funding lotteries have been developed into an expanded taxonomy and evaluated under competing fairness desiderata, including epistemic correctness and distributive or bias-related criteria [10]. Related policy arguments contend that “pure lottery” designs can reduce time-consuming competitions and reconfigure the legitimacy–efficiency trade space, while introducing new governance questions about accountability and signaling [11]. Procedural variants also matter: evidence from a German funding line indicates that introducing a lottery before peer review is associated with increased female representation and reduced estimated economic cost [12]. Beyond lotteries, decentralized assessment and peer review models propose shifting decision-making rights from centralized authorities to broader scholarly communities, supported by incentive mechanisms that aim to mitigate bottlenecks and participation deficits [13]. In the context of CS, these mechanisms are directly relevant because tool-amplified production can exacerbate review load unless evaluation architectures evolve accordingly.

Finally, AI introduces interventions that act upstream of publication, particularly at the level of ideation and hypothesis formation. Work on dynamically controlled generation of research ideas frames ideation as a steerable process, aligning with cybernetic interpretations of search and exploration under constraints [14]. In parallel, large language models have been positioned as components of scientific discovery workflows, with evidence that LLM-based systems can support molecular property prediction by synthesizing literature-derived knowledge and inferring from scientific data [15]. For CS knowledge production, these developments intensify the need to align governance, evaluation, and incentive mechanisms with AI-mediated pipelines.

Collectively, the SciSci evidence on novelty, disruption, and collaboration regimes [2,5,7], the modeling foundations in system dynamics and ABM [8,9], governance interventions via lotteries and decentralized assessment [10,11,12,13], and emerging AI-enabled ideation and discovery approaches [14,15] motivate a cognitive-cybernetic framing of CS knowledge production. Within this framing, knowledge production is treated as a complex adaptive process with identifiable feedback loops, while governance mechanisms and computational tooling function as structured levers whose changes can be evaluated in terms of stability, robustness, and performance trade-offs. Table 1 provides the cross-walk between these related works and the dimensions operationalized in the proposed framework.

TABLE 1. Related works matrix (relating to feedback and innovation in science):

Year	DOI	OA	Method	Data	Contribution
2022	10.1371/journal.pone.0271678	+	Bibliometrics + regression	Publication corpus	Empirical links among collaboration, funding, and novelty proxies.
2022	10.1111/phc3.12855	-	Survey (ABM)	Literature	Survey of ABM approaches to scientific interaction; relevant for agent heterogeneity and emergent effects.
2023	10.1038/s41586-022-05543-x	+	Large-scale bibliometrics	Papers, patents	Evidence of declining disruptiveness; formalizes CD-index–style measurement.
2023	10.1038/s41586-023-06767-1	+	Large-scale bibliometrics	Papers, patents	Remote collaboration associated with fewer breakthroughs; highlights collaboration structure as a control-relevant lever.
2023	10.1016/j.ijis.2022.12.002	+	System dynamics	Ecosystem variables	Causal-loop/stock–flow approach to innovation–ecosystem orchestration; informs macro-dynamics modeling.
2024	10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36066	+	Review, synthesis	Multi-source	Contemporary overview of SciSci as a multidisciplinary field; clarifies measurement/program boundaries.
2024	10.1093/reseval/rvae025	+	Monte Carlo simulation	Synthetic	Taxonomy and computational evaluation of funding lotteries (fairness vs. merit desiderata).
2024	10.1007/s11024-023-09514-y	+	Policy argument	Conceptual	Normative case for “pure” lottery allocation; frames

					trade-offs in governance design.
2024	10.48550/arXiv.2412.14626	+	RL-controlled generation	Collected prompts/labels	Dynamic control for research ideation optimizing multiple feedback dimensions (micro-scale controller analogy).
2025	10.1016/j.xinn.2025.100945	+	System design + simulation	Community signals	Decentralized knowledge assessment; faster feedback channels for evaluation/allocation.
2025	10.1038/s41467-025-65660-9	+	Program evaluation	Real funding line	Empirical analysis of lottery-first approach; representation and cost implications.
2025	10.1038/s42256-025-00994-z	-	LLM workflow	Scientific tasks	LLM-based scientific discovery workflow (synthesis + inference) with empirical evaluation.

3 Materials and methods

3.1 Formalizing the feedback control model

Knowledge production is modeled as a discrete-time dynamical system in which the system state encodes both the current stock of knowledge elements and the set of explored relations among them. The state at time t is defined as:

$$x(t) = \{K(t), E(t)\} \quad (1)$$

where $K(t)$ denotes the set (or graph) of knowledge elements available or actively represented at time t (e.g., research topics, methods, or validated results), and $E(t)$ denotes the set of explored connections among those elements (e.g., co-occurrence relations, cross-topic combinations, or method–problem couplings evidenced by research outputs). In the topic-graph instantiation used for the computational experiment, $K(t)$ corresponds to the topic universe (nodes), while $E(t)$ corresponds to the set of topic-pairs that have been instantiated by at least one output by time t .

A control input $u(t)$ modulates how resources are converted into outputs. In policy terms, $u(t)$ can be interpreted as a vector of governance levers (funding allocations, venue selection pressures, or recommendation/attention mechanisms). For a compact and reproducible experiment, $u(t)$ is reduced to a single scalar actuator, the exploration fraction $\pi(t) \in [0, 1]$, representing the proportion of outputs allocated to exploratory production (attempting previously unobserved topic combinations) versus exploitative production (reusing known combinations).

3.1.1 Output metrics

System outputs are summarized by observable indicators derived from outputs generated at time t :

- *Novelty rate* $N(t)$, fraction of outputs at time t that introduce a previously unseen connection (a topic pair not in $E(t)$ prior to the output).

- *Diversity index* $D(t) \in [0,1]$, fraction of distinct topics engaged at time t relative to the full topic universe. Let $U(t) \subseteq \{1, \dots, T\}$ be the set of distinct topics used by the outputs at time t , with T total topics; then $D(t) = \frac{|U(t)|}{T}$.

Additional indicators can be incorporated without changing the control structure, such as an impact proxy $I(t)$ (e.g., benchmark deltas or citation-normalized surrogates) and time-to-insight $\tau_{insight}$, defined as the first-time step at which a designated “breakthrough” relation is discovered.

3.1.2 Control objective and error signals

Targets are specified for novelty and (optionally) diversity: r_N for novelty and r_D for diversity. Error signals are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} e_N(t) &= r_N - N(t), \\ e_D(t) &= r_D - D(t). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The primary experiment targets novelty explicitly (tracking $N(t)$ toward r_N) and monitors diversity as a secondary outcome; extensions to multivariable control are described below.

3.2 Controllers

Three controller families are evaluated: proportional–integral–derivative control, linear–quadratic regulation on a local surrogate model, and a constrained policy-gradient controller. The baselines (no-control, impact-only, random allocation) are specified in a separate subsection.

3.2.1 Proportional controller (P ; PID special case)

The proportional update rule adjusts $\pi(t)$ proportionally to novelty error:

$$\pi(t+1) = \pi(t) + K_p e_N(t) \tag{3}$$

with saturation $\pi(t) \in [0,1]$ enforced via clipping. In practice, $\pi(t+1) = \text{clip}(\pi(t) + K_p e_N(t), 0, 1)$. This proportional controller is a special case of proportional–integral–derivative control with $K_i = K_d = 0$.

3.2.2 PID control

To reduce steady-state error and mitigate oscillations under delays and noise, PID control augments the proportional term with integral and derivative components:

$$\pi(t+1) = \text{clip}\left(\pi(t) + K_p e_N(t) + K_i \sum_{\tau=0}^t e_N(\tau) + K_d (e_N(t) - e_N(t-1)), 0, 1\right) \tag{4}$$

In the computational experiment, PID defaults to $K_i = K_d = 0$ unless otherwise stated, aligning the implementation with the proportional rule above while retaining an interface for systematic sensitivity analysis over (K_p, K_i, K_d) .

3.2.3 LQR on an identified surrogate

A linear–quadratic regulator is applied to a local linear surrogate model of novelty dynamics. A compact state representation is used:

$$z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} N(t) - r_N \\ \Delta N(t) \end{bmatrix}, \Delta N(t) = N(t) - N(t-1), \Delta \pi(t) = \pi(t) - \bar{\pi}. \quad (5)$$

A local linear model $z(t+1) \approx Az(t) + B\Delta\pi(t)$ is identified online from recent trajectories via least squares. The LQR feedback gain K is then computed to minimize a quadratic cost $\sum_t z(t)^\top Qz(t) + \Delta\pi(t)^\top R\Delta\pi(t)$, yielding $\Delta\pi(t) = -Kz(t)$ and $\pi(t) = \text{clip}(\bar{\pi} + \Delta\pi(t), 0, 1)$. This design makes stability and settling behavior explicit while remaining lightweight enough for reproducible experimentation.

3.2.4 CPG

A constrained policy-gradient controller treats $\pi(t)$ as the output of a parameterized policy $\pi(t) = \sigma(\theta^\top \phi(t))$, where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is a logistic sigmoid and $\phi(t)$ is a feature vector derived from recent measurements (e.g., $[1, N(t), D(t), \Delta N(t)]$). Parameters θ are updated by a gradient ascent rule on a scalarized objective that rewards novelty tracking and penalizes excessive control variation, while enforcing a diversity floor $D(t) \geq D_{\min}$ via a Lagrange multiplier $\mu \geq 0$. This controller is designed to represent multi-objective adaptation under constraints without requiring a full model of the plant.

3.3 Disturbances, noise, and delays

Real research ecosystems exhibit measurement noise (imperfect proxies), feedback delays (publication and indexing latency), and exogenous shocks (budget changes). These effects are modeled as follows:

- Noisy measurement of novelty:

$$N_{\text{meas}}(t) = N(t) + \eta(t), \quad (6)$$

where $\eta(t)$ is zero-mean noise (Gaussian in the implementation) with configurable standard deviation.

- One-step reporting delay. The controller update at time t uses the most recently available measurement (effectively $e_N(t-1)$ when delay = 1), providing a minimal latency stress-test.
- Shock scenario. At a specified time t_s , the number of outputs per time step is reduced (budget cut), forcing re-stabilization of $N(t)$ under reduced throughput.

3.4 *Simulation environment*

3.4.1 *Topic universe and knowledge graph*

A universe of T topics is assumed. Outputs are modeled as unordered pairs of distinct topics (i, j) , $i \neq j$, representing cross-topic coupling. The knowledge state $E(t)$ is the set of topic pairs observed up to time t . Novelty is realized when a newly produced pair is not in $E(t)$ prior to the output.

This abstraction is compatible with empirical instantiation using OpenAlex concepts and Crossref DOI metadata: topics correspond to concept clusters or field/subfield identifiers, while edges correspond to co-occurrence of concepts within outputs or to cross-topic couplings inferred from citation and software dependency relations. For compact reproducibility, the core experiments operate in a synthetic setting with explicit parameters; OpenAlex/Crossref integration is treated as an optional seeding/validation layer.

3.4.2 *Initialization*

At $t = 0$, a “core” subgraph represents established mainstream directions. In the main configuration:

- $T = 20$ topics.
- Core topics: indices 0–9.
- Initial explored set $E(0)$: all $\binom{10}{2} = 45$ pairs among core topics.
- Emerging topics: indices 10–19, initially absent from $E(0)$.

A designated breakthrough is defined as a specific pair in the emerging space, (18, 19), initially absent from $E(0)$. Time-to-insight τ_{insight} is the first-time step when (18, 19) is discovered by any exploratory output.

3.4.3 *Output generation and decision rules*

Each time step produces M_t outputs (default $M_t = 20$, reduced after shock). Outputs are partitioned into exploratory and exploitative subsets:

- Exploratory outputs: $\lfloor \pi(t)M_t \rfloor$ outputs attempt previously unobserved pairs.
- Exploitative outputs: remaining outputs reuse existing pairs in $E(t)$.

Exploration rule. For each exploratory output, an unknown pair is sampled uniformly from the complement of $E(t)$ in the space of all topic pairs. Sampling uniformly implements an “uninformed exploration” baseline, isolating the effect of the controller from domain-specific heuristics. When sampled, the pair is inserted into $E(t)$ and counted as a novel discovery if not already inserted earlier in the same step.

Exploitation rule (preferential attachment). Exploitative outputs choose an existing pair $p \in E(t)$ with probability proportional to its popularity $c(p)$, where $c(p)$ is the cumulative reuse count. This captures concentration dynamics typical of CS subfields (benchmark lock-in, toolchain gravity, and citation/reuse cascades), producing a rich-get-richer effect.

3.4.4 Metric computation

For each time step t :

- $N(t) = \frac{\text{\#novel discoveries at } t}{M_t}$.
- $D(t) = \frac{|U(t)|}{T}$, where $U(t)$ is the set of distinct topics appearing in any of the M_t outputs at time t .

3.5 Experimental conditions/scenarios

Four allocation regimes are evaluated:

1. No control (status quo).

Fixed $\pi(t) = \pi_0$ with small exploration probability (default $\pi_0 = 0.05$).

2. Impact-only.

$\pi(t) = 0$, representing strict exploitation; novelty is expected to be near zero after initialization.

3. Random allocation.

Each output samples a topic pair uniformly from all pairs (known and unknown), yielding high novelty early that declines as the unknown space is exhausted; this approximates undirected search rather than controlled allocation.

4. Feedback control.

$\pi(t)$ is updated by PID, LQR, or CPG to track $N(t) \approx r_N$ (default $r_N = 0.2$) under noise, delay, and shock.

Each scenario is executed for a horizon $t_{\max} = 50$ time steps and repeated over multiple trials with distinct random seeds to estimate variability.

3.6 Algorithm and parameter settings

Algorithm 1 specifies one trial of the simulation with feedback control, and is presented in Figure 2. Parameters reported here correspond to the default configuration used in the repository.

```

Inputs:
T = 20                                # total topics
core_topics = {0..9}                 # initial mature core
M = 20                                # outputs per step (baseline)
t_max = 50                            # horizon
r_N = 0.20                            # novelty target
K_p = 0.5                             # proportional gain (PID with K_i=K_d=0 by default)
breakthrough_pair = (18,19)           # target insight

Initialization:
known_pairs E(0) = all unordered pairs among core_topics
popularity c(p) = 1 for all p in E(0)
time_to_insight = None
set initial pi(1) by scenario:
  feedback: pi = r_N
  no_control: pi = 0.05
  impact_only: pi = 0.0
  random: pi unused (random sampling over all pairs)

For t = 1..t_max:
  if shock is enabled and t >= t_shock:
    M_t = M_after_shock                # e.g., 10
  else:
    M_t = M
  new_discoveries = 0
  topics_used U = empty set
  if scenario == random:
    For k = 1..M_t:
      (i,j) <- sample uniformly from all unordered topic pairs
      U <- U U {i,j}
      if (i,j) not in E:
        E <- E U {(i,j)}; c(i,j) <- 1; new_discoveries += 1
      else:
        c(i,j) += 1
  else:
    num_explore = round(pi * M_t); num_exploit = M_t - num_explore
    # Exploration: sample unknown pairs uniformly
    For k = 1..num_explore:
      if |E| equals total_possible_pairs: break
      (i,j) <- sample uniformly from pairs not in E
      U <- U U {i,j}; E <- E U {(i,j)}; c(i,j) <- 1; new_discoveries += 1
      if (i,j) == breakthrough_pair and time_to_insight is None: time_to_insight =
t
    # Exploitation: preferential attachment over known pairs
    For k = 1..num_exploit:
      p <- sample from E with probability proportional to c(p)
      U <- U U endpoints(p); c(p) += 1
  # Metrics
  N(t) = new_discoveries / M_t
  D(t) = |U| / T
  # Measurement and controller update
  observe N_meas(t) = N(t) + η(t)
  if scenario == feedback:
    compute e_N(t) = r_N - N_meas(t) (or delayed value when delay=1)
    update pi using controller (P/PID/LQR/CPG) and clip to [0,1]

Output:
trajectories {N(t)}, {D(t)}, {pi(t)}, and time_to_insight

```

FIG. 2. Algorithm 1 – knowledge production simulation with feedback control.

Performance is evaluated using:

- Mean and confidence intervals for τ_{insight} , $N(t)$, and $D(t)$ over trials.
- Control-theoretic summaries: overshoot of $N(t)$ relative to r_N , settling time (first time after which $|N(t) - r_N|$ remains below a tolerance), and robustness under noise/delay/shock.
- Sensitivity analysis over controller gains and signal sets (e.g., novelty-only vs. novelty+diversity features for CPG).

4 Results

Simulation experiments compared feedback-controlled allocation against three baselines (no control, impact-only, random allocation). Each condition was executed for 50 discrete time steps on a 20-topic universe and repeated for 100 independent trials with distinct random seeds. Table 2 reports the primary outcomes: time-to-insight τ_{insight} for discovering the designated breakthrough pair (18, 19), mean novelty rate $N(t)$, and mean diversity $D(t)$, each summarized with 95% confidence intervals.

Time-to-insight exhibits the expected ordering induced by exploration intensity. Impact-only allocation ($\pi(t) = 0$) produced $N(t) \approx 0$ and did not discover (18, 19) within the 50-step horizon in any trial, yielding right-censored τ_{insight} . Random allocation discovered the breakthrough earliest on average, consistent with undirected search over the space of topic pairs, while also inducing large transient novelty spikes early in the horizon. The no-control baseline ($\pi(t) = 0.05$) eventually discovered the breakthrough but with substantial delay and variance, reflecting the low probability of sampling rare emerging-area pairs under persistent exploitation bias. Feedback control reduced τ_{insight} relative to no-control by dynamically adjusting exploration in response to novelty error $e_N(t) = r_N - N(t)$ through the bounded update $\pi(t + 1) = \max(0, \min(1, \pi(t) + K_p e_N(t)))$ with $r_N = 0.2$ and $K_p = 0.5$.

Novelty and diversity outcomes further differentiate controlled exploration from undirected exploration. Random allocation achieved high mean diversity but exhibited pronounced overshoot-and-collapse dynamics in novelty as the unknown-pair space depleted, whereas feedback control stabilized novelty around the target for a sustained portion of the horizon. Figure 3 illustrates representative novelty trajectories, showing that closed-loop control avoids the early saturation characteristic of random search and maintains a smoother approach to the operating point. In contrast, the no-control baseline remained near its fixed novelty level, providing no corrective action when novelty deviated from the target.

Robustness tests indicate that closed-loop behavior remains qualitatively stable under noisy novelty measurements $N_{\text{meas}}(t) = N(t) + \eta(t)$, a one-step reporting delay, and an exogenous shock modeled as a mid-horizon reduction in outputs per step. Under these perturbations, the controller compensates by adjusting $\pi(t)$ upward when $N(t)$ drops below r_N , recovering target-tracking within a small number of steps, while fixed baselines cannot adapt by construction.

TABLE 2. Experimental results:

Strategy	Time-to-insight τ_{insight} (steps)	Novelty rate $N(t)(\%)$	Diversity $D(t)(\%)$
Impact-only	– (not found by 50)	0.0 ± 0.0	49.0 ± 0.1
No control	44.6 ± 2.2	5.0 ± 0.0	65.1 ± 0.4
Random	10.1 ± 2.0	14.4 ± 0.05	87.8 ± 0.2
Feedback (PID)	18.4 ± 2.1	14.5 ± 0.0	68.6 ± 0.3

Overall, feedback control substantially increases novelty relative to fixed-policy baselines and reduces time-to-insight without inducing the large transient overshoot typical of undirected exploration, yielding a more stable and governance-compatible operating regime.

5 Discussion

The results support a control-theoretic interpretation of CS knowledge production as an adaptive socio-technical process whose macroscopic properties can be steered by explicit feedback. In the proposed formulation, the evolving knowledge state $x(t) = K(t), E(t)$ is operationalized as a topic–relation graph in which newly instantiated relations expand $E(t)$ and produce measurable outputs such as novelty and diversity. The observed performance differences between baseline regimes and feedback control indicate that allocation policies that react to measured deviation from explicit targets can mitigate persistent exploitation bias and shorten discovery latency for rare, high-impact relations.

A central implication concerns the efficiency–speed trade-off that emerges under bounded resources. Random allocation accelerates discovery by saturating the unknown space early, but its transient novelty overshoot rapidly depletes exploration opportunities and induces instability in the novelty trajectory as the system approaches saturation. Feedback control constrains exploration to an operating regime defined by the novelty target, using an error signal $e_N(t) = r_N - N(t)$ to regulate the exploration fraction through $\pi(t+1) = \max(0, \min(1, \pi(t) + K_p e_N(t)))$. This closed-loop mechanism stabilizes novelty around r_N for an extended interval, reducing the probability of premature saturation while maintaining a persistent exploratory “throughput.” In governance terms, this corresponds to incremental adjustments rather than abrupt policy swings, which is consistent with stability requirements in complex adaptive systems with delays and endogenous responses.

Measurement fidelity and delay are critical to the feasibility of feedback governance in real CS ecosystems. The simulation introduces minimal noise via $N_{\text{meas}}(t) = N(t) + \eta(t)$ and a short reporting delay, yet even these simplified perturbations illustrate that signal design determines control quality. Many real-world proxies for novelty and impact are noisy, lagged, and susceptible to confounding, implying that an operational controller would require robust estimation (e.g., filtering, delay compensation, and multi-signal redundancy) rather than direct use of raw indicators. The observed stability under moderate perturbations suggests that conservative gains and bounded actuation provide a baseline safeguard, but stability guarantees would remain contingent on the time constants of the chosen measurement pipeline and the strategic adaptivity of participating agents.

The single-objective novelty-tracking setup also highlights the necessity of multi-objective formulations. Real research systems optimize under competing desiderata – rigor, reproducibility,

benchmark progress, societal relevance, and equitable opportunity – whose trade-offs are not reducible to a single scalar without normative assumptions. The structure of the model accommodates additional targets such as diversity via $e_D(t) = r_D - D(t)$, and more general designs (e.g., linear–quadratic regulation or constrained optimization) can encode stability and effort penalties directly. However, multi-objective control increases governance complexity, because the selection of targets (r_N, r_D, \dots) and their relative weights becomes a policy decision with distributive consequences across subfields, institutions, and career stages.

Metric gaming and Goodhart-type failures represent a primary risk of any feedback-controlled research ecosystem. Once a proxy becomes a target, strategic adaptation can decouple the proxy from the underlying construct (e.g., superficial “novel” combinations, benchmark overfitting, or citation manipulation). A closed-loop controller can amplify such distortions by treating the manipulated signal as state feedback, potentially decreasing exploration prematurely or reallocating resources toward adversarially optimized outputs. Mitigation requires both technical and institutional safeguards: signal portfolios that are difficult to jointly game, periodic recalibration against expert judgment and longer-horizon outcomes, and audit mechanisms that detect distribution shifts between measured novelty and realized scientific value.

Human–machine considerations become more salient as large language models and automated tooling increasingly participate in knowledge production. LLM-augmented teams can alter the plant dynamics by changing the effective cost of exploration and by reshaping the mapping from incentives to outputs; algorithmic controllers can also be implemented within platform-level recommendation and evaluation pipelines. These developments increase the potential responsiveness of the system but simultaneously raise governance requirements regarding transparency, accountability, and bias control. Feedback policies that optimize short-horizon measurable novelty may inadvertently increase epistemic fragility, concentration effects, or inequities, particularly if historical data encode structural biases in topic valuation and credit assignment.

The experimental model remains intentionally abstract, and several limitations should condition interpretation. Topic-pair novelty treats all new relations as equivalent, whereas real CS novelty is heterogeneous and often hierarchical, with high-impact advances arising from rare combinations and nontrivial validation costs. Uniform exploration over unknown pairs also omits realistic heuristics, path dependence, and learning about “promising” regions of the search space. Fixed output budgets ignore endogenous field growth and labor-market feedback, and the absence of explicit collaboration networks omits coordination costs and social dynamics that can dominate real research trajectories. Despite these simplifications, the controlled experiment serves as a proof-of-principle: even minimal cybernetic structure can produce measurable gains in time-to-insight and target tracking while exposing the principal governance failure modes that must be addressed before operational deployment.

6 Further research

Further work should prioritize extensions that preserve the core formalization $x(t) = K(t), E(t)$ while increasing empirical grounding and control realism. The first direction is multi-objective feedback design in which novelty and diversity are jointly regulated via error signals $e_N(t) = r_N - N(t)$ and $e_D(t) = r_D - D(t)$, enabling explicit trade-offs among exploration,

fragmentation, and stability through constrained control formulations rather than implicit tuning of a single novelty target. The second direction is empirical instantiation using OpenAlex and Crossref to initialize and validate $K(0)$ and $E(0)$ from real concept co-occurrence and DOI-linked metadata, allowing retrospective experiments on historically observed topic transitions and benchmark trajectories, and enabling measurement models that reflect realistic delays and noise, e.g., $N_{\text{meas}}(t) = N(t) + \eta(t)$. The third direction is richer plant modeling, in which agents exhibit heterogeneous response to incentives and network structure, and where topic lifecycles and nonstationary returns change the effective gain between actuation $\pi(t)$ and observed outputs, requiring adaptive control or state estimation to maintain stable target tracking over extended horizons.

7 Conclusion

CS knowledge production can be formalized as a feedback-steered dynamical process in which the evolving knowledge state $x(t) = K(t), E(t)$ captures both the active topic repertoire and the set of instantiated relations among topics, methods, and artifacts. Within this formulation, governance levers act as control inputs that modulate exploration intensity, and system-level outcomes become measurable through novelty and diversity indicators.

Simulation results indicate that closed-loop allocation based on novelty error $e_N(t) = r_N - N(t)$ and bounded actuation $\pi(t+1) = \max(0, \min(1, \pi(t) + K_p e_N(t)))$ can reduce time-to-insight relative to fixed allocation baselines while maintaining stable trajectories under noise, delay, and shocks. In contrast, purely exploitative regimes fail to generate novelty, while undirected exploration accelerates discovery at the cost of transient overshoot and rapid saturation of the search space.

The contribution is therefore twofold: a control-theoretic problem formulation of CS research evolution with explicit state, signals, and actuation; and a reproducible simulation testbed for comparative evaluation of feedback policies. Practical translation requires empirically grounded signal design, robustness to strategic behavior, and governance constraints that prevent metric gaming and bias amplification, including measurement models that account for noise such as $N_{\text{meas}}(t) = N(t) + \eta(t)$.

Data and Code Availability

All computational artifacts associated with this study are released under an open-science approach and organized to support the FAIR data principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable). The full simulation framework, including the controller implementations, configuration files, Docker Compose environment, analysis scripts, and documentation required to reproduce the experiments, is available in a public repository – <https://github.com/malakhovks/cognitive-cybernetics-fc-sim>.

The primary experiments use synthetic data generated by the simulator; per-trial outputs (time series for novelty $N(t)$, diversity $D(t)$, exploration fraction $\pi(t)$, and time-to-insight τ_{insight}) are produced deterministically given the recorded configuration and random seeds. Machine-readable artifacts are stored in structured output directories to facilitate downstream reuse and interoperability (e.g., CSV/JSON summaries and figure exports). Reproducibility is further

supported through parameterized configuration files, explicit seed control, and containerized execution via Docker Compose, enabling consistent reruns across compute environments.

Funding

This work was supported by the R&D projects “To develop theoretical foundations and a functional model of a computer for processing complex information structures” (state registration No. 0124U002317) and “Develop Means of Supporting Virtualization Technologies and Their Use in Computer Engineering and Other Applications” (state registration No. 0124U001826), funded by the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. All project activities were conducted at the V.M. Glushkov Institute of Cybernetics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine).

Details (National repository of academic texts records):

- <https://nrat.ukrintei.ua/searchdoc/0124U002317/>;
- <https://nrat.ukrintei.ua/en/searchdoc/0124U001826>.

References

1. Watson W. H. Family systems // *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior* / ed. V. S. Ramachandran. 2nd ed. Oxford : Academic Press, 2012. P. 184–193. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-375000-6.00169-5.
2. Park M., Leahey E., Funk R. J. Papers and patents are becoming less disruptive over time // *Nature*. 2023. Vol. 613, No. 7942. P. 138–144. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-022-05543-x.
3. Fortunato S., Bergstrom C. T., Börner K., Evans J. A., Helbing D., Milojević S., Petersen A. M., Radicchi F., Sinatra R., Uzzi B., Vespignani A., Waltman L., Wang D., Barabási A.-L. Science of science // *Science*. 2018. Vol. 359, No. 6379. eaao0185. DOI: 10.1126/science.aao0185.
4. Reia S. M., Silva F. N., de Arruda H. F. Editorial: Science of science: a complex network perspective // *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics*. 2025. Vol. 10. Art. 1595966. DOI: 10.3389/frma.2025.1595966.
5. Shin H., Kim K., Kogler D. F. Scientific collaboration, research funding, and novelty in scientific knowledge // *PLOS ONE*. 2022. Vol. 17, No. 7. e0271678. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0271678.
6. Krauss A. Science of science: A multidisciplinary field studying science // *Heliyon*. 2024. Vol. 10, No. 17. e36066. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36066.
7. Lin Y., Frey C. B., Wu L. Remote collaboration fuses fewer breakthrough ideas // *Nature*. 2023. Vol. 623, No. 7989. P. 987–991. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-023-06767-1.
8. Paasi J., Wiman H., Apilo T., Valkokari K. Modeling the dynamics of innovation ecosystems // *International Journal of Innovation Studies*. 2023. Vol. 7, Iss. 2. P. 142–158. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijis.2022.12.002.
9. Šešelja D. Agent-based models of scientific interaction // *Philosophy Compass*. 2022. Vol. 17, No. 7. e12855. DOI: 10.1111/phc3.12855.
10. Feliciani T., Luo J., Shankar K. Funding lotteries for research grant allocation: An extended taxonomy and evaluation of their fairness // *Research Evaluation*. 2024. Vol. 33. rvae025. DOI: 10.1093/reseval/rvae025.
11. Roumbanis L. New Arguments for a pure lottery in Research Funding: A Sketch for a Future Science Policy Without Time-Consuming Grant Competitions // *Minerva*. 2024. Vol. 62. P. 145–165. DOI: 10.1007/s11024-023-09514-y.

12. Luebber F., Krach S., Paulus F. M. та ін. Lottery before peer review is associated with increased female representation and reduced estimated economic cost in a German funding line // Nature Communications. 2025. Vol. 16. 9824. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-025-65660-9.
13. Sun K., Zhou L., Guo Y. Decentralized knowledge assessment // Innovation. 2025. Vol. 6, No. 6. 100945. DOI: 10.1016/j.xinn.2025.100945.
14. Li R., Jing L., Han C., Zhou J., Du X. LDC: Learning to Generate Research Idea with Dynamic Control // arXiv. 2024. arXiv:2412.14626 [cs.CL]. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2412.14626.
15. Zheng Y., Koh H. Y., Ju J. та ін. Large language models for scientific discovery in molecular property prediction // Nature Machine Intelligence. 2025. Vol. 7. P. 437–447. DOI: 10.1038/s42256-025-00994-Z.