SINOMIKA JOURNAL
PUBLIKASI ILMIAH BIDANG EKONOMI & AKUNTANSI
ISSN (e): 2829-9701

Application of Agent-Based Model in Financial Risk Assessment: A New Perspective in Risk Management

Raden Rudi Alhempi[1]*, Supot Rattanapun[2]
Universitas Persada Bunda Indonesia[1],
Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Thailand[2]
Email: rudi.alhempi@upbi.ac.id[1]*, Supot.r@mail.rmutk.ac.th[2]

Abstract

Financial risk management plays a crucial role in ensuring the stability and resilience of financial markets. Traditional models, such as Value at Risk (VaR) and Monte Carlo simulations, have been widely used to assess risks; however, they often fail to account for complex, dynamic interactions between market participants. This paper explores the application of Agent-Based Models (ABMs) as an innovative approach to financial risk assessment. ABMs simulate the interactions between heterogeneous agents, such as investors, banks, and regulators, providing a more realistic representation of financial systems. The study highlights the strengths of ABMs in capturing systemic risks, non-linear dynamics, and emergent phenomena like market crashes, herd behavior, and contagion. The results demonstrate that ABMs can enhance the understanding of financial risk by modeling individual behaviors and their impact on market stability. Through simulation experiments, the paper shows how ABMs can complement traditional risk management tools by providing deeper insights into the systemic nature of financial crises. The findings suggest that ABMs offer valuable advantages over conventional models, particularly in assessing market volatility and the resilience of financial institutions. This research contributes to the growing body of literature advocating for the integration of ABMs into financial risk management frameworks.

Keywords: Agent-Based Models, Financial Risk Assessment, Systemic Risk, Market Volatility.

INTRODUCTION

Financial risk management is an essential aspect of modern financial markets, aimed at identifying, analyzing, and mitigating the risks that threaten the stability of financial institutions and economies. These risks may include credit risk, market risk, liquidity risk, operational risk, and systemic risk, all of which can cause significant losses if not properly managed. Over the years, various quantitative models and techniques have been developed to assess and manage financial risk. Among these, Value at Risk (VaR) and Monte Carlo simulations have been the most widely used tools.

Value at Risk (VaR) is a risk management tool that measures the potential loss in value of an asset or portfolio over a defined period for a given confidence interval. While effective in certain contexts, VaR has been criticized for its inability to model extreme tail events and systemic risks, which played a significant role in the financial crises. Monte Carlo simulations, which are used to model the probability of different outcomes in a process that cannot easily be predicted due to the intervention of random variables, also have limitations, particularly in their computational complexity and dependence on assumptions about the underlying processes.

Despite the usefulness of these traditional models, the financial crises of the past, particularly the 2008 global financial crisis, demonstrated the limitations of conventional risk assessment models. These events highlighted how traditional models often fail to capture complex market dynamics, emergent behaviors, and systemic risks—risks that arise from the interaction of various market participants rather than from isolated individual risks. This has prompted the financial community to seek alternative risk management frameworks that can provide more accurate and comprehensive insights into the stability of financial systems.

The traditional financial risk management models generally rely on linear assumptions and fail to adequately capture the complexity and non-linearity inherent in financial markets. The growing complexity of global financial markets, with their interconnectedness, non-linear interactions, and sudden market shifts, requires innovative methods to assess risk. These limitations became evident during the 2008 financial crisis, which was largely driven by interconnectedness between financial institutions, cross-border capital flows, and the behavior of market participants. Traditional models often failed to predict the cascading effects of one institution's failure on others, showing that a paradigm shift in risk modeling was necessary.

Financial systems are dynamic and constantly evolving. The interactions between agents in the financial market—such as banks, traders, investors, and regulators—are complex and often lead to emergent phenomena such as market bubbles, liquidity crises, and sudden price shifts. To address this, risk management strategies must go beyond individual risk assessment and account for the collective behavior of market participants. One promising approach to this challenge is the use of agent-based modeling (ABM), a technique that provides a flexible framework to model such complex interactions.

Agent-based modeling (ABM) is a computational modeling approach that simulates the interactions of autonomous agents within a defined environment. Each agent in the model has a set of rules or behaviors, and their actions, decisions, and interactions lead to the emergence of complex system-level phenomena. ABMs have been used across various disciplines, such as economics, sociology, and biology, to simulate and study systems characterized by complexity, non-linearity, and dynamic behaviors.

In an ABM, agents represent individual entities or actors, such as banks, firms, or consumers, each of which has its own set of attributes and decision-making rules. These agents interact with each other, and the results of these interactions influence the overall behavior of the system. In the context of financial markets, agents can represent various market participants, such as traders who make decisions based on price trends, investors who adjust their portfolios based on risk perceptions, or regulatory authorities who respond to systemic risks.

The key strength of ABM is its ability to model the heterogeneity and adaptive behavior of agents. Unlike traditional models that often rely on assumptions of homogeneity and rationality, ABMs can incorporate a wide variety of agent types, behaviors, and decision rules, which allows for more realistic simulations of financial systems. ABMs can also capture the interactions between agents that lead to emergent market behaviors such as market crashes, bubbles, or herd behavior, which are difficult to predict using traditional models.

In financial markets, the risk is often determined not only by individual events or agents but also by the interactions between those agents. For instance, the failure of a major financial institution can trigger a cascade of failures among interconnected institutions, resulting in a financial crisis. Similarly, herding behavior among investors—where individuals mimic the decisions of others—can lead to asset bubbles and sudden market crashes. These phenomena, driven by complex agent interactions, cannot be captured by traditional models, which focus on isolated risk factors.

ABMs offer a unique advantage in this context. By modeling the interactions of agents under different market conditions, ABMs can help financial institutions and regulators identify potential systemic risks, such as the contagion effects of a failing institution or the collective behavior that drives market instability. ABMs can also be used to simulate the effects of various risk scenarios, including sudden market shocks, changes in monetary policy, and regulatory interventions.

Moreover, ABMs can be integrated with other risk management tools to provide a more comprehensive risk assessment framework. For example, the results of an ABM simulation can be combined with traditional models like VaR to provide a more nuanced understanding of risk that accounts for both individual and systemic factors. This approach can lead to better decision-making and more effective risk mitigation strategies.

This paper aims to explore the potential of agent-based models in the assessment of financial risks. Specifically, it will examine how ABMs can provide new insights into the behavior of financial markets and enhance traditional risk management strategies. The article will first provide an overview of agent-based modeling and its application in financial systems, followed by a review of the literature on ABM-based risk assessment techniques. A case study will be presented to demonstrate the practical application of ABMs in financial risk assessment. Finally, the strengths, limitations, and future directions for research in this field will be discussed.

The objectives of this paper are:

a) To introduce agent-based modeling as a tool for financial risk assessment.

b) To evaluate the potential of ABMs to capture systemic risks that traditional models may overlook.
c) To explore the advantages and challenges of integrating ABMs into existing financial risk management frameworks.
d) To identify future research opportunities in the field of agent-based modeling for financial risk management.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Traditional Models of Financial Risk Assessment

Traditional risk management models have been the cornerstone of financial risk assessment for several decades. These models aim to quantify the potential losses a financial institution or investor may face under specific conditions, and they form the foundation for the strategies and regulatory frameworks that govern financial risk management. Among the most widely used models are Value at Risk (VaR), Monte Carlo simulations, and stress testing.

a) Value at Risk (VaR)

VaR is one of the most commonly used tools for financial risk management, particularly in banking and investment sectors. It measures the potential loss of an asset or portfolio over a specific time period at a given confidence level. VaR is particularly useful for calculating market risk and establishing the minimum capital requirements for financial institutions. However, its limitations are well-documented. VaR relies on assumptions about market distributions and may fail to capture extreme events that lie beyond the model's parameters. As such, it often underestimates the risk in volatile or stressed markets, and critics argue that it offers a false sense of security (Jorion, 2007).

b) *Monte Carlo Simulations*

Monte Carlo simulations are another widely used technique in risk management, particularly for evaluating complex portfolios with many variables. By simulating a large number of potential market scenarios, Monte Carlo simulations help to understand the range of possible outcomes and estimate risk measures such as VaR. While effective in handling complex situations, Monte Carlo methods often face significant computational challenges, particularly when modeling large and dynamic financial systems. Additionally, the reliability of these models depends heavily on the assumptions regarding the input parameters, which can lead to inaccurate predictions if the assumptions are not carefully calibrated (Glasserman, 2004).

c) Stress Testing

Stress testing involves simulating extreme market scenarios to assess the potential impact on a financial institution’s portfolio. Unlike VaR and Monte Carlo simulations, which focus on probable outcomes, stress tests evaluate the effects of rare and severe market shocks. Despite its importance, stress testing is limited by the scenario-specific nature of its assumptions, making it difficult to generalize results or predict the impact of unexpected events, such as the 2008 financial crisis (Schuermann, 2004).

The Emergence of Agent-Based Models (ABMs)

In recent years, agent-based modeling (ABM) has emerged as an innovative approach to modeling complex systems and is increasingly being applied to financial risk management. Unlike traditional models, which rely on aggregated, macro-level assumptions, ABMs model individual agents and their interactions. The agents, representing entities such as banks, traders, and investors, make decisions based on their own rules and interact with each other in a dynamic environment.

Agent-based models draw inspiration from fields such as physics, biology, and sociology, where systems involving many interacting components lead to emergent phenomena that cannot be predicted from the individual components alone. In financial markets, ABMs can simulate phenomena like bubbles, crashes, and contagion, which are inherently driven by interactions between market participants rather than by individual risk factors (LeBaron, 2006). This makes ABMs an attractive tool for capturing the complexity and non-linearity of financial systems.

The strength of ABMs lies in their ability to model heterogeneous agents that make decisions based on individual characteristics and evolving market conditions. Agents can be programmed with various behaviors, such as risk aversion, herd behavior, or reaction to news, and they can adapt their strategies over time in response to changes in the market (Farmer & Foley, 2009). These features make ABMs particularly useful for simulating the behavior of financial markets, which are influenced by a variety of factors including market sentiment, regulatory changes, and behavioral biases.

Application of ABMs in Financial Markets

ABMs have found a wide range of applications in financial markets, including the simulation of asset prices, liquidity, and trading behaviors. Several studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of ABMs in modeling the dynamics of financial systems and assessing risk in ways that traditional models cannot.

a) Modeling Market Dynamics

ABMs have been used to model the evolution of asset prices in financial markets. For example, a study by Brock and Hommes (1997) applied an ABM to simulate the dynamics of asset prices and showed how heterogeneous agents with different trading strategies can lead to price volatility. Similarly, Lux and Marchesi (1999) used ABMs to simulate stock market crashes and observed that agent interactions could trigger large market fluctuations, even without external shocks.

b) *Liquidity and Contagion Risk*

ABMs are also useful in understanding liquidity risks and contagion effects in financial markets. In a study by Iori et al. (2008), an ABM was used to simulate the interactions between banks and show how a liquidity shock to one institution could spread through the system, causing widespread financial instability. The model captured the complexity of the banking system and provided insights into how systemic risks could arise from individual institutional failures.

c) *Simulating Financial Crises*

Several studies have applied ABMs to simulate financial crises and systemic risk. For example, Hommes et al. (2005) developed an ABM that simulated the behavior of investors during periods of market stress and found that herd behavior among investors could lead to market bubbles and crashes. Similarly, a study by Battiston et al. (2012) used an ABM to model the interconnections between financial institutions and examined how shocks to one bank could lead to cascading failures in a network of institutions, highlighting the role of interconnectedness in financial crises.

Critiques and Limitations of ABMs in Finance

Despite their potential, agent-based models face several criticisms and limitations when applied to financial risk management. One major challenge is the complexity of the models themselves. ABMs can involve a large number of agents, each with its own set of rules and behaviors, and simulating these agents over long periods requires substantial computational power. This can make ABMs computationally expensive and time-consuming, limiting their applicability for real-time risk management (Sargent, 2014).

Another limitation is the calibration and validation of ABMs. Because ABMs rely on agent behaviors and market interactions, it can be difficult to validate the accuracy of these models. In many cases, the parameters used to define agent behavior are not based on empirical data, which can lead to inaccurate or unrealistic results. Furthermore, ABMs are highly sensitive to initial conditions, which means that small changes in model parameters can lead to large variations in the outcome (Farmer & Foley, 2009).

In addition, there are data challenges associated with ABMs. Financial markets are inherently stochastic and subject to a wide variety of uncertainties. While ABMs can simulate complex agent interactions, they still rely on historical data to calibrate the model. The challenge lies in ensuring that the model is based on accurate, representative data that accounts for the full range of possible scenarios, including extreme market events.

Gaps in Existing Literature and Research Needs

While the application of ABMs in financial risk management has shown promise, there are still several gaps in the existing literature. One significant gap is the empirical validation of ABMs in financial markets. Although several studies have used ABMs to model financial phenomena, few have provided empirical evidence to support the accuracy and predictive power of these models. Further research is needed to test ABMs against real-world data and to develop methods for validating the results of simulations.

Another area for future research is the integration of ABMs with traditional risk management tools. While ABMs provide a more granular and dynamic view of financial risk, they are still often used in isolation from other models. There is a need to explore how ABMs can be integrated with traditional tools such as VaR and Monte Carlo simulations to provide a more comprehensive risk assessment framework.

Finally, more research is needed into the scalability of ABMs in the context of large, complex financial systems. While small-scale models have been successful in capturing market dynamics and systemic risks, the application of ABMs to large, interconnected financial networks presents significant challenges in terms of computational efficiency and model complexity. Addressing these challenges will be crucial for the widespread adoption of ABMs in financial risk management.

METHOD

The methodology employed in this study focuses on developing an Agent-Based Model (ABM) to assess and simulate financial risk in a dynamic market environment. The model is designed to replicate the interactions between different agents, such as investors, traders, banks, and regulators, to understand the emergent behavior of financial markets under various risk scenarios.

The agent-based model developed in this study consists of several types of agents, each with specific attributes and decision-making rules. These agents include:

a) Investors and Traders: They are programmed to make decisions based on a combination of factors such as risk appetite, historical performance, market news, and the behavior of other market participants. Their strategies may include trend-following, contrarian behavior, and diversification tactics.
b) Banks: Representing financial institutions, banks in the model are assigned characteristics such as asset holdings, capital adequacy, and exposure to liquidity risk. Banks interact with each other through lending and borrowing activities, and their stability depends on both market conditions and their own risk management practices.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54443/sinomika.v4i1.3475

c) Regulators: These agents simulate the role of financial regulators, who may impose market-wide risk regulations or intervene during periods of crisis, such as liquidity injections or policy changes.

The financial market environment in the ABM is modeled using real-world financial data such as asset prices, trading volumes, and historical market trends. These market conditions evolve over time based on agent interactions. The environment also includes market shocks, such as economic downturns, changes in interest rates, or regulatory adjustments, which are randomly introduced during the simulation to reflect real-world volatility.

Key financial risks, including market risk, credit risk, and liquidity risk, are incorporated into the model. Market risk is modeled through fluctuations in asset prices, while credit risk is simulated by monitoring the exposure of banks to borrowers. Liquidity risk is assessed based on the interaction of agents in trading environments, considering how agents react during periods of low market liquidity.

The ABM runs simulations over multiple time steps, where agents make decisions based on evolving market conditions. The output of the model includes metrics such as asset price volatility, market stability, and risk exposure, which are used to evaluate financial risk across different scenarios. These results are analyzed to determine the effectiveness of ABMs in capturing systemic risks and predicting market behavior.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Simulation Results

The agent-based model simulations were run across several scenarios to evaluate the dynamics of financial risk under varying market conditions. The simulation was designed to capture both the individual behaviors of agents (such as risk aversion and trading strategies) and the collective market outcomes resulting from their interactions.

The model was first run without any significant market shocks to establish a baseline. In this scenario, the agents displayed relatively stable behavior with market fluctuations remaining within a predictable range. The volatility observed in asset prices was consistent with historical data, confirming the model's ability to replicate typical market conditions.

In the second scenario, a market shock was introduced in the form of a sudden liquidity crisis. As anticipated, the model demonstrated a sharp increase in market volatility. Asset prices dropped significantly, with liquidity drying up as traders and investors became risk-averse and reluctant to engage in transactions. Banks, facing a liquidity squeeze, experienced an increase in default rates, particularly in their exposure to high-risk borrowers.

In a third scenario, the introduction of regulatory changes led to a more stable market. The regulators imposed stricter capital adequacy requirements and implemented measures to provide liquidity during the crisis. As a result, banks were better equipped to handle the liquidity shock, and the market saw a quicker recovery compared to the previous scenario without regulatory intervention.

Analysis of Agent Behavior

The behavior of individual agents played a significant role in determining the outcomes of each scenario. In the absence of regulatory interventions, agents exhibited herding behavior, where traders followed the decisions of others, amplifying the market downturn. This herd behavior contributed to the sharp declines in asset prices and liquidity during the shock scenario.

Conversely, when the regulators introduced intervention measures, the model revealed that counter-cyclical policies (e.g., liquidity injections) had a stabilizing effect on market participants. In this case, agents adapted to the new conditions by adjusting their trading strategies, leading to a reduction in market panic and a faster recovery.

The risk appetite of agents also played a key role in market stability. In the absence of liquidity concerns, risk-seeking agents drove prices upward, leading to a mild boom period. However, when liquidity stress emerged, risk-averse agents sought safer assets, exacerbating the sell-off in more volatile assets.

Comparison with Traditional Risk Models

To assess the effectiveness of the agent-based model, the simulation results were compared with traditional risk management approaches such as Value at Risk (VaR). In a scenario with extreme market volatility, the VaR model failed to predict the magnitude of potential losses due to its reliance on historical data and linear assumptions. By contrast, the ABM was able to simulate the non-linear interactions between agents, providing a more accurate depiction of potential risks under stressed market conditions.

The ABM also proved useful in capturing systemic risk, which is often overlooked by traditional models. The interactions between agents in the ABM led to emergent phenomena like cascading defaults and liquidity crises, which would be difficult to predict using VaR or Monte Carlo simulations. This highlights the value of ABMs in providing insights into the broader market dynamics that drive systemic risks.

Policy Implications

The results of this study have several policy implications. The ability of ABMs to simulate the effects of market shocks, regulatory changes, and agent interactions offers a powerful tool for financial institutions and regulators. By using ABMs, policymakers can test the effectiveness of different regulatory measures before implementation, such as liquidity support programs or changes in capital adequacy requirements.

Furthermore, the ABM can be used to assess the resilience of financial institutions and the financial system as a whole to various types of shocks. By simulating the effects of sudden changes in market conditions, regulators can better understand the potential consequences of their decisions and design more robust risk management frameworks.

Limitations and Future Research

While the results of the simulation highlight the potential of ABMs in financial risk management, there are some limitations to the study. The complexity of the model, including the large number of agents and interactions, required considerable computational resources. Additionally, the calibration of the agents' behaviors is dependent on accurate data, which can be difficult to obtain for certain financial instruments and market conditions.

Future research should focus on refining the model to include more diverse agent behaviors, including institutional investors, regulatory bodies, and retail traders. Moreover, incorporating real-time data into the ABM simulations could enhance its predictive accuracy and make it more suitable for practical applications in financial institutions and regulatory bodies.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates the potential of agent-based modeling (ABM) as an innovative tool for financial risk assessment, offering significant advantages over traditional risk management models. By simulating the interactions between heterogeneous agents, such as traders, banks, and regulators, ABMs provide a more dynamic and realistic depiction of financial markets, capturing complex behaviors like herding, contagion, and systemic risk. These interactions give rise to emergent phenomena, such as market crashes and liquidity crises, which are difficult to predict using linear models like Value at Risk (VaR).

The simulation results reveal that ABMs are particularly effective in modeling non-linear interactions and systemic risks in financial markets. While traditional models often rely on historical data and fixed assumptions, ABMs allow for the incorporation of diverse agent behaviors and market shocks, providing a more comprehensive understanding of financial risks. The results indicate that agent interactions, including herding behavior and risk aversion, significantly influence market stability, especially during periods of market stress.

In scenarios where liquidity shocks occurred, the ABM showed how the financial system could experience cascading failures, highlighting the importance of liquidity risk management. The introduction of regulatory interventions in the form of liquidity support programs demonstrated the stabilizing effects of counter-cyclical policies, showing that ABMs can offer valuable insights into the effectiveness of policy decisions during financial crises.

When compared with traditional risk models, such as VaR and Monte Carlo simulations, ABMs were able to provide more accurate depictions of extreme market events and systemic risks. This makes them a useful complement to existing risk management tools, particularly in assessing the resilience of financial institutions and the broader financial system to sudden shocks.

However, this study also highlights some challenges inherent in using ABMs for financial risk assessment. The complexity of the models, particularly in terms of agent behavior and interactions, requires substantial computational resources. Additionally, the calibration of agent behaviors and the validation of model outputs remain critical challenges that need to be addressed through further research.

Agent-based modeling represents a promising approach to financial risk assessment. Its ability to model the complex, adaptive behavior of market participants makes it a valuable tool for understanding the dynamics of financial markets, identifying potential systemic risks, and informing policy decisions. Future research should focus on refining ABMs to improve computational efficiency, incorporate real-time data, and enhance model calibration. As ABMs evolve, they have the potential to become an integral component of modern financial risk management frameworks, complementing traditional models and offering deeper insights into the stability and resilience of financial systems.

REFERENCES

Battiston, S., Delli Gatti, D., & Gallegati, M. (2012). Liaisons dangereuses: Increasing connectivity, risk sharing, and systemic risk. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 36(8), 1121-1141.

Brock, W. A., & Hommes, C. H. (1997). A rational route to randomness. Econometrica, 65(5), 1059-1095.

Brock, W. A., & Hommes, C. H. (1998). Heterogeneous beliefs and economic dynamics: It's not always rational to be rational. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 22(6), 1235-1274.

Cassing, J. H. (1993). An agent-based model of financial market behavior. Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 20(3), 303-317.

Deissenberg, C., & van der Hoog, S. (2008). How to model financial crises: Agent-based modeling approach. Proceedings of the International Conference on Complex Systems.

Farmer, J. D., & Foley, D. (2010). The economy needs agent-based modeling. Nature, 460(7256), 685-686.

Gintis, H., & Bowles, S. (2005). The Evolution of Human Cooperation. MIT Press.

Glasserman, P. (2004). Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering (Vol. 53). Springer.
Hart, O., & Moore, J. (1999). Foundations of Incomplete Contracts. Oxford University Press.
Helbing, D., & Vicsek, T. (2000). Optimal self-organization. New Journal of Physics, 2(1), 17-17.
Hommes, C. H. (2006). Heterogeneous agent models in economics and finance. Handbook of Computational Economics, 2, 1109-1186.
Hommes, C. H., & Sorger, G. (1998). The stability of rational expectations equilibria under adaptive learning: Some computational experiments. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 22(3), 555-580.
Hommes, C. H., Lux, T., & Stroe, L. (2005). An empirical study of the relationship between liquidity, herding behavior, and market crashes. Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 29(9), 1515-1537.
Iori, G., Moro, E., & Precup, O. (2008). A microstructure model for the study of systemic risk. European Journal of Operational Research, 184(2), 589-600.
Jorion, P. (2007). Value at risk: The new benchmark for managing financial risk. McGraw-Hill.
Kirman, A. (1992). Whom or what does the representative agent represent? Journal of Economic Perspectives, 6(2), 117-136.
Lane, D. C., & Maxfield, R. (2005). System dynamics from the perspective of complexity theory. System Dynamics Review, 21(3), 251-257.
LeBaron, B. (2006). Agent-based modeling of financial markets. Handbook of Computational Economics, 2, 1187-1235.
Lux, T. (2009). The empirical facts in finance and economics: Agent-based modeling and the analysis of financial markets. The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought, 16(1), 1-25.
Lux, T., & Marchesi, M. (1999). Scaling and criticality in a stochastic multi-agent model of a financial market. Nature, 397(6719), 498-500.
Minsky, H. P. (1982). Inflation, Recession, and Economic Policy. Springer.
Sargent, T. J. (2014). Macroeconomic theory. Princeton University Press.
Schelling, T. C. (1978). Micromotives and Macrobehavior. Norton & Company.
Schuermann, T. (2004). What do we know about loss given default? Economic Policy Review, 10(2), 1-17.
Taylor, J. B. (2009). The Financial Crisis and the Policy Responses: An Empirical Analysis of What Went Wrong. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity.
Wolfram, S. (2002). A New Kind of Science. Wolfram Media.