

The quantitative rules

Proof of 2.19

Credit to atwwgb

Continuing to get 2.19 from 2.18:

We have then $G(x, y)G(y, z) = P(x, z)$. Pick any fixed z . Denote $P(x, z) = A(x)$ and $G(y, z) = B(y)$. Then $G(x, y) = \frac{A(x)}{B(y)}$ [and $G(y, z) = \frac{A(y)}{B(z)}$].

Plug this in to $G(x, y)G(y, z) = P(x, z)$ to get $\frac{A(x)A(y)}{B(y)B(z)} = P(x, z)$. So $A(y)/B(y)$ is independent of y , so is constant equal to r . This means

$$G(x, y) = \frac{A(x)}{B(y)} = \frac{A(x)A(y)}{A(y)B(y)} = r \frac{A(x)}{A(y)}$$

Brief explanation of the overall line of reasoning on from 2.45 to 2.58

TODO

Proof of Equation 2.50

Source: stackexchange, I've reworded it and added detail to (hopefully) make it clearer.

We will use the Taylor series approximation, which is an approximation of $f(t)$ around the point a :

$$f(t) = f(a) + f'(a)(t - a) + O((t - a)^2)$$

Big O notation is described on Wikipedia.

The proof:

Letting $\delta = e^{-q}$, we have from (2.48):

$$S(y) = S\left[\frac{S(x)}{1 - \delta}\right]$$

We then use a Taylor series approximation of the function $f(\delta) = \frac{1}{1 - \delta}$ around with $a = 0$.

$$S(y) = S[S(x)(1 + \delta + O(\delta^2))]$$

$$S(y) = S[S(x) + S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)]$$

Now we want to get rid of the $S[]$ surrounding the equation, so we will use another Taylor approximation of the function $S(t)$. We approximate around the point $a = S(x)$.

This gives us the approximation of $S(t)$ as:

$$S(t) = S[S(x)] + S'[S(x)](t - S(x)) + O((t - S(x))^2)$$

Letting $t = S(x) + S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)$

$$S[S(x) + S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)] = S[S(x)] + S'[S(x)](S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)) + O((S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2))^2)$$

$$S[S(x) + S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)] = S[S(x)] + S'[S(x)]S(x)\delta + S'[S(x)]S(x)O(\delta^2) + O((S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2))^2)$$

With big O notation we can get rid of constant factors:

$$S[S(x) + S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)] = S[S(x)] + S'[S(x)]S(x)\delta + O(\delta^2) + O((\delta + O(\delta^2))^2)$$

With big O notation we can also get rid terms that drop asymptotically faster than the largest term.

$$S[S(x) + S(x)\delta + S(x)O(\delta^2)] = S[S(x)] + S'[S(x)]S(x)\delta + O(\delta^2)$$

□

Explanation of 2.52, 2.53

2.45 says $S[S(x)] = x$. Differentiating in x we get $S'[S(x)]S'(x) = 1$, or $S'[S(x)] = 1/S'(x)$. Now we plug in into 2.50 to get

$$S(y) = x + \exp\{-q\}S(x)/S'(x) + O(\exp\{-2q\})$$

Denoting by $\alpha(x) = \log \left[\frac{-xS'(x)}{S(x)} \right]$ we get

$$S(y) = x + \exp\{-q\}(-x \exp -\alpha) + O(\exp\{-2q\})$$

Dividing by x

$$\frac{S(y)}{x} = 1 - \exp\{-(q + \alpha)\} + \frac{1}{x}O(\exp\{-2q\})$$

which is a version of 2.51.

From now on we will treat x as fixed and only vary q , sending it to $+\infty$, which in light of 2.48 means keeping x fixed and sending y to $S(x)$ from below.

Then we can write

$$\frac{S(y)}{x} = 1 - \exp\{-(q + \alpha)\} + O(\exp\{-2q\}),$$

which is 2.51.

Now we want to deduce 2.53. We make some progress but ultimately do not succeed (yet).

We start with 2.45

$$xS\left[\frac{S(y)}{x}\right] = yS\left[\frac{S(x)}{y}\right]$$

and plug in 2.51 and 2.48 to get

$$xS[1 - \exp\{-(q + \alpha)\} + O(\exp\{-2q\})] = yS[1 - \exp\{-q\}]$$

Right hand side is $y \exp\{-J(q)\}$ by definition 2.49. We also plug in 2.48 in the form $y = S(x)/(1 - \exp\{-q\})$ to get

$$RHS = S(x) \exp\{-J(q)\} / (1 - \exp\{-q\})$$

Now take log to get

$$\begin{aligned} \log x + \log S[1 - \exp\{-(q + \alpha)\} + O(\exp\{-2q\})] \\ = \log S(x) - J(q) - \log(1 - \exp\{q\}) \end{aligned}$$

Now if we could write

$$\begin{aligned} \log S[1 - \exp\{-(q + \alpha)\} + O(\exp\{-2q\})] = \\ \log S[1 - \exp\{-(q + \alpha)\}] + O(\exp\{-2q\}) \end{aligned}$$

we would get $J(q + \alpha) + O(\exp\{-2q\})$ and 2.53 would follow.

Proof of 2.57

Proof of 2.58

$S^{m-1}S' = -x^{m-1}$ is equivalent to $(S^m)' = -\frac{1}{m}x^{m-1}$, so that $S^m = C - x^m$. Initial value $S(0) = 1$ fixes $C = 1$ and $S(x) = (1 - x^m)^{1/m}$ as wanted.

Exercise 2.1

I think this problem is ambiguous and can be interpreted in multiple ways, see here for a different interpretation. But I think the following interpretation makes more sense.

With X representing any background information:

$$\begin{aligned} p(C|(A+B)X) &= \frac{p(A+B|CX)p(C|X)}{p(A+B|X)} \\ &= \frac{(p(A|CX) + p(B|CX) - p(AB|CX))p(C|X)}{p(A|X) + p(B|X) - p(AB|X)} \\ &= \frac{p(AC|X) + p(BC|X) - p(ABC|X)}{p(A|X) + p(B|X) - p(AB|X)} \end{aligned}$$

Exercise 2.2

TODO

Exercise 2.3

TODO