

# STATE-EXAM

## [A] Theoretical Fundamentals.

a) TFAI:

### i) First Order Logic (FOL):

Propositional logic: assumes that the world contains facts

\* First-order logic: assumes the world contains

→ OBJECTS: people, houses, numbers, etc

→ RELATIONS: red, round, brother of, bigger than, etc.

→ FUNCTIONS: +, middle of, father of

\* Syntax of FOL

Symbols:

our convention all lowercase

Constants → KingJohn, 2, Koblenz, ...

Predicates → Brother, >, =, ...

Functions → Sqrt, depth of, ...

Variables → x, y, a, b, ...

Connectives →  $\wedge$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\neg$ ,  $\rightarrow$ ,  $\leftrightarrow$

Quantifiers →  $\forall$ ,  $\exists$

Atomic Sentence:

predicate(term<sub>1</sub>, term<sub>2</sub>, ..., term<sub>n</sub>)

or

term<sub>1</sub> = term<sub>2</sub>

Term:

Function ( $t_{\alpha 1}, \dots, t_{\alpha n}$ )

+ Example:

Brother (kingjohn, richard)

predicate constant/term constant/term

atomic sentence

&gt; (length (leftlegof (richard)), length (leftlegof (kingjohn)))

predicate function function constant function function constant  
team team

atomic sentence

Complex sentences:

Sibling (kingjohn, richard)  $\rightarrow$  sibling (richard, kingjohn)+ Universal Quantifier ( $\forall$ ) $\forall x (\text{Studiesat}(x, \text{Koblenz}) \rightarrow \text{Smart}(x))$ 

Everyone studying in Koblenz is smart

Don't use  $\wedge$  with  $\forall$

$$\begin{aligned} 5x+10 &= 2xy+4y \\ 5x+10 &= y(2x+4) \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{5x+10}{2x+4} = y$$

$$\frac{5(x+2)}{2(x+2)} = y$$

$$\frac{5}{2} = y$$

$$y = \frac{5}{2}$$

$$\frac{3890}{2300} = \frac{5}{2}$$

$$\frac{3890}{2300} = \frac{5}{2}$$

$$15,50,000$$

+ Existential quantifier

Someone studying in London is smart

$\exists n (\text{Studies at}(n, \text{London}) \wedge \text{Smart}(n))$

Use  $\wedge$  with  $\exists$

E.g. Prove A from  $(B \wedge A) \vee (A \wedge C)$

|   |                                  |                        |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | $(B \wedge A) \vee (A \wedge C)$ |                        |
| 2 | $B \wedge A$                     | Assumption             |
| 3 | A                                | $\wedge E : 2$         |
| 4 | $A \wedge C$                     |                        |
| 5 | A                                | $\wedge E : 4$         |
| 6 | A                                | $\wedge E 1, 2-3, 4-5$ |

+ Universal Quantifier.

Elimination Rule

|   |                  |                            |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | $\forall x P(x)$ |                            |
| 2 | P(c)             | $\forall E : 1$ for some c |

Introduction Rule

|   |                  |                   |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | C                |                   |
| 2 | :<br>P(c)        |                   |
| 3 | $\forall x P(x)$ | $\forall I : 1-2$ |

## + Existential Quantifier ( $\exists$ )

### Elimination Rule

|    |                  |        |                     |
|----|------------------|--------|---------------------|
| 1. | $\exists x P(x)$ |        |                     |
| 2. |                  | $P(c)$ |                     |
| 3. |                  | $Q$    |                     |
|    |                  | $Q$    | $\exists E: 1, 2-3$ |

### Introduction Rule

|    |                  |  |                |
|----|------------------|--|----------------|
| 1. | $P(c)$           |  |                |
| 2. | $\exists x P(x)$ |  | $\exists I: 1$ |

## + AND ( $\wedge$ ) Connective (Conjunction)

### $\wedge$ Elimination

|    |              |               |
|----|--------------|---------------|
| 1. | $P \wedge Q$ |               |
| 2. | $P$          | $\wedge E: 1$ |
| 3. | $Q$          | $\wedge E: 1$ |

### $\wedge$ Introduction

|    |              |                  |
|----|--------------|------------------|
| 1. | $P$          |                  |
| 2. | $Q$          |                  |
| 3. | $P \wedge Q$ | $\wedge I: 1, 2$ |

+ OR ( $\vee$ ) Connective (Disjunction)

\*  $\vee$  Elimination

$$1. P \vee Q$$

$$2. | P$$

$$3. | R$$

$$4. | Q$$

$$5. | R$$

R  $\vee E : 1, 2-3, 4-5$

$\vee$  Introduction

$$1. | P$$

$$2. | P \vee Q \quad \vee I : 1$$

$$1. | Q$$

$$2. | P \vee Q \quad \vee I : 1$$

+ Negation & [Contradiction]

$\neg$  Introduction

( $\neg$  INTRO)  $\neg$  elimination

( $\neg$  ELIM)

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \neg \text{Introduction} \wedge \\ \hline 1. & | P \\ \hline & | \dots \\ \hline 2. & | \perp \\ \hline & | \neg P \quad \neg I : 1-2 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \neg \neg P \\ \hline 1. & | \dots \\ \hline 2. & | P \quad \neg E : 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

+ Conditional connective ( $\rightarrow$ )

$$A \wedge B \vdash (\lambda x P : Q) \quad P \rightarrow Q$$

$$T \wedge T \vdash T$$

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| T | F | F |
|---|---|---|

$$F \vee T \wedge V T$$

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| F | F | T |
|---|---|---|

$\rightarrow$  Introduction

$\rightarrow$  Elimination

|   |                   |   |
|---|-------------------|---|
|   |                   | 1   P $\rightarrow$ Q      A $\wedge$ I |
| 1 | P                 | i, i, i, i                              |
| 2 | Q                 | P                                       |
| 3 | P $\rightarrow$ Q | $\rightarrow$ I 1-2                     |

  

|   |   |                       |
|---|---|-----------------------|
|   |   | 2   P      A $\neg$ I |
| 2 | P | i, i, i, i            |
| 3 | Q | A $\neg$ I            |

  

|   |                   |                        |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| 3 | P $\rightarrow$ Q | $\rightarrow$ E : 1, 2 |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|

+ Biconditional connective ( $\leftrightarrow$ )

$$P \quad Q \quad P \leftrightarrow Q$$

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| T | T | T |
|---|---|---|

$$T \quad F \quad F$$

$$F \quad T \quad F$$

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| F | F | T |
|---|---|---|

$\leftrightarrow$  Introduction

$\leftrightarrow$  Elimination

|   |                       |                                |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
|   |                       | 1   P $\leftrightarrow$ Q      |
| 2 | Q                     | P                              |
| 3 | Q                     | $\leftrightarrow$ E 1, 2       |
| 4 | P                     |                                |
|   | P $\leftrightarrow$ Q | $\leftrightarrow$ I : 1-2, 3-4 |

Examples:

$$i) \neg(P \vee Q) \vdash \neg P \wedge \neg Q$$

|    |                                |
|----|--------------------------------|
| 1  | $\neg P \vdash \neg(P \vee Q)$ |
| 2  | P                              |
| 3  | $P \vee Q$ VI: 2               |
| 4  | $\perp$ I I: 1, 3              |
| 5  | $\neg P$                       |
| 6  | Q                              |
| 7  | $P \vee Q$ VI: 6               |
| 8  | $\perp$ I I: 1, 7              |
| 9  | $\neg Q$                       |
| 10 | $\neg P \wedge \neg Q$ XI 5, 9 |

SEMANTICS:

Vocabulary is a list of words or terms

words in vocab could be pronouns, nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. These are grammars.

A reference function maps each word in the vocabulary onto the object to which it refers

e.g. Samuel Clemens refers to Mark Twain.

Model:

A model for the language is an image of its vocabulary under its reference function

$[f(w_0), f(w_1), f(w_2) \dots f(w_n)]$  is the model

Syntactic form means types of words in a certain order.

for example → <NAME is ADJ>

→ <Socrates is male>

Each syntactic form is associated with a truth condition that spells the circumstances under which the sentence is true.

e.g -  $f(\text{NAME}) \in f(\text{ADJ})$

In semantics, modality refers to linguistic devices that indicate degree to which an observation is possible, probable, likely or prohibited

Possible world semantics is a framework used in philosophical logic and semantics to analyze and interpret the meaning of statements about necessity and possibility as well as other modalities

Each possible world is a comprehensive scenario that specifies the truth value of every proposition

## \* Probability :

Sample Space of an experiment is a set of possible outcomes.

An event is a collection of possibilities, i.e. a subset of sample space of an experiment.

The entire sample space or an empty set is also an event.

Simple Probability ( $P(E) = |E| / |S|$ )

For eg:  $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$

$E = \{1, 2\}$

$$P(E) = \frac{|E|}{|S|} = \frac{2}{5}$$

Complement of  $E$ , denoted by  $E^c$  (The probability of not  $E$ )

$$P(E^c) = 1 - P(E)$$

When two events have an empty intersection, they are said to be mutually exclusive.

A probability distribution is a function

$$P : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

$$\text{such that } \sum_{n \in S} P(n) = 1$$

A probability distribution function (pdf) is a mathematical function that gives the probability of occurrence of different possible outcomes for an experiment.

For eg  $\rightarrow$  Coin toss  $S = \{\text{"heads", "tails"}\}$

$$\text{pdf}(x) = 0.5 \quad \text{for } x = \text{heads or tails}$$

Conditional probability

Probability of an event H given event E  $[P(H|E)]$   
it's not defined if  $P(E) = 0$

For eg

|       | Opaque | Translucent | Total |
|-------|--------|-------------|-------|
| Red   | 180    | 120         | 300   |
| Blue  | 320    | 80          | 400   |
| Total | 500    | 200         | 700   |

$$P(\text{Red} | \text{Opaque}) = \frac{\text{Total Red opaque}}{\text{Total Opaque}} = \frac{180}{500}$$

*[Handwritten signature]*

+ Independent events:

$$P(E|F) = \frac{P(E \cap F)}{P(F)}$$

So for independent event,

$$P(E|F) = P(E)$$

$$\frac{P(E \cap F)}{P(F)} = P(E)$$

So, E & F are independent if

$$P(E \cap F) = P(E) \cdot P(F)$$

Mutually exclusive events are only independent if one of them is impossible.

+ Bayes Theorem

First form of Bayes Theorem

$$P(H|E) = \frac{P(E|H) \cdot P(H)}{P(E)}$$

Second form of Bayes Thm:

$$P(H|E) = \frac{P(E|H) \cdot P(H)}{P(E|H) \cdot P(H) + P(E|H^c) \cdot P(H^c)}$$

degree of belief in probability is a concept from bayesian prob. which interprets probability as a measure of confidence in the occurrence of an event.

Bayesian confirmation theory applies Bayesian prob. to evaluation in empirical evidence in order to update the degree of belief. Degree of belief increases when new evidence confirms and decreases when new evidences disconfirms.

Information Theory:

Efficient communication

where expected length of encoded messages is minimized

Huffman coding.

1. Probability of each occurrence
2. Order it in descending order
3. Fork (Add two occurrences forming two leaf nodes)
4. Form a tree from bottom-up.

## Shannon entropy

It is the average (or expected) amount of information contained in a set. provides a lower bound on the average length of lossless encoding.

$$H(A) = - \sum_{n=0}^i P(x_i) \cdot \log_2 P(x_i)$$

Entropy is the measure of randomness/ uncertainty in a set

Entropy is maximum when distribution is uniform

## Joint Probability:

Taking marble out of an urn and tossing a coin  
→ it shows the probability of different outcomes (two or more) random variable occurring simultaneously. Table for discrete variables and formula for continuous.

## Joint entropy

measures the set of uncertainty associated with a set of variables

## Interdependence:

Occurrence of one variable affects the probability of occurrence of other variable

If independent,  $H(X, Y) = H(X) + H(Y)$

If interdependent,  $H(X, Y) < H(X) + H(Y)$

## Mutual information

it is a measure of amount of information gained about one random variable by observing another.

measures the reduction in uncertainty about one variable given we know the value of another.

$$I(X, Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X, Y)$$

if  $X$  &  $Y$  are independent then  $I(X, Y) = 0$

## \* Decisions & Games:

Utility:

it represents the measure of satisfaction, benefit, or preference an individual associates with a particular outcome.

provides a framework for making rational decisions.

Expected utility:

it provides a way to make rational decisions when outcome is not certain but prob. are known.

$$E(U_a) = \sum_{x \in C(a)} V(x) \cdot P(x)$$

a rational agent will take a decision that maximizes EU

Decision Theory is what a rational agent makes decisions in the face of uncertainty.