

3) Interventions were deleted via rule 3 when no active paths existed between intervention and outcome + Rule 3 was directly applied when no active paths were present.

- Observations were deleted via rule 1 when inactive paths between observation and outcome were found
- Rule 1 simplified queries by removing unnecessary observations.
- Exercise demonstrated how rule 3 removes interventions with no active paths and rule 1 simplifies queries by eliminating unnecessary observations (ref rules of Do Calc)

5) Rules of Do Calculus

1. If there is no active path between the intervention variable (\hat{x}) and the outcome (y), then we can directly remove the intervention.
2. If all active paths between the intervention variable (\hat{x}) and the outcome (y) are blocked by observing a descendant of the intervention variable, we can condition on that descendant and remove the intervention.
3. If there is at least one unblocked active path between the intervention variable (\hat{x}) and the outcome (y), then the intervention is non-identifiable.

So since the 1st rule essentially says that you cannot have a set of independent parents, can write as since for 3, remove all of the backdoor paths ($Y \rightarrow W \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y$)

6) $P(y|\hat{x}, z_1) = P(y|\hat{x}, z_1)$ NOT infinite recursion but a trivial identity

- states that the $P(y|\hat{x}, z_1) ==$ to itself, since first part of the identity in Sol 2 $== 1$ as a total sum of the probability

- $\sum_{y'} P(z_3|\hat{x}, z_1, y') P(y'|\hat{x}, z_1)$ → this one specifically means that it is inclusive in $P(y|\hat{x}, z_3, z_1)$

7) $P(y|\hat{x}, z_1) = P(y, z_1|\hat{x}) / P(z_1|\hat{x})$

- decomposition of joint probabilities $P(A \text{ and } B \text{ given } C)$, invert identity to express $P(y|\hat{x}, z_1)$ as $P(y, z_1|\hat{x}) / P(z_1|\hat{x})$

8) Not sure how to proceed here but so far