

1.1 (a) Non-Singular, full rank, $|A| \neq 0$ (determinant is non-zero), A^{-1} exist

(b) $A A^T = I$ (orthogonal matrix property)

$$\downarrow x A^T$$

$$A^{-1}(AA^T) = A^{-1}I \rightarrow \underline{A^T = A^{-1}}$$

1.2 (a) $P(A, C | B) = P(A|B)P(C|B)$ (\because conditional independence)

$$\frac{P(A, C | B)}{P(C | B)} = P(A|B) \quad \left(\frac{P(A, C | B)}{P(A | B)} = \frac{P(A, B, C)}{P(B)} \cdot \frac{P(B)}{P(B, C)} = \frac{P(A, B, C)}{P(B, C)} = P(A|B, C) \right)$$

\downarrow chain rule
 $\underline{P(A|B,C) = P(A|B)}$

(b) $P(X)$: Bernoulli distribution, X : boolean

$$\begin{aligned} E_x[X] &= \sum_x P(x) \cdot X \\ &= \sum_x \theta^x (1-\theta)^{1-x} \cdot X \\ &= (1-\theta) \cdot 0 + \theta \cdot 1 = \underline{0} \end{aligned}$$

(c) $H(P) = -E_{x \sim P(x)} \log P(x)$

$$D_{KL}(P||Q) = E_{x \sim P(x)} (\log P(x) - \log Q(x))$$

$$\begin{aligned} H(P, Q) &= -E_{x \sim P(x)} \log Q(x) = -E_{x \sim P(x)} \log P(x) + E_{x \sim P(x)} (\log P(x) - \log Q(x)) \\ &= H(P) + D_{KL}(P||Q) \end{aligned}$$

2.1 (a) Arad \rightarrow Zerind \rightarrow Sibiu \rightarrow Timisoara \rightarrow Oradea \rightarrow Fagaras \rightarrow Rimnicu Vilcea

\rightarrow Lugoj \rightarrow Bucharest \rightarrow P: testi

(b) Neamt \rightarrow Iasi \rightarrow Vaslui \rightarrow Urziceni \rightarrow Hirsova \rightarrow Eforie \rightarrow Bucharest \rightarrow Giurgiu

\rightarrow P: testi \rightarrow Craiova \rightarrow Drobeta \rightarrow Mehadia \rightarrow Lugoj \rightarrow Timisoara \rightarrow Arad

\rightarrow Zerind \rightarrow Oradea \rightarrow Sibiu

2.2 (a) Timisoara \rightarrow Lugoj \rightarrow Mehadia \rightarrow Drobeta \rightarrow Craiova \rightarrow P: testi \rightarrow Bucharest

(b) Zerind \rightarrow Arad \rightarrow Oradea \rightarrow Sibiu \rightarrow Rimnicu Vilcea \rightarrow Fagaras

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0+374 & 75+366 & 91+380 & 25+253 & 245+143 & 314+176 \\ 374 & 441 & 451 & 468 & 488 & 490 \end{array}$$

\rightarrow P: testi \rightarrow Bucharest

$$\begin{array}{cc} 392+100 & 443+0 \\ 492 & 443 \end{array}$$

3.1 (a) $A = \{(1), (2)\}, B = \{(3), (4)\}, \neg A = \{(1), (3)\}, \neg B = \{(1), (2)\}$
 $A \vee B = \{(2), (3), (4)\}$ $\neg A \wedge \neg B = \{(1)\}$
 $\neg(A \vee B) = \{(1)\}$ $\therefore \neg(A \vee B) = \neg A \wedge \neg B$ always hold

(b) $A \quad B \quad | \quad A \rightarrow B \quad B \rightarrow A \quad A \leftrightarrow B$

A	B	$A \rightarrow B$	$B \rightarrow A$	$A \leftrightarrow B$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T

$$A \rightarrow B = \{(T,T), (F,T), (F,F)\} \quad B \rightarrow A = \{(T,T), (T,F), (F,F)\}$$

$$\underline{A \leftrightarrow B} = \{(T,T), (F,F)\} = \underline{(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (B \rightarrow A)}$$

- 3.2 (a) In case of Model checking, we get the information we want by just making a truth table about all the propositions.
So, it's easier to automatize and it's simple.

In contrast, propositional theorem proving only uses some propositions which we are "interested" in. Hence, it can be more efficient rather than model checking because we don't care about irrelevant propositions. (But not easy to automatize)

- (b) $R_5 : (B_{1,1} \rightarrow (P_{1,1} \vee P_{2,1})) \wedge ((P_{1,1} \vee P_{2,1}) \rightarrow B_{1,1})$ biconditional elimination
 $R_6 : (P_{1,1} \vee P_{2,1}) \rightarrow B_{1,1}$ And - Elimination
 $R_7 : \neg B_{1,1} \rightarrow \neg (P_{1,1} \vee P_{2,1})$ contrapositive
 $R_8 : \neg P_{1,1} \wedge \neg P_{2,1}$ Modus Ponens & De Morgan
 $R_9 : \neg P_{2,1}$ And - Elimination

- (c) This will be attached at last page.

- 4.1 (a) JohnCalls and MaryCalls are conditionally independent given Alarm.
 JohnCalls and Earthquake are conditionally independent given Alarm.
 Burglary and MaryCalls are conditionally independent given Alarm.

(b) $P(E | A=\text{true}, J=\text{true}, M=\text{true})$

$$\begin{aligned} P(E | a, j, m) &= \alpha \sum_b P(b) P(e) P(a|b,e) P(j|ba) P(m|ma) \\ &= \alpha P(e) P(j|ba) P(m|ma) \sum_b P(b) P(a|b,e) \\ &= \alpha \underline{P(e)} \underline{P(j|ba) P(m|ma)} [P(b) P(a|b,e) + P(\neg b) P(a|\neg b,e)] \\ P(\neg e | a, j, m) &= \alpha \underline{P(\neg e)} \underline{P(j|ba) P(m|ma)} [P(b) P(a|b,\neg e) + P(\neg b) P(a|\neg b,\neg e)] \\ &\quad \text{common part} \rightarrow \text{ignore} \\ \therefore P(E | a, j, m) &= \frac{P(e) (0.001 \times 0.95 + 0.999 \times 0.24)}{P(e)(0.001 \times 0.95 + 0.999 \times 0.24) + P(\neg e)(0.001 \times 0.94 + 0.999 \times 0.00)} \\ &= \frac{P(e) \times 0.24066}{P(e) \times 0.24066 + P(\neg e) \times 0.00199} = \underline{0.231\dots} \end{aligned}$$

(c) $0.001 \times 0.002 \times 0.95 + 0.001 \times 0.999 \times 0.94 + 0.999 \times 0.002 \times 0.24 + 0.999 \times 0.999 \times 0.00$
 $= \underline{0.002516442}$

$$\begin{aligned} (d) P(a|b,m) &= \alpha \sum_e P(e) P(a|b,e) P(j|ba) P(m|ma) \\ &= \alpha \underline{P(b)} \underline{P(m|ma)} \sum_e P(e) P(a|b,e) \sum_j P(j|ba) \\ P(\neg a|b,m) &= \alpha \underline{P(b)} \underline{P(m|\neg a)} \sum_e P(e) P(\neg a|b,e) \sum_j P(j|\neg ba) \\ &\quad \text{common} = 1 \\ P(a|b,m) &= \frac{0.7 (0.002 \times 0.95 + 0.998 \times 0.94)}{0.7 (0.002 \times 0.95 + 0.998 \times 0.94) + 0.01 \times (0.002 \times 0.05 + 0.998 \times 0.06)} \\ &= \underline{0.99908\dots} \end{aligned}$$

- 4.2 (a) $P(B=\text{False}, E=\text{False}, A=\text{False}, J=\text{False}, M=\text{False})$

- (b) The cases which we are interested in is when the alarm rang.
 So, we can reject 1, 5 in advance.

At remaining cases, {2, 3, 4}, a burglary had invaded only in 3.

$$\therefore P(b|a) = \underline{\frac{1}{3}}$$

HW1 3.2 (c)