PrSAT: Some Examples

First, load the **Prsat** package:

<< Prsat`

■ Example #1: X, Y, Z pairwise independent, but not independent

```
MODEL1 =
  PrSAT[
      Pr[X \land Y] = Pr[X] Pr[Y],
      Pr[X \wedge Z] = Pr[X] Pr[Z],
      Pr[Z \wedge Y] = Pr[Z] Pr[Y],
      Pr[X \land Y \land Z] \neq Pr[X] Pr[Y] Pr[Z]
    Probabilities → Regular
\{X \rightarrow \{a_2, a_5, a_6, a_8\},
    Y \to \{a_3, a_5, a_7, a_8\}, Z \to \{a_4, a_6, a_7, a_8\},
    \Omega \rightarrow \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7, a_8\}\},
  \Big\{ \text{a}_1 \to \frac{295\,043 - 117\,\sqrt{4\,676\,097}}{168\,831} \; \text{,} \\
   a_2 \rightarrow \frac{-84085 + 39\sqrt{4676097}}{168831},
   a_3 \rightarrow \frac{-84085 + 39\sqrt{4676097}}{168831},
   a_4 \rightarrow \frac{-84085 + 39\sqrt{4676097}}{168831} , a_5 \rightarrow \frac{42}{169} ,
   a_6 \rightarrow \frac{42}{169}, a_7 \rightarrow \frac{42}{169}, a_8 \rightarrow \frac{1}{999} \}
```

TruthTable[MODEL1]

Χ	Y	Z	var	Pr
Т	Т	Т	a ₈	<u>1</u> 999
Т	Т	F	a ₅	42 169
Т	F	Т	a ₆	42 169
Т	F	F	a ₂	$\frac{-84085 + 39\sqrt{4676097}}{168831}$
F	Т	Т	a ₇	$\frac{42}{169}$
F	Т	F	a ₃	$\frac{-84085+39\sqrt{4676097}}{168831}$
F	F	Т	a ₄	$\frac{-84085 + 39\sqrt{4676097}}{168831}$
F	F	F	a_1	$\frac{295043-117\sqrt{4676097}}{168831}$

```
EvaluateProbability[
  {
    Pr[X \times Y] == Pr[X] Pr[Y],
    Pr[X \times Z] == Pr[X] Pr[Z],
    Pr[Z \times Y] == Pr[Z] Pr[Y],
    Pr[X \times Y \times Z] \neq Pr[X] Pr[Y] Pr[Z]
  }, MODEL1]

{True, True, True, True}
```

■ Example #2: *s* violates (†)

```
s[h_{-}, e_{-}] := Pr[h | e] - Pr[h | \neg e];
```

TruthTable[MODEL2]

$\mathbb{E}1$	E2	\mathbb{H}	var	Pr
Т	Т	Т	a ₈	26 87
Т	Т	F	a ₅	1/49
Т	F	Т	a ₆	1 532
Т	F	F	a ₂	2 31
F	Т	Т	a ₇	10 37
F	Т	F	a ₃	$\frac{4}{21}$
F	F	Т	a14	1 999
F	F	F	a ₁	510 368 209 3 344 528 124

```
EvaluateProbability[
  {
    Pr[H | E1] > Pr[H | E2],
    s[H, E1] < s[H, E2]
  }, MODEL2]

{True, True}</pre>
```

Note: *d satisfies* (†)

■ Example #3: A Counterexample Requiring 4-Events (Douven)

Question: Given a finite set S of propositions such that (1) each proposition H in S is correlated with the conjunction of the members of any non-empty of subset of S that does not contain H, is (2) the conjunction of the members of any non-empty subset S' of S correlated with the conjunction of any non-empty subset S'' of S not overlapping with S''?

Answer: No. Note: the answer is YES for 3-event spaces. So, we assume a fourevent probability space, over the propositions $\{X, Y, Z, W\}$. To try to find a 4-element countermodel, we first represent condition (1):

```
C1 :=
   {
    Pr[X \mid Y] > Pr[X],
    Pr[X \mid Z] > Pr[X],
    Pr[X \mid W] > Pr[X],
    Pr[Y \mid Z] > Pr[Y],
    Pr[Y | W] > Pr[Y],
    Pr[Z \mid W] > Pr[Z],
    Pr[X \mid Y \land Z] > Pr[X]
    Pr[X \mid Y \land W] > Pr[X]
    Pr[X \mid Z \wedge W] > Pr[X],
    Pr[Y \mid X \wedge Z] > Pr[Y],
    Pr[Y \mid X \land W] > Pr[Y],
    Pr[Y \mid Z \land W] > Pr[Y],
    Pr[Z \mid X \land Y] > Pr[Z]
    Pr[Z \mid X \land W] > Pr[Z]
    Pr[Z \mid Y \land W] > Pr[Z]
    Pr[X \mid Y \land Z \land W] > Pr[X]
    Pr[Y \mid X \land Z \land W] > Pr[Y]
    Pr[Z \mid X \land Y \land W] > Pr[Z]
   };
```

Now, the key will be trying to find models in which C1 (*i.e.*, all the inequalities in C1) holds, and in which at least one of the following equalities holds (these would, of course, be models in which (2) *fails*):

```
C2 :=
{
    Pr[X \times Y | Z \times W] == Pr[X \times Y],
    Pr[X \times Z | Y \times W] == Pr[X \times Z],
    Pr[Y \times Z | X \times W] == Pr[Y \times Z]
}
```

In fact, we'll find a model in which **all** the equations in **C2** hold, using our **PrSAT** function, as follows:

```
MODEL3 =
   Prsat[
     Union[C1, C2],
     Probabilities → Regular
\Big\{ \{ \mathtt{W} 
ightarrow \{ \mathtt{a}_2 \,,\, \mathtt{a}_6 \,,\, \mathtt{a}_7 \,,\, \mathtt{a}_8 \,,\, \mathtt{a}_{12} \,,\, \mathtt{a}_{13} \,,\, \mathtt{a}_{14} \,,\, \mathtt{a}_{16} \} \,, \Big\}
     X \rightarrow \{a_3, a_6, a_9, a_{10}, a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{15}, a_{16}\},
     Y \rightarrow \{a_4, a_7, a_9, a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{14}, a_{15}, a_{16}\},
     Z \rightarrow \{a_5, a_8, a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{13}, a_{14}, a_{15}, a_{16}\},\
     a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}, a_{13}, a_{14}, a_{15}, a_{16}},
  \left\{ \text{a}_1 \to \frac{53\,930\,355\,133\,083\,251\,854}{389\,885\,438\,824\,209\,942\,075} \, , \, \, \text{a}_2 \to \frac{2}{45} \, , \right.
    a_3 \to \frac{2}{45}, a_4 \to \frac{1}{25}, a_5 \to \frac{2}{45}, a_6 \to \frac{91386781}{2219960050},
    a_7 \rightarrow \frac{372759}{8066450}, a_8 \rightarrow \frac{13109319}{290102450},
    a_9 \rightarrow \frac{1}{18}, a_{10} \rightarrow \frac{3}{55}, a_{11} \rightarrow \frac{2}{33}, a_{12} \rightarrow \frac{1}{14},
    a_{13} \rightarrow \frac{4}{55}, a_{14} \rightarrow \frac{3}{39}, a_{15} \rightarrow \frac{5}{61}, a_{16} \rightarrow \frac{2}{25}
```

TruthTable[MODEL3]

W	Х	Y	Z	var	Pr
Т	Т	Т	Т	a ₁₆	$\frac{2}{25}$
Т	Т	Т	F	a ₁₂	$\frac{1}{14}$
T	Т	F	Т	a ₁₃	<u>4</u> 55
Т	Т	F	F	a ₆	91 386 781 2 219 960 050
Т	F	Т	Т	a ₁₄	3 38
Т	F	Т	F	a ₇	372 759 8 066 450
Т	F	F	Т	a ₈	13 109 319 290 102 450
T	F	F	F	a_2	2 45
F	Т	Т	Т	a ₁₅	<u>5</u> 61
F	Т	Т	F	ag	1/18
F	Т	F	Т	a ₁₀	<u>3</u> 55
F	Т	F	F	a ₃	$\frac{2}{45}$
F	F	Т	Т	a ₁₁	<u>2</u> 33
F	F	Т	F	a ₄	$\frac{1}{25}$
F	F	F	Т	a ₅	$\frac{2}{45}$
F	F	F	F	a_1	53 930 355 133 083 251 854 389 885 438 824 209 942 075

```
EvaluateProbability[
    {
      Union[C1, C2]
    }, MODEL3]

{{True, True, True
```

■ "Proving" Theorems

Bayes's Theorem is trivial:

Popper-Miller Theorem "Additivity of d-Confirmation" Theorem is trivial:

```
Prsat[
     d[H \lor \neg E, E] > 0
– PrSAT::srchfail:
     Search phase failed; attempting
              FindInstance
   {}
   Prsat[
    {
     d[H, E] \neq d[H \land E, E] + d[H \land \neg E, E]
– PrSAT::srchfail:
     Search phase failed; attempting
              FindInstance
   { }
   Prsat[
     d[H \land \neg E, E] > 0
– PrSAT::srchfail:
     Search phase failed; attempting
              FindInstance
   { }
```

Note: Popper-Miller Theorem fails for r (first pointed out by Redhead)

```
r[h_, e_] := Pr[h | e] / Pr[h];
```

TruthTable[MODEL4]

\mathbb{E}	\mathbb{H}	var	Pr
Т	Т	a ₄	285 286
Т	F	a ₂	1 999
F	Т	a ₃	<u>1</u> 999
F	F	a_1	$\frac{427}{285714}$

Wagner's "Probabilistic Modus Tollens" Theorem is trivial

```
Prsat
              \frac{1-\Pr[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}]-\Pr[\neg\mathbb{E}]}{1-\Pr[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}]}\geq\frac{\Pr[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}]+\Pr[\neg\mathbb{E}]-1}{\Pr[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}]},
              \frac{1-\Pr[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}]-\Pr[\neg\mathbb{E}]}{1-\Pr[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}]}>\Pr[\neg\mathbb{H}]
– PrSAT::srchfail:
             Search phase failed; attempting
                                   FindInstance
        { }
       PrSAT
              \frac{\Pr\left[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}\right]+\Pr\left[\neg\mathbb{E}\right]-1}{\Pr\left[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}\right]}\geq\frac{1-\Pr\left[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}\right]-\Pr\left[\neg\mathbb{E}\right]}{1-\Pr\left[\mathbb{E}\mid\mathbb{H}\right]},
              \frac{\Pr[\mathbb{E} \mid \mathbb{H}] + \Pr[\neg \mathbb{E}] - 1}{\Pr[\mathbb{E} \mid \mathbb{H}]} > \Pr[\neg \mathbb{H}]
– PrSAT::srchfail:
             Search phase failed; attempting
                                   FindInstance
        { }
```