**Comments for Stefan**

* Title
* TOC: Consolidate chapters
* Abstract:

A statement of motivation: bring out WHY we should care about pme

Consider using “MaxEnt” instead of “pme”.

Avoid technicality as much as possible in the Abstract.

Some details need to be either filled in OR moved to the main proposal.

Some clarifications/questions as noted in margins.

Last part is opaque for most readers.

* Literature review: the part that needs the most work.

Use past tense instead of present tense throughout.

Initial summary of the relevant literature, e.g.:

* Probability: historical, early work on logical probability (Keynes and Carnap), subjective probability (Ramsey, de Finetti, Jeffreys, Jeffrey), \*\*splitting into majority subjective camp and minority objective/logical camp. (Explain: WHY this historical development? Why strive for return to objective if the battle was lost?)
* General literature: Bayes, Information theory
* Recent/latter-day perspectives on pme (Jaynes, defenders, critics)
* Rival views (AGM, Spohn, entrenchment, the ‘two worlds’; AIC may be another rival OR friend?)
* [Maybe: some literature from *physics*? Scientific practice?]

Organize this into a few sub-sections; it will help the reader. Could even be along the lines just suggested.

Summarize the main challenges to pme – but also the reason it is still discussed/used.

* Project and chapter review.

Fix symbols.

Consolidate to about six chapters – not 13!

Explain: you are abandoning the application of pme to get objective priors, but still pursuing the idea that there is a single objectively correct updating rule. Why?

The core idea (p. 8): information theory delivers the unique and across the board successful candidate.

The business about the two levels near bottom of page 10 needs to be made clearer.

**General comment:** It looks like your dissertation is going to be an initial presentation of pme, then a bunch of chapters in which you respond vigorously to technical criticisms **,** then one or two subtle chapters looking at complex philosophical issues about entrenchment, two levels, etc. You have an excellent and well-defined core project. But people could raise objections on three counts: a) where are the positive reasons for pme (as opposed to just knocking down your opponents)? b) Related to a): shouldn’t you try to define the *common ground* held with critics of PME? That is a valuable tactic. c) Outline of wider implications in (4.13) may need a little more explanation than you give at present.