# Back to the Promised Land (Mathematical Analysis)

#### Yakov Ben-Haim

#### Technion

#### Israel Institute of Technology



 $<sup>^{0}\</sup>$ lectures\talks\lib\promised-land01.tex 20.1.2016

Back to the Promised Land (Mathematical Analysis) promised-land01.tex

#### Contents

1	Highlights (promised-land01.tex)	3
<b>2</b>	Two Systems, One Test (two-systems02.tex)	14
3	Two Systems, One Test, CDF Known (two-systems02.tex)	27
4	Robustness of Two Systems, One Test (two-systems02.tex)	31
5	Three Systems, Two Tests (two-systems02.tex)	55
6	Three Systems, One Test (two-systems02.tex)	62
7	n Systems, $m$ Tests (two-systems02.tex)	69
8	Extensions (promised-land01.tex)	70
9	Final Thoughts	71

 $lectures \verb+ talks \verb+ lib \verb+ promised-land01.tex$ 

# 1 Highlights

# § Binary decisions, expensive tests:

• Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?
  - Military budget: Tanks or intelligence?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?
  - Military budget: Tanks or intelligence?
  - Energy supply: Nuclear or fossil?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?
  - Military budget: Tanks or intelligence?
  - Energy supply: Nuclear or fossil?
- § How good is:
  - Our knowledge?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?
  - Military budget: Tanks or intelligence?
  - Energy supply: Nuclear or fossil?
- § How good is:
  - Our knowledge?
  - Our knowledge about our knowledge?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - Pollution control: Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?
  - Military budget: Tanks or intelligence?
  - Energy supply: Nuclear or fossil?
- § How good is:
  - Our knowledge?
  - Our knowledge about our knowledge?
  - Our intuition about our ignorance?

- § Binary decisions, expensive tests:
  - Airplane designs: Lockheed or Raytheon?
  - **Pollution control:** Tax or cap-and-trade?
  - Medical intervention: Surgery or pharmaceuticals?
  - Military budget: Tanks or intelligence?
  - Energy supply: Nuclear or fossil?
- § How good is:
  - Our knowledge?
  - Our knowledge about our knowledge?
  - Our intuition about our ignorance?
  - Our ability to use knowledge and manage ignorance?

#### Highlights

- § 2 Systems, 1 Test: Probabilistic Alg.
- § Info-gap uncertainty on pdf: Robustify.
- § *n* Systems, *m* Tests.
- § Source: http://info-gap.com

#### **2** Two Systems, One Test

<sup>0</sup> lectures\talks\lib\two-systems02.tex, 20.1.2016. See 'Problem Set on Info-Gap Uncertainty', \lectures\risk\homework\ps1\_rk.tex, #10. Yakov Ben-Haim, 2011, Two for the price of one: Info-gap robustness of the 1-test algorithm, ISIPTA2011, 25-28 July 2011, Innsbruck, Austria.

- § Two systems, with qualities  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Re$ .
  - Choose one system.
  - Bigger is better.

- § Two systems, with qualities  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Re$ .
  - Choose one system.
  - Bigger is better.
- § No prior knowledge?
  - Flip a fair coin.
  - 50/50 chance of success.

- § Two systems, with qualities  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Re$ .
  - Choose one system.
  - Bigger is better.
- § No prior knowledge?
  - Flip a fair coin.
  - 50/50 chance of success.
- § One system tested: quality  $x_r$ .

- § Two systems, with qualities  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Re$ .
  - Choose one system.
  - Bigger is better.
- § No prior knowledge?
  - Flip a fair coin.
  - 50/50 chance of success.
- § One system tested: quality  $x_r$ .
  - Enhanced chance of success?

- § Two systems, with qualities  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Re$ .
  - Choose one system.
  - Bigger is better.
- § No prior knowledge?
  - Flip a fair coin.
  - 50/50 chance of success.
- § One system tested: quality  $x_r$ .
  - Enhanced chance of success?
  - Which system to use?

- § Two systems, with qualities  $x_1 \neq x_2 \in \Re$ .
  - Choose one system.
  - Bigger is better.
- § No prior knowledge?
  - Flip a fair coin.
  - 50/50 chance of success.
- § One system tested: quality  $x_r$ .
  - Enhanced chance of success?
  - Which system to use?
  - It looks like 1 measurement can't help.

- § Algorithm for choosing a system:
  - q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .

# § Algorithm for choosing a system:

- q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
- Draw y from q(y).

# § Algorithm for choosing a system:

- q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
- Draw y from q(y).
- If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.

#### § Algorithm for choosing a system:

- q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
- Draw y from q(y).
- If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
- If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.

#### § Algorithm for choosing a system:

- q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
- Draw y from q(y).
- If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
- If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.
- § Probability of success,  $P_s(q)$ :

Probability of choosing larger  $x_i$ .

- § Algorithm for choosing a system:
  - q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
  - Draw y from q(y).
  - If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
  - If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.
- § Probability of success,  $P_s(q)$ : Probability of choosing larger  $x_i$ .
- § Theorem (Thomas Cover, 1987):<sup>1</sup> If tested system chosen with probability 0.5, then  $P_{\rm s}(q) > 0.5$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Cover, Thomas M., 1987, Pick the largest number, chapter 5.1 in T. Cover and B. Gopinath, 1987, Open Problems in Communication and Computation, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

# **3** Two Systems, One Test, CDF Known

# § F(x) is known cdf.

# § F(x) is known cdf.

- § Algorithm for choosing a system:
  - If  $F(x_r) < \frac{1}{2}$ , choose un-tested system.
  - If  $F(x_r) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ , choose tested system.

#### § F(x) is known cdf.

§ Algorithm for choosing a system:

- If  $F(x_r) < \frac{1}{2}$ , choose un-tested system.
- If  $F(x_r) \ge \frac{1}{2}$ , choose tested system.
- § **Theorem:**  $P_{\rm s} = \frac{3}{4}$

Proof: Robert R. Snapp, 2005.<sup>2</sup>

 $<sup>^2</sup> Robert R.$ Snapp, 2005, U of Vermont, \papers\2-systems-1test\isipta2011\covers-problem.pdf

# 4 Robustness of Two Systems, One Test

- § Recall no-knowledge algorithm:
  - q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
  - Draw y from q(y).
  - If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
  - If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.

- § Recall no-knowledge algorithm:
  - q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
  - Draw y from q(y).
  - If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
  - If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.
- § Cover's Theorem:  $P_s(q) > 0.5$ .

- § Recall no-knowledge algorithm:
  - q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
  - Draw y from q(y).
  - If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
  - If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.
- § Cover's Theorem:  $P_s(q) > 0.5$ .
- § How to choose q(y)?

**Can we beat**  $P_{\rm s}(q) > 0.5$ ?

- § Recall no-knowledge algorithm:
  - q(y) is any pdf: q(y) > 0 for all  $y \in \Re$ .
  - Draw y from q(y).
  - If  $y \ge x_r$  then choose un-tested system.
  - If  $y < x_r$  then choose tested system.
- § Cover's Theorem:  $P_{s}(q) > 0.5$ .
- § How to choose q(y)? Can we beat  $P_s(q) > 0.5$ ?
- § If we know  $p(x_i)$  then  $P_s = 0.75$ . Can we achieve  $P_s(q) = 0.75$  w/o knowing  $p(x_i)$ ?

# § Info-gap robust-satisficing:

- Our guess:  $x \sim \widetilde{p}(x)$ .
## § Info-gap robust-satisficing:

- Our guess:  $x \sim \tilde{p}(x)$ .
- $\widetilde{p}(x)$  highly uncertain.

## § Info-gap robust-satisficing:

- Our guess:  $x \sim \tilde{p}(x)$ .
- $\widetilde{p}(x)$  highly uncertain.
- Choose q(y) to robust satisfice:
  - $\circ$  Satisfy  $P_{\rm s} \geq P_{\rm c}$ .

0

#### § Info-gap robust-satisficing:

- Our guess:  $x \sim \tilde{p}(x)$ .
- $\widetilde{p}(x)$  highly uncertain.
- Choose q(y) to robust satisfice:
  - $\circ$  Satisfy  $P_{\rm s} \ge P_{\rm c}$ .
  - $\circ$  Maximize robustness to uncertain  $\tilde{p}$ .

- § Info-gap model for uncertain  $\widetilde{p}(x)$ :  $\mathcal{U}(h)$ .
  - Nesting:  $h < h' \implies \mathcal{U}(h) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(h')$ .

- § Info-gap model for uncertain  $\widetilde{p}(x)$ :  $\mathcal{U}(h)$ .
  - Nesting:  $h < h' \implies \mathcal{U}(h) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(h')$ .
  - Contraction:  $\mathcal{U}(0) = \{ \widetilde{p} \}.$

- § Info-gap model for uncertain  $\tilde{p}(x)$ :  $\mathcal{U}(h)$ .
  - Nesting:  $h < h' \implies \mathcal{U}(h) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(h')$ .
  - Contraction:  $\mathcal{U}(0) = \{ \widetilde{p} \}.$
  - $\bullet~h~{\rm is}~{\rm unbounded}~{\rm horizon}~{\rm of}~{\rm uncertainty}.$

# § Robustness, $\hat{h}(q, P_c)$ :

Maximum tolerable uncertainty.

$$\widehat{h}(q, P_{c}) = \max\left\{h: \left(\min_{p \in \mathcal{U}(h)} P_{s}(q|p)\right) \ge P_{c}\right\}$$

- Estimated pdf:  $\tilde{p}(x) = \tilde{\lambda} e^{-\tilde{\lambda}x}$ .

- Estimated pdf:  $\widetilde{p}(x) = \widetilde{\lambda} e^{-\widetilde{\lambda}x}$ .
- Decision pdf:  $q(y) = \gamma e^{-\gamma y}$ . Need to choose  $\gamma$ .

- Estimated pdf:  $\widetilde{p}(x) = \widetilde{\lambda} e^{-\widetilde{\lambda}x}$ .
- Decision pdf:  $q(y) = \gamma e^{-\gamma y}$ . Need to choose  $\gamma$ .
- Prob of success:  $P_{\rm s}(q|\tilde{p}) > 0.5$

### § Example:

- Estimated pdf:  $\tilde{p}(x) = \tilde{\lambda} e^{-\tilde{\lambda}x}$ .
- Decision pdf:  $q(y) = \gamma e^{-\gamma y}$ . Need to choose  $\gamma$ .
- Prob of success:  $P_{\rm s}(q|\tilde{p}) > 0.5$
- Putative optimal choice:

$$\gamma^{\star} = \arg \max_{\gamma} P_{s}(q|\widetilde{p})$$
  
=  $\widetilde{\lambda}\sqrt{2}$ 

• E.g.,  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ :  $P_{\rm s}(q|\tilde{p}) = 0.67 \gg 0.5$ 

- Estimated pdf:  $\tilde{p}(x) = \tilde{\lambda} e^{-\tilde{\lambda}x}$ .
- Decision pdf:  $q(y) = \gamma e^{-\gamma y}$ . Need to choose  $\gamma$ .
- Prob of success:  $P_{\rm s}(q|\tilde{p}) > 0.5$
- Putative optimal choice:

$$\gamma^{\star} = \arg \max_{\gamma} P_{s}(q|\widetilde{p})$$
  
=  $\widetilde{\lambda}\sqrt{2}$ 

- E.g.,  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ :  $P_{\rm s}(q|\tilde{p}) = 0.67 \gg 0.5$
- Robust to uncertainty in  $\tilde{p}(x)$ ???



Figure 1: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .

#### § Zeroing:

Estimated prob of success: no robustness.



Figure 2: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .

#### § Zeroing:

Estimated prob of success: no robustness.

§ Trade off: robustness vs prob. of success.



Figure 3: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .

Figure 4: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .





Figure 5: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .

## § Zeroing: no robustness of estimate.



Figure 6: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .

§ Zeroing: no robustness of estimate.

§ Trade off: robustness vs prob. of success.



Figure 7: Robustness curves with  $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$ .

- § Zeroing: no robustness of estimate.
- § Trade off: robustness vs prob. of success.
- § Preference reversal.
  - $\gamma = \sqrt{2}$  more robust for  $P_{\rm c} > 0.62$ .
  - $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{2}$  more robust for  $P_{\rm c} < 0.62$ .

## **5** Three Systems, Two Tests

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

### § Test two systems with revealed attributes:

 $r_1 < r_2$ 

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

§ Test two systems with revealed attributes:

 $r_1 < r_2$ 

§ Goal: Exclude worst system.

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

§ Test two systems with revealed attributes:

 $r_1 < r_2$ 

- § Goal: Exclude worst system.
- § Blind probability of success:  $\frac{1}{3}$

# § Algorithm:

- q(y) any non-zero pdf on  $\Re$ .
- Draw y from q(q).
- If  $y < r_1$  choose 2 tested systems.
- If  $r_1 \leq y$  choose  $r_2$  and untested system.

#### § Algorithm:

- q(y) any non-zero pdf on  $\Re$ .
- Draw y from q(q).
- If  $y < r_1$  choose 2 tested systems.
- If  $r_1 \leq y$  choose  $r_2$  and untested system.

#### § Theorem:

If tested systems chosen with equal prob. then  $P_{\rm s}(q) > \frac{1}{3}$ .

## 6 Three Systems, One Test

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

#### § Test one system with revealed attribute r.

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

- § Test one system with revealed attribute r.
- § Goal: Select best system.

 $x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ 

- § Test one system with revealed attribute r.
- § Goal: Select best system.
- § Blind probability of success:  $\frac{1}{3}$

# § Algorithm:

- q(y) any non-zero pdf on  $\Re$ .
- Draw y from q(q).
- If  $y \leq r$  choose tested system.
- If r < y choose equi-prob from untested.

## § Algorithm:

- q(y) any non-zero pdf on  $\Re$ .
- Draw y from q(q).
- If  $y \leq r$  choose tested system.
- If r < y choose equi-prob from untested.

#### § Theorem:

If tested system chosen with equal prob. then  $P_{\rm s}(q) > \frac{1}{3}$ .

- 7 n Systems, m Tests
- **Hypothesized generalization to** n systems, m tests.

- § Multiple attributes.
- § Adaptive testing.
- § Best possible probability of success.

# 9 Final Thoughts

- § We began by asking the following questions. How good is:
  - Our knowledge?
  - Our knowledge about our knowledge?
  - Our intuition about our ignorance?
  - Our ability to use knowledge and manage ignorance?
- § We began by asking the following questions. How good is:
  - Our knowledge?
  - Our knowledge about our knowledge?
  - Our intuition about our ignorance?
  - Our ability to use knowledge and manage ignorance?
- § The 2-system 1-test example showed that:
  - We are sometimes wrong about the answers.
  - We should be ready for surprises.

## § A final thought on Optimism:

• Scientific optimism: We're approaching the truth.

75/74

- § A final thought on Optimism:
  - Scientific optimism: We're approaching the truth.
  - My optimism:
    - We will always be surprised.
    - Science will always continue.
    - Uncertainty will never disappear.