

Getting Wiser from Multiple Data: Probabilistic Updating according to Jeffrey and Pearl

Bart Jacobs

iHub, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

bart@cs.ru.nl

May 22, 2024

Abstract. In probabilistic updating one transforms a prior distribution in the light of given evidence into a posterior distribution, via what is called conditioning, updating, belief revision or inference. This is the essence of learning, as Bayesian updating. It will be illustrated via a physical model involving (adapted) water flows through pipes with different diameters.

Bayesian updating makes us wiser, in the sense that the posterior distribution makes the evidence more likely than the prior, since it incorporates the evidence. Things are less clear when one wishes to learn from multiple pieces of evidence / data. It turns out that there are (at least) two forms of updating for this, associated with Jeffrey and Pearl. The difference is not always clearly recognised.

This paper provides an introduction and an overview in the setting of discrete probability theory. It starts from an elementary question, involving multiple pieces of evidence, that has been sent to a small group academic specialists. Their answers show considerable differences. This is used as motivation and starting point to introduce the two forms of updating, of Jeffrey and Pearl, for multiple inputs and to elaborate their properties. In the end the account is related to so-called variational free energy (VFE) update in the cognitive theory of predictive processing. It is shown that both Jeffrey and Pearl outperform VFE updating and that VFE updating need not decrease divergence — that is correct errors — as it is supposed to do.

1 Introduction

Before introducing the topic of this paper, readers are kindly invited to consider the following situation and answer the subsequent three question themselves. This self-test will be useful for understanding what this paper is about. Impatient readers are invited to answer at least the first question.

Consider a disease, like Covid, say with a **prevalence** of 5%. This means that the chance that an arbitrary person in the population has the disease is $\frac{1}{20} = 0.05$. This is the **prior** disease probability.

There is a test for the disease that is not perfect, as usual.

- The **sensitivity** of the test is 90%; this means that if a person has the disease, the probability that the test is positive (for this person) is $\frac{9}{10} = 0.9$.

- The **specificity** is 60%; this means that if a person does not have the disease, then the probability that the test is negative is $\frac{3}{5} = 0.6$.

In this situation the predicted positive test probability is $\frac{17}{40} = 0.425$.

The questions

In the situation described above **three tests** are performed, out of which two turn out to be positive and one negative.

Consider the following three questions.

1. What is the likelihood of this three-test outcome, with two positive, one negative?
2. Using this three-test outcome as evidence, what is the posterior (updated) disease probability?
3. This posterior disease probability is now taken as new prior. Again three tests are performed, and again two of them appear to be positive and one negative. How likely is that outcome — with this new prior, and with the same test? This is the same calculation as in point 1, but now with a different prior.

You may ask yourself the question if the probability outcome of point 3 should be lower or higher than the outcome of point 1? (In this example the differences are small, but significant.)

Please take your time.

This example with questions has been distributed among about a hundred (local, academic) colleagues of the author, working in AI and (medical) statistics. The questions came with the following explanations¹.

If the above description appears unclear or incomplete to you — for instance whether or not all tests are applied to the same individual — please do not ask for clarification, but make explicit how you choose to interpret or complete it. This is relevant information in itself.

This small survey was not meant as a systematic study, but was intended to get an impression of how specialists address such a situation, with multiple test results. Seventeen replies came back, before a given deadline, which will be discussed later in Subsection 2.4. The short summary is that the first question is answered in a reasonably systematic manner, yielding two groups of answers that are labelled as ‘Jeffrey’ and ‘Pearl’ below. Things are less clear with the second question about updating. Several people use the ‘Pearl’ update, but no-one uses the ‘Jeffrey’ update. Some people use ‘Jeffrey’ for the first question and ‘Pearl’ for the second.

¹ More explanations were provided, including a clarification that the answers would be used for a publication (this one) in an anonymous manner, without identifying individuals, but with an indication of their area. Participants could also indicate that they did not allow the usage of their answers, but no-one did so. The full text of the question is available via Mastodon at: <https://social.edu.nl/@bjacobs/112051242549499170>.

The fact that there is limited consensus among academic specialists, even in a small survey, serves as motivation to try and clarify the situation. At the same time this lack of consensus is worrying, since the above question describes a simple scenario of learning from multiple data that is common in the current AI revolution. Whether you or I get a mortgage or a medical treatment may be determined by such update mechanisms. What is the rationale to use which update mechanism, and what are the consequences? These questions have a certain scientific and societal urgency. How are we ever going to explain AI-based decisions if we do not understand the rules that are used and the guarantees that they provide?

Updating (or conditioning, belief revision or inference) is one of the most fascinating topics of probability theory. It involves going from prior belief, in the form of a probability distribution, to an updated posterior belief, by incorporating evidence. This is the essence of learning. This paper describes updating as an operation on probability distributions: given a prior distribution ω and evidence p , one can form a posterior distribution written as $\omega|_p$ that incorporates p into ω . This updating with a single piece of evidence p is the standard form of Bayesian updating. Its general mathematical formulation appears in Section 5.

Since this Bayesian updating $\omega \mapsto \omega|_p$ is such an elementary operation we illustrate it via a simple physical model, see Subsection 1.1. A probability distribution is represented by a pump that pushes water through parallel pipes with different diameters. These pipes may then be (partially) blocked, leading to adapted flows, corresponding to a Bayesian update of the original (prior) distribution.

A key property of learning that runs through this paper is that learning makes us wiser. We express this via validity \models , in several ways. In elementary form, validity is the expected value $\omega \models p$ of evidence p in a distribution ω . A key property of Bayesian updating is that the evidence p is ‘more true’ in the posterior than in the prior. This takes the form of a fundamental inequality $(\omega|_p \models p) \geq (\omega \models p)$, see Theorem 15 (1) below.

Bayesian updating is a well-established technique that is used here as a building block. This paper is about how to learn from multiple pieces of evidence p_i , like in the above example where we have three test outcomes as evidence. We consider three forms of learning from multiple evidence — initially two, later one more. We briefly illustrate them below, for the simple situation with only two pieces of evidence p_1 and p_2 . The three forms of updating combine Bayesian updating in different ways.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Jeffrey update:} & \quad \frac{1}{2} \cdot \omega|_{p_1} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \omega|_{p_2} \\
 \text{Pearl update:} & \quad \omega|_{p_1 \& p_2} = \omega|_{p_1|p_2} \\
 \text{VFE update:} & \quad \omega|_{p_1^{1/2} \& p_2^{1/2}} = \omega|_{p_1^{1/2}|p_2^{1/2}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

This first form of Jeffrey updating uses a convex combination of (independent) Bayesian updates with the separate pieces of evidence. The second form of updating, associated with Pearl, does a single (dependent) Bayesian update with a conjunction $p_1 \& p_2$ of the two pieces of evidence. This is the same as doing the two updates consecutively. The variational free energy (VFE) update is similar, but uses a conjunction of the square roots of the two pieces. This third form of updating arises in computational cognition

theory and will be discussed only at the very end, in Section 7. The emphasis lies on Jeffrey and Pearl. We include the VFE case here for comparison.

Jeffrey's update rule goes back to [25] (see also [15,35]) and is reformulated in [18] into a form that is close to how it is used here. Pearl's update rule, see [30,31], captures what happens in Bayesian networks when evidence arrives at a node via two different branches and is combined via conjunction $\&$, see also [24].

The above short descriptions (1) are meant to give a first impression. Details will appear below. Associated with the first two update mechanism there are forms of validity, written as \models_J and \models_P , for Jeffrey and Pearl. Each form of update increases the associated form of validity — making us appropriately wiser in each case. This getting wiser may fail if we mix up the various forms of updating and validity, as will be demonstrated. Prevention of such mix-ups is an important reason for distinguishing these two forms of updating and validity.

The focus of this paper is on handling multiple pieces of evidence. Interestingly, when we have only a single piece of evidence, all three update rules (Jeffrey, Pearl and also VFE) coincide and give the same outcome as Bayesian updating. Differences arise when there is more than one piece of evidence. This multiplicity of evidence will be formalised below in terms of multisets of predicates, as pieces of evidence. We recall that a multiset is like a subset but can contain multiple occurrences of elements. Indeed, in learning from data / evidence, there may be multiple occurrences of the same data / evidence item.

This paper is organised as follows. It continues the introduction below, as already announced, with a physical explanation of (Bayesian) updating. Section 2 answers the above medical question by describing the approaches of Jeffrey and Pearl in a concrete situation. It ends in Subsection 2.4 with an account of the answers given by colleagues to the question. Sections 3 and 4 start the more thorough mathematical analysis of the situation, by providing background information on multisets and distributions, and on predicates and validity. This includes validity for evidence, both for Jeffrey and Pearl. Next, Section 5 looks at updating of distributions, first in basic Bayesian form, for a single piece of evidence, then for multiple pieces of evidence, using separate update rules of Jeffrey and Pearl. For each of them various properties are made explicit. Section 6 introduces the concept of channel, as mathematical formalisation of conditional probabilities in generative models. These channels make it possible to handle more general situations, with distributions and evidence given for different underlying sets (hidden and observable). It is shown that in the running medical example there is a channel involved, capturing the sensitivity and specificity of the test. Finally, Section 7 sketches the context of the cognitive theory of predictive coding, where the VFE update rule appears. Within this context the human mind is understood as an update engine that constantly corrects errors, in the form of reduction of so-called KL-divergence. Interestingly, Jeffrey's rule decreases KL-divergence, but the VFE rule does not, in general. The VFE update rule does increase Pearl validity, but not as much as Pearl updating. The question remains what the right form of updating is in probabilistic cognition theory. This paper provides input for further clarification.


This paper explains updating within the setting of finite, discrete probability theory. This setting is rich enough to explain and illustrate the relevant phenomena. Defini-

tions and results extend easily to a more general continuous setting — technically by changing from the distribution monad \mathcal{D} to the Giry monad \mathcal{G} , see *e.g.* [17,28]. Indeed, underneath the current work there is deeper level of analysis of probabilistic systems in terms of category theory and string diagrams [13,22]. We do not use those mathematical formalisms here in order not to restrict the audience (size). These new formalisms try to improve the language that is common in probability theory. Indeed, we see the fact that there is such a wide variety of answers to a basic question as a sign that the current dominant language — that is based on assigning probabilities to events and does not treat distributions, predicates, updating and channels as first class citizens — is deficient. This area could use a new, more formal ‘logic’. This paper tries to contribute to such a more precise approach.

1.1 A physical model of Bayesian updating

Updating of probability distributions plays a central role in this paper. That’s why it is important to have a good understanding of what is going on. Here, in this introduction, we introduce a physical model in terms of (water) flows to provide an intuition. Mathematical formalisations will appear in the course of the paper.


Consider the picture below of a pump with one input pipe at the bottom and three output pipes at the top. The outgoing pipes have relative diameters, as indicated at the top. Thus, half a liter per second emerges from the left pipe, one third from the middle pipe, and one sixth from the pipe on the right. This represents a probability distribution ω , on the right.



The letters L , M , R refer to the left, middle and right pipe. We write these letters inside ‘kets’ $| - \rangle$ in order to separate them from the corresponding fragments $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{6}$ of the throughput. These kets are just syntactic sugar.

We now turn to conditioning / updating. New information arrives and is added to the picture, namely that the middle pipe is blocked. We assume that the pump keeps on operating and still realises the throughput of one liter per second (with increased pressure). The question becomes what the left and right flows become, indicated as f_L

and f_R below.




After a moment's thought we see that the left pipe (with diameter $\frac{1}{2}$) is three times wider than the right pipe (with diameter $\frac{1}{6}$). Hence the new outflows will be in relationship 3 : 1. Since the total throughput is (still) one liter per second, the new left flow f_L will be $\frac{3}{4}$ and the right flow f_R will be $\frac{1}{4}$.

In a more systematic approach one computes the new flows f_L and f_R via (re)normalisation. The combined diameters are $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{2}{3}$. This gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{updated left flow:} \quad f_L &= \frac{1/2}{2/3} = \frac{3}{4} \\ \text{updated right flow:} \quad f_R &= \frac{1/6}{2/3} = \frac{1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

In ket notation, the new updated distribution ω' can be written as $\omega' = \frac{3}{4}|L\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|R\rangle = \frac{3}{4}|L\rangle + 0|M\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|R\rangle$.

We make the situation a bit more interesting, by not fully closing one pipe, but by closing all of them partially via three taps, as sketched in:



The fractions written on the left of these taps indicate the fraction of openness. We still assume that the pump realises the same throughput of one liter per second² and ask what the new output flows f_L , f_M and f_R are in this new case.

The normalisation now has to take both the original diameters and the openness of the taps into account, resulting in a normalisation factor:

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{19}{36}.$$

The second conditioning ω'' of the original distribution ω thus takes the form:

$$\omega'' = \frac{1/2 \cdot 2/3}{19/36}|L\rangle + \frac{1/3 \cdot 1/3}{19/36}|M\rangle + \frac{1/6 \cdot 1/2}{19/36}|R\rangle = \frac{12}{19}|L\rangle + \frac{4}{19}|M\rangle + \frac{3}{19}|R\rangle.$$

² When the taps leave only small openings the pressure must rise considerably, turbulences may arise, and the pump may break. We ignore such physical effects and limitations.

Thus, in the above picture we get $f_L = \frac{12}{19}$, $f_M = \frac{4}{19}$ and $f_R = \frac{3}{19}$.

Conditioning will be described more abstractly below. The first form, with the entire closure of a pipe, leading to the ‘posterior’ distribution ω' , is an instance of updating with a *sharp* predicate. The second form, leading to posterior ω'' , is updating with a *fuzzy* or *soft* predicate, see Example 13 for details.

2 Two solutions for the medical question

This section introduces basic terminology, notation, and results for distributions, predicates, validity, and updating (conditioning) in order to answer the medical test challenge from the introduction in an informal but systematic manner. A more general treatment follows in subsequent sections.

Consider an urn containing 10 balls, with 5 red (R), 2 blue (B) and 3 green (G). There is an associated probability distribution that gives the chance of drawing at random a ball of a particular colour. We write this distribution as $\frac{1}{2}|R\rangle + \frac{1}{5}|B\rangle + \frac{3}{10}|G\rangle$. It uses ket notation $|-\rangle$, borrowed from quantum physics, that we also used for the pipes in Subsection 1.1. The number $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{5}{10}$ written before $|R\rangle$ is the probability of drawing a red ball, corresponding to the fraction of red balls in the urn. Similarly for B and G .

In general, a (discrete finite probability) distribution over a set X is given by an expression of the form $r_1|x_1\rangle + \dots + r_n|x_n\rangle$ where x_1, \dots, x_n are elements from the set X , and r_1, \dots, r_n are probabilities from the unit interval $[0, 1]$ satisfying $r_1 + \dots + r_n = 1$.

A predicate on a set X is a function $p: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. For a distribution ω over X we write $\omega \models p$ for the validity (or expected value) of the predicate p in ω . Explicitly, we define this validity as the following number in $[0, 1]$.

$$r_1|x_1\rangle + \dots + r_n|x_n\rangle \models p := r_1 \cdot p(x_1) + \dots + r_n \cdot p(x_n). \quad (2)$$

This validity $\omega \models p$ can also be written as $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \omega} p(x)$.

If we have two predicates $p, q: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ we write $p \& q: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for their conjunction, defined as pointwise multiplication: $(p \& q)(x) := p(x) \cdot q(x)$, for $x \in X$.

2.1 Question 1

At this stage we can already start our analysis of the medical test scenario from the introduction. Recall the disease prevalence of 5%. This is captured in a (prior) disease distribution ω . In ket notation we write it as:

$$\omega := \frac{1}{20}|d\rangle + \frac{19}{20}|d^\perp\rangle, \quad \text{a distribution over the set } D = \{d, d^\perp\}.$$

The symbols d and d^\perp are used for ‘disease’ and ‘no-disease’. In this expression the presence of the disease d gets probability $\frac{1}{20}$ and the absence of the disease d^\perp gets probability $\frac{19}{20}$.

Consider next the two predicates $pt, nt : D \rightarrow [0, 1]$, for ‘positive test’ and for ‘negative test’. Following the descriptions of the sensitivity (of $\frac{9}{10}$) and specificity (of $\frac{3}{5}$) of the test they satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} pt(d) &= \frac{9}{10} & nt(d) &= 1 - \frac{9}{10} = \frac{1}{10} \\ pt(d^\perp) &= 1 - \frac{3}{5} = \frac{2}{5} & nt(d^\perp) &= \frac{3}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

We can compute the probability of a positive test in the prior distribution $\omega = \frac{1}{20}|d\rangle + \frac{19}{20}|d^\perp\rangle$ as:

$$\omega \models pt = \frac{1}{20} \cdot pt(d) + \frac{19}{20} \cdot pt(d^\perp) = \frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{9}{10} + \frac{19}{20} \cdot \frac{2}{5} = \frac{85}{200} = \frac{17}{40}.$$

Similarly, the probability of a negative test is:

$$\omega \models nt = \frac{1}{20} \cdot nt(d) + \frac{19}{20} \cdot nt(d^\perp) = \frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{10} + \frac{19}{20} \cdot \frac{3}{5} = \frac{115}{200} = \frac{23}{40}.$$

We can now address the first question: what is the likelihood of this three-test outcome, with two positive, one negative? There are two reasonable approaches, associated with the researchers Jeffrey and Pearl.

Jeffrey We have just calculated the probabilities of a single positive test and of a single negative test as two validities $\frac{17}{40}$ and $\frac{23}{40}$. The Jeffrey-style likelihood of the three tests, two positive one negative, is obtained by multiplying these validities, as in:

$$\begin{aligned} 3 \cdot (\omega \models pt) \cdot (\omega \models pt) \cdot (\omega \models nt) &= 3 \cdot \frac{17}{40} \cdot \frac{17}{40} \cdot \frac{23}{40} \\ &= 19941/64000 \approx 0.3116. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The multiplication factor 3 is needed to accommodate the three possible orders of the test outcomes, pos-pos-neg, pos-neg-pos, neg-pos-pos, each with the same probability. One may recognise in this expression the binomial probability for two-out-of-three, with parameter $(\omega \models pt) = \frac{17}{40}$.

Pearl Instead of multiplying these validities, one can multiply the predicates by taking their conjunction, as in $ppnt := pt \ \& \ pt \ \& \ nt$. This works pointwise, so that:

$$\begin{aligned} ppnt(d) &= pt(d) \cdot pt(d) \cdot nt(d) = \frac{9}{10} \cdot \frac{9}{10} \cdot \frac{1}{10} = \frac{81}{1000} \\ ppnt(d^\perp) &= pt(d^\perp) \cdot pt(d^\perp) \cdot nt(d^\perp) = \frac{2}{5} \cdot \frac{2}{5} \cdot \frac{3}{5} = \frac{12}{125}. \end{aligned}$$

The Pearl-style answer to the first question is the validity of this conjunction of predicates:

$$\begin{aligned} 3 \cdot (\omega \models pt \ \& \ pt \ \& \ nt) &= 3 \cdot (\omega \models ppnt) = 3 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{81}{1000} + \frac{19}{20} \cdot \frac{12}{125} \right) \\ &= \frac{1143}{4000} \approx 0.2858 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Again, the factor 3 is used to deal with the three possible orders in the conjunction. The Pearl outcome differs slightly from Jeffrey’s outcome (3). In general, the differences may be substantial, see the illustrations before Remark 7 below.

Using more traditional expectation notation \mathbb{E} , with sampling $x \sim \omega$, one can describe the Jeffrey likelihood as on the left below, and the Pearl likelihood as on the right.

$$3 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \omega} pt(x) \right)^2 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \omega} nt(x) \right) \qquad 3 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \omega} \left(pt(x)^2 \cdot nt(x) \right).$$

In the Jeffrey case one evaluates each of the three tests separately / independently, as if for a new person from the population. In the Pearl cases one first combines the three tests via conjunction, and then evaluates the result. This corresponds to applying the tests to the same individual. In light of this interpretation we associate (in this medical setting) Jeffrey's method with an epidemiological approach, and Pearl's method with a clinical approach.

2.2 Question 2

The second question involves updating of distributions. We describe it here as incorporating evidence into a distribution. The evidence has the form of a predicate. It corresponds to the taps on the outgoing pipes in Subsection 1.1.

Thus, for a general distribution $\omega = r_1|x_1\rangle + \dots + r_n|x_n\rangle$ over a set X and for a predicate $p: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we introduce a new, updated distribution $\omega|_p$.

$$\omega|_p := \frac{r_1 \cdot p(x_1)}{\omega \models p} |x_1\rangle + \dots + \frac{r_n \cdot p(x_n)}{\omega \models p} |x_n\rangle. \quad (5)$$

This updating only works if the validity $\omega \models p$ is non-zero.

We can now update the prior ω with the positive-test predicate pt . This gives, according to the above formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{pt} &= \frac{1/20 \cdot pt(d)}{\omega \models pt} |d\rangle + \frac{19/20 \cdot pt(d^\perp)}{\omega \models pt} |d^\perp\rangle \\ &= \frac{1/20 \cdot 9/10}{17/40} |d\rangle + \frac{19/20 \cdot 2/5}{17/40} |d^\perp\rangle = \frac{9}{85} |d\rangle + \frac{76}{85} |d^\perp\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In a similar way one obtains as update of the prior with a negative test:

$$\omega|_{nt} = \frac{1}{115} |d\rangle + \frac{114}{115} |d^\perp\rangle. \quad (7)$$

We see, as expected, that updating with a positive test yields a higher disease probability in (6), than the 5% of the prior, and that updating with a negative test yields a lower disease probability, in (7).

We have seen that there are two ways to answer the first question about likelihoods of tests. There are also two corresponding ways to perform updating.

Jeffrey The posterior ω_J , given the evidence of two positive and one negative test, in Jeffrey-style is a weighted mixture, reflecting two-out-of-three positive plus one-out-of-three negative:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_J &:= \frac{2}{3} \cdot \omega|_{pt} + \frac{1}{3} \cdot \omega|_{nt} = \frac{431}{5865} |d\rangle + \frac{5434}{5865} |d^\perp\rangle \\ &\approx 0.073 |d\rangle + 0.927 |d^\perp\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This Jeffrey-posterior ω_J has a slightly higher disease probability of 7.3% than the prior (5%).

Pearl Recall the conjunction $ppnt = pt \ \& \ pt \ \& \ nt$. In Pearl-style updating one uses this predicate as evidence for the posterior:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_P & := \omega|_{pt\&pt\&nt} = \omega|_{ppnt} = \frac{1/20 \cdot 81/1000}{381/4000} |d\rangle + \frac{19/20 \cdot 12/125}{381/4000} |d^\perp\rangle \\ & = \frac{27}{635} |d\rangle + \frac{608}{635} |d^\perp\rangle \\ & \approx 0.043 |d\rangle + 0.957 |d^\perp\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The Pearl-posterior ω_P has a lower disease probability than the prior. As we shall see later, this Pearl update $\omega|_{ppnt}$ can equivalently be computed as three successive updates $\omega|_{pt|pt|nt}$. The order of the separate updates is irrelevant.

The Jeffrey and Pearl updates are represented in Figure 1 as adapted flows, in the style of Subsection 1.1. In the remainder of this paper we shall work with the mathematical formulations of conditioning and no longer uses such water flow illustrations. In principle, these flows can be used to describe more general probabilistic constructions, like product distributions and marginalisation (see Section 4 below). One could even try to build such physical models for Bayesian networks, in which evidence at some point in the network, for instance in the form of blocking outgoing flows, propagates through the network and influences other flows, according to the laws of forward and backward reasoning [24]. One then has to reason with both water pressure and flows to form a physical model of string diagrams [13,4,34]. These string diagrams form an intuitive formalism that is increasingly used in quantum foundations [7] and probability theory.

Which update outcome makes most sense? Let's reason informally. We have seen in the formulation of the question that the predicted positive test probability is $\frac{17}{40} = 0.425$. Thus one expects roughly 2 out of 5 tests to be positive. The evidence that we have shows 2 positive out of 3, with a higher positive test ratio. In light of this a higher posterior disease probability makes sense — as with Jeffrey and not with Pearl.

Remark 1. Now that we have seen how to update a distribution, one can reconsider the first question and argue that one should compute the three-test likelihood by iteratively evaluating, in a dependent manner, each of the individual tests in an updated distribution. The outcome order pos-pos-neg gives:

$$(\omega \models pt) \cdot (\omega|_{pt} \models pt) \cdot (\omega|_{pt|pt} \models nt) = \frac{381}{4000}.$$

This can be done in three different orders, each time giving the same outcome. Hence we have to multiply this outcome by three. It reproduces the Pearl validity that we have seen in (4) as: $3 \cdot \frac{381}{4000} = \frac{1143}{4000}$. Later in Lemma 14 (6) a general explanation is given.

2.3 Question 3

The third question is in fact the same one as the first, but now with the Jeffrey and Pearl updates ω_J and ω_P instead of the original prior ω .




Fig. 1. Posterior, updated disease distributions as water flows regulated by taps, in the style of Subsection 1.1. The prior is on the top left, and the Pearl update is on the top right. It involves successive conditionings, via successive taps, corresponding to the conjunction of predicates pt & pt & nt used for updating (9). The Jeffrey update, as a convex combination of conditionings, is at the bottom. The incoming flow of one liter per second is divided, in a convex sum of $\frac{2}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{3}$ liter over two pumps. The positive test tap setting is applied to the left pump and the negative test tap setting is used on the right. The resulting outgoing flows are combined in merged pipes, corresponding to the convex sum (8). The diameters of the various pipes are not precise and only give an indication.

Jeffrey We apply the same formula (3), but now with ω_J instead of ω . For this we first calculate:

$$\omega_J \models pt = \frac{5123}{11730} \approx 0.437 \qquad \omega_J \models nt = \frac{6607}{11730} \approx 0.563$$

The Jeffrey-likelihood of the three tests, two positive one negative, in the Jeffrey-posterior is then:

$$3 \cdot (\omega_J \models pt)^2 \cdot (\omega_J \models nt) \approx 0.322 \qquad (10)$$

Pearl We now calculate, as in (4), the Pearl-style likelihood in the Pearl-posterior:

$$3 \cdot (\omega_P \models ppnt) = 3 \cdot (\omega_P \models pt^2 \ \& \ nt) \approx 0.2861 \qquad (11)$$

In the end we take a step back and compare the likelihoods of the three tests that we have found as answers to questions 1 and 3. The following table gives an overview.

	Jeffrey	Pearl
prior	0.3116 in Eqn. (3)	0.2858 in Eqn. (4)
posterior	0.322 in Eqn. (10)	0.2861 in Eqn. (11)

In both cases we see increases of likelihoods, from prior to posterior, even though the increases are small, certainly in the Pearl case. The increases make perfect sense, since the posterior is obtained by incorporating during updating the very evidence of which we determine the likelihood. Informally speaking, after learning p , this p becomes more true. Later on in Theorems 17 (1), and 18 (1), we shall see general results about such increases, for the Jeffrey, and Pearl cases.

The numbers in the prior and test described in the introduction have been chosen in a devious way, namely such that such increases do not happen if one mixes up the mechanisms of Pearl and Jeffrey. This happens for both mix-ups.

If one combines Jeffrey likelihood with Pearl update one computes for question 3 the validity:

$$3 \cdot (\omega_P \models pt)^2 \cdot (\omega_P \models nt) \approx 0.3081.$$

This is less than the original Jeffrey likelihood (3) of 0.3116.

Similarly, if Pearl likelihood is combined with a Jeffrey update one's answer to question 3 is:

$$3 \cdot (\omega_J \models ppnt) \approx 0.2847.$$

This is less than the original Pearl likelihood (4) of 0.2858

Our lesson is that mixing up likelihood and update mechanisms may break the likelihood increase that is naturally associated with learning / updating. Therefore it is important not only to be aware of the kind of likelihood computation (Jeffrey or Pearl), but also of the (associated) kind of update mechanism.

2.4 Replies to medical questions from the introduction

As mentioned in the introduction, seventeen academic colleagues have been kind enough to send in answers to the questions formulated in the introduction. There is quite a bit of

variation in the replies, especially for updating. The number of participants is too low to draw general conclusions, but the replies do give indications. At least they show that specialists in the field do not all give the same answer — a fact that serves as motivation for the clarifications provided in this paper.

Roughly, people in AI choose Pearl likelihood (17) and also do the corresponding Pearl update rule (9). This is a consistent approach. Four of the respondents used a tool (Octave, Prodigy, EfProb, Genfer) for the computation, which then does require a particular formalisation of the solution.

People in medical statistics mostly choose Jeffrey likelihood (16), one of them via the tool Julia. Several of them mention that they choose an independent interpretation of the three tests. They do not use the corresponding Jeffrey update rule (8) that we apply above. This update rule seems to be unfamiliar, even among specialists. Three of these respondents combine Jeffrey’s likelihood with Pearl’s update — which is more familiar — but the decrease of likelihood resulting from this mix-up does not seem to raise concerns among them.

Several of the respondents shared their calculations. It was hard to recognise systematics in the notation or in the approach — apart from two people referring to the binomial distribution. Several people fill in numbers in a concrete computation and calculate an outcome, without explaining the particular arrangement of numbers.

It is fair to say, even after such a small survey, that there is no common, established ‘logic’ to answer the medical test questions involving multiple pieces of evidence.

3 Multisets and distributions

After these preliminary discussions and observations about the medical test questions we now proceed to introduce and develop the relevant theory. This section describes for this purpose some basic facts about multisets and distributions.

A multiset is like a subset, except that elements may occur multiple times. An urn with five red balls, two blue and three green, is written as a multiset of the form $5|R\rangle + 2|B\rangle + 3|G\rangle$. We thus use ket’s $| - \rangle$ not only for distributions, but also for multisets. The three-test that we considered in the previous section involves a multiset of predicates, namely $2|pt\rangle + 1|nt\rangle$. Data items that are used for (probabilistic or machine) learning can often be organised appropriately as multisets, especially when items may occur multiple times and the order of occurrence is irrelevant.

In general, a (finite) multiset over a set X is written as $m_1|x_1\rangle + \dots + m_N|x_N\rangle$, with $x_1, \dots, x_N \in X$ and $m_1, \dots, m_N \in \mathbb{N}$. The number m_i expresses the multiplicity of element x_i , that is, the number of its occurrences in the multiset. Such a multiset over a set X may equivalently be described as a function $\varphi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, with finite support, where the support of φ is the subset $\text{supp}(\varphi) := \{x \in X \mid \varphi(x) \neq 0\}$. We can then write φ alternatively as formal sum $\sum_x \varphi(x)|x\rangle$. We will freely switch between the ket notation and function notation and use whichever form suits best. We write $\mathcal{M}(X)$ for the set of multisets over a set X .

The size $\|\varphi\| \in \mathbb{N}$ of a multiset $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is the total number of its elements, including multiplicities. Thus we define $\|\varphi\| := \sum_x \varphi(x)$. For a number $K \in \mathbb{N}$ we write $\mathcal{M}[K](X) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(X)$ for the subset of multisets of size K .

A K -sized list $(x_1, \dots, x_K) \in X^K$ of elements from X can be turned into a K -sized multiset, via what we call accumulation. It is defined as $\text{acc}(x_1, \dots, x_K) = 1|x_1\rangle + \dots + 1|x_K\rangle$ and gives a function $\text{acc}: X^K \rightarrow \mathcal{M}[K](X)$. Concretely, we have $\text{acc}(c, b, a, a, b, a) = 3|a\rangle + 2|b\rangle + 1|c\rangle$.

Given a multiset $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](X)$ there are (φ) many sequences in X^K that accumulate to φ . This number $(\varphi) \in \mathbb{N}$ is the multinomial coefficient of the multiset φ of size K , defined as:

$$(\varphi) := \frac{K!}{\varphi_{\parallel}} \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi_{\parallel} := \prod_{x \in X} \varphi(x)!. \quad (12)$$

Multinomial coefficients are useful, for instance in the famous Multinomial Theorem (see e.g. [33]) which has a snappy formulation in terms of multisets, as:

$$(r_1 + \dots + r_n)^K = \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](\{1, \dots, n\})} (\varphi) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} r_i^{\varphi(i)} \quad \text{for } r_i \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (13)$$

We turn to distributions. As mentioned in Section 2, a distribution over a set X is a finite formal convex sum $\sum_i r_i |x_i\rangle$ with $x_i \in X$, $r_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_i r_i = 1$. We can equivalently describe such a distribution as a function $\omega: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with finite support and $\sum_x \omega(x) = 1$. We write $\mathcal{D}(X)$ for the set of distributions on a set X . Each element $x \in X$ gives rise to a point (or Dirac) distribution $1|x\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(X)$.

Each non-empty multiset $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ can be turned into a distribution via normalisation. We call this frequentist learning and describe it as $\text{Flrn}(\varphi)$, where:

$$\text{Flrn}(\varphi) := \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\varphi(x)}{\|\varphi\|} |x\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Thus, for instance, $\text{Flrn}(3|a\rangle + 4|b\rangle + 5|c\rangle) = \frac{1}{4}|a\rangle + \frac{1}{3}|b\rangle + \frac{5}{12}|c\rangle$.

For two distributions $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$ we can form the parallel ‘tensor’ product $\omega \otimes \rho \in \mathcal{D}(X \times Y)$. It is defined in ket notation on the left below, and as function on the right.

$$\omega \otimes \rho := \sum_{x \in X, y \in Y} \omega(x) \cdot \rho(y) |x, y\rangle \quad \text{i.e.} \quad (\omega \otimes \rho)(x, y) := \omega(x) \cdot \rho(y).$$

We write ω^n for the n -fold tensor $\omega \otimes \dots \otimes \omega \in \mathcal{D}(X^n)$.

Distributions are closed under convex sums, in the following way. For numbers $r_1, \dots, r_n \in [0, 1]$, with $\sum_i r_i = 1$, and distributions $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ we can form a new distribution in $\mathcal{D}(X)$, namely:

$$\sum_i r_i \cdot \omega_i = r_1 \cdot \omega_1 + \dots + r_n \cdot \omega_n = \sum_{x \in X} \left(\sum_i r_i \cdot \omega_i(x) \right) |x\rangle.$$

Concretely: $\frac{1}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}|a\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|b\rangle \right) + \frac{2}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4}|a\rangle + \frac{3}{4}|b\rangle \right) = \frac{1}{3}|a\rangle + \frac{2}{3}|b\rangle$.

A function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ can be turned into a function $\mathcal{D}(f): \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$. It acts on a distribution in $\mathcal{D}(X)$ as described below.

$$\mathcal{D}(f) \left(\sum_i r_i |x_i\rangle \right) := \sum_i r_i |f(x_i)\rangle. \quad (15)$$

The function $\mathcal{D}(\pi_1): \mathcal{D}(X \times Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(X)$ obtained from the first projection $\pi_1: X \times Y \rightarrow X$ performs marginalisation. It maps a joint distribution τ over $X \times Y$ to a distribution over X by summing out the Y -part, as in:

$$\mathcal{D}(\pi_1)(\tau) = \sum_{x \in X} \left(\sum_{y \in Y} \tau(x, y) \right) |x\rangle \quad \text{so that} \quad \mathcal{D}(\pi_1)(\omega \otimes \rho) = \omega.$$

The copy map $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$, given by $\Delta(x) = (x, x)$, gives $\mathcal{D}(\Delta): \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(X \times X)$. It satisfies in general $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \neq \omega \otimes \omega$. For instance, for the fair coin flip distribution $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}|H\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|T\rangle$ one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\sigma) &= \frac{1}{2}|H, H\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|T, T\rangle \\ &\neq \frac{1}{4}|H, H\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|H, T\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|T, H\rangle + \frac{1}{4}|T, T\rangle = \sigma \otimes \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, flipping a coin once and copying the outcomes is different from flipping two coins.

4 Validity for multisets of evidence

In Section 2 we have already introduced validity $\omega \models p := \sum_x \omega(x) \cdot p(x)$ for a distribution ω and a predicate p . Also, we introduced likelihoods in the style of Jeffrey and Pearl, for multiple predicates. In this section we take a more systematic look at these notions.

Definition 2. *Let X be an arbitrary set.*

1. A predicate on X is a function $X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. More generally, a factor on X is a function $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and an observation is a function $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Thus, each predicate is a factor, and each factor is an observation. A predicate is called sharp if it restricts to $\{0, 1\} \subseteq [0, 1]$, that is, if either $p(x) = 0$ or $p(x) = 1$, for each $x \in X$.
2. The truth predicate $\mathbf{1}: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is always 1 and the falsity predicate $\mathbf{0}: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is always 0. Explicitly, $\mathbf{1}(x) = 1$ and $\mathbf{0}(x) = 0$ for each $x \in X$. Both $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ are thus sharp.
3. Observations (and factors and predicates) are ordered pointwise: $p \leq q$ means that $p(x) \leq q(x)$ holds for all x . Thus, each factor p satisfies $\mathbf{0} \leq p$ and each predicate p additionally satisfies $p \leq \mathbf{1}$.
4. For each subset $U \subseteq X$ there is sharp indicator predicate $\mathbf{1}_U: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\mathbf{1}_U(x) = 1$ if $x \in U$ and $\mathbf{1}_U(x) = 0$ if $x \notin U$. For an element $x \in X$ we write $\mathbf{1}_x$ for $\mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}$. This $\mathbf{1}_x$ is called a point predicate.

5. For two observations $p, q: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the same set we define the conjunction $p \& q: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $(p \& q)(x) := p(x) \cdot q(x)$. This conjunction $\&$ restricts to factors and to (sharp) predicates. It is easy to see that $\&$ is commutative and that it satisfies $p \& \mathbf{1} = p$ and $p \& \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$.
6. For two observations $p: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $q: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on (possibly) different sets we define the parallel conjunction $p \otimes q: X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ also by pointwise multiplication: $(p \otimes q)(x, y) := p(x) \cdot q(y)$. This \otimes restricts to factors and predicates too.
7. For two observations $p, q: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define the sum $p + q: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ also pointwise, as $(p + q)(x) := p(x) + q(x)$. This sum restricts to factors but not to predicates.
8. For an observation $p: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a scalar $s \in \mathbb{R}$ one defines the scalar multiplication $s \cdot p: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $(s \cdot p)(x) := s \cdot p(x)$. This scalar multiplication restricts to factors if one restricts the scalar s to the non-negative reals $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and to predicates if the scalars are from the unit interval $[0, 1]$.
9. For a predicate $p: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ there is the orthosupplement / negation $p^\perp: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined as $p^\perp(x) := 1 - p(x)$. Then $p^{\perp\perp} = p$ and $p + p^\perp = \mathbf{1}$.
10. We write $\text{Obs}(X) = \mathbb{R}^X$ for the set of observations / functions $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The subset of factors and predicates are written as $\text{Pred}(X) \subseteq \text{Fact}(X) \subseteq \text{Obs}(X)$. One may identify sharp predicates with subsets, giving an inclusion $\mathbf{1}_{(-)}: \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \text{Pred}(X)$.

Traditionally in probability theory one assigns probabilities to ‘events’, that is, to subsets $U \subseteq X$ of the space of possibilities X . In the present setting such an event corresponds to a sharp indicator predicate $\mathbf{1}_U$. The probability of this event is often written as $P(U)$, where the distribution at hand is left implicit. We would write this as $\omega \models \mathbf{1}_U = \sum_{x \in U} \omega(x) = P(U)$. Leaving the distribution implicit is inconvenient, or even confusing, when there are different distributions around. For instance, the important validity increase of Theorem 15 (1) cannot be expressed at all if one leaves the distribution implicit.

Predicates with values in $[0, 1]$, as used above, are often called fuzzy or soft. They make perfectly good sense in a probabilistic setting, as we have seen in Section 2 with the positive and negative test predicates pt and nt . See also for instance [8, §3.6-3.7] for other usage of fuzzy predicates in a probabilistic context. Using the notation introduced in the above definition we can write these two predicates pt and nt as weighted sums of point predicates: $pt = \frac{9}{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + \frac{2}{5} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp}$ and $nt = \frac{1}{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + \frac{3}{5} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp}$. Notice that $pt + nt = \mathbf{1}$, so that we can also write $pt = nt^\perp$.

The sum $p + q$ is defined above only for observations and factors p, q . It may also be defined for predicates p, q as a partial operation that exists when $p(x) + q(x) \leq 1$ for each x . Such partial sums are axiomatised in the notion of effect algebra; it appeared in the context of quantum logic, see [10, 14, 9, 5], but will not be used here.

It is easy to see that $p \otimes \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$. In contrast, $p \otimes \mathbf{1}$ does not trivialise. In logical terms, $p \otimes \mathbf{1}$ is the weakening of p , arising by moving a predicate (or factor, observation) $p: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ in context X to an extended context $X \times Y$, as $p \otimes \mathbf{1}: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$, with $(p \otimes \mathbf{1})(x, y) = p(x)$. Thus, where marginalisation moves a (joint) distribution to a smaller context, weakening moves a predicate to a larger context, see Lemma 3 (6) below.

We collect some basic results about validity \models . The proofs are easy and left to the reader.

Lemma 3. Recall from (2) that we write $\omega \models p$ for the sum $\sum_x \omega(x) \cdot p(x)$, for a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ and an observation $p \in \text{Obs}(X)$. Then:

1. $\omega \models \mathbf{1} = 1$ and $\omega \models \mathbf{0} = 0$, and $\omega \models \mathbf{1}_x = \omega(x)$;
2. $\omega \models (p + q) = (\omega \models p) + (\omega \models q)$ and $\omega \models (s \cdot p) = s \cdot (\omega \models p)$;
3. if $p \leq q$ then $(\omega \models p) \leq (\omega \models q)$;
4. $(\omega \otimes \rho) \models (p \otimes q) = (\omega \models p) \cdot (\rho \models q)$;
5. $\omega \models p^\perp = 1 - (\omega \models p)$;
6. $\mathcal{D}(\pi_1)(\tau) \models p = \tau \models p \otimes \mathbf{1}$ and $\omega \models (p \& q) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \models (p \otimes q)$. \square

In the present context we use the word evidence for multiple pieces of information whose validity can be determined and that can be used for updating (learning). A crucial point is that evidence may have multiple items, for instance coming from an experiment that is repeated several times. More concretely, we define evidence as a multiset of factors. We use factors, and not more general observations, since we like to use evidence for updating (in the next section). Updating works for factors, not for observations, since negative values are problematic in normalisation.

Definition 4. 1. Evidence is given by a multiset of factors over the same underlying set, say X , so that evidence is a multiset $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$. A common special case is where all factors involved are predicates, so that $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Pred}(X))$.

2. We use the following two special cases.
 - A single factor $p: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ will also be called evidence, where formally it would be a single piece of evidence as given by the singleton multiset $1|p\rangle$.
 - When evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Pred}(X))$ consists only of point predicates $\mathbf{1}_x$, this ψ may be identified with a multiset $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ over X . We may then call ψ point evidence.
3. We say that evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$ matches (or is a match) when the sum of all factors in the support of ψ is below the truth predicate $\mathbf{1}$, that is, if $\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p \leq \mathbf{1}$. This implies that all factors in ψ are predicates, and thus that ψ inhabits the set $\mathcal{M}(\text{Pred}(X))$. We call ψ a perfect match when $\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p = \mathbf{1}$.

The evidence used in Section 2 consisted of two positive and one negative test. We can write this now as a multiset $2|pt\rangle + 1|nt\rangle$. It is a perfect match since $pt + nt = \mathbf{1}$.

We define evidence as a *multiset*, and not as a *list*, of factors because we regard the order of the factors involved as irrelevant. This order-irrelevance also applies to updating, in Section 5.

We need to fix some notation for iterated conjunctions of predicates and evidence.

Definition 5. 1. Let a factor $p \in \text{Fact}(X)$ be given, with a number $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We iterate the two conjunctions $\&$ and \otimes for factors in the following way.

$$p^n := \underbrace{p \& \cdots \& p}_{n \text{ times}} \in \text{Fact}(X) \quad \text{and} \quad p^{\otimes n} := \underbrace{p \otimes \cdots \otimes p}_{n \text{ times}} \in \text{Fact}(X^n).$$

Explicitly, $p^n(x) = p(x)^n$ and $p^{\otimes n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = p(x_1) \cdots p(x_n)$. In the border case, when $n = 0$, we have $p^0 = \mathbf{1} \in \text{Fact}(X)$ and $p^{\otimes 0} = \mathbf{1} \in \text{Fact}(X^0) = \text{Fact}(1)$, where 1 is a singleton set.

2. For an evidence multiset $\psi \in \mathcal{M}[K](\text{Fact}(X))$ of size K we write:

$$\begin{aligned}\&\psi &:= \&_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\psi(p)} \in \text{Fact}(X) \\ \otimes \psi &:= \bigotimes_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\otimes \psi(p)} \in \text{Fact}(X^K).\end{aligned}$$

For instance, for evidence $\psi = 2|q\rangle + 3|r\rangle$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\&\psi &= q^2 \& r^3 = q \& q \& r \& r \& r \\ \otimes \psi &= q^{\otimes 2} \& r^{\otimes 3} = q \otimes q \otimes r \otimes r \otimes r.\end{aligned}$$

As an aside: the notation $\otimes \psi$ is a bit dangerous because the order of tensoring is relevant, in principle. We evaluate such expressions $\otimes \psi$ only in distributions of the form $\omega \otimes \dots \otimes \omega$ or $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega)$, so that such order issues do not matter.

We now turn to a general formulation of the two likelihoods of Jeffrey and Pearl that we distinguished in Subsection 2.1.

Definition 6. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be a distribution and let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$ be an evidence multiset of size $K = \|\psi\|$.

1. The Jeffrey validity $\omega \models_J \psi$ of ψ in ω is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega \models_J \psi &:= (\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega \models p)^{\psi(p)} \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \left(\underbrace{\omega \otimes \dots \otimes \omega}_{K \text{ times}} \models \bigotimes_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\otimes \psi(p)} \right) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot (\omega^K \models \otimes \psi).\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

This last equation holds by Lemma 3 (4). We recall that (ψ) is the multinomial coefficient from (12). It takes care of the different orders in which the validities of the factors in ψ may be evaluated.

2. The Pearl validity $\omega \models_P \psi$ of ψ in ω is:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega \models_P \psi &:= (\psi) \cdot (\omega \models \&\psi) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \left(\omega \models \&_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\psi(p)} \right) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \left(\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \models \bigotimes_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\otimes \psi(p)} \right) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot (\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \models \otimes \psi),\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

where $\Delta: X \rightarrow X^K$ is the K -fold copier $x \mapsto (x, \dots, x)$. The last equation holds by Lemma 3 (6).

The last lines of (16) and (17) give a clear difference between the formulations of Jeffrey and Pearl: they both use the validity of the parallel conjunction factor $\otimes \psi$, in the parallel product distribution $\omega^K = \omega \otimes \dots \otimes \omega \in \mathcal{D}(X^K)$ for Jeffrey, and in the copied distribution $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \in \mathcal{D}(X^K)$ for Pearl. As we have seen in Section 3, these two distributions ω^K and $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega)$ differ, in general. The difference between the joint distributions ω^K and $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega)$ corresponds to the difference between independent and dependent evaluation of the evidence items, in Jeffrey's and in Pearl's approach. Later, in Lemma 14 (6), we shall see that this Pearl validity can be expressed in yet another way, as discussed in Remark 1.

It is easy to see that the earlier Jeffrey and Pearl likelihood calculations (3) and (4) are instances of the above general definitions (16) and (17). As further illustration, we elaborate these definitions for $\psi = 2|p\rangle + 3|q\rangle$, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega \vDash_J \psi &\stackrel{(16)}{=} (\psi) \cdot (\omega \vDash p)^2 \cdot (\omega \vDash q)^3 \\
&= \frac{5!}{2! \cdot 3!} \cdot (\omega \vDash p) \cdot (\omega \vDash p) \cdot (\omega \vDash q) \cdot (\omega \vDash q) \cdot (\omega \vDash q) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\omega \otimes \omega \otimes \omega \otimes \omega \otimes \omega \vDash p \otimes p \otimes q \otimes q \otimes q) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\omega^5 \vDash p^{\otimes 2} \otimes q^{\otimes 3}) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\omega^5 \vDash \otimes \psi).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for Pearl:

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega \vDash_P \psi &\stackrel{(17)}{=} (\psi) \cdot (\omega \vDash \& \psi) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\omega \vDash p^2 \& q^3) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\omega \vDash p \& p \& q \& q \& q) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \vDash p \otimes p \otimes q \otimes q \otimes q) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \vDash p^{\otimes 2} \otimes q^{\otimes 3}) \\
&= 10 \cdot (\mathcal{D}(\Delta)(\omega) \vDash \otimes \psi).
\end{aligned}$$

In Figure 2 we plot, in the earlier medical setting, the 100 Jeffrey and Pearl validities for evidence of the form $i|pt\rangle + j|nt\rangle$, representing i positive and j negative tests, where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$. We see that the shapes look remarkably similar, but there are small differences between their validities (all less than 0.033).

Unlike in these cases, there can be substantial differences between Jeffrey and Pearl validities. For instance for the set $X = \{a, b, c\}$ consider the distribution and predicate:

$$\omega = \frac{3}{10}|a\rangle + \frac{3}{10}|b\rangle + \frac{2}{5}|c\rangle \quad p = \frac{1}{100} \cdot \mathbf{1}_a + \frac{1}{100} \cdot \mathbf{1}_b + \frac{49}{50} \cdot \mathbf{1}_c,$$

with (perfectly matching) evidence $\psi = 1|p\rangle + 1|p^\perp\rangle$. The difference between the Jeffrey and Pearl validities is more than 0.45, since:

$$\omega \vDash_J \psi \approx 0.479 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \vDash_P \psi \approx 0.028.$$




Fig. 2. Jeffrey and Pearl validities in the medical test scenario from the introduction, with 100 different versions of evidence $i|pt\rangle + j|nt\rangle$, where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$.

It may also happen that the Pearl validity is bigger. For instance, for the same distribution ω , but with predicate $q = \frac{3}{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_a + \frac{1}{5} \cdot \mathbf{1}_b + \frac{9}{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_c$ and evidence $\chi = 1|q\rangle + 4|q^\perp\rangle$ one gets:

$$\omega \vDash_J \chi \approx 0.054 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \vDash_P \chi \approx 0.154.$$

Hence it does matter which kind of validity is used in a particular situation. We see that the Jeffrey validity can be both bigger and smaller than the Pearl validity. In one special situation it is always smaller, namely when we have evidence of the form $n|p\rangle$ with one factor p occurring multiple (in fact, n) times. Then, for any distribution ω ,

$$\omega \vDash_J n|p\rangle = (\omega \vDash p)^n \leq \omega \vDash p^n = \omega \vDash_P n|p\rangle.$$

The proof for $n = 2$ is given in [20, Proof of Prop. 12], but the inequality holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 7. When the evidence consists of two factors both occurring once, say $\psi = 1|p_1\rangle + 1|p_2\rangle$, one has as Jeffrey and Pearl validities:

$$\omega \vDash_J \psi = 2 \cdot (\omega \vDash p_1) \cdot (\omega \vDash p_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \vDash_P \psi = 2 \cdot (\omega \vDash p_1 \& p_2).$$

These two expressions occur in the covariance of p_1, p_2 , since:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\omega, p_1, p_2) &:= \omega \vDash (p_1 - (\omega \vDash p_1) \cdot \mathbf{1}) \& (p_2 - (\omega \vDash p_2) \cdot \mathbf{1}) \\ &= (\omega \vDash p_1 \& p_2) - (\omega \vDash p_1) \cdot (\omega \vDash p_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left((\omega \vDash_P \psi) - (\omega \vDash_J \psi) \right). \end{aligned}$$

This relationship suggests that one can define covariance more generally, of the form $\text{Cov}(\omega, \psi)$, for a general evidence multiset ψ , via the difference between Pearl and Jeffrey validity of ψ .

Lemma 8. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be an arbitrary distribution.

1. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Pred}(X))$ be matching evidence, so that $\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p \leq \mathbf{1}$. Both the Jeffrey and Pearl validities $\omega \models_{\mathcal{J}} \psi$ and $\omega \models_{\mathcal{P}} \psi$ are in the unit interval $[0, 1]$. Explicitly:

$$\omega \models_{\mathcal{J}} \psi \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \models_{\mathcal{P}} \psi \leq 1.$$

2. Let $P \subseteq \text{Pred}(X)$ be a finite subset of predicates that add up to one: $\sum_{p \in P} p = \mathbf{1}$. For each $K \geq 1$, the sums of Jeffrey and Pearl validities of all (perfectly matching) evidence over P of size K add up to one and form distributions of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](P)} (\omega \models_{\mathcal{J}} \varphi) |\varphi\rangle &= \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](P)} (\varphi) \cdot \prod_{p \in P} (\omega \models p)^{\varphi(p)} |\varphi\rangle \\ \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](P)} (\omega \models_{\mathcal{P}} \varphi) |\varphi\rangle &= \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](P)} (\varphi) \cdot (\omega \models \&_{p \in P} p^{\varphi(p)}) |\varphi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. 1. Let the evidence multiset ψ have size K , that is, $\|\psi\| = K$. We use the Multinomial Theorem 13. In the Jeffrey case this gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \models_{\mathcal{J}} \psi &\stackrel{(16)}{=} (\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega \models p)^{\psi(p)} \\ &\leq \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](\text{supp}(\psi))} (\varphi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega \models p)^{\varphi(p)} \\ &\stackrel{(13)}{=} \left(\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \omega \models p \right)^K \\ &= \left(\omega \models \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p \right)^K \quad \text{by Lemma 3 (2)} \\ &\leq \left(\omega \models \mathbf{1} \right)^K \quad \text{since } \psi \text{ is matching} \\ &= 1^K = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For the Pearl case we write $q := \&_p p^{\psi(p)}$ for the conjunction. We now use the Multinomial Theorem to show that $(\psi) \cdot q$ is pointwise below $\mathbf{1}$, in:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\psi) \cdot q)(x) &= (\psi) \cdot q(x) = (\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{\psi(p)} \\ &\leq \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](\text{supp}(\psi))} (\varphi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{\varphi(p)} \\ &\stackrel{(13)}{=} \left(\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x) \right)^K \\ &\leq 1^K \quad \text{since } \psi \text{ is matching} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now we hare done by Lemma 3 (2):

$$\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi \stackrel{(17)}{=} (\psi) \cdot (\omega \vDash q) = \omega \vDash (\psi) \cdot q \leq \omega \vDash \mathbf{1} = 1.$$

2. Again, by the Multinomial Theorem the probabilities $\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \varphi$ and $\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \varphi$, for all perfectly matching evidence $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](P)$, now add up to precisely one. \square

The match requirement is necessary in order to get validities below one. Consider, for instance the uniform distribution $\omega = \frac{1}{2}|a\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|b\rangle$ with non-matching evidence $\psi = 2|p\rangle + 3|q\rangle$, for $p = \mathbf{1}_a + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1}_b$ and $q = \frac{4}{5} \cdot \mathbf{1}_a + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1}_b$. Then $\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi = \frac{19773}{12800} > 1$, but < 2 , and $\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi = \frac{2173}{800} > 2$.

Jeffrey validity is sometimes expressed via log-likelihood. One motivation to switch to (natural) logarithmic formulations is that the multiplication in (16) may lead to very small numbers, so small that rounding errors start to kick in. Another motivation is that sum formulas may be easier to maximise, for instance by taking derivatives — since the derivative of a sum is a sum of derivatives.

Lemma 9. *Let $\omega, \omega' \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be two distributions, with an evidence multiset $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$. Then:*

$$\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi \leq \omega' \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi \iff \text{Flm}(\psi) \vDash \ln \left(\frac{\omega \vDash -}{\omega' \vDash -} \right) \leq 0.$$

Proof. We use that the (natural) logarithm $\ln: \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ preserves and reflects the order: $a \leq b$ iff $\ln(a) \leq \ln(b)$. We additionally use that the logarithm sends multiplications to sums.

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi &\leq \omega' \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi \\ \iff \ln(\omega \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi) &\leq \ln(\omega' \vDash_{\mathbb{F}} \psi) \\ \stackrel{(16)}{\iff} \ln \left((\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega \vDash p)^{\psi(p)} \right) &\leq \ln \left((\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega' \vDash p)^{\psi(p)} \right) \\ \iff \ln((\psi)) + \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \psi(p) \cdot \ln(\omega \vDash p) & \\ &\leq \ln((\psi)) + \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \psi(p) \cdot \ln(\omega' \vDash p) \\ \iff \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \frac{\psi(p)}{\|\psi\|} \cdot \ln(\omega \vDash p) &\leq \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \frac{\psi(p)}{\|\psi\|} \cdot \ln(\omega' \vDash p) \\ \iff \text{Flm}(\psi) \vDash \ln(\omega \vDash -) &\leq \text{Flm}(\psi) \vDash \ln(\omega' \vDash -). \\ \iff \text{Flm}(\psi) \vDash \left(\ln(\omega \vDash -) - \ln(\omega' \vDash -) \right) &\leq 0 \\ \iff \text{Flm}(\psi) \vDash \ln \left(\frac{\omega \vDash -}{\omega' \vDash -} \right) &\leq 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4.1 Jeffrey validity of point evidence

In the remainder of this section we concentrate on point evidence and its Jeffrey validity. But first, we introduce the multinomial distribution, in general, multivariate form. It captures the probabilities associated with drawing (with replacement) multiple balls from an urn, filled with balls of various colours. The urn is represented by a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$, where X is the set of colours. Thus, the probability of drawing a ball of colour $x \in X$ is given by $\omega(x)$. We are interested in drawing multiple balls, of a fixed size K . These draws are represented by a multiset $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](X)$. The multinomial distribution $mn[K](\omega) \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}[K](X))$ assigns probabilities to such draws. It can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} mn[K](\omega) &:= \mathcal{D}(acc)(\omega^K) \stackrel{(15)}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X^K} \omega^K(\mathbf{x}) |acc(\mathbf{x})\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](X)} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in acc^{-1}(\varphi)} \omega^K(\mathbf{x}) |\varphi\rangle. \quad (18) \\ &= \sum_{\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](X)} (\varphi) \cdot \prod_{x \in X} \omega(x)^{\varphi(x)} |\varphi\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For instance, for $\omega = \frac{1}{2}|R\rangle + \frac{1}{3}|G\rangle + \frac{1}{6}|B\rangle$ the multinomial distribution of draws of size three is:

$$\begin{aligned} mn[3](\omega) &= \frac{1}{8} |3|R\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{4} |2|R\rangle + 1|G\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{6} |1|R\rangle + 2|G\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{27} |3|G\rangle\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8} |2|R\rangle + 1|B\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{6} |1|R\rangle + 1|G\rangle + 1|B\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{18} |2|G\rangle + 1|B\rangle\rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{24} |1|R\rangle + 2|B\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{36} |1|G\rangle + 2|B\rangle\rangle + \frac{1}{216} |3|B\rangle\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Each draw, as multiset of size 3, is inside a big ket, with the probability of that draw written before the big ket.

Lemma 10. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}[K](X)$ be point evidence, where we identify $\psi = \sum_x \psi(x)|x\rangle$ with the multiset of point predicates $\sum_x \psi(x)|\mathbf{1}_x\rangle$.*

1. For a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$,

$$\omega \models \psi = mn[K](\omega)(\psi).$$

2. The distribution that gives the highest Jeffrey validity to the point evidence ψ is $Flrn(\psi)$.

Proof. 1. We use the equation $\omega \models \mathbf{1}_x = \omega(x)$ in:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \models \psi &\stackrel{(16)}{=} (\psi) \cdot \prod_{x \in X} (\omega \models \mathbf{1}_x)^{\psi(x)} \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \prod_{x \in X} \omega(x)^{\psi(x)} \stackrel{(18)}{=} mn[K](\omega)(\psi). \end{aligned}$$

2. This is a standard result, see e.g. [26, Ex. 17.5], or the appendix of [20], which one proves via the Lagrange multiplier method (as in the appendix). \square

Pearl validity of the form (17) does not make much sense for point evidence because it becomes zero as soon as there is more than one point, since $\mathbf{1}_x \& \mathbf{1}_y = \mathbf{0}$ when $x \neq y$. However, in Section 6, we shall see that point evidence in the presence of channels does make sense for Pearl validity.

For future use we show how Jeffrey validity of point evidence is related to Kullback-Leibler divergence D_{KL} . This divergence is a standard method for measuring the difference between two distributions. Its definition (here) uses the natural logarithm \ln . Explicitly, for $\omega, \rho \in \mathcal{D}(X)$,

$$D_{KL}(\omega, \rho) := \sum_{x \in X} \omega(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\omega(x)}{\rho(x)} \right). \quad (19)$$

The convention is that $r \cdot \ln(r) = 0$ when $r = 0$. This is not a metric, since KL-divergence D_{KL} is not symmetric: $D_{KL}(\omega, \rho) \neq D_{KL}(\rho, \omega)$, in general. One does have $D_{KL}(\omega, \rho) \geq 0$, which can be shown via Jensen's inequality, and $D_{KL}(\omega, \rho) = 0$ if and only if $\omega = \rho$.

Lemma 11 (From [23]). *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}[K](X)$ be a given multiset of size $K > 0$. Consider two distributions $\omega, \omega' \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ with the same support as φ . Then:*

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \vDash \varphi \leq \omega' \vDash \varphi &\iff mn[K](\omega)(\varphi) \leq mn[K](\omega')(\varphi) \\ &\iff D_{KL}(Flrn(\varphi), \omega) \geq D_{KL}(Flrn(\varphi), \omega'). \end{aligned}$$

The first equivalence \iff is a direct consequence of Lemma 10. The second equivalence is the main statement.

This result makes perfect sense: the lower the (Jeffrey) validity of point evidence φ is in distribution ω , the higher the divergence is between the normalised distribution $Flrn(\varphi)$ and ω . Very briefly: low validity corresponds to high divergence.

Proof. We use, as first step below, that the logarithm \ln preserves and reflects the order and that it sends multiplications to sums.

$$\begin{aligned}
mn[K](\omega)(\varphi) &\leq mn[K](\omega')(\varphi) \\
\iff \ln \left(mn[K](\omega)(\varphi) \right) &\leq \ln \left(mn[K](\omega')(\varphi) \right) \\
\stackrel{(18)}{\iff} \ln \left((\varphi) \cdot \prod_{x \in X} \omega(x)^{\varphi(x)} \right) &\leq \ln \left((\varphi) \cdot \prod_{x \in X} \omega'(x)^{\varphi(x)} \right) \\
\iff \ln \left((\varphi) \right) + \sum_{x \in X} \varphi(x) \cdot \ln \left(\omega(x) \right) &\leq \ln \left((\varphi) \right) + \sum_{x \in X} \varphi(x) \cdot \ln \left(\omega'(x) \right) \\
\iff - \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\varphi(x)}{\|\varphi\|} \cdot \ln \left(\omega(x) \right) &\geq - \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\varphi(x)}{\|\varphi\|} \cdot \ln \left(\omega'(x) \right) \\
\iff \sum_{x \in X} \text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \ln \left(\text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \right) - \sum_{x \in X} \text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \ln \left(\omega(x) \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{x \in X} \text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \ln \left(\text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \right) - \sum_{x \in X} \text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \ln \left(\omega'(x) \right) \\
\iff \sum_{x \in X} \text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x)}{\omega(x)} \right) &\geq \sum_{x \in X} \text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\text{Flrn}(\varphi)(x)}{\omega'(x)} \right) \\
\stackrel{(19)}{\iff} D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\varphi), \omega) &\geq D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\varphi), \omega'). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

5 Updating distributions

This section first recalls how to update a distribution with a single predicate, basically as in (5). Then it introduces two update mechanisms, for Jeffrey and for Pearl, about updating a distribution with evidence, in the form of a multiset of predicates.

Definition 12. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be distribution and $p: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a factor with non-zero validity $\omega \models p$. We write $\omega|_p \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ for the new, Bayesian update of ω obtained as:

$$\omega|_p := \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\omega(x) \cdot p(x)}{\omega \models p} |x\rangle. \quad (20)$$

Whenever we write $\omega|_p$ we implicitly assume $\omega \models p \neq 0$.

We have seen an example of how this updating works in (6), by incorporating the predicate into the distribution.

Example 13. We can now describe the physical model from Subsection 1.1 in a mathematically precise manner. There we started with a distribution $\omega = \frac{1}{2}|L\rangle + \frac{1}{3}|M\rangle + \frac{1}{6}|R\rangle$ corresponding to the division of water flows over three pipes, labeled as left (L), middle (M) and right (R).

During the first update, the middle pipe was blocked. This can be captured by the sharp predicate $(\mathbf{1}_M)^\perp = \mathbf{1}_{\{L,R\}}$ corresponding to the subset $\{L, R\} \subseteq \{L, M, R\}$ of open pipes. This sharp predicate has validity:

$$\omega \models \mathbf{1}_{\{L,R\}} = \sum_{x \in \{L,M,R\}} \omega(x) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{L,R\}}(x) = \omega(L) + \omega(R) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{2}{3}.$$

Updating with this predicate yields the distribution written as ω' in Subsection 1.1. Explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega' &:= \omega|_{\mathbf{1}_{\{L,R\}}} \stackrel{(20)}{=} \sum_{x \in \{L,M,R\}} \frac{\omega(x) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{L,R\}}(x)}{\omega \models \mathbf{1}_{\{L,R\}}} |x\rangle \\ &= \frac{1/2 \cdot 1}{2/3} |L\rangle + \frac{1/3 \cdot 0}{2/3} |M\rangle + \frac{1/6 \cdot 1}{2/3} |R\rangle = \frac{3}{4} |L\rangle + \frac{1}{4} |R\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The second distribution ω'' in Subsection 1.1 is obtained by updating ω with the fuzzy predicate $p = \frac{2}{3} \cdot \mathbf{1}_L + \frac{1}{3} \cdot \mathbf{1}_M + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \mathbf{1}_R$. It captures the openness of the three taps. This leads to a validity $\omega \models p = \frac{19}{36}$. It is called a normalisation factor in Subsection 1.1. The calculation of ω'' given there fits the above definition (20) of the Bayesian update.

Bayesian updating satisfies several basic, standard properties that are easy to prove.

Lemma 14. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ and $p, q \in \text{Fact}(X)$ be factors.*

1. $\omega|_{\mathbf{1}} = \omega$ and $\omega|_{p \& q} = \omega|_p|_q$; as a result, the order of multiple updates is irrelevant;
2. $\omega|_{\mathbf{1}_x} = |x\rangle$, for each $x \in \text{supp}(\omega)$;
3. $\omega|_{s \cdot p} = \omega|_p$ for a scalar $s > 0$;
4. The product rule holds:

$$\omega|_p \models q = \frac{\omega \models p \& q}{\omega \models p}.$$

5. Bayes' rule holds:

$$\omega|_p \models q = \frac{(\omega|_q \models p) \cdot (\omega \models q)}{\omega \models p}.$$

6. For a sequence of factors $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \text{Fact}(X)$ one has:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega \otimes (\omega|_{p_1}) \otimes (\omega|_{p_1|p_2}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\omega|_{p_1 \dots |p_{n-1}}) &\models p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_n \\ &= \omega \models p_1 \& \dots \& p_n. \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \cdot \left(\omega \models \sum_i |p_i\rangle \right).\end{aligned}$$

The last item generalises what we have seen in Remark 1. Recall from (16) that the Jeffrey validity of the factors in the last item takes the form $\omega \otimes \dots \otimes \omega \models p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_n = \prod_i \omega \models p_i$. It thus involves the ‘independent’ validity of each of the factors p_i in the same distribution ω . The above last item (6) shows the difference with Pearl validity, which involves ‘dependent’ validity of p_{i+1} in the distribution that is updated with the previous factors p_1, \dots, p_i . Thus, at state $i + 1$ one takes into account what has already been learned at previous stages $1, \dots, i$.

Proof. We only prove the last item (6) since the other ones are standard (see e.g. [24, Lemma 5]) and easy to show. We use induction on n , where the base case for $n = 1$ is obvious. Next, by Lemma 3 (4) and Lemma 14 (1), (4):

$$\begin{aligned}\omega \otimes (\omega|_{p_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\omega|_{p_1 \dots |p_{n-1}}) \otimes (\omega|_{p_1 \dots |p_n}) &\models p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_n \otimes p_{n+1} \\ &= \left(\omega \otimes (\omega|_{p_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\omega|_{p_1 \dots |p_{n-1}}) \models p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_n \right) \cdot \left(\omega|_{p_1 \dots |p_n} \models p_{n+1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(IH)}}{=} \left(\omega \models p_1 \& \dots \& p_n \right) \cdot \left(\omega|_{p_1 \& \dots \& p_n} \models p_{n+1} \right) \\ &= \omega \models p_1 \& \dots \& p_n \& p_{n+1}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

We now formulate two general results about the gains of learning. They will be applied later for the rules of Jeffrey and Pearl. The formulation below occurs in [20] and is proven there. For completeness we reproduce the proof in the appendix.

Theorem 15. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be a distribution.*

1. *For a factor p on X with non-zero validity $\omega \models p$ one has:*

$$\omega|_p \models p \geq \omega \models p.$$

2. *Let p_1, \dots, p_n be factors on X , all with non-zero validity $\omega \models p_i$. The uniform convex sum of updates $\omega' := \sum_i \frac{1}{n} \cdot \omega|_{p_i}$ satisfies:*

$$\prod_i (\omega' \models p_i) \geq \prod_i (\omega \models p_i). \quad \square$$

The first item expresses that in a Bayesian update of a distribution with evidence / factor p this p becomes ‘more true’ in the updated posterior distribution, than in the original prior distribution. This is a benefit that one expects from learning. The second item is more subtle and expresses an increase of multiplied validities.

We now give general formulations for the Jeffrey and Pearl update mechanisms, with evidence. We have used the vertical bar $|$ for Bayesian updating in the notation $\omega|_p$. For the Jeffrey, and Pearl versions we make subtle variations: we change the vertical bar $|$ into \downarrow for the Jeffrey update and into \uparrow for the Pearl update, referring respectively to the letters ‘J’ and ‘P’.

Definition 16. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be a distribution with evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$.*

1. *The Jeffrey update $\omega\downarrow_\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ of the distribution ω with the evidence ψ is defined as a convex sum of Bayesian updates with separate predicates:*

$$\omega\downarrow_\psi := \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \text{Flrn}(\psi)(p) \cdot \omega|_p. \quad (21)$$

2. *The Pearl update $\omega\uparrow_\psi \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ is the Bayesian update with a single factor, namely with the conjunction $\& \psi = \&_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\psi(p)}$, as in:*

$$\omega\uparrow_\psi := \omega|_{\& \psi} = \omega|_{\&_p p^{\psi(p)}}. \quad (22)$$

For singleton evidence $1|p\rangle$ one has $\omega\downarrow_{1|p\rangle} = \omega\uparrow_{1|p\rangle} = \omega|_p$, so Jeffrey and Pearl updates coincide in this trivial case with a Bayesian update. The differences between the update modes arise for multiple pieces of evidence.

Equations (8) and (9) provide illustrations of these two update mechanisms. Figure 3 contains plots of the updated (posterior) disease probabilities, for Jeffrey and Pearl, using evidence of the form $i|pt\rangle + j|nt\rangle$, with i positive and j negative tests, for all values $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$. We see that in comparison with the validities in Figure 2 there are now considerable differences between Jeffrey and Pearl. In the Jeffrey case




Fig. 3. Posterior disease probabilities in the medical test scenario from the introduction, for the two update mechanisms of Jeffrey and Pearl, with 100 different versions of evidence $i|pt\rangle + j|nt\rangle$, where $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$.

the plot is rather flat, since the posterior disease probability is a convex combination of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{i}{i+j} \cdot \omega|_{pt}(d) + \frac{j}{i+j} \cdot \omega|_{nt}(d), & \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq 10, \text{ see (21)} \\ & = \frac{i}{i+j} \cdot \frac{9}{85} + \frac{j}{i+j} \cdot \frac{1}{115} & \text{see (6) and (7).} \end{aligned}$$

In the Pearl case, on the right in Figure 3, we see more variation. The relevant formula is not as simple as in the Jeffrey case. The Pearl posterior disease probability is highest when the evidence contains a high number i of positive tests and a low number j of negative tests. This makes sense.

We proceed with some key validity increase — and other — properties of these updates with evidence. We begin with the Jeffrey case.

Theorem 17. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be a distribution with evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$.*

1. *Jeffrey updating increases the Jeffrey validity:*

$$\omega|_{\psi} \models_{\text{J}} \psi \geq \omega \models_{\text{J}} \psi.$$

2. *In the special case that ψ is point evidence, inhabiting $\mathcal{M}(X)$, Jeffrey updating gives a reduction of KL-divergence:*

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\psi), \omega|_{\psi}) \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\psi), \omega).$$

3. *More of the same evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$ does not change Jeffrey updating: for each $n \geq 1$,*

$$\omega|_{n \cdot \psi} = \omega|_{\psi} \quad \text{where} \quad n \cdot \psi = \psi + \dots + \psi.$$

4. Jeffrey updating is sensitive to the order of updating: for other evidence $\chi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$, in general,

$$\omega|_{\psi}|_{\chi} \neq \omega|_{\chi}|_{\psi}.$$

5. Let ω be ‘fractional’, that is, the probabilities in ω are fractions, and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $N \cdot \omega$ is a multiset. Consider this $N \cdot \omega \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ as point evidence. Then, updating with this point evidence has no effect:

$$\omega|_{N \cdot \omega} = \omega.$$

6. A fractional convex sum of Jeffrey updates can be turned into a single Jeffrey update: for numbers $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sum_i n_i = n$ and for evidence multisets $\psi_i \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$,

$$\frac{n_1}{n} \cdot \omega|_{\psi_1} + \cdots + \frac{n_L}{n} \cdot \omega|_{\psi_L} = \omega|_{\psi} \quad \text{for } \psi = n_1 \cdot \psi_1 + \cdots + n_L \cdot \psi_L.$$

Item (5) says that you learn nothing if you use the information from the distribution ω as evidence. More informally, you learn nothing in Jeffrey style from what you already know. The fact that ω is required to be fractional is not essential. It is needed because we have defined multisets of evidence to have only natural numbers as frequencies. One can drop this limitation and allow non-negative real numbers as frequencies. Then one can use the distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ as a multiset of point predicates itself — without multiplication with the number N — and write $\omega|_{\omega} = \omega$. The same thing applies in item (6).

Proof. Let the evidence multinomial $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$ have size K .

1. We write the multiset ψ as accumulation $\psi = \text{acc}(p_1, \dots, p_K)$ of a sequence of factors, including multiple occurrences, with each $p \in \text{supp}(\psi)$ occurring $\psi(p)$ many times in this sequence p_1, \dots, p_K . Theorem 15 (2) tells us that:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega' \vDash_{\mathcal{J}} \psi &\stackrel{(16)}{=} (\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega' \vDash p)^{\psi(p)} = (\psi) \cdot \prod_i (\omega' \vDash p_i) \\ &\geq (\psi) \cdot \prod_i (\omega \vDash p_i) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega \vDash p)^{\psi(p)} \stackrel{(16)}{=} \omega \vDash_{\mathcal{J}} \psi, \end{aligned}$$

where, as defined in Theorem 15 (2):

$$\omega' := \sum_i \frac{1}{K} \cdot \omega|_{p_i} = \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \frac{\psi(p)}{K} \cdot \omega|_p = \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \text{Flrn}(\psi)(p) \cdot \omega|_p = \omega|_{\psi}.$$

2. This is obtained by combining the validity increase of the previous point with Lemma 10 and 11:

$$\text{mn}[K](\omega|_{\psi})(\psi) = \omega|_{\psi} \vDash_{\mathcal{J}} \psi \geq \omega \vDash_{\mathcal{J}} \psi = \text{mn}[K](\omega)(\psi)$$

It gives the required divergence decrease:

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\psi), \omega|_{\psi}) \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\psi), \omega).$$

3. Since $\text{Flrn}(n \cdot \psi) = \text{Flrn}(\psi)$.
4. We give an illustration showing that the two orders of updating are not equal. We re-use the situation described in the introduction, with prior $\omega = \frac{1}{20}|d\rangle + \frac{19}{20}|d^\perp\rangle$ and positive and negative test predicates pt and nt . We take the original evidence $\psi = 2|pt\rangle + 1|nt\rangle$ with new evidence $\chi = 1|pt\rangle + 2|nt\rangle$. Then:

$$\omega|_{\psi|\chi} = 0.059|d\rangle + 0.941|d^\perp\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \omega|_{\chi|\psi} = 0.061|d\rangle + 0.939|d^\perp\rangle.$$

5. Suppose we can write $\omega = \sum_i \frac{n_i}{N}|x_i\rangle$, with $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N = \sum_i n_i$. Then $N \cdot \omega$ is the multiset $\sum_i n_i|x_i\rangle$, which we identify with the point evidence $\sum_i n_i|\mathbf{1}_{x_i}\rangle$. Hence, by Lemma 14 (2),

$$\omega|_{N \cdot \omega} = \sum_i \text{Flrn}(N \cdot \omega)(x_i) \cdot \omega|_{\mathbf{1}_{x_i}} = \sum_i \frac{n_i}{N} \cdot 1|x_i\rangle = \omega. \quad \square$$

We turn to Pearl's style of updating.

Theorem 18. *Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be a distribution with evidence $\psi, \chi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$.*

1. *Pearl updating increases the Pearl validity:*

$$\omega|_{\psi}^p \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi \geq \omega \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi.$$

2. *The 'product' and 'Bayes' analogues of Proposition 14 (4), (5) hold for Pearl updating:*

$$\omega|_{\psi}^p \models_{\mathbb{P}} \chi = \frac{\omega \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi + \chi}{\omega \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi} = \frac{(\omega|_{\chi}^p \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi) \cdot (\omega \models_{\mathbb{P}} \chi)}{\omega \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi},$$

where $\psi + \chi$ is the pointwise sum of multisets.

3. *Pearl updates compose, as in:*

$$\omega|_{\psi|\chi}^p = \omega|_{\psi+\chi}^p.$$

4. *Pearl updating is insensitive to the order of updating:*

$$\omega|_{\psi|\chi}^p = \omega|_{\chi|\psi}^p.$$

5. *One learns nothing via Pearl updates with uniform factors, that is, with scalars $s \cdot \mathbf{1}$ of the truth predicate, for $s > 0$. Explicitly,*

$$\omega|_{\psi}^p = \omega \quad \text{for } \psi = \sum_i \psi(i)|s_i \cdot \mathbf{1}\rangle \text{ with } s_i > 0.$$

Proof. 1. Directly by Theorem 15 (1):

$$\omega|_{\psi}^p \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi = \omega|_{\&\psi} \models \&\psi \geq \omega \models \&\psi = \omega \models_{\mathbb{P}} \psi.$$

2. The first thing to note is that $\&(\psi + \chi) = \&(\psi) \& \&(\chi)$. This uses $p^{n+m} = p^n \& p^m$. Then, following Definition 5 (2) one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \&(\psi + \chi) &= \&_{p \in \text{Fact}(X)} p^{(\psi + \chi)(p)} = \&_{p \in \text{Fact}(X)} p^{\psi(p) + \chi(p)} \\ &= \&_{p \in \text{Fact}(X)} p^{\psi(p)} \& p^{\chi(p)} \\ &= \&_{p \in \text{Fact}(X)} p^{\psi(p)} \& \&_{p \in \text{Fact}(X)} p^{\chi(p)} \\ &= \&(\psi) \& \&(\chi). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using Proposition 14 (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{\psi}^p \models \chi &= \omega|_{\&(\psi)} \models \&(\chi) = \frac{\omega \models \&(\psi) \& \&(\chi)}{\omega \models \&(\psi)} \\ &= \frac{\omega \models \&(\psi + \chi)}{\omega \models \&(\psi)} = \frac{\omega|_{\psi}^p \models \psi + \chi}{\omega|_{\psi}^p \models \psi}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using Proposition 14 (5), one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{\psi}^p \models \chi &= \omega|_{\&(\psi)} \models \&(\chi) = \frac{\omega \models \&(\psi) \& \&(\chi)}{\omega \models \&(\psi)} \\ &= \frac{(\omega|_{\&(\chi)} \models \&(\psi)) \cdot (\omega \models \&(\chi))}{\omega \models \&(\psi)} \\ &= \frac{(\omega|_{\chi}^p \models \psi) \cdot (\omega \models \chi)}{\omega|_{\psi}^p \models \psi}. \end{aligned}$$

3. We again use the equation $\&(\psi + \chi) = \&(\psi) \& \&(\chi)$, now together with Proposition 14 (1), in:

$$\omega|_{\psi}^p \models \chi = \omega|_{\&(\psi) \& \&(\chi)} \models \&(\chi) = \omega|_{\&(\psi) \& \&(\chi)} \models \&(\chi) = \omega|_{\&(\psi + \chi)} \models \&(\chi) = \omega|_{\psi + \chi}^p \models \chi.$$

4. We use the previous point and the commutativity of addition $+$ of multisets, in:

$$\omega|_{\psi}^p \models \chi = \omega|_{\psi + \chi}^p \models \chi = \omega|_{\chi + \psi}^p \models \chi = \omega|_{\chi}^p \models \psi.$$

5. Let the evidence be of the form $\psi = \sum_i \psi(i) |s_i \cdot \mathbf{1}\rangle$ with $s_i > 0$. Then $\& \psi = \&_{i} (s_i \cdot \mathbf{1})^{\psi(i)} = s \cdot \mathbf{1}$, where $s = \prod_i s_i^{\psi(i)} > 0$. Then, by Proposition 14 (3), (1), in:

$$\omega|_{\psi} = \omega|_{\& \psi} = \omega|_{s \cdot \mathbf{1}} = \omega|_{\mathbf{1}} = \omega. \quad \square$$

We thus see that X-updating increases X-validity for $X \in \{\text{Jeffrey}, \text{Pearl}\}$, see Theorem 17 (1) and Theorem 18 (1). Such learning makes us appropriately wiser. At the end of Section 2 we have seen that mixing validity and update of different kinds may lead to a decrease of validity — making us less wise. We can now formulate this more precisely: for the prior disease distribution $\omega = \frac{1}{20} |d\rangle + \frac{19}{20} |d^\perp\rangle$ and the three-test evidence $\psi = 2 |pt\rangle + 1 |nt\rangle$ one has validity decreases after (the wrong kind of) updates:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{\psi}^p \models \psi &= 0.3081 < 0.3116 = \omega \models \psi \\ \omega|_{\psi} \models \psi &= 0.2847 < 0.2858 = \omega \models \psi. \end{aligned}$$

A final question that we consider in this section is: what happens if one tries to update a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ with inconsistent evidence? We take this inconsistent evidence to be of the form $\psi = 1|_{\mathbf{1}_U} + 1|_{\mathbf{1}_{\neg U}}$, with two sharp predicates $\mathbf{1}_U$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\neg U}$, for a non-empty subset $U \subseteq \text{supp}(\omega)$ with non-empty complement $\neg U = \text{supp}(\omega) \setminus U$. The Jeffrey update with such inconsistent evidence yields a convex combination of the two updates:

$$\omega|_{\psi} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \omega|_{\mathbf{1}_U} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \omega|_{\mathbf{1}_{\neg U}}. \quad (23)$$

This can be interpreted as a ‘superposition’ of the two updated distributions. To be explicit, the update $\omega|_{\mathbf{1}_U}$ is the normalised restriction of ω to the subset U , as in:

$$\omega|_{\mathbf{1}_U} \stackrel{(20)}{=} \sum_{x \in U} \frac{\omega(x)}{\omega \models \mathbf{1}_U} |x\rangle = \sum_{x \in U} \frac{\omega(x)}{\sum_{y \in U} \omega(y)} |x\rangle.$$

Thus, the two distributions $\omega|_{\mathbf{1}_U}$ and $\omega|_{\mathbf{1}_{\neg U}}$ have disjoint supports, but happily live together in the Jeffrey update (23). This reinforces the idea that Jeffrey’s approach involves a convex combination of independent updates.

The Pearl update would be of the form $\omega|_{\mathbf{1}_U \& \mathbf{1}_{\neg U}} = \omega|_{\mathbf{1}_{\neg U}}$. We notice that the conjunction $\& \psi = \mathbf{1}_U \& \mathbf{1}_{\neg U} = \mathbf{1}_{U \cap \neg U} = \mathbf{1}_{\emptyset} = \mathbf{0}$ yields falsity. Updating with the predicate $\mathbf{0}$ is impossible, since its validity is 0.

6 Channels

At this stage we have seen the basics of validity and updating according to Jeffrey and Pearl, and how these updates make us appropriately wiser. In the set up so far we have used a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ on a set X , and evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$ on this same set X . We now generalise this situation to allow evidence on a different set, say Y . This is a common situation in which information on Y is observable, and information on X is hidden, often called latent. The connection between the sets X and Y happens via what is called a channel, forming a generative model. This section outlines the role that these channels play in probabilistic updating.

Channels formalise the idea of conditional probabilities. They carry a rich mathematical structure that can be used in compositional reasoning, with both sequential and parallel composition and with reversal. The concept of a channel has emerged in various forms, namely as conditional probability, stochastic matrix, probabilistic classifier, Markov kernel, statistical model, conditional probability table (in Bayesian network), probabilistic function / computation, and finally as Kleisli map (in category theory).

We begin with the definition of a channel and with the associated forward and backward transformation mechanisms.

Definition 19. *Let X, Y be arbitrary sets.*

1. *A channel c from X to Y is a function of the form $c: X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$. It assigns a distribution $c(x) \in \mathcal{D}(Y)$ to an arbitrary element $x \in X$, and thus corresponds to a conditional probability $P(y|x)$. We write such a channel as $c: X \rightarrow Y$, with a circle on the shaft of the arrow.*

2. For a channel $c: X \rightarrow Y$ and a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ we can form the pushforward distribution $c \gg \omega$ on Y , as:

$$c \gg \omega := \sum_{y \in Y} \left(\sum_{x \in X} \omega(x) \cdot c(x)(y) \right) |y\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(Y). \quad (24)$$

This pushforward $c \gg \omega$ is also called the prediction, see Example 21 below.

3. For a channel $c: X \rightarrow Y$ and an observation $q: Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we can form the pullback observation $c \ll q$ on X , via:

$$(c \ll q)(x) := \sum_{y \in Y} c(x)(y) \cdot q(y). \quad (25)$$

This pullback operation $c \ll (-)$ restricts to factors and to fuzzy predicates, but not to sharp predicates.

Using point predicates we can equivalently write (when the set X is finite):

$$c \ll q := \sum_{x \in X} \left(\sum_{y \in Y} c(x)(y) \cdot q(y) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_x. \quad (26)$$

The following easy result shows how forward and backward transformation are closely related via validity. The proof follows from unravelling the relevant definitions.

Lemma 20. For a channel $c: X \rightarrow Y$ with a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ on its domain X and an observation $q \in \text{Obs}(Y)$ on its codomain one has the following equality of validities.

$$(c \gg \omega) \models q = \omega \models (c \ll q). \quad (27)$$

Hidden in the medical test description in the introduction there is a channel. We make it explicit below. In this situation the distributions have only two elements in their support, so the situation may look rather trivial. But channels may involve much more complicated distributions, where the approach of the above definition provides a clear general methodology.

Example 21. We will redescribe the medical test from the introduction as a channel $c: D \rightarrow T$, where $D = \{d, d^\perp\}$ is the disease set and $T = \{p, n\}$ is the set of test outcomes. This test channel c is determined by the sensitivity of $\frac{9}{10}$ and specificity of $\frac{3}{5}$, namely as:

$$c(d) = \frac{9}{10}|p\rangle + \frac{1}{10}|n\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad c(d^\perp) = \frac{2}{5}|p\rangle + \frac{3}{5}|n\rangle.$$

One sees that in the first case, in presence of the disease d , the channel outcome $c(d)$ gives a $\frac{9}{10}$ chance of a positive test. Similarly, in absence of the disease d^\perp , the distribution $c(d^\perp)$ gives a $\frac{3}{5}$ chance of a negative test.

We assumed a prevalence of 5%, corresponding to the prior disease distribution $\omega = \frac{1}{20}|d\rangle + \frac{19}{20}|d^\perp\rangle$. The predicted test outcome distribution is the pushforward $c \gg \omega$ of the prior along the channel. It is computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} c \gg \omega &\stackrel{(24)}{=} \left(\sum_{x \in D} \omega(x) \cdot c(x)(p) \right) |p\rangle + \left(\sum_{x \in D} \omega(x) \cdot c(x)(n) \right) |n\rangle \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{9}{10} + \frac{19}{20} \cdot \frac{2}{5} \right) |p\rangle + \left(\frac{1}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{10} + \frac{19}{20} \cdot \frac{3}{5} \right) |n\rangle \\ &= \frac{17}{40} |p\rangle + \frac{23}{40} |n\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Backward transformation of (point) predicates is also relevant in this example, since in this way we rediscover the positive / negative test predicates pt, nt on D that we used before:

$$\begin{aligned} c \ll \mathbf{1}_p &\stackrel{(26)}{=} \left(\sum_{y \in T} c(d)(y) \cdot \mathbf{1}_p(y) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + \left(\sum_{y \in T} c(d^\perp)(y) \cdot \mathbf{1}_p(y) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp} \\ &= c(d)(p) \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + c(d^\perp)(p) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp} = \frac{9}{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + \frac{2}{5} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp} = pt \\ c \ll \mathbf{1}_n &\stackrel{(26)}{=} \left(\sum_{y \in T} c(d)(y) \cdot \mathbf{1}_n(y) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + \left(\sum_{y \in T} c(d^\perp)(y) \cdot \mathbf{1}_n(y) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp} \\ &= c(d)(n) \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + c(d^\perp)(n) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp} = \frac{1}{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_d + \frac{3}{5} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d^\perp} = nt. \end{aligned}$$

In order to be able to speak of validity and updating along a channel we transform evidence along this channel. Then we can easily define channel-based validity and updating.

Definition 22. Let $c: X \rightarrow Y$ be a channel, with a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ on its domain X and with evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(Y))$ on its codomain Y .

1. We write $c \ll \psi$ for the evidence on X obtained by transforming factor-wise along c . Thus:

$$c \ll \psi := \sum_{q \in \text{Fact}(Y)} \psi(q) |c \ll q\rangle \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X)).$$

This can also be described via the functoriality of \mathcal{M} , applied to the function $c \ll (-): \text{Fact}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Fact}(X)$.

2. The Jeffrey validity of ψ in ω along the channel c is now defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \models c \ll \psi &= (\psi) \cdot \prod_{q \in \text{Fact}(Y)} (\omega \models c \ll q)^{\psi(q)} \\ &\stackrel{(27)}{=} (\psi) \cdot \prod_{q \in \text{Fact}(Y)} (c \gg \omega \models q)^{\psi(q)} \\ &= c \gg \omega \models \psi. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

By construction, this Jeffrey validity satisfies an analogue of Lemma 20.

Similarly, the Pearl validity along the channel is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega \vDash_P c \lll \psi &= (\psi) \cdot \left(\omega \vDash \& c \lll \psi \right) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \left(\omega \vDash \bigg\&_{q \in \text{Fact}(Y)} (c \lll q)^{\psi(q)} \right).\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

(This is not equal to $c \gg \omega \vDash_P \psi$ since transformation $c \lll (-): \text{Fact}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Fact}(X)$ does not preserve conjunctions $\&$.)

3. Along the same lines, the Jeffrey update along a channel with evidence ψ is:

$$\omega \rfloor_{c \lll \psi} = \sum_{q \in \text{Fact} Y} \text{Flrn}(\psi)(q) \cdot \omega \rfloor_{c \lll q}.$$

And the Pearl update along a channel is:

$$\omega \dagger_{c \lll \psi} = \omega \rfloor_{\& c \lll q}^{\psi(q)}.$$

We can now check that the Jeffrey and Pearl updates in (8) and (9) are updates along the test channel $c: D \rightarrow T$ from Example 21, using the point evidence $2|\mathbf{1}_p\rangle + 1|\mathbf{1}_n\rangle$.

The special case of updating with point evidence along a channel is worth a closer look. The reformulations in terms of multinomials come from [23]. The formulation of Jeffrey's update rule via a dagger channel occurs in [18] and the associated decrease of KL-divergence in item (3) was first identified in [19]. In [23] one can also find a description of Jeffrey updating along a channel via variational inference.

Proposition 23. *Let $c: X \rightarrow Y$ be a channel, with a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ and with point evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}[K](Y)$, so that $c \lll \psi$ is $\sum_y \psi(y) |c \lll \mathbf{1}_y\rangle$. Then:*

1. The Jeffrey validity of ψ along c can be expressed as multinomial probability:

$$\omega \vDash_J c \lll \psi = \text{mn}[K](c \gg \omega)(\psi).$$

2. The Pearl validity of ψ along c is:

$$\omega \vDash_P c \lll \psi = (\text{mn}[K](c) \gg \omega)(\psi),$$

where $\text{mn}[K](c) := \text{mn}[K] \circ c: X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{M}[K](Y))$.

3. The Jeffrey update of ω with point evidence ψ along c can be described as:

$$\omega \rfloor_{c \lll \psi} = c_\omega^\dagger \gg \text{Flrn}(\psi),$$

where $c_\omega^\dagger: Y \rightarrow X$ is the reversed 'dagger' channel defined by $c_\omega^\dagger(y) = \omega \rfloor_{c \lll \mathbf{1}_y}$. Abbreviating $\omega' := c_\omega^\dagger \gg \text{Flrn}(\psi)$, we have associated validity increases and divergence decreases:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mn}[K](c \gg \omega')(\psi) &= c \gg \omega' \vDash_J \psi \geq c \gg \omega \vDash_J \psi = \text{mn}[K](c \gg \omega)(\psi) \\ D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\psi), c \gg \omega') &\leq D_{\text{KL}}(\text{Flrn}(\psi), c \gg \omega).\end{aligned}$$

4. The Pearl update of ω with ψ along the channel c satisfies:

$$\omega|_{c \ll \psi}^p = \omega|_{mn[K](c) \ll \mathbf{1}_\psi} = mn[K](c)^\dagger_\omega(\psi).$$

Writing $\omega' = \omega|_{mn[K](c) \ll \mathbf{1}_\psi}$ we get:

$$(mn[K](c) \gg \omega')(\psi) = \omega' \Vdash c \ll \psi \geq \omega \Vdash c \ll \psi = (mn[K](c) \gg \omega)(\psi).$$

Proof. 1. First, the Jeffrey validity can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \Vdash c \ll \psi &\stackrel{(28)}{=} (\psi) \cdot \prod_{y \in Y} (c \gg \omega \Vdash \mathbf{1}_y)^{\psi(y)} \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \prod_{y \in Y} ((c \gg \omega)(y))^{\psi(y)} \stackrel{(18)}{=} mn[K](c \gg \omega)(\psi). \end{aligned}$$

2. For the Pearl validity we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \Vdash c \ll \psi &\stackrel{(29)}{=} (\psi) \cdot \left(\omega \Vdash \bigotimes_{y \in Y} (c \gg \mathbf{1}_y)^{\psi(y)} \right) \\ &= (\psi) \cdot \sum_{x \in X} \omega(x) \cdot \prod_{y \in Y} (c \ll \mathbf{1}_y)(x)^{\psi(y)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} \omega(x) \cdot (\psi) \cdot \prod_{y \in Y} c(x)(y)^{\psi(y)} \\ &\stackrel{(18)}{=} \sum_{x \in X} \omega(x) \cdot mn[K](c(x))(\psi) \\ &= (mn[K](c) \gg \omega)(\psi), \quad \text{where } mn[K](c) = mn[K] \circ c. \end{aligned}$$

3. We move to the Jeffrey update and compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{c \ll \psi} &\stackrel{(21)}{=} \sum_{y \in Y} Flrn(\psi)(y) \cdot \omega|_{c \ll \mathbf{1}_y} \\ &= \sum_{y \in Y} Flrn(\psi)(y) \cdot c_\omega^\dagger(y) = c_\omega^\dagger \gg Flrn(\psi). \end{aligned}$$

The validity increases and divergence decreases mentioned above follow directly from Theorem 17 (1), (2).

4. For Pearl update with point evidence we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{mn[K](c) \ll \mathbf{1}_\psi} &\stackrel{(20)}{=} \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\omega(x) \cdot (mn[K](c) \ll \mathbf{1}_\psi)(x)}{\omega \Vdash mn[K](c) \ll \mathbf{1}_\psi} |x\rangle \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\omega(x) \cdot mn[K](c(x))(\psi)}{(mn[K](c) \gg \omega)(\psi)} |x\rangle \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\omega(x) \cdot (\psi) \cdot \prod_y c(x)(y)^{\psi(y)}}{\sum_x \omega(x) \cdot (\psi) \cdot \prod_y c(x)(y)^{\psi(y)}} |x\rangle \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} \frac{\omega(x) \cdot (\&_y (c \ll \mathbf{1}_y)^{\psi(y)})(x)}{\sum_x \omega(x) \cdot (\&_y (c \ll \mathbf{1}_y)^{\psi(y)})(x)} |x\rangle \\ &\stackrel{(20)}{=} \omega|_{\&_y (c \ll \mathbf{1}_y)^{\psi(y)}} \\ &= \omega|_{c \ll \psi}^p. \end{aligned}$$

The claimed increase of multinomial probability follows from Theorem 18 (1). \square

7 A glance at updating in predictive coding

The naive picture of human learning involves a teacher pouring knowledge into a student's brain — as visually expressed by what is called a Nuremberg Funnel. One more modern approach in (computational) cognitive science is called predictive coding (or processing), see *e.g.* the books [6,16,29] or articles [1,12]. Very briefly, the idea is that the human mind projects, evaluates and updates. Predictive coding describes the mind basically as a prediction engine that compares its predictions to observations, leading to internal adaptations. To quote Friston [11]: “The Bayesian brain hypothesis uses Bayesian probability theory to formulate perception as a constructive process based on internal or generative models. [...] In this view, the brain is an inference machine that actively predicts and explains its sensations. Central to this hypothesis is a probabilistic model that can generate predictions, against which sensory samples are tested to update beliefs about their causes.” This testing involves error reduction: “. . . the core function of the brain is simply to minimize prediction error, where the prediction errors signal mismatches between predicted input and the input actually received.” [27]. Mathematically, these prediction errors can be expressed in terms of KL-divergence (19), see *e.g.* [27,32]. The aimed decrease of prediction errors / KL-divergence is a form of what we call getting wiser. Here we concentrate on this error correction aspect of predictive coding. There is however, a wider story, especially about active inference [29].

When the human mind is understood as a Bayesian inference engine, the question comes up: how does the mind handle multiple observations, via the rules of Jeffrey or Pearl? Predictive coding emphasises error correction, which, in terms of reducing KL-divergence, is achieved via the update rule of Jeffrey (for point evidence), see Theorem 17 (2) and Proposition 23 (3). This suggests that the mind is a Jeffreyan update engine. A further indication is that Jeffrey's updating is sensitive to the order of updating, see Theorem 17 (4). As is well-known, humans are very sensitive to the order in which they process information (are ‘primed’). On the other hand, recall that in the medical example in the beginning we associated Pearl's approach with a clinical perspective, where tests are applied to the same person. This fits a Pearlian perspective in predictive coding where updates apply (independently) to the same mind, of a single individual. In predictive coding the updates of Jeffrey and Pearl are not (explicitly) used, but an approximation of Jeffrey, called VFE update, where VFE is an abbreviation of variational free energy. Below we briefly put this VFE rule in the setting of predictive coding, based on [19,37].

Updating in predictive coding happens via variational inference, in order to minimise free energy [11]. This is an approximation technique, which in this case produces VFE updating as an approximation of Jeffrey updating. As will be shown, VFE does not inherit the crucial KL-divergence reduction from Jeffrey, but it does increase Pearl validity — although less than Pearl updating does. One can conclude that both Jeffrey and Pearl updating outperform VFE updating.

Later on, in Remark 26 we go into the details of what free energy amounts to in the setting of predictive coding. At this stage we first provide the description of the VFE update, in item (??) below. It uses a softmax description, involving normalisation of e -powers. This is used more widely in cognitive modeling, see *e.g.* [36]. The description

that we use is based on [37, Eqn. (44)]. The subsequent minimality characterisation in item (2) occurs (in essence) in [32,37].

Definition 24. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be a distribution with evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$. The VFE update $\omega_{\bar{\psi}}$ is defined as normalised ‘softmax’ of the form:

$$\omega_{\bar{\psi}} := \text{Flrn} \left(\sum_{x \in \text{supp}(\omega)} e^{\text{Flrn}(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(x))} | x \rangle \right). \quad (30)$$

The letter ‘F’ in the sign $\bar{\psi}$ refers to ‘free’ in free energy.

We immediately give an alternative description of VFE updating, together with its characterisation in terms of minimal free energy. In item (1) below we stretch earlier notation since we use a predicate power p^f for a fraction f and not for a natural number n , as originally in Definition 5 (1). But the meaning is the same, given pointwise as $p^f(x) = p(x)^f$. Similarly, we use the conjunction $\&$ not only for multisets $\&(\psi)$ but also for distributions $\&(\text{Flrn}(\psi))$, where:

$$\&(\text{Flrn}(\psi))(x) = \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p^{\text{Flrn}(\psi)(p)}(x) = \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{\text{Flrn}(\psi)(p)}.$$

Proposition 25. In the setting of Definition 24.

1. The VFE update (30) can alternatively be described as:

$$\omega_{\bar{\psi}} = \omega|_{\&p p^{\text{Flrn}(\psi)(p)}} = \omega|_{\&(\text{Flrn}(\psi))}. \quad (31)$$

2. The VFE update can be characterised as a minimum below. This is the minimum free energy, see Remark 26 below.

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{\bar{\psi}} &\in \underset{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(X)}{\text{argmin}} \text{Flrn}(\psi) \models D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_{(-)}) \\ &= \underset{\rho \in \mathcal{D}(X)}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \text{Flrn}(\psi)(p) \cdot D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_p). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Here we consider argmin as giving a subset of outcomes, since there may be multiple distributions with the same minimum value.

Notice that the VFE update (31) looks very much like the Pearl update $\omega_{\bar{\psi}}$ in (22), which does not involve fractional powers: $\omega_{\bar{\psi}} = \omega|_{\&p p^{\psi(p)}} = \omega|_{\&\psi}$. The VFE and Pearl update behave similarly, see Theorem 29 below.

Proof. 1. Using the familiar equations $e^{a+b} = e^a \cdot e^b$ and $e^{a \cdot b} = (e^a)^b$ we observe that we can write the e -expression in (30) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{Flm(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(x))} \\
&= e^{\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} Flm(\psi)(p) \cdot \ln(\omega|_p(x))} \\
&= \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} e^{Flm(\psi)(p) \cdot \ln(\omega|_p(x))} \\
&= \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \left(e^{\ln(\omega|_p(x))} \right)^{Flm(\psi)(p)} \\
&= \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \left(\omega|_p(x) \right)^{Flm(\psi)(p)} \\
&\stackrel{(20)}{=} \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \left(\frac{\omega(x) \cdot p(x)}{\omega \models p} \right)^{Flm(\psi)(p)} \\
&= \omega(x)^{\sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} Flm(\psi)(p)} \cdot \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{Flm(\psi)(p)} \cdot \frac{1}{\prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} (\omega \models p)^{Flm(\psi)(p)}} \\
&\stackrel{(16)}{=} \omega(x) \cdot (\& Flm(\psi))(x) \cdot \left(\frac{(\psi)}{\omega \models \psi} \right)^{1/\|\psi\|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this formulation we obtain Equation (30):

$$\begin{aligned}
& Flm \left(\sum_{x \in \text{supp}(\omega)} e^{Flm(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(x))} |x\rangle \right) (z) \\
&= \frac{e^{Flm(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(z))}}{\sum_y e^{Flm(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(y))}} \\
&= \frac{\omega(z) \cdot (\& Flm(\psi))(z)}{\sum_y \omega(y) \cdot (\& Flm(\psi))(y)} \quad \text{as just shown} \\
&\stackrel{(20)}{=} \omega|_{\& Flm(\psi)}(z) \\
&\stackrel{(31)}{=} \omega \models_{\psi}(z).
\end{aligned}$$

2. Let the normalisation factor in (30) be s , so that $s = \sum_x e^{Flrn(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(x))}$. For an arbitrary distribution $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ we compute the value of the expression in (32).

$$\begin{aligned}
Flrn(\psi) \models D_{KL}(\rho, \omega|_{(-)}) &= \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} Flrn(\psi)(p) \cdot \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\rho(x)}{\omega|_p(x)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \left[\ln(\rho(x)) - \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} Flrn(\psi)(p) \cdot \ln(\omega|_p(x)) \right] \\
&= \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \left[\ln(\rho(x)) - Flrn(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(x)) \right] \\
&= \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \left[\ln(\rho(x)) - \ln(e^{Flrn(\psi) \models \ln(\omega|_{(-)}(x))}) \right] \\
&\stackrel{(30)}{=} \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \left[\ln(\rho(x)) - \ln(s \cdot \omega|_{\psi}^{\uparrow}(x)) \right] \\
&= D_{KL}(\rho, \omega|_{\psi}^{\uparrow}) - \ln(s).
\end{aligned}$$

The latter expression reaches its minimum when the divergence $D_{KL}(\rho, \omega|_{\psi}^{\uparrow}) \geq 0$ is actually 0, that is, when the distributions ρ and $\omega|_{\psi}^{\uparrow}$ are equal. \square

Via the formulation (31) we see that more of the same evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$ does not change VFE updating: $\omega|_{n \cdot \psi}^{\uparrow} = \omega|_{\psi}^{\uparrow}$, for each $n \geq 1$. Similarly, VFE updating is insensitive to the order of updating: $\omega|_{\psi}^{\uparrow} \uparrow_{\chi} = \omega|_{\chi}^{\uparrow} \uparrow_{\psi}$.

Remark 26. It may not be immediately clear that the VFE update defined in (30) corresponds to what is used in predictive coding. Therefore we elaborate this relationship more explicitly, using the setting of [37]. There, two sets S and O are used for hidden elements and for observations in a generative model. It is given by a joint distribution $M \in \mathcal{D}(S \times O)$, together with a distribution $o \in \mathcal{D}(O)$ of observations. The latter corresponds to point evidence in our situation, so that we can think of it as $o = Flrn(\psi)$ for point evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(O)$.

The joint distribution $M \in \mathcal{D}(S \times O)$ may be disintegrated [4] into a form $M = \langle id, c \rangle \gg \omega$, for a channel $c: S \rightarrow O$ and a distribution $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(S)$. We write d for the reversal / dagger of the channel c , of the form $d = c_{\omega}^{\dagger}: O \rightarrow S$, so that $d(y)(s) = (\omega|_{c \ll \mathbf{1}_y})(s)$, see Proposition 23 (3). In [37] this dagger d is written as $M(s|y)$.

The VFE-update rule considered in [37], in Equations (44) and (45), produces a posterior, via normalisation, written as:

$$\text{Norm}_s \left(e^{\mathbb{E}_{y \sim o} \ln(M(s|y))} \right). \quad (33)$$

In our setting we write frequentist learning $Flrn$ for the normalisation and validity \models for the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim o}$. This turns (33) into:

$$Flrn \left(\sum_{s \in S} e^{o \models \ln(d(-)(s))} | s \rangle \right) = Flrn \left(\sum_{s \in S} e^{o \models \ln((\omega|_{c \ll \mathbf{1}_{(-)}(s)})} | s \rangle \right).$$

The VFE update (30) is a generalisation of the latter formula, in the following way. The evidence that is used for updating ω is not of the pullback form $c \approx\!\!\ll \mathbf{1}_{(-)}$, but is a general factor p . This factor comes from the evidence o , which is generalised from point evidence, to arbitrary evidence $o = \text{Flrn}(\psi)$, for $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(O))$.

Having explained the formula (30), we turn to the associated free energy formulation. It can also be translated to the current setting, again starting from [37]. There, the free energy of a distribution $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(S)$, is defined with respect to the generative model $M \in \mathcal{D}(S \times O)$ and the distribution of observations $o \in \mathcal{D}(O)$. It involves the dagger $M(s|y)$ that we mentioned before and takes the explicit form:

$$(\omega|_{c \approx\!\!\ll \mathbf{1}_y})(s) = c_\omega^\dagger(y)(s) = d(y)(s) = M(s|y) = \frac{M(s, y)}{M(y)} = \frac{M(s, y)}{(c \approx\!\!\gg \omega)(y)}.$$

What is then called free energy of ρ is computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in S, y \in O} \rho(s) \cdot o(y) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\rho(s)}{M(s, y)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{s \in S, y \in O} \rho(s) \cdot o(y) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\rho(s) \cdot (c \approx\!\!\gg \omega)(y)}{(\omega|_{c \approx\!\!\ll \mathbf{1}_y})(s)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{y \in O} o(y) \cdot \sum_{s \in S} \rho(s) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\rho(s)}{(\omega|_{c \approx\!\!\ll \mathbf{1}_y})(s)} \right) - \sum_{y \in O} o(y) \cdot \ln ((c \approx\!\!\gg \omega)(y)) \\ &= o \models D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_{c \approx\!\!\ll \mathbf{1}_{(-)}}) - o \models \ln ((c \approx\!\!\gg \omega)(-)). \end{aligned}$$

The latter term does not depend on ρ and can be ignored when we wish to minimise. The VFE-update from [37] is the argmin of the first divergence-validity expression. Translated to the current setting it occurs in Proposition 25 (2), again with the distribution o replaced by $\text{Flrn}(\psi)$ and the factor $c \approx\!\!\ll \mathbf{1}_{(-)}$ by $p \in \text{supp}(\psi)$.

We like to put the expression after argmin in (32) in a wider perspective. The first inequality below stems from [37, Eqn (41)].

Lemma 27. *1. For a channel $c: Z \rightarrow X$ and two distributions $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(Z)$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ there is an inequality of the form:*

$$\sigma \models D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, c(-)) \geq D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, c \approx\!\!\gg \sigma).$$

2. When we apply this inequality to the expression in (32) for distributions $\omega, \rho \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ with evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$, we see that the KL-divergence between ρ and the Jeffrey update $\omega|_\psi$ serves as lower bound for the minimisation in (32):

$$\text{Flrn}(\psi) \models D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_{(-)}) \geq D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_\psi). \quad (34)$$

Proof. 1. We consider the minus on both sides and use Jensen's inequality in:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\left(\sigma \models D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, c(-))\right) &= -\sum_{z \in Z} \sigma(z) \cdot \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\rho(x)}{c(z)(x)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \sum_{z \in Z} \sigma(z) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{c(z)(x)}{\rho(x)} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \ln \left(\sum_{z \in Z} \sigma(z) \cdot \frac{c(z)(x)}{\rho(x)} \right) \\
&= \sum_{x \in X} \rho(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{(c \gg \sigma)(x)}{\rho(x)} \right) \\
&= -D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, c \gg \sigma).
\end{aligned}$$

2. By using the mapping $p \mapsto \omega|_p$ as function / channel $\text{Fact}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(X)$, with distribution $\text{Flrn}(\psi) \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Fact}(X))$ we get:


$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Flrn}(\psi) \models D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_{(-)}) &\geq D_{\text{KL}}\left(\rho, \sum_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} \text{Flrn}(\psi)(p) \cdot \omega|_p\right) \\
&\stackrel{(21)}{=} D_{\text{KL}}(\rho, \omega|_\psi). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that the VFE update, as minimiser of the left-hand-side in (34) — see Proposition 25 (2) — is used to approximate the Jeffrey update $\omega|_\psi$, on the right-hand-side in (34), via KL-divergence. This VFE update may approximate the Jeffrey update, but it does not do a crucial thing that Jeffrey update does, namely correct errors — see below — in the form of decrease of KL-divergence. This is remarkable, since predictive coding is all about error correction.

Remark 28. In Figure 3 we have considered 100 different updates, in the running medical example, for point evidence of the form $\psi_{i,j} = i|p\rangle + j|n\rangle$, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$. We re-use the test channel $t: D \rightarrow T$ and the prior $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(D)$ from Example 21. We abbreviate the VFE updates as:

$$\omega_{i,j} := \omega|_{t \ll \psi_{i,j}} = \omega|_{i|t \ll \mathbf{1}_p + j|t \ll \mathbf{1}_n} = \omega|_{i|pt + j|nt} \in \mathcal{D}(D).$$

The the VFE posterior disease probabilities $\omega_{i,j}(d)$ give the following plot — like in Figure 3 for Jeffrey and Pearl.



This plot looks much like the one for Jeffrey in Figure 3. That is not strange since VFE updating approximates Jeffrey updating, as we have just seen.

We then check for the expected decrease of KL-divergence via VFE update in:

$$D_{KL}(\text{Flrn}(\psi_{i,j}), t \gg \omega_{i,j}) \stackrel{?}{\leq} D_{KL}(\text{Flrn}(\psi_{i,j}), t \gg \omega).$$

This fails for 37 out of 100 possible cases, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$. For instance, already for $i = j = 1$ we have a uniform state of the world $\text{Flrn}(\psi_{1,1}) = \frac{1}{2}|p\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|n\rangle$ with a positive and negative test outcome that we wish to get close to via learning. Stepwise, this works as follows.

prior	$\omega = 0.05 d\rangle + 0.95 d^\perp\rangle$
prior prediction	$t \gg \omega = 0.425 p\rangle + 0.575 n\rangle$
VFE posterior	$\omega_{1,1} = 0.031 d\rangle + 0.969 d^\perp\rangle$
posterior prediction	$t \gg \omega_{1,1} = 0.416 p\rangle + 0.584 n\rangle$
prior divergence	$D_{KL}(\text{Flrn}(\psi_{1,1}), t \gg \omega) = 0.0164$
posterior divergence	$D_{KL}(\text{Flrn}(\psi_{1,1}), t \gg \omega_{1,1}) = 0.0208.$

Thus, VFE updating takes us further away from the goal distribution $\text{Flrn}(\psi_{1,1})$.

This is puzzling: the stated aim in predictive coding is error correction in the form of KL-divergence reduction. In our medical example this reduction fails for a bit more than one third of the cases. In contrast, the decrease of KL-divergence with Jeffrey updating holds in all cases, see Theorem 17 (2). It seems that predictive coding should not use VFE updating, but use Jeffrey updating instead, at least if it really aims to achieve error correction as goal of updating.

In the end we ask ourselves in what sense does VFE updating make us wiser? Does it increase Jeffrey and/or Pearl validity? It turns out that it does not increase Jeffrey validity, in general. VFE updating does increase Pearl validity, but not as much as Pearl updating.

Theorem 29. Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be distribution with evidence $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(\text{Fact}(X))$.

1. VFE updating does not increase Jeffrey validity, in general.
2. VFE updating does increase Pearl validity, but not as much as Pearl updating itself:

$$\omega \models_{\overline{P}} \psi \leq \omega \overset{F}{\models}_{\psi} \models_{\overline{P}} \psi \leq \omega \overset{P}{\models}_{\psi} \models_{\overline{P}} \psi \quad (35)$$

Proof. 1. We can reformulate the counterexample from Remark 28. For evidence $\chi = 1|pt\rangle + 1|nt\rangle$ with one positive and one negative test, and prior $\omega = 0.05|d\rangle + 0.95|d^\perp\rangle$ we get:

$$\omega \models_{\overline{P}} \chi \approx 0.489 > 0.486 \approx \omega \overset{F}{\models}_{\chi} \models_{\overline{P}} \chi.$$

2. We start with a number of auxiliary results (for $K \geq 1$).

- (i) $(\& \text{Flrn}(\psi))^K = \& \psi$, where $K = \|\psi\|$;
- (ii) $\omega|_q \models q \leq \omega|_{q^K} \models q$;
- (iii) $\omega \models q^K \leq \omega|_q \models q^K$;
- (iv) $\omega|_q \models q^K \leq \omega|_{q^K} \models q^K$.

The first inequality in (35) is then an instance of point (iii), for $q = \& \text{Flrn}(\psi)$. The second inequality in (35) is an instance (iv).

It thus suffices to prove these points (i) – (iv). For (i) we use:

$$\begin{aligned} (\& \text{Flrn}(\psi))^K(x) &= (\& \text{Flrn}(\psi))(x)^K = \left(\prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{\text{Flrn}(\psi)(p)} \right)^K \\ &= \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{\text{Flrn}(\psi)(p) \cdot K} \\ &= \prod_{p \in \text{supp}(\psi)} p(x)^{\psi(p)} = (\& \psi)(x). \end{aligned}$$

The equation in (ii) obviously holds for $K = 1$. The induction step works as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_{q^{K+1}} \models q &= \omega|_{q^K \& q} \models q = \omega|_{q^K|q} \models q && \text{by Lemma 14 (1)} \\ &\geq \omega|_{q^K} \models q && \text{by Theorem 15 (1)} \\ &\geq \omega|_q \models q && \text{by induction hypothesis.} \end{aligned}$$

The case $K = 1$ of (iii) is covered by Theorem 15 (1). For the induction step we use:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega|_q \models q^{K+1} &= \omega|_q \models q \& q^K \\ &= (\omega|_q \models q) \cdot (\omega|_{q|q} \models q^K) && \text{by Lemma 14 (4)} \\ &\geq (\omega \models q) \cdot (\omega|_q \models q^K) && \text{by Theorem 15 (1) and induction hypothesis} \\ &= \omega \models q^{K+1} && \text{by Lemma 14 (4) again.} \end{aligned}$$

The case $K = 1$ trivially holds for (iv). Next:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \omega|_{q^{K+1}} \models q^{K+1} \\
& = \omega|_{q^{K+1}} \models q \ \& \ q^K \\
& = (\omega|_{q^{K+1}} \models q) \cdot (\omega|_{q^{K+1}|_q} \models q^K) \quad \text{by Lemma 14 (4)} \\
& = (\omega|_q|_{q^K} \models q) \cdot (\omega|_q|_q|_{q^K} \models q^K) \quad \text{by Lemma 14 (1)} \\
& \geq (\omega|_q|_q \models q) \cdot (\omega|_q|_q|_q \models q^K) \quad \text{by (ii) and induction hypothesis} \\
& \geq (\omega|_q \models q) \cdot (\omega|_q|_q \models q^K) \quad \text{by Theorem 15 (1) and (iii)} \\
& = \omega|_q \models q^{K+1} \quad \text{by Lemma 14 (4) again.} \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

In predictive coding one chooses to approximate distributions for efficiency reasons — especially in the context of continuous probability. The problem lies in the computation of the normalisation constants. In Jeffrey’s update rule (21) one has to compute a normalisation constant $\omega \models p$ for each factor $p \in \text{supp}(\psi)$ in the evidence. In the Pearl and VFE update rules (22), (31) only one normalisation constant needs to be computed.

In practice, the Pearl and VFE approaches have the problem that the conjunctions $\&\mathcal{L}(\psi) = \&\mathcal{L}_p p^{\psi(p)}$ and $\&\mathcal{L}(\text{Flrn}(\psi)) = \&\mathcal{L}_p p^{\text{Flrn}(\psi)(p)}$ may lead to many multiplications of small numbers, giving outcomes that become too small to be reliable. One can do the updates successively, using the equation $\omega|_{p\&q} = \omega|_p|_q$ from Lemma 14 (1), but then one has to do multiple normalisations. In practice, Pearl’s updates are most conveniently done in a conjugate prior situation, so that one can directly update the parameters, without computing any distributions.

We may cautiously conclude that the mathematical clarifications about validity and updating in this paper have not (yet) fully clarified which update mechanism should be used in predictive coding and that a more detailed explanation and analysis is needed.

8 Concluding remarks

The topic of this paper is updating of probability distributions in the face of multiple pieces of evidence. As shown, there are several possible approaches, associated with Jeffrey, Pearl and VFE, with different properties. Guarantees, like validity increase or divergence decrease, only work for the right combination of validity and updating. Hence, awareness of the different approaches is relevant in practical situations. As the small survey with the medical tests shows, such awareness is not common, not even among academic professionals working in this area.

This article synthesises an earlier line of work of the author on probabilistic updating [18,19,20,21,23], concentrating on the approaches of Jeffrey and Pearl. These two approaches occur in the literature, but are not always identified as such. For instance, in [23] it is shown that Jeffrey’s update rule is at the heart of the Expectation Maximisation and Latent Dirichlet Allocation algorithms.

In contrast to the setting of this earlier work, the current paper puts the emphasis on multiple pieces of evidence as the key distinguishing element between Jeffrey and Pearl. At first, notably in [18,19], the difference between Jeffrey and Pearl involved treating evidence as distribution or as predicate. The current approach combines these

perspectives by seeing evidence as a multiset of predicates (or factors), which can be turned into a distribution via frequentist learning *Flrn*. The difference between the validity / update rules of Jeffrey and Pearl lies in the assumption of independence (or not). Also, in earlier work the difference between Jeffrey and Pearl was described in the setting with a generative model, given by both a channel and a distribution on its domain. Here, in contrast, the different forms of updating are defined in a simpler setting with only a prior distribution and with a multiset of evidence. The more complex generative situation with a channel is treated here as a special case.

A point on the horizon is a symbolic logic for probabilistic reasoning that incorporates the various forms of probabilistic updating, with appropriate derivation rules.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Dario Stein, Sean Tull and Toby St Clere Smithe for helpful discussions on the topic of this paper.

References

1. M. Allen and K. Friston. From cognitivism to autopoiesis: towards a computational framework for the embodied mind. *Synthese*, 195:2459–2482, 2018. doi:10.1007/s11229-016-1288-5.
2. L. Baum, T. Petrie, G. Soules, and N. Weiss. A maximization technique occurring in the statistical analysis of probabilistic functions of Markov chains. *Ann. Math. Statistics*, 41:164–171, 1970.
3. C. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer, 2006.
4. K. Cho and B. Jacobs. Disintegration and Bayesian inversion via string diagrams. *Math. Struct. in Comp. Sci.*, 29(7):938–971, 2019. doi:10.1017/s0960129518000488.
5. K. Cho, B. Jacobs, A. Westerbaan, and B. Westerbaan. An introduction to effectus theory. see <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.05813>, 2015.
6. A. Clark. *Surfing Uncertainty. Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2016. doi:10.1093/mind/fzx038.
7. B. Coecke and A. Kissinger. *Picturing Quantum Processes. A First Course in Quantum Theory and Diagrammatic Reasoning*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2016. doi:10.1017/9781316219317.
8. A. Darwiche. *Modeling and Reasoning with Bayesian Networks*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009.
9. A. Dvurečenskij and S. Pulmannová. *New Trends in Quantum Structures*. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.
10. D. J. Foulis and M.K. Bennett. Effect algebras and unsharp quantum logics. *Found. Physics*, 24(10):1331–1352, 1994.
11. K. Friston. The free-energy principle: a rough guide to the brain? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 13(7):293–301, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2009.04.005.
12. K. Friston and S. Kiebel. Predictive coding under the free-energy principle. *Phil. Trans. of the Royal Society B: Biological sciences*, 364(1521):1211–1221, 2009. doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0300.

13. T. Fritz. A synthetic approach to Markov kernels, conditional independence, and theorems on sufficient statistics. *Advances in Math.*, 370:107239, 2020. doi:10.1016/J.AIM.2020.107239.
14. S. Gudder. Examples, problems, and results in effect algebras. *Int. Journ. Theor. Physics*, 35(11):2365–2376, 1996.
15. J. Halpern. *Reasoning about Uncertainty*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003. doi:10.7551/mitpress/10951.001.0001.
16. J. Hohwy. *The Predictive Mind*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2013. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199682737.001.0001.
17. B. Jacobs. From probability monads to commutative effectuses. *Journ. of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 94:200–237, 2018. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2016.11.006.
18. B. Jacobs. The mathematics of changing one’s mind, via Jeffrey’s or via Pearl’s update rule. *Journ. of Artif. Intelligence Research*, 65:783–806, 2019. doi:10.1613/jair.1.11349.
19. B. Jacobs. Learning from what’s right and learning from what’s wrong. In A. Sokolova, editor, *Math. Found. of Programming Semantics*, number 351 in Elect. Proc. in Theor. Comp. Sci., pages 116–133, 2021. doi:10.4204/EPTCS.351.8.
20. B. Jacobs. Multisets and distributions, in drawing and learning. In A. Palmigiano and M. Sadrzadeh, editors, *Samson Abramsky on Logic and Structure in Computer Science and Beyond*, pages 1095–1146. Springer, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-24117-8_29.
21. B. Jacobs. A principled approach to Expectation Maximisation and Latent Dirichlet Allocation using Jeffrey’s update rule. In H. Hansen, A. Scedrov, and R. de Queiroz, editors, *Worksh. on Logic, Language, Inf. & Comp.*, number 13923 in Lect. Notes Comp. Sci., pages 256–273, 2023. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-39784-4_16.
22. B. Jacobs. Structured probabilistic reasoning. Book, in preparation, see <http://www.cs.ru.nl/B.Jacobs/PAPERS/ProbabilisticReasoning.pdf>, 2023.
23. B. Jacobs and D. Stein. Pearl’s and Jeffrey’s update as modes of learning in probabilistic programming. *Elect. Notes in Theor. Inform. & Comp. Sci.*, Volume 3 - Proceedings of MFPS XXXIX, 2023. doi:10.46298/entics.12281.
24. B. Jacobs and F. Zanasi. The logical essentials of Bayesian reasoning. In G. Barthe, J.-P. Katoen, and A. Silva, editors, *Foundations of Probabilistic Programming*, pages 295–331. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2021. doi:10.1017/9781108770750.010.
25. R. Jeffrey. *The Logic of Decision*. The Univ. of Chicago Press, 2nd rev. edition, 1983.
26. D. Koller and N. Friedman. *Probabilistic Graphical Models. Principles and Techniques*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2009.
27. B. Millidge, A. Seth, and C. Buckley. Predictive coding: a theoretical and experimental review. 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2107.12979.
28. P. Panangaden. *Labelled Markov Processes*. Imperial College Press, London, 2009.
29. T. Parr, G. Pezzulo, and K. Friston. *Active Inference. The Free Energy Principle in Mind, Brain, and Behavior*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2022.
30. J. Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems: Networks of Plausible Inference*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 118. Morgan Kaufmann, 1988. doi:10.1016/C2009-0-27609-4.
31. J. Pearl. Jeffrey’s rule, passage of experience, and neo-Bayesianism. In Jr. H. Kyburg, editor, *Knowledge Representation and Defeasible Reasoning*, pages 245–265. Kluwer Acad. Publishers, 1990. doi:10.1007/978-94-009-0553-5_10.
32. W. Penny. Bayesian models of brain and behaviour. *ISRN Biomathematics*, 2012. doi:10.5402/2012/785791.

33. S. Ross. *A first course in probability*. Pearson Education, 10th edition, 2018.
34. P. Selinger. A survey of graphical languages for monoidal categories. In B. Coecke, editor, *New Structures in Physics*, number 813 in Lect. Notes Physics, pages 289–355. Springer, Berlin, 2011.
35. G. Shafer. Jeffrey’s rule of conditioning. *Philosophy of Science*, 48(3):337–362, 1981.
36. A. Stuhlmüller and N. Goodman. Reasoning about reasoning by nested conditioning: Modeling theory of mind with probabilistic programs. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 28:80–99, 2014. doi:10.1016/j.cogsys.2013.07.003.
37. S. Tull, J. Kleiner, and T. St Clere Smithe. Active inference in string diagrams: A categorical account of predictive processing and free energy, 2023. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2308.00861.

A Appendix, with the proof of Theorem 15

We first describe an auxiliary result which we shall call the sum-increase lemma. It is a special (discrete) case of a more general result [2, Thm. 2.1]. It describes how to find increases for sum expressions in general.

Lemma 30. *Let X, Y be finite sets, with a function $F: X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. For each element $x \in X$, write $F_1(x) := \sum_{y \in Y} F(x, y)$ for the sum that we wish to increase. Assume that there is an $x' \in X$ with:*

$$x' \in \underset{z}{\operatorname{argmax}} G(x, z) \quad \text{where} \quad G(x, z) := \sum_{y \in Y} F(x, y) \cdot \ln(F(z, y)).$$

Then $F_1(x') \geq F_1(x)$.

Proof. Let x' be an element where $G(x, -): Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ takes its maximum. This x' satisfies $F_1(x') \geq F_1(x)$, since:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\left(\frac{F_1(x')}{F_1(x)}\right) &= \ln\left(\sum_{y \in Y} \frac{F(x', y)}{F_1(x)}\right) \\ &= \ln\left(\sum_{y \in Y} \frac{F(x, y)}{F_1(x)} \cdot \frac{F(x', y)}{F(x, y)}\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{y \in Y} \frac{F(x, y)}{F_1(x)} \cdot \ln\left(\frac{F(x', y)}{F(x, y)}\right) \quad \text{by Jensen's inequality} \\ &= \frac{1}{F_1(x)} \cdot \sum_{y \in Y} F(x, y) \cdot \left(\ln(F(x', y)) - \ln(F(x, y))\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{F_1(x)} \cdot \left(G(x, x') - G(x, x)\right) \geq 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We use this result to prove the two items of Theorem 15 separately.

Proof (of Theorem 15 (1)). We start from a validity $\omega \models p$, where $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ and $p \in \operatorname{Fact}(X)$, which we would like to increase, by changing the distribution ω , while

keeping p fixed. We apply Lemma 30 with $F: \mathcal{D}(X) \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given by $F(\omega, x) = \omega(x) \cdot p(x)$. Then $F_1(\omega) = \sum_x F(\omega, x) = \sum_x \omega(x) \cdot p(x) = \omega \models p$.

We have $G(\omega, \omega') = \sum_x \omega(x) \cdot p(x) \cdot \ln(\omega'(x) \cdot p(x))$ and we wish to find a maximum of $G(\omega, -): \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Let $\text{supp}(\omega) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$; we will use variables v_i for the values $\omega'(x_i)$ that we wish to find, by seeing $G(\omega, -)$ as a function $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with constraints.

These constraints are handled via the Lagrange multiplier method for finding the maximum (see *e.g.* [3, §2.2]). We keep ω fixed and consider a new function H , also known as the Lagrangian, with an additional parameter κ .

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mathbf{v}, \kappa) &:= G(\omega, \mathbf{v}) - \kappa \cdot ((\sum_i v_i) - 1) \\ &= \sum_i \omega(x_i) \cdot p(x_i) \cdot \ln(v_i \cdot p(x_i)) - \kappa \cdot ((\sum_i v_i) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

The partial derivatives of H are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H}{\partial v_i}(\mathbf{v}, \kappa) &= \frac{\omega(x_i) \cdot p(x_i)}{v_i \cdot p(x_i)} \cdot p(x_i) - \kappa = \frac{\omega(x_i) \cdot p(x_i)}{v_i} - \kappa \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial \kappa}(\mathbf{v}, \kappa) &= 1 - \sum_i v_i. \end{aligned}$$

Setting all these derivatives to zero yields:

$$1 = \sum_i v_i = \sum_i \frac{\omega(x_i) \cdot p(x_i)}{\kappa} = \frac{\omega \models p}{\kappa}.$$

Hence $\kappa = \omega \models p$ and thus:

$$v_i = \frac{\omega(x_i) \cdot p(x_i)}{\kappa} = \frac{\omega(x_i) \cdot p(x_i)}{\omega \models p} = \omega|_p(x_i).$$

Hence, Lemma 30 gives as ‘better’ distribution the updated version $\omega|_p$ of ω , as in Theorem 15 (1), satisfying $(\omega|_p \models p) \geq (\omega \models p)$. \square

Proof (of Theorem 15 (2)). Let $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(X)$ be distribution on a set X and let p_1, \dots, p_n be factors on X , all with non-zero validity $\omega \models p_i$. The claim is that the distribution $\omega' = \sum_i \frac{1}{n} \cdot \omega|_{p_i}$ satisfies:

$$\prod_i (\omega' \models p_i) \geq \prod_i (\omega \models p_i). \quad (36)$$

We shall prove (36) for $n = 2$. The generalisation to arbitrary n works similarly, but involves much more book-keeping of additional variables.

We use Lemma 30 with function $F: \mathcal{D}(X) \times X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given by:

$$F(\omega, x, y) := \omega(x) \cdot p_1(x) \cdot \omega(y) \cdot p_2(y).$$

Then by distributivity of multiplication over addition:

$$\sum_{x,y} F(\omega, x, y) = \left(\sum_x \omega(x) \cdot p_1(x) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_y \omega(y) \cdot p_2(y) \right) = (\omega \models p_1) \cdot (\omega \models p_2).$$

Let $\text{supp}(\omega) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and let the function H be given by:

$$H(\mathbf{v}, \lambda) := \sum_{i,j} F(\omega, x_i, x_j) \cdot \ln(v_i \cdot p_1(x_i) \cdot v_j \cdot p_2(x_j)) - \lambda \cdot ((\sum_i v_i) - 1).$$

Then:

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial v_k}(\mathbf{v}, \lambda) = \sum_i \frac{F(\omega, x_k, x_i) + F(\omega, x_i, x_k)}{v_k} - \lambda \quad \frac{\partial H}{\partial \lambda}(\mathbf{v}, \lambda) = 1 - \sum_i v_i.$$

Setting these to zero gives:

$$1 = \sum_k v_k = \frac{\sum_{k,i} F(\omega, x_k, x_i) + F(\omega, x_i, x_k)}{\lambda} = \frac{2 \cdot (\omega \models p_1) \cdot (\omega \models p_2)}{\lambda}.$$

Hence $\lambda = 2 \cdot (\omega \models p_1) \cdot (\omega \models p_2)$ so that:

$$\begin{aligned} v_k &= \frac{\sum_i F(\omega, x_k, x_i) + F(\omega, x_i, x_k)}{\lambda} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\omega(x_k) \cdot p_1(x_k) \cdot (\omega \models p_2)}{(\omega \models p_1) \cdot (\omega \models p_2)} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{(\omega \models p_1) \cdot \omega(x_k) \cdot p_2(x_k)}{(\omega \models p_1) \cdot (\omega \models p_2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\omega(x_k) \cdot p_1(x_k)}{\omega \models p_1} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\omega(x_k) \cdot p_2(x_k)}{\omega \models p_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \omega|_{p_1}(x_k) + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \omega|_{p_2}(x_k). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$