Authentication Trust Level Network Architecture

Akash K Singh, PhD

IBM Corporation

Sacramento, USA

Abstract— **Service-oriented Architectures (SOA) facilitate the dynamic and seamless integration of services offered by different service providers which in addition can be located in different trust domains. Especially for business integration scenarios, Federated Identity Management emerged as a possibility to propagate identity information as security assertions across company borders in order to secure the interaction between different services. Although this approach guarantees scalability regarding the integration of identity-based services, it exposes a service provider to new security risks. These security risks result from the complex trust relationships within a federation. In a federation the authentication of a user is not necessarily performed within the service provider's domain, but can be performed in the user's local domain. Consequently, the service provider has to rely on authentication results received from a federation partner to enforce access control. This implies that the quality of the authentication process is out of control by the service provider and therefore becomes a factor which needs to be considered in the access control step. In order to guarantee a designated level of security, the quality of the authentication process should be part of the access control decision. To ease this process, we propose in this paper a method to rate authentication information by a level of trust which describes the strength of an authentication method. Additionally, in order to support the concept of a two-factor authentication, we also present a mathematical model to calculate the trust level when combining two authentication methods. Quantitative Trust Management (QTM) provides a dynamic interpretation of authorization policies for access control decisions based on upon evolving reputations of the entities involved. QuanTM, a QTM system, selectively combines elements from trust management and reputation management to create a novel method for policy evaluation. Trust management, while effective in managing access with delegated credentials (as in PolicyMaker and KeyNote), needs greater flexibility in handling situations of partial trust. Reputation management provides a means to quantify trust, but lacks delegation and policy enforcement. This paper reports on QuanTM's design decisions and novel policy evaluation procedure. A representation of quantified trust relationships, the trust dependency graph, and a sample QuanTM application specific to the KeyNote trust management language, are also proposed.**

Keywords- **Trust management, Trust levels, Authentication and Access Control, Web Service Federation, Federated Identity Management**

I. INTRODUCTION

Creating software which is flexible and highly customizable to adapt to fast changing business needs has moved into the main focus of software developers. Enterprises demand a seamless communication between applications independent from the platform on which they run and even across domain boundaries. Service-oriented Architectures and XML Web Services have been designed to meet these concerns, allowing a flexible integration of services provided by independent business partners. However, the seamless and straightforward integration of cross-organisational services conflicts with the need to secure and control access to these services. The traditional approach to restrict service access is based on user authentication performed by the service provider itself, cf. [18]. Since credentials (e.g. user name and password) needed to access a service are issued and managed by the service provider, this approach is referred to as isolated identity management as stated in [13]. It requires service users to register a digital identity at each involved service provider and to authenticate separately for each service access. Federated Identity Management as a new identity model provides solutions for these problems by enabling the propagation of identity information to services located in different trust domains. It enables service users to access all services in a federation using the same identification data. Several frameworks and standards for Federated Identity Management have been specified (e.g. WS-Federation [1] and Liberty Identity Web Services Framework (ID-WSF) 2.0 [31]). The key concept in a federation is the establishment of trust whereby all parties in a federation are willing to rely on asserted claims about a digital identity such as SAML assertions [24]. As Service-oriented Architectures move from an isolated identity management scheme to a federated identity management, service providers are exposed to new risks. In a federation the authentication of a user is not necessarily performed within the service provider's domain, but can be done within the user's local domain. Consequently, the service provider has to trust the authentication performed by the user's identity provider. In terms of security this is a critical situation since authorization and access control of the service are highly dependent on the authentication results. A weak authentication jeopardises the dependent service's security by increasing the risk that a user can personate as someone else and gain improper access. OASIS considers this as a serious risk [23] and recommends to agree on a common trust level in terms of policies, procedures and responsibilities to ensure that a relying party can trust the processes and methods used by the identity provider. Jøsang et. al. [13] describe the usage of such a common trust level as a

symmetric trust relationship, since all parties are exposed to an equal risk in the case of failure. As opposed to this, having different trust requirements and mechanisms is referred to as an asymmetric trust relationship. They argue that asymmetric trust relationships are hard to establish, since the parties are exposed to different risks in the case of failure. However, with regard to complex SOA – that might be based on the dynamic selection of services and service providers – defining and enforcing a common trust level is disadvantageous: A symmetric trust relationship between the providers in a federation would require a trust level, which is sufficient for the service with the strongest authentication requirements. These requirements, however, might not be necessary for all services within the federation and might change if this service is dynamically replaced. Consequently, users are forced to authenticate by a predefined strong authentication method, even though weak authentication would be sufficient for the service they want to access. Likewise, when users are fixed to a predefined authentication method according to the specified trust level, access will be denied even though the user might be able to verify his identity in an even more trusted way. Altogether, there is a growing demand for more flexibility in authentication processes in SOA. To achieve this flexibility, a way to rate the trust relationship between identity provider and service provider is needed in order to restrict the service access based on an individual trust level. The general idea of classifying authentication methods according to their level of trustworthiness is not new. Especially in the field of e-Government, various countries have launched e-authentication initiatives in order to secure access to critical e-Government services [26, 11, 17, 5]. All of these initiatives have in common that they define authentication trust levels – mostly four different levels – in a way that covers the main use cases, reaching from "no security needed" to "critical application". For each level, requirements for the authentication process are defined. This means, authentication methods are always assigned to predefined levels, but not the other way around. To provide authentication in a truly flexible manner, we present in this paper:

• A formal definition of trust levels to quantify the trust that is established by using a particular authentication method. This definition is globally applicable and not restricted to a specific use case setting requiring specific bootstrapping algorithms. This way, the meaning of a trust level based on our approach is clear and can be applied to any use case without the need to know any further set up or environment parameters.
• A mathematical model to combine different authentication methods as used in a two-factor authentication and to calculate their combined authentication trust level.
• An example calculation that demonstrates the applicability of our mathematical model to existing authentication methods.

The emergence of distributed topologies and networked services has resulted in applications that are stored, maintained, and accessed remotely via a client/server model.

The advantages of such a setup are many, but the challenges of access control and identity management must be addressed. Trust management and reputation management are two differing approaches to the problem. While effective with regard to explicit declarations, trust management lacks applicability when relationships are characterized by uncertainty. Thus, trust management is useful in enforcing existing trust relationships but ineffective in the formation of partially trusted ones. Reputation management provides a means of quantifying trust relationships dynamically, but lacks access enforcement and delegation mechanisms. To address this divide we introduce the notion of Quantitative Trust Management (QTM), an approach that merges concepts from trust and reputation management. It (QTM) creates a method for specifying both policy and reputation for dynamic decision making in access control settings. A system built upon QTM can not only enforce delegated authorizations but also adapt its policy as partial information becomes more complete. The output is a quantitative trust value that expresses how much a policy-based decision should be trusted given the reputations of the entities involved. Further, to make this novel concept concrete, we propose QuanTM, an architecture for supporting QTM. In this application of QuanTM, we use the KeyNote [8, 7] (KN) trust management language and specification, due to its well defined delegation logic and compliance system. Summarily, a KN evaluator checks a user's access credentials against local policy to produce a compliance value from a finite and predefined set of values. The compliance value is then used to make access decisions. KN allows principals to delegate access rights to other principals without affecting the resulting compliance value. Further, KN is monotonic: If a given request evaluates to some compliance value, adding more credentials or delegations will not lower that value. We argue that credentials should not be explicitly trusted, nor should the trustworthiness of delegating principals be ignored. Furthermore, the result of evaluation for a given access request may need to be dynamic [9]. Service providers may find it desirable to arrive at different opinions based on local constraints, policies, and principals for the same request. In QuanTM, this is easily expressed. We address these issues in the following two ways: (1) It includes a means to dynamically assign reputation to principals and their relationships within a request, and (2) It provides a mechanism for combining this information to produce a trust value. In QuanTM, a trust value (often a real number) is used to represent the the trustworthiness of a given compliance value and how it was reached. Our proposed QuanTM architecture (see Fig. 1) consists of three sub-systems:

1. Trust management consists of a trust language evaluator that verifies requests meet policy constraints, and a trust dependency graph (TDG) extractor that constructs a graph representing trust relationships.
2. Reputation management consists of two modules. First, a reputation algorithm to dynamically produce reputation values by combining feedback. These reputation values weigh TDG

edges. Second, a reputation quantifier computes the trust value for a given request by evaluating the weighted TDG.

3. Decision management is composed of a decision maker that arrives at an access determination based on a trust

value, context, and an application specific meta-policy that encodes a cost-benefit analysis. The design of QuanTM has been guided by the requirement that the individual components will be application specific, and thus, we have designed QuanTM modularly. QuanTM provides a simple interface by which different trust management languages, reputation algorithms, and decision procedures may be included. In this paper, we propose a QuanTM design instance that utilizes the KeyNote language and TNA-SL [11, 12] reputation algorithm. This instance's implementation and evaluation is the subject of future work.

A. Background

Several approaches to define levels of trustworthiness for authentication mechanisms have been proposed in recent years indicating the importance of such a concept. In the area of e-Government, the UK Office of the e-Envoy has published a document called "Registration and Authentication – e-Government Strategy Framework Policy and Guideline" [26]. In this document the initial registration process of a person with the system as well as the authentication process for a user's engagement in an e-Government transaction are defined. Depending on the severity of consequences that might arise from unauthorized access, four authentication trust levels are defined, reaching from Level 0 for minimal damage up to Level 3 for substantial damage. The IDABC [11] (Interoperable Delivery of European eGovernment Services to public Administrations, Businesses and Citizens) is a similar project managed by the European Commission. It publishes recommendations and develops common solutions in order to improve the electronic communication within the public sector. Its Authentication Policy Document [7] defines four assurance levels as well, which are also associated with the potential damage that could be caused. For each of the four levels the document defines the requirements for the registration phase and for the electronic authentication. The e-Authentication Initiative is a major project of the e-Government program of the US. The core concept is a federated architecture with multiple e-Government applications and credential providers. The intention is that the e-Authentication Initiative provides an architecture which delivers a uniform, government-wide approach for authentication while leaving the choice of concrete authentication technologies with the individual government agencies. In this context, the initiative has published a policy called "EAuthentication Guidance for Federal Agencies" [5] to assist agencies in determining the appropriate level of identity assurance for electronic transactions. The document defines four assurance levels, which are based on the risks associated with an authentication error. Which technical requirements apply for each assurance level is described in a

recommendation of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), which is called

II. SECURE FRAMEWORK

The SECURE1 project is working towards a trust-based generic decision-making framework for use in Global Computing. One of the target application-areas is Trust-Based Access Control (TBAC), extending our existing work on role-based access control to give the authorisation manager grained control over who they trust. In SECURE, the access control manager grants or denies permission for principals to execute actions. A decision is a parameterised boolean value . the parameters allow the AC manager to indicate its reasons for denying a request or constrain a positive decision. For every decision the SECURE framework considers the trust it has in the requesting principal p and the risk of granting the request. In our previous work [8], we observed that risk is the combination of the costs and likelihoods of all the possible outcomes and we described a model for combining trust and cost information to give a risk metric. The problem with this approach is that the risk metrics were insufficiently expressive to capture all the subtleties conveyed by the trust value. Information is lost since decisions can only be made based on simplistic metrics such as expected benefit and standard deviation. In this new model, we still use an outcome based approach, but allow the policy author to reason about and compare the raw trust and cost information on a per-outcome basis, thereby giving them full-control over the level of uncertainty they wish to permit.

A. The Secure Trust Model

A request by principal p to perform an action is submitted to the access control manager. The principal may also supply a list of credentials which may include signed trust-assertions (recommendations) from other principals, and/or a list of referees whom the trust calculator may wish to contact for recommendations. The AC manager looks up the relevant contexts for the requested action, and queries the trust calculator for a trust-value, Tv about p. The notion of context is important in the SECURE trust model. We observe that trust is a multi-dimensional quantity . by analogy, a person who is trusted to drive a car may not be trusted to y a plane. However, in the absence of directly relevant information, we may infer a trust-value in one dimension from trust-information in related dimensions, so it may be possible to infer some information about a server's trustworthiness to relay e-mail (and not spam) from how much they are trusted to serve webpages. We call these different dimensions, trust-contexts. Trust in a principal is computed by examining evidence relevant to the current context. Evidence consists of observations of previous interactions we have had with this principal and recommendations from other principals, suitably discounted depending on our trust in them [12]. The output of the trust calculator is Tv, a list of .t; c/ pairs, where t is the trust-value assigned to p for trust-context c. The domain of a trust-value ti

in trust-context ci is the lattice Tc over which there are two orderings denied, trust (indicating increasing/decreasing trustworthiness) and information (how much evidence was used to calculate the trust-value) [7]. For each possible action, the policy author specifies which trust-contexts are relevant and the trust calculator forms a projection of the relevant contexts from all the trust-information known about p. Since principals may be identied by any suitable mechanism, for example, public-keys, biometrics, passwords or similar, and some mechanisms are more capable and/or secure than others, Tv also includes tid, our trust in the mechanism used to authenticate or recognize p [15].

B. Making Trust based decisions

Intuitively, a high-risk action requires greater trust in its participants and the lower the risk, the less worthwhile it is expending resources in establishing a high level of trust. The majority of computational trust systems, such as [1] and [2], concentrate on aspects relating to assigning a trust-value to a principal; they do not consider policy-driven decision-making using trust. [18] and [19] make use of thresholding in their policy languages . the former checks that the trust-value is greater than a scalar, while in the latter there must be at least a certain number of evidence statements of at least a predefined level of reliability. However, all of these thresholds are statically determined by the policy author and there is no run-time evaluation of risk. In SECURE, an explicit cost-benefit analysis is used to determine how much trust is required to offset the risk. While the trust framework is calculating a trust-value for p, the AC manager looks up the outcome costs for the action and checks any specified environmental constraints (for example, time of day), then evaluates a series of predicates which compare trust-values to costs.

III. AUTHENTICATION TRUST LEVEL

To overcome the limitations revealed, we want to give a definition for a numerical representation of an authentication trust level with a clear semantical meaning. Having a clear semantical meaning of a trust level, such a model is applicable to all current and upcoming authentication mechanisms and can therefore serve as a base for further research in this area. In the following we introduce our notion of an authentication trust level. An authentication trust level refers to the trust or confidence that a service provider has into a single authentication method or the combination of different authentication methods. It reflects the strength of the authentication and how easy it is for an attacker to fool the authentication process: The stronger the authentication, the higher the confidence that a user corresponds with the claimed set of attributes. However, the strength of an authentication method depends on many criteria and these criteria differ tremendously between different categories of user authentication. While biometric authentication methods are

mostly characterized by criteria like the false acceptance rate (FAR) and false rejection rate (FRR), the security of knowledge based authentication methods as e.g. passwords depends on criteria like the theoretical or effective password space as well as whether passwords were auto-generated or chosen by humans. Our idea is to use a criterion which is common to all authentication methods. As this criterion, we propose to use the probability that an attacker can crack the authentication method and personate as the right user. Based on this idea, we define an authentication trust level in the following way:

Definition 1.0. Let A be the event that the authentication method A˜ is cracked by an attacker. P is the corresponding probability distribution. We define an authentication trust level as:

Given Definition, we can derive directly some characteristic values:
• An authentication trust level of zero represents no trust at all.
• An authentication trust level of one means that this authentication method fails in 10 percent of all authentication attempts.
• An authentication trust level of two means that this authentication method fails in 1 percent of all authentication attempts.

Therefore, increasing the authentication trust level by one means that this authentication method is ten times more secure. If an authentication method is twice as secure as a method ˜B ,its authentication trust level is increased by approximately 0.3 or rather log(2). We summarize this relation in the following definition.

IV. SMART AUTHENTICATION TRUST LEVEL NETWORK ARCHITECTURE

A. Authentication Trust Level Determination

Based on the definition of an authentication trust level, the critical point of determining the authentication trust level for an authentication method. Since this topic is complex enough and only provide some basic principles and methods for the process of defining the authentication trust level. However, it should have become clear that with our notion of an authentication trust level everybody is able to provide adequate algorithms to map any authentication method to such a trust level. Due to the clear semantical meaning even somebody who was not involved in the determination process is able to assess the result. As said before, an authentication method is characterized by many different criteria, which are mapped into one authentication trust level, which represents the probability that the authentication process can be cracked. This probability is the result of many influencing variables. Since it is impossible to take all criteria into account, it is

important to identity those criteria which have the highest impact on the probability value and to omit those values which only have little or no impact at all. This is a challenging task, which has to be done by experts and those results should be reviewed several times. As a starting point several existing and upcoming approaches for a common language to describe the authentication process can be used. The OASIS' Authentication Context Classes [25], which are part of the SAML 2 specification, for example, already provide an XML schema to describe the authentication process related to a specific authentication method. Also, the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) aims on developing a common description language for authentication methods [6]. These approaches are a good reference since they comprise the opinions and experiences of many people about which parameters are relevant when describing an authentication method. Finally, the most important step to arrive at an authentication trust level is to determine the probability that the considered method is cracked. In classical probability theory, two approaches are used to identify probabilities: Either the theoretical probability is calculated or probabilities are determined empirically based on observations. Whenever possible, the first approach should be used, since it provides more exact results. However, there are certain preconditions:

One has to be able to define all the possible outcomes and all possible events must be equally likely. In most cases, the world is not that easy and the only way is to determine the probabilities empirically. Therefore experiments with a large number of iterations and a large number of test data are necessary, which are rarely available. However, the more an authentication method is established, the more benchmarks and test results already exist. This is, for example, the case for fingerprint-based authentication systems. In order to compare and evaluate the security of fingerprint readers of different vendors, the Fingerprint Vendor Technology Evaluation [20] has been conducted by the National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST) [21] in the US in 2003. Eighteen different companies competed in the test and 34 systems were evaluated. Of course, not for all authentication methods the evaluation of their security is as advanced as for the fingerprint authentication. However, by time such statistics will exist, since no one will use a method without an evaluation of its security and without knowing about the risks. Several publications also evaluate the security of fingerprint systems and biometric authentication in general as for example [27, 8, 4]. Similar studies on the security of smart-cards, palmprint readers and many others are also available (cf. e.g. [14, 16, 15, 29]). Even though empirical methods will be the more frequent case, there are - especially in the field of knowledge-based authentication methods - parameters which are qualified to be determined theoretically. One of these criteria is the theoretical password space, since the number of all possible passwords is easy to calculate. Given for example the number of possible passwords and the number of false

attempts, the probability that the password is cracked by a brute-force attack can be calculated using classical probability theory. However, while in general the theoretical password space is quite large, the space actually used is often much smaller making brute force attacks easier. Many passwords can be guessed by doing a little research on the user or trying standard password lists. How hard it is to guess a password is described by a measure called entropy. While the theoretical password space can be computed easily, it is often hard to estimate the entropy of user-chosen passwords, since it is based upon the actual used password space. To evaluate the user's influence on the strength of a password, several studies have been conducted [33, 19, 9, 12]. All together, determining the authentication trust level of an authentication method is a challenging and critical task, which has to be done by experts and those results should be reviewed several times.

B. Authentication Trust Level Combination

Multi-factor authentication is an important concept, which is frequently used nowadays to increase the reliability of a user's authentication. The advantage is that the risk of the authentication process to fail is split up onto several authentication methods, whereas each of the methods is quite different in its kind of effectiveness. Hence, even if one factor fails, access is still denied as long as at least one of the other factors is not cracked by an attacker. In which way adding a further authentication factor contributes to the overall security of the authentication process is a question which is not easy to answer. If two authentication methods belong to the same category, the mechanisms to crack the authentication are quite similar, which makes it easier for an attacker to crack both authentication methods. In this case, adding a second method will not increase the overall security of the authentication as much as in the case of the multi-factor authentication. Therefore, we have to take the similarity between two methods into account when assessing the effect of their combination. Based on the authentication trust level of an authentication method, propose a way to calculate the combined authentication trust level of two authentication methods. A mathematical model is developed which allows

C. Joint Probability Function

Definition 1.1 The authentication trust level of an authentication method is based on the probability that this method is cracked by an attacker. This means, when combining two methods, we are looking for the probability that both authentication methods have failed, namely the probability of the joint event. According to probability theory, we can calculate the joint probability of two events. The combined authentication trust level is defined by equation While P(A) in equation is the known probability that the mechanism A˜ is cracked, the only thing we know from P(B | A) is that it is a function in dependency of P(A) and P(B). Therefore, in order to calculate the combined authentication trust level, we need to define this function. As the first step we consider the bounds in which the joint probability function is defined.

We consider the following Trust level field equations defined over an open bounded piece of network and /or feature space $\Omega \subset R^d$. They describe the dynamics of the mean anycast of each of p node populations.

$$\begin{cases} (\frac{d}{dt}+l_i)V_i(t,r) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_\Omega J_{ij}(r,\bar{r})S[(V_j(t-\tau_{ij}(r,\bar{r}),\bar{r})-h_{\mid j})]d\bar{r} \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad + I_i^{ext}(r,t), \qquad t\geq 0, 1\leq i\leq p, \\ \qquad V_i(t,r)=\phi_i(t,r) \qquad\qquad t\in[-T,0] \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We give an interpretation of the various parameters and functions that appear in (1), Ω is finite piece of nodes and/or feature space and is represented as an open bounded set of R^d. The vector r and $\bar{r}$ represent points in Ω. The function $S: R \to (0,1)$ is the normalized sigmoid function:

$$S(z) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-z}} \qquad (2)$$

It describes the relation between the input rate v_i of population i as a function of the packets potential, for example, $V_i = v_i = S[\sigma_i(V_i-h_i)]$. We note V the $p-$ dimensional vector $(V_1,...,V_p)$. The p function $\phi_i, i=1,...,p,$ represent the initial conditions, see below. We note ϕ the $p-$ dimensional vector $(\phi_1,...,\phi_p)$. The p function $I_i^{ext}, i=1,...,p,$ represent external factors from other network areas. We note I^{ext} the $p-$ dimensional vector $(I_1^{ext},...,I_p^{ext})$. The $p\times p$ matrix of functions $J=\{J_{ij}\}_{i,j=1,...,p}$ represents the connectivity between populations i and j, see below. The p real values $h_i, i=1,...,p,$ determine the threshold of activity for each population, that is, the value of the nodes potential corresponding to 50% of the maximal activity. The p real positive values $\sigma_i, i=1,...,p,$ determine the slopes of the sigmoids at the origin. Finally the p real positive values $l_i, i=1,...,p,$ determine the speed at which each anycast node potential decreases exponentially toward its real value. We also introduce the function $S: R^p \to R^p$, defined by $S(x)=[S(\sigma_1(x_1-h_1)),...,S(\sigma_p-h_p))]$, and the diagonal $p\times p$ matrix $L_0 = diag(l_1,...,l_p).$ Is the intrinsic dynamics of the population given by the linear response of data transfer. $(\frac{d}{dt}+l_i)$ is replaced by $(\frac{d}{dt}+l_i)^2$ to use the

alpha function response. We use $(\frac{d}{dt}+l_i)$ for simplicity although our analysis applies to more general intrinsic dynamics. For the sake, of generality, the propagation delays are not assumed to be identical for all populations, hence they are described by a matrix $\tau(r,\bar{r})$ whose element $\tau_{ij}(r,\bar{r})$ is the propagation delay between population j at $\bar{r}$ and population i at r. The reason for this assumption is that it is still unclear from authentication level if propagation delays are independent of the populations. We assume for technical reasons that τ is continuous, that is $\tau \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}^2, R_+^{p\times p})$. Moreover packet data indicate that τ is not a symmetric function i.e., $\tau_{ij}(r,\bar{r}) \neq \tau_{ij}(\bar{r},r)$, thus no assumption is made about this symmetry unless otherwise stated. In order to compute the righthand side of (1), we need to know the node potential factor V on interval $[-T,0]$. The value of T is obtained by considering the maximal delay:

$$\tau_m = \max_{i,j(r,\bar{r}\in\Omega\times\overline{\Omega})} \tau_{i,j}(r,\bar{r}) \qquad (3)$$

Hence we choose $T=\tau_m$

D. Mathematical Framework

A convenient functional setting for the authentication and authorization field equations is to use the space $F = L^2(\Omega, R^p)$ which is a Hilbert space endowed with the usual inner product:

$$\langle V,U \rangle_F = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_\Omega V_i(r)U_i(r)dr \qquad (1)$$

To give a meaning to (1), we defined the history space $C = C^0([-\tau_m,0], F)$ with $\|\phi\| = \sup_{t\in[-\tau_m,0]} \|\phi(t)\|F$, which is the Banach phase space associated with equation (3). Using the notation $V_t(\theta)=V(t+\theta), \theta\in[-\tau_m,0]$, we write (1) as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{V}(t) = -L_0 V(t) + L_1 S(V_t) + I^{ext}(t), \\ \qquad V_0 = \phi \in C, \end{cases} \qquad (2)$$

Where

$$\begin{cases} L_1 : C \to F, \\ \phi \to \int_\Omega J(.,\bar{r})\phi(\bar{r},-\tau(.,\bar{r}))d\bar{r} \end{cases}$$

Is the linear continuous operator satisfying $\|L_1\| \leq \|J\|_{L^2(\Omega^2, R^{p\times p})}$. Notice that most of the papers on this subject assume Ω infinite, hence requiring $\tau_m = \infty$.

Proposition 1.0 If the following assumptions are satisfied.

1. $J \in L^2(\Omega^2, R^{p \times p})$,

2. The external current $I^{ext} \in C^0(R, F)$,

3. $\tau \in C^0(\overline{\Omega^2}, R_+^{p \times p}), \sup_{\overline{\Omega^2}} \tau \le \tau_m.$

Then for any $\phi \in C$, there exists a unique solution $V \in C^1([0,\infty), F) \cap C^0([-\tau_m, \infty, F)$ to (3)

Notice that this result gives existence on R_+, finite-time explosion is impossible for this delayed differential equation. Nevertheless, a particular solution could grow indefinitely, we now prove that this cannot happen.

E. Boundedness of Solutions

A valid model of neural networks should only feature bounded packet node potentials.

Theorem 1.0 All the trajectories are ultimately bounded by the same constant R if $I \equiv \max_{t \in R^+} \left\| I^{ext}(t) \right\|_F < \infty.$

Proof :Let us defined $f : R \times C \to R^+$ as

$$f(t, V_t) \overset{def}{=} \left\langle -L_0 V_t(0) + L_1 S(V_t) + I^{ext}(t), V(t) \right\rangle_F = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d \|V\|_F^2}{dt}$$

We note $l = \min_{i=1,\dots p} l_i$

$$f(t, V_t) \le -l \|V(t)\|_F^2 + (\sqrt{p|\Omega|} \|J\|_F + I) \|V(t)\|_F$$

Thus, if

$$\|V(t)\|_F \ge 2 \frac{\sqrt{p|\Omega|}.\|J\|_F + I}{l} \overset{def}{=} R, f(t, V_t) \le -\frac{lR^2}{2} \overset{def}{=} -\delta < 0$$

Let us show that the open route of F of center 0 and radius R, B_R, is stable under the dynamics of equation. We know that $V(t)$ is defined for all $t \ge 0s$ and that $f < 0$ on ∂B_R, the boundary of B_R. We consider three cases for the initial condition V_0. If $\|V_0\|_C < R$ and set $T = \sup\{t \mid \forall s \in [0,t], V(s) \in \overline{B_R}\}$. Suppose that $T \in R$, then $V(T)$ is defined and belongs to $\overline{B_R}$, the closure of B_R, because $\overline{B_R}$ is closed, in effect to ∂B_R, we also have $\frac{d}{dt} \|V\|_F^2 \mid_{t=T} = f(T, V_T) \le -\delta < 0$ because $V(T) \in \partial B_R$. Thus we deduce that for $\varepsilon > 0$ and small enough,

$V(T + \varepsilon) \in \overline{B_R}$ which contradicts the definition of T. Thus $T \notin R$ and $\overline{B_R}$ is stable. Because f<0 on $\partial B_R, V(0) \in \partial B_R$ implies that $\forall t > 0, V(t) \in B_R$. Finally we consider the case $V(0) \in C\overline{B_R}$. Suppose that $\forall t > 0, V(t) \notin \overline{B_R}$, then $\forall t > 0, \frac{d}{dt} \|V\|_F^2 \le -2\delta$, thus $\|V(t)\|_F$ is monotonically decreasing and reaches the value of R in finite time when $V(t)$ reaches ∂B_R. This contradicts our assumption. Thus $\exists T > 0 \mid V(T) \in B_R.$

Proposition 1.1 : Let s and t be measured simple functions on $X.$ for $E \varepsilon M$, define

$$\phi(E) = \int_E s \, d\mu \qquad (1)$$

Then ϕ is a measure on M.

$$\int_X (s+t) d\mu = \int_X s \, d\mu + \int_X t d\mu \qquad (2)$$

Proof : If s and if $E_1, E_2, \dots$ are disjoint members of M whose union is E, the countable additivity of μ shows that

$$\phi(E) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mu(A_i \cap E) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \sum_{r=1}^\infty \mu(A_i \cap E_r)$$

$$= \sum_{r=1}^\infty \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mu(A_i \cap E_r) = \sum_{r=1}^\infty \phi(E_r)$$

Also, $\varphi(\phi) = 0$, so that φ is not identically ∞.

Next, let s be as before, let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ be the distinct values of t, and let $B_j = \{x : t(x) = \beta_j\}$ If $E_{ij} = A_i \cap B_j$, the

$$\int_{E_{ij}} (s+t) d\mu = (\alpha_i + \beta_j) \mu(E_{ij})$$

and $\int_{E_{ij}} s d\mu + \int_{E_{ij}} t d\mu = \alpha_i \mu(E_{ij}) + \beta_j \mu(E_{ij})$ Thus (2) holds with E_{ij} in place of X. Since X is the disjoint union of the sets E_{ij} $(1 \le i \le n, 1 \le j \le m)$, the first half of our proposition implies that (2) holds.

Theorem 1.1: If K is a compact set in the plane whose complement is connected, if f is a continuous complex function on K which is holomorphic in the interior of , and if $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists a polynomial P such that $|f(z) = P(z)| < \varepsilon$ for all $z \varepsilon K$. If the interior of K is

empty, then part of the hypothesis is vacuously satisfied, and the conclusion holds for every $f \varepsilon C(K)$. Note that K need to be connected.

Proof: By Tietze's theorem, f can be extended to a continuous function in the plane, with compact support. We fix one such extension and denote it again by f. For any $\delta > 0$, let $\omega(\delta)$ be the supremum of the numbers $|f(z_2) - f(z_1)|$ Where z_1 and z_2 are subject to the condition $|z_2 - z_1| \le \delta$. Since f is uniformly continuous, we have $\lim_{\delta \to 0} \omega(\delta) = 0$ (1) From now on, δ will be fixed. We shall prove that there is a polynomial P such that

$$|f(z) - P(z)| < 10,000 \ \omega(\delta) \quad (z \varepsilon K) \qquad (2)$$

By (1), this proves the theorem. Our first objective is the construction of a function $\Phi \varepsilon C_c'(R^2)$, such that for all z

$$|f(z) - \Phi(z)| \le \omega(\delta), \qquad (3)$$

$$|(\partial \Phi)(z)| < \frac{2\omega(\delta)}{\delta}, \qquad (4)$$

And

$$\Phi(z) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_X \frac{(\partial \Phi)(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta d\eta \qquad (\zeta = \xi + i\eta), \qquad (5)$$

Where X is the set of all points in the support of Φ whose distance from the complement of K does not δ. (Thus X contains no point which is "far within" K.) We construct Φ as the convolution of f with a smoothing function A. Put $a(r) = 0$ if $r > \delta$, put

$$a(r) = \frac{3}{\pi\delta^2}(1 - \frac{r^2}{\delta^2})^2 \qquad (0 \le r \le \delta), \qquad (6)$$

And define

$$A(z) = a(|z|) \qquad (7)$$

For all complex z. It is clear that $A \varepsilon C_c'(R^2)$. We claim that

$$\iint_{R^s} A = 1, \qquad (8)$$

$$\iint_{R^2} \partial A = 0, \qquad (9)$$

$$\iint_{R^3} |\partial A| = \frac{24}{15\delta} < \frac{2}{\delta}, \qquad (10)$$

The constants are so adjusted in (6) that (8) holds. (Compute the integral in polar coordinates), (9) holds simply because A

has compact support. To compute (10), express ∂A in polar coordinates, and note that $\frac{\partial A}{\partial \theta} = 0$,

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial r} = -a',$$

Now define

$$\Phi(z) = \iint_{R^2} f(z - \zeta)A d\xi d\eta = \iint_{R^2} A(z - \zeta)f(\zeta)d\xi d\eta \qquad (11)$$

Since f and A have compact support, so does Φ. Since

$$\Phi(z) - f(z)$$
$$= \iint_{R^2} [f(z - \zeta) - f(z)]A(\xi)d\xi d\eta \quad (12)$$

And $A(\zeta) = 0$ if $|\zeta| > \delta$, (3) follows from (8). The difference quotients of A converge boundedly to the corresponding partial derivatives, since $A \varepsilon C_c'(R^2)$. Hence the last expression in (11) may be differentiated under the integral sign, and we obtain

$$(\partial \Phi)(z) = \iint_{R^2} (\overline{\partial A})(z - \zeta)f(\zeta)d\xi d\eta$$
$$= \iint_{R^2} f(z - \zeta)(\partial A)(\zeta)d\xi d\eta$$
$$= \iint_{R^2} [f(z - \zeta) - f(z)](\partial A)(\zeta)d\xi d\eta \qquad (13)$$

The last equality depends on (9). Now (10) and (13) give (4). If we write (13) with Φ_x and Φ_y in place of $\partial \Phi$, we see that Φ has continuous partial derivatives, if we can show that $\partial \Phi = 0$ in G, where G is the set of all $z \varepsilon K$ whose distance from the complement of K exceeds δ. We shall do this by showing that

$$\Phi(z) = f(z) \qquad (z \varepsilon G); \qquad (14)$$

Note that $\partial f = 0$ in G, since f is holomorphic there. Now if $z \varepsilon G$, then $z - \zeta$ is in the interior of K for all ζ with $|\zeta| < \delta$. The mean value property for harmonic functions therefore gives, by the first equation in (11),

$$\Phi(z) = \int_0^\delta a(r)r dr \int_0^{2\pi} f(z - re^{i\theta})d\theta$$
$$= 2\pi f(z) \int_0^\delta a(r)r dr = f(z)\iint_{R^2} A = f(z) \qquad (15)$$

For all $z \ \varepsilon \ G$, we have now proved (3), (4), and (5) The definition of X shows that X is compact and that X can be covered by finitely many open discs $D_1, ..., D_n$, of radius 2δ, whose centers are not in K. Since $S^2 - K$ is

connected, the center of each D_j can be joined to ∞ by a polygonal path in $S^2 - K$. It follows that each D_j contains a compact connected set E_j, of diameter at least 2δ, so that $S^2 - E_j$ is connected and so that $K \cap E_j = \phi$. with $r = 2\delta$. There are functions $g_j \varepsilon H(S^2 - E_j)$ and constants b_j so that the inequalities.

$$\left| Q_j(\zeta, z) \right| < \frac{50}{\delta}, \qquad (16)$$

$$\left| Q_j(\zeta, z) - \frac{1}{z - \zeta} \right| < \frac{4,000\delta^2}{\left| z - \zeta \right|^2} \qquad (17)$$

Hold for $z \notin E_j$ and $\zeta \in D_j$, if

$$Q_j(\zeta, z) = g_j(z) + (\zeta - b_j) g_j^2(z) \qquad (18)$$

Let Ω be the complement of $E_1 \cup ... \cup E_n$. Then Ω is an open set which contains K. Put $X_1 = X \cap D_1$ and $X_j = (X \cap D_j) - (X_1 \cup ... \cup X_{j-1})$, for $2 \le j \le n$,

Define

$$R(\zeta, z) = Q_j(\zeta, z) \qquad (\zeta \varepsilon X_j, z \varepsilon \Omega) \qquad (19)$$

And

$$F(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_X (\partial \Phi)(\zeta) R(\zeta, z) d\zeta \, d\eta \qquad (20)$$

$$(z \, \varepsilon \, \Omega)$$

Since,

$$F(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{} \frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{X_i} (\partial \Phi)(\zeta) Q_j(\zeta, z) d\xi d\eta, \qquad (21)$$

(18) shows that F is a finite linear combination of the functions g_j and g_j^2. Hence $F \varepsilon H(\Omega)$. By (20), (4), and (5) we have

$$\left| F(z) - \Phi(z) \right| < \frac{2\omega(\delta)}{\pi\delta} \iint_X | R(\zeta, z)$$

$$- \frac{1}{z - \zeta} | d\xi d\eta \quad (z \, \varepsilon \, \Omega) \quad (22)$$

Observe that the inequalities (16) and (17) are valid with R in place of Q_j if $\zeta \, \varepsilon \, X$ and $z \, \varepsilon \, \Omega$. Now fix $z \, \varepsilon \, \Omega$., put $\zeta = z + \rho e^{i\theta}$, and estimate the integrand in (22) by (16) if $\rho < 4\delta$, by (17) if $4\delta \le \rho$. The integral in (22) is then seen to be less than the sum of

$$2\pi \int_0^{4\delta} \left(\frac{50}{\delta} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \rho d\rho = 808\pi\delta \qquad (23)$$

And

$$2\pi \int_{4\delta}^{\infty} \frac{4,000\delta^2}{\rho^2} \rho d\rho = 2,000\pi\delta. \qquad (24)$$

Hence (22) yields

$$\left| F(z) - \Phi(z) \right| < 6,000\omega(\delta) \qquad (z \, \varepsilon \, \Omega) \quad (25)$$

Since $F \, \varepsilon \, H(\Omega)$, $K \subset \Omega$, and $S^2 - K$ is connected, Runge's theorem shows that F can be uniformly approximated on K by polynomials. Hence (3) and (25) show that (2) can be satisfied. This completes the proof.

Lemma 1.0 : Suppose $f \varepsilon C_c'(R^2)$, the space of all continuously differentiable functions in the plane, with compact support. Put

$$\partial = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \right) \qquad (1)$$

Then the following "Cauchy formula" holds:

$$f(z) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \iint_{R^2} \frac{(\partial f)(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\xi d\eta$$

$$(\zeta = \xi + i\eta) \qquad (2)$$

Proof: This may be deduced from Green's theorem. However, here is a simple direct proof:

Put $\varphi(r, \theta) = f(z + re^{i\theta})$, $r > 0$, θ real

If $\zeta = z + re^{i\theta}$, the chain rule gives

$$(\partial f)(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2} e^{i\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{i}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \right] \varphi(r, \theta) \qquad (3)$$

The right side of (2) is therefore equal to the limit, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, of

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial r} + \frac{i}{r} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \theta} \right) d\theta dr \qquad (4)$$

For each $r > 0$, φ is periodic in θ, with period 2π. The integral of $\partial \varphi / \partial \theta$ is therefore 0, and (4) becomes

$$-\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial r} dr = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \varphi(\varepsilon, \theta) d\theta \qquad (5)$$

As $\varepsilon \to 0$, $\varphi(\varepsilon, \theta) \to f(z)$ uniformly. This gives (2)

If $X^\alpha \in a$ and $X^\beta \in k[X_1, ... X_n]$, then $X^\alpha X^\beta = X^{\alpha+\beta} \in a$, and so A satisfies the condition $(*)$. Conversely,

$$(\sum_{\alpha \in A} c_\alpha X^\alpha)(\sum_{\beta \in \square^n} d_\beta X^\beta) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta} c_\alpha d_\beta X^{\alpha+\beta} \qquad (finite\ sums),$$

and so if A satisfies $(*)$, then the subspace generated by the monomials $X^\alpha, \alpha \in a$, is an ideal. The proposition gives a classification of the monomial ideals in $k[X_1,...X_n]$: they are in one to one correspondence with the subsets A of $\square^n$ satisfying $(*)$. For example, the monomial ideals in $k[X]$ are exactly the ideals $(X^n), n \geq 1$, and the zero ideal (corresponding to the empty set A). We write $\langle X^\alpha \mid \alpha \in A \rangle$ for the ideal corresponding to A (subspace generated by the $X^\alpha, \alpha \in a$).

LEMMA 1.1. Let S be a subset of $\square^n$. The the ideal a generated by $X^\alpha, \alpha \in S$ is the monomial ideal corresponding to

$$A \stackrel{df}{=} \{\beta \in \square^n \mid \beta - \alpha \in \square^n, \quad some\ \alpha \in S\}$$

Thus, a monomial is in a if and only if it is divisible by one of the $X^\alpha, \alpha \in| S$

PROOF. Clearly A satisfies $(*)$, and $a \subset \langle X^\beta \mid \beta \in A \rangle$. Conversely, if $\beta \in A$, then $\beta - \alpha \in \square^n$ for some $\alpha \in S$, and $X^\beta = X^\alpha X^{\beta-\alpha} \in a$. The last statement follows from the fact that $X^\alpha \mid X^\beta \Leftrightarrow \beta - \alpha \in \square^n$. Let $A \subset \square^n$ satisfy $(*)$. From the geometry of A, it is clear that there is a finite set of elements $S = \{\alpha_1,...\alpha_s\}$ of A such that $A = \{\beta \in \square^n \mid \beta - \alpha_i \in \square^2, some\ \alpha_i \in S\}$ (The α_i's are the corners of A) Moreover, $a \stackrel{df}{=} \langle X^\alpha \mid \alpha \in A \rangle$ is generated by the monomials $X^{\alpha_i}, \alpha_i \in S$.

DEFINITION 1.0. For a nonzero ideal a in $k[X_1,...,X_n]$, we let $(LT(a))$ be the ideal generated by $\{LT(f) \mid f \in a\}$

LEMMA 1.2 Let a be a nonzero ideal in $k[X_1,...,X_n]$; then $(LT(a))$ is a monomial ideal, and it equals $(LT(g_1),...,LT(g_n))$ for some $g_1,...,g_n \in a$.

PROOF. Since $(LT(a))$ can also be described as the ideal generated by the leading monomials (rather than the leading terms) of elements of a.

THEOREM 1.2. Every *ideal* a in $k[X_1,...,X_n]$ is finitely generated; more precisely, $a = (g_1,...,g_s)$ where $g_1,...,g_s$ are any elements of a whose leading terms generate $LT(a)$

PROOF. Let $f \in a$. On applying the division algorithm, we find
$$f = a_1 g_1 + ... + a_s g_s + r, \qquad a_i, r \in k[X_1,...,X_n],$$
where either $r = 0$ or no monomial occurring in it is divisible by any $LT(g_i)$. But $r = f - \sum a_i g_i \in a$, and therefore $LT(r) \in LT(a) = (LT(g_1),...,LT(g_s))$, implies that every monomial occurring in r is divisible by one in $LT(g_i)$. Thus $r = 0$, and $g \in (g_1,...,g_s)$.

DEFINITION 1.1. A finite subset $S = \{g_1,|...,g_s\}$ of an ideal a is a standard ($(Gr\ddot{o}bner)$ bases for a if $(LT(g_1),...,LT(g_s)) = LT(a)$. In other words, S is a standard basis if the leading term of every element of a is divisible by at least one of the leading terms of the g_i.

THEOREM 1.3 *The ring $k[X_1,...,X_n]$ is Noetherian i.e., every ideal is finitely generated.*

PROOF. For $n = 1$, $k[X]$ is a principal ideal domain, which means that every ideal is generated by single element. We shall prove the theorem by induction on n. Note that the obvious map $k[X_1,...X_{n-1}][X_n] \to k[X_1,...X_n]$ is an isomorphism – this simply says that every polynomial f in n variables $X_1,...X_n$ can be expressed uniquely as a polynomial in X_n with coefficients in $k[X_1,...,X_n]$:
$$f(X_1,...X_n) = a_0(X_1,...X_{n-1})X_n^r + ... + a_r(X_1,...X_{n-1})$$
Thus the next lemma will complete the proof

LEMMA 1.3. If A is Noetherian, then so also is $A[X]$
PROOF. For a polynomial

$$f(X) = a_0 X^r + a_1 X^{r-1} + ... + a_r, \qquad a_i \in A, \qquad a_0 \neq 0,$$

r is called the degree of f, and a_0 is its leading coefficient. We call 0 the leading coefficient of the polynomial 0.

Let a be an ideal in $A[X]$. The leading coefficients of the polynomials in a form an ideal a' in A, and since A is Noetherian, a' will be finitely generated. Let $g_1,...,g_m$ be elements of a whose leading coefficients generate a', and let r be the maximum degree of g_i. Now let $f \in a$, and suppose f has degree $s > r$, say, $f = aX^s + ...$. Then $a \in a'$, and so we can write

$$a = \sum b_i a_i, \qquad b_i \in A,$$

a_i =leading coefficient of g_i

Now

$$f - \sum b_i g_i X^{s-r_i}, \quad r_i = \deg(g_i), \text{has degree} < \deg(f).$$

By continuing in this way, we find that $f \equiv f_t \pmod{g_1,...g_m}$ With f_t a polynomial of degree $t < r$. For each $d < r$, let a_d be the subset of A consisting of 0 and the leading coefficients of all polynomials in a of degree d; it is again an ideal in A. Let $g_{d,1},...,g_{d,m_d}$ be polynomials of degree d whose leading coefficients generate a_d. Then the same argument as above shows that any polynomial f_d in a of degree d can be written $f_d \equiv f_{d-1} \pmod{g_{d,1},...g_{d,m_d}}$ With f_{d-1} of degree $\leq d-1$. On applying this remark repeatedly we find that $f_t \in (g_{r-1,1},...g_{r-1,m_{r-1}},...g_{0,1},...g_{0,m_0})$ Hence

$$f_t \in (g_1,...g_m g_{r-1,1},...g_{r-1,m_{r-1}},...,g_{0,1},...,g_{0,m_0})$$

and so the polynomials $g_1,...,g_{0,m_0}$ generate a

One of the great successes of category theory in computer science has been the development of a "unified theory" of the constructions underlying denotational semantics. In the untyped λ-calculus, any term may appear in the function position of an application. This means that a model D of the λ-calculus must have the property that given a term t whose interpretation is $d \in D$, Also, the interpretation of a functional abstraction like $\lambda x . x$ is most conveniently defined as a function from D to D, which must then be regarded as an element of D. Let $\psi : [D \to D] \to D$ be the function that picks out elements of D to represent elements of $[D \to D]$ and $\phi : D \to [D \to D]$ be the function that maps elements of D to functions of D. Since $\psi(f)$ is intended to represent the function f as an element of *D*, it makes sense to require that $\phi(\psi(f)) = f$, that is, $\psi o \psi = id_{[D \to D]}$ Furthermore, we often want to view every element of D as representing some function from *D to D* and require that elements representing the same function be equal – that is

$$\psi(\varphi(d)) = d$$

or

$$\psi o \phi = id_D$$

The latter condition is called extensionality. These conditions together imply that $\phi \, and \, \psi$ are inverses--- that is, *D* is isomorphic to the space of functions from *D to D* that can be the interpretations of functional abstractions: $D \cong [D \to D]$ .Let us suppose we are working with the untyped $\lambda - calculus$, we need a solution ot the equation $D \cong A + [D \to D]$, where A is some predetermined domain containing interpretations for elements of *C*. Each element of *D* corresponds to either an element of *A* or an element of $[D \to D]$, with a tag. This equation can be solved by finding least fixed points of the function $F(X) = A + [X \to X]$ from domains to domains --- that is, finding domains X such that $X \cong A + [X \to X]$, and such that for any domain *Y* also satisfying this equation, there is an embedding of *X* to *Y* --- a pair of maps

$$X \underset{f^R}{\overset{f}{\square}} Y$$

Such that

$$f^R o f = id_X$$
$$f o f^R \subseteq id_Y$$

Where $f \subseteq g$ means that *f approximates g* in some ordering representing their information content. The key shift of perspective from the domain-theoretic to the more general category-theoretic approach lies in considering *F* not as a function on domains, but as a *functor* on a category of domains. Instead of a least fixed point of the function, *F.*

Definition 1.3: Let ***K*** be a category and $F : K \to K$ as a functor. A fixed point of *F* is a pair (A,a), where A is a ***K-object*** and $a : F(A) \to A$ is an isomorphism. A prefixed point of F is a pair (A,a), where A is a ***K-object*** and a is any arrow from F(A) to A

Definition 1.4 : An $\omega - chain$ in a category ***K*** is a diagram of the following form:

$$\Delta = D_o \overset{f_o}{\longrightarrow} D_1 \overset{f_1}{\longrightarrow} D_2 \overset{f_2}{\longrightarrow} \dots$$

Recall that a cocone μ of an $\omega - chain\ \Delta$ is a *K*-object *X* and a collection of K –*arrows* $\{\mu_i : D_i \to X \mid i \geq 0\}$ such that $\mu_i = \mu_{i+1} o\, f_i$ for all $i \geq 0$. We sometimes write $\mu : \Delta \to X$ as a reminder of the arrangement of $\mu's$ components Similarly, a colimit $\mu : \Delta \to X$ is a cocone with the property that if $\nu : \Delta \to X'$ is also a cocone then there exists a unique mediating arrow $k : X \to X'$ such that for all $i \geq 0,$, $v_i = k\, o\, \mu_i$. Colimits of $\omega - chains$ are sometimes referred to as $\omega - co\lim its$. Dually, an $\omega^{op} - chain$ in *K* is a diagram of the following form:

$$\Delta = D_o \overset{f_o}{\longleftarrow} D_1 \overset{f_1}{\longleftarrow} D_2 \overset{f_2}{\longleftarrow} \dots$$ A cone $\mu : X \to \Delta$ of an $\omega^{op} - chain\ \Delta$ is a *K*-object X and a collection of **K**-arrows $\{\mu_i : D_i \mid i \geq 0\}$ such that for all $i \geq 0$, $\mu_i = f_i\, o\, \mu_{i+1}$. An ω^{op} -limit of an $\omega^{op} - chain\ \Delta$ is a cone $\mu : X \to \Delta$ with the property that if $\nu : X' \to \Delta$ is also a cone, then there exists a unique mediating arrow $k : X' \to X$ such that for all $i \geq 0, \mu_i o\, k = v_i$. We write $\perp_k$ (or just $\perp$) for the distinguish initial object of *K,* when it has one, and $\perp \to A$ for the unique arrow from $\perp$ to each *K*-object A. It is also convenient to write $\Delta^- = D_1 \overset{f_1}{\longrightarrow} D_2 \overset{f_2}{\longrightarrow} \dots$ to denote all of Δ except D_o and f_0. By analogy, μ^- is $\{\mu_i \mid i \geq 1\}$. For the images of Δ and μ under *F* we write

$$F(\Delta) = F(D_o) \overset{F(f_o)}{\longrightarrow} F(D_1) \overset{F(f_1)}{\longrightarrow} F(D_2) \overset{F(f_2)}{\longrightarrow} \dots$$

and $F(\mu) = \{F(\mu_i) \mid i \geq 0\}$

We write F^i for the *i*-fold iterated composition of *F* – that is, $F^o(f) = f, F^1(f) = F(f), F^2(f) = F(F(f))$,etc. With these definitions we can state that every monitonic function on a complete lattice has a least fixed point:

Lemma 1.4. Let *K* be a category with initial object $\perp$ and let $F : K \to K$ be a functor. Define the $\omega - chain\ \Delta$ by

$$\Delta = \perp \overset{! \perp \to F(\perp)}{\longrightarrow} F(\perp) \overset{F(! \perp \to F(\perp))}{\longrightarrow} F^2(\perp) \overset{F^2(! \perp \to F(\perp))}{\longrightarrow} \dots$$

If both $\mu : \Delta \to D$ and $F(\mu) : F(\Delta) \to F(D)$ are colimits, then (D,d) is an intial F-algebra, where

$d : F(D) \to D$ is the mediating arrow from $F(\mu)$ to the cocone μ^-

Theorem 1.4 Let a DAG G given in which each node is a random variable, and let a discrete conditional probability distribution of each node given values of its parents in G be specified. Then the product of these conditional distributions yields a joint probability distribution P of the variables, and (G,P) satisfies the Markov condition.

Proof. Order the nodes according to an ancestral ordering. Let $X_1, X_2, \dots X_n$ be the resultant ordering. Next define.

$$P(x_1, x_2, \dots x_n) = P(x_n \mid pa_n) P(x_{n-1} \mid Pa_{n-1}) \dots$$
$$\dots P(x_2 \mid pa_2) P(x_1 \mid pa_1),$$

Where PA_i is the set of parents of X_i of in G and $P(x_i \mid pa_i)$ is the specified conditional probability distribution. First we show this does indeed yield a joint probability distribution. Clearly, $0 \leq P(x_1, x_2, \dots x_n) \leq 1$ for all values of the variables. Therefore, to show we have a joint distribution, as the variables range through all their possible values, is equal to one. To that end, Specified conditional distributions are the conditional distributions they notationally represent in the joint distribution. Finally, we show the Markov condition is satisfied. To do this, we need show for $1 \leq k \leq n$ that

$$P(pa_k) \neq 0, if\ P(nd_k \mid pa_k) \neq 0$$

whenever $\quad and\quad P(x_k \mid pa_k) \neq 0$

$$then\ P(x_k \mid nd_k, pa_k) = P(x_k \mid pa_k),$$

Where ND_k is the set of nondescendents of X_k of in G. Since $PA_k \subseteq ND_k$, we need only show $P(x_k \mid nd_k) = P(x_k \mid pa_k)$. First for a given k, order the nodes so that all and only nondescendents of X_k precede X_k in the ordering. Note that this ordering depends on k, whereas the ordering in the first part of the proof does not. Clearly then

$$ND_k = \{X_1, X_2, \dots X_{k-1}\}$$

$$Let$$

$$D_k = \{X_{k+1}, X_{k+2}, \dots X_n\}$$

follows $\sum_{d_k}$

We define the mth cyclotomic field to be the field $Q[x]/(\Phi_m(x))$ Where $\Phi_m(x)$ is the mth cyclotomic polynomial. $Q[x]/(\Phi_m(x))$ $\Phi_m(x)$ *has degree* $\varphi(m)$ *over* Q *since* $\Phi_m(x)$ has degree $\varphi(m)$. *The roots of* $\Phi_m(x)$ *are just the primitive* m^{th} *roots of unity, so the complex embeddings of* $Q[x]/(\Phi_m(x))$ *are simply the* $\varphi(m)$ *maps*

$\sigma_k : Q[x]/(\Phi_m(x)) \mapsto C,$
$1 \le k \prec m, (k,m)=1, \quad where$
$$\sigma_k(x) = \xi_m^k,$$

ξ_m being our fixed choice of primitive m^{th} root of unity. Note that $\xi_m^k \in Q(\xi_m)$ for every k; it follows that $Q(\xi_m) = Q(\xi_m^k)$ for all k relatively prime to m . In particular, the images of the σ_i coincide, so $Q[x]/(\Phi_m(x))$ *is Galois over* Q. *This means that we can write* $Q(\xi_m)$ *for* $Q[x]/(\Phi_m(x))$ *without much fear of ambiguity; we will do so from now on, the identification being* $\xi_m \mapsto x.$ *One advantage of this is that one can easily talk about cyclotomic fields being extensions of one another,or intersections or compositums; all of these things take place considering them as subfield of* C. We now investigate some basic properties of cyclotomic fields. The first issue is whether or not they are all distinct; to determine this, we need to know which roots of unity lie in $Q(\xi_m)$ .Note, for example, that if m is odd, then $-\xi_m$ is a $2m^{th}$ root of unity. We will show that this is the only way in which one can obtain any non-m^{th} roots of unity.

LEMMA 1.5 If m divides n , then $Q(\xi_m)$ *is contained in* $Q(\xi_n)$

PROOF. Since $\xi^{n/m} = \xi_m$, *we have* $\xi_m \in Q(\xi_n),$ *so the result is clear*

LEMMA 1.6 If m and n are relatively prime, then
$$Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) = Q(\xi_{nm})$$
and
$$Q(\xi_m) \cap Q(\xi_n) = Q$$

(Recall the $Q(\xi_m, \xi_n)$ is the compositum of $Q(\xi_m) \text{ and } Q(\xi_n)$)

PROOF. One checks easily that $\xi_m \xi_n$ is a primitive mn^{th} root of unity, so that
$$Q(\xi_{mn}) \subseteq Q(\xi_m, \xi_n)$$
$$[Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) : Q] \le [Q(\xi_m) : Q][Q(\xi_n) : Q]$$
$$= \varphi(m)\varphi(n) = \varphi(mn);$$

Since $\underline{[Q(\xi_{mn}) : Q] = \varphi(mn)};$ this implies that $Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) = Q(\xi_{nm})$ We know that $Q(\xi_m, \xi_n)$ has degree $\varphi(mn)$ over Q, so we must have
$$[Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) : Q(\xi_m)] = \varphi(n)$$
and
$$[Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) : Q(\xi_m)] = \varphi(m)$$

$$[Q(\xi_m) : Q(\xi_m) \cap Q(\xi_n)] \ge \varphi(m)$$
And thus that $Q(\xi_m) \cap Q(\xi_n) = Q$

PROPOSITION 1.2 For any m and n

$$Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) = Q(\xi_{[m,n]})$$
And
$$Q(\xi_m) \cap Q(\xi_n) = Q(\xi_{(m,n)});$$

here $[m,n]$ and (m,n) denote the least common multiple and the greatest common divisor of m and n, respectively.

PROOF. Write $m = p_1^{e_1}......p_k^{e_k}$ and $p_1^{f_1}....p_k^{f_k}$ where the p_i are distinct primes. (We allow $e_i \text{ or } f_i$ to be zero)

$$Q(\xi_m) = Q(\xi_{p_1^{e_1}}) Q(\xi_{p_2^{e_2}}) ... Q(\xi_{p_k^{e_k}})$$

and

$$Q(\xi_n) = Q(\xi_{p_1^{f_1}}) Q(\xi_{p_2^{f_2}}) ... Q(\xi_{p_k^{f_k}})$$

Thus

$$Q(\xi_m, \xi_n) = Q(\xi_{p_1^{e_1}}) .... Q(\xi_{p_2^{e_k}}) Q(\xi_{p_1^{f_1}}) ... Q(\xi_{p_k^{f_k}})$$

$$= Q(\xi_{p_1^{e_1}}) Q(\xi_{p_1^{f_1}}) ... Q(\xi_{p_k^{e_k}}) Q(\xi_{p_k^{f_k}})$$

$$= Q(\xi_{p_1^{\max(e_1, f_1)}}) .... Q(\xi_{p_1^{\max(e_k, f_k)}})$$

$$= Q(\xi_{p_1^{\max(e_1, f_1)} .... p_1^{\max(e_k, f_k)}})$$

$$= Q(\xi_{[m,n]});$$

An entirely similar computation shows that $Q(\xi_m) \cap Q(\xi_n) = Q(\xi_{(m,n)})$

Mutual information measures the information transferred when x_i is sent and y_i is received, and is defined as

$$I(x_i, y_i) = \log_2 \frac{P(x_i/y_i)}{P(x_i)} \ bits \qquad (1)$$

In a noise-free channel, **each** y_i is uniquely connected to the corresponding x_i , and so they constitute an input –output pair (x_i, y_i) for which

$$P(x_i/y_j) = 1 \ and \ I(x_i, y_j) = \log_2 \frac{1}{P(x_i)} \text{ bits; that is, the}$$

transferred information is equal to the self-information that corresponds to the input x_i In a very noisy channel, the output y_i and input x_i would be completely uncorrelated, and so

$$P(x_i/y_j) = P(x_i) \text{ and also } I(x_i, y_j) = 0; \text{that is, there is no}$$

transference of information. In general, a given channel will operate between these two extremes. The mutual information is defined between the input and the output of a given channel. An average of the calculation of the mutual information for all input-output pairs of a given channel is the average mutual information:

$$I(X,Y) = \sum_{i.j} P(x_i, y_j) I(x_i, y_j) = \sum_{i.j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \left[\frac{P(x_i/y_j)}{P(x_i)} \right] \text{ bits per}$$

symbol . This calculation is done over the input and output alphabets. The average mutual information. The following expressions are useful for modifying the mutual information expression:

$$P(x_i, y_j) = P(x_i/y_j) P(y_j) = P(y_j/x_i) P(x_i)$$

$$P(y_j) = \sum_i P(y_j/x_i) P(x_i)$$

$$P(x_i) = \sum_i P(x_i/y_j) P(y_j)$$

Then

$$I(X,Y) = \sum_{i.j} P(x_i, y_j)$$

$$= \sum_{i.j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \left[\frac{1}{P(x_i)} \right]$$

$$- \sum_{i.j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \left[\frac{1}{P(x_i/y_j)} \right]$$

$$\sum_{i.j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \left[\frac{1}{P(x_i)} \right]$$

$$= \sum_i \left[P(x_i/y_j) P(y_j) \right] \log_2 \frac{1}{P(x_i)}$$

$$\sum_i P(x_i) \log_2 \frac{1}{P(x_i)} = H(X)$$

$$I(X,Y) = H(X) - H(X/Y)$$

Where $H(X/Y) = \sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \frac{1}{P(x_i/y_j)}$ is

usually called the equivocation. In a sense, the equivocation can be seen as the information lost in the noisy channel, and is a function of the backward conditional probability. The observation of an output symbol y_j provides $H(X) - H(X/Y)$ bits of information. This difference is the mutual information of the channel. *Mutual Information: Properties* Since

$$P(x_i/y_j) P(y_j) = P(y_j/x_i) P(x_i)$$

The mutual information fits the condition

$$I(X,Y) = I(Y,X)$$

And by interchanging input and output it is also true that

$$I(X,Y) = H(Y) - H(Y/X)$$

Where

$$H(Y) = \sum_j P(y_j) \log_2 \frac{1}{P(y_j)}$$

This last entropy is usually called the noise entropy. Thus, the information transferred through the channel is the difference between the output entropy and the noise entropy. Alternatively, it can be said that the channel mutual information is the difference between the number of bits needed for determining a given input symbol before knowing the corresponding output symbol, and the number of bits needed for determining a given input symbol after knowing the corresponding output symbol

$$I(X,Y) = H(X) - H(X/Y)$$

As the channel mutual information expression is a difference between two quantities, it seems that this parameter can adopt negative values. However, and is spite of the fact that for some $y_j, H(X/y_j)$ can be larger than $H(X)$, this is not possible for the average value calculated over all the outputs:

$$\sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \frac{P(x_i/y_j)}{P(x_i)} = \sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \frac{P(x_i, y_j)}{P(x_i)P(y_j)}$$

Then

$$-I(X,Y) = \sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \frac{P(x_i)P(y_j)}{P(x_i, y_j)} \le 0$$

Because this expression is of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} P_i \log_2 \left(\frac{Q_i}{P_i}\right) \le 0$$

The above expression can be applied due to the factor $P(x_i)P(y_j)$, which is the product of two probabilities, so that it behaves as the quantity Q_i, which in this expression is a dummy variable that fits the condition $\sum_i Q_i \le 1$. It can be concluded that the average mutual information is a non-negative number. It can also be equal to zero, when the input and the output are independent of each other. A related entropy called the joint entropy is defined as

$$H(X,Y) = \sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \frac{1}{P(x_i, y_j)}$$
$$= \sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \frac{P(x_i)P(y_j)}{P(x_i, y_j)}$$
$$+ \sum_{i,j} P(x_i, y_j) \log_2 \frac{1}{P(x_i)P(y_j)}$$

Theorem 1.5: Entropies of the binary erasure channel (BEC) The BEC is defined with an alphabet of two inputs and three outputs, with symbol probabilities.

$$P(x_1) = \alpha \text{ and } P(x_2) = 1 - \alpha,$$ and transition probabilities

$$P(y_3/x_2) = 1 - p \text{ and } P(y_2/x_1) = 0,$$
$$\text{and } P(y_3/x_1) = 0$$
$$\text{and } P(y_1/x_2) = p$$
$$\text{and } P(y_3/x_2) = 1 - p$$

Lemma 1.7. Given an arbitrary restricted time-discrete, amplitude-continuous channel whose restrictions are determined by sets F_n and whose density functions exhibit no dependence on the state s, let n be a fixed positive integer, and $p(x)$ an arbitrary probability density function on Euclidean n-space. $p(y \mid x)$ for the density $p_n(y_1, ..., y_n \mid x_1, ... x_n)$ and F for F_n. For any real number a, let

$$A = \left\{ (x, y) : \log \frac{p(y \mid x)}{p(y)} > a \right\} \quad (1)$$

Then for each positive integer u, there is a code (u, n, λ) such that

$$\lambda \le u e^{-a} + P\{(X, Y) \notin A\} + P\{X \notin F\} \quad (2)$$

Where

$$P\{(X, Y) \in A\} = \int_A ... \int p(x, y) dx dy, \qquad p(x, y) = p(x) p(y \mid x)$$

and

$$P\{X \in F\} = \int_F ... \int p(x) dx$$

Proof: A sequence $x^{(1)} \in F$ such that

$$P\{Y \in A_{x^1} \mid X = x^{(1)}\} \ge 1 - \varepsilon$$

$$\text{where } A_x = \{y : (x, y) \varepsilon A\};$$

Choose the decoding set B_1 to be $A_{x^{(1)}}$. Having chosen $x^{(1)}, ..., x^{(k-1)}$ and $B_1, ..., B_{k-1}$, select $x^k \in F$ such that

$$P\left\{Y \in A_{x^{(k)}} - \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} B_i \mid X = x^{(k)}\right\} \ge 1 - \varepsilon;$$

Set $B_k = A_{x^{(k)}} - \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} B_i$, If the process does not terminate in a finite number of steps, then the sequences $x^{(i)}$ and decoding sets $B_i, i = 1, 2, ..., u,$ form the desired code. Thus assume that the process terminates after t steps. (Conceivably $t = 0$). We will show $t \ge u$ by showing that $\varepsilon \le t e^{-a} + P\{(X, Y) \notin A\} + P\{X \notin F\}$. We proceed as follows.

$$B = \bigcup_{j=1}^{t} B_j. \quad (If \ t = 0, \ take \ B = \phi). \ Then$$

$$P\{(X,Y) \in A\} = \int_{(x,y)\in A} p(x,y)dx\,dy$$

Let
$$= \int_x p(x) \int_{y \in A_x} p(y\,|\,x)dy\,dx$$

$$= \int_x p(x) \int_{y \in B \cap A_x} p(y\,|\,x)dy\,dx + \int_x p(x)$$

F. Algorithms

Ideals. Let A be a ring. Recall that an *ideal a* in A is a subset such that a is subgroup of A regarded as a group under addition;

$$a \in a, r \in A \Rightarrow ra \in A$$

The ideal generated by a subset S of A is the intersection of all ideals A containing a ----- it is easy to verify that this is in fact an ideal, and that it consist of all finite sums of the form $\sum r_i s_i$ with $r_i \in A, s_i \in S$. When $S = \{s_1,.....,s_m\}$, we shall write $(s_1,.....,s_m)$ for the ideal it generates.

Let a and b be ideals in A. The set $\{a + b\,|\,a \in a, b \in b\}$ is an ideal, denoted by $a + b$. The ideal generated by $\{ab\,|\,a \in a, b \in b\}$ is denoted by ab . Note that $ab \subset a \cap b$. Clearly ab consists of all finite sums $\sum a_i b_i$ with $a_i \in a$ and $b_i \in b$, and if $a = (a_1,...,a_m)$ and $b = (b_1,...,b_n)$, then $ab = (a_1 b_1,...,a_i b_j,...,a_m b_n)$ .Let a be an ideal of A. The set of cosets of a in A forms a ring A/a , and $a \mapsto a + a$ is a homomorphism $\phi : A \mapsto A/a$. The map $b \mapsto \phi^{-1}(b)$ is a one to one correspondence between the ideals of A/a and the ideals of A containing a . An ideal p if *prime* if $p \neq A$ and $ab \in p \Rightarrow a \in p$ or $b \in p$. Thus p is prime if and only if A/p is nonzero and has the property that $ab = 0, \quad b \neq 0 \Rightarrow a = 0$, i.e., A/p is an integral domain. An ideal m is *maximal* if $m \neq| A$ and there does not exist an ideal n contained strictly between m and A . Thus m is maximal if and only if A/m has no proper nonzero ideals, and so is a field. Note that m maximal $\Rightarrow m$ prime. The ideals of $A \times B$ are all of the form $a \times b$, with a and b ideals in A and B . To see this, note that if c is an ideal in $A \times B$ and $(a,b) \in c$, then

$(a,0) = (a,b)(1,0) \in c$ and $(0,b) = (a,b)(0,1) \in c$. This shows that $c = a \times b$ with

$$a = \{a\,|\,(a,b) \in c \ some \ b \in b\}$$
and
$$b = \{b\,|\,(a,b) \in c \ some \ a \in a\}$$

Let A be a ring. An A-algebra is a ring B together with a homomorphism $i_B : A \rightarrow B$. A *homomorphism of A-algebra* $B \rightarrow C$ is a homomorphism of rings $\varphi : B \rightarrow C$ such that $\varphi(i_B(a)) = i_C(a)$ for all $a \in A$. An A-algebra B is said to be *finitely generated* (or of *finite-type* over A) if there exist elements $x_1,...,x_n \in B$ such that every element of B can be expressed as a polynomial in the x_i with coefficients in $i(A)$, i.e., such that the homomorphism $A[X_1,...,X_n] \rightarrow B$ sending X_i to x_i is surjective. A ring homomorphism $A \rightarrow B$ is *finite,* and B is finitely generated as an A-module. Let k be a field, and let A be a k-algebra. If $1 \neq 0$ in A , then the map $k \rightarrow A$ is injective, we can identify k with its image, i.e., we can regard k as a subring of A . If 1=0 in a ring R, the R is the zero ring, i.e., $R = \{0\}$. **Polynomial rings.** Let k be a field. A *monomial* in $X_1,...,X_n$ is an expression of the form $X_1^{a_1}...X_n^{a_n}, \quad a_j \in N$. The *total degree* of the monomial is $\sum a_i$. We sometimes abbreviate it by $X^{\alpha}, \alpha = (a_1,...,a_n) \in \Box^n$. The elements of the polynomial ring $k[X_1,...,X_n]$ are finite sums $\sum c_{a_1...a_n} X_1^{a_1}...X_n^{a_n}, \quad c_{a_1...a_n} \in k, \quad a_j \in \Box$ With the obvious notions of equality, addition and multiplication. Thus the monomials from basis for $k[X_1,...,X_n]$ as a k-vector space. The ring $k[X_1,...,X_n]$ is an integral domain, and the only units in it are the nonzero constant polynomials. A polynomial $f(X_1,...,X_n)$ is *irreducible* if it is nonconstant and has only the obvious factorizations, i.e., $f = gh \Rightarrow g$ or h is constant. **Division in $k[X]$.** The division algorithm allows us to divide a nonzero polynomial into another: let f and g be polynomials in $k[X]$ with $g \neq 0$; then there exist unique polynomials $q, r \in k[X]$ such that $f = qg + r$ with either $r = 0$ or $\deg r < \deg g$. Moreover, there is an algorithm for

deciding whether $f \in (g)$, namely, find r and check whether it is zero. Moreover, the Euclidean algorithm allows to pass from finite set of generators for an ideal in $k[X]$ to a single generator by successively replacing each pair of generators with their greatest common divisor.

(Pure) **lexicographic** *ordering (lex)*. Here monomials are ordered by lexicographic(dictionary) order. More precisely, let $\alpha = (a_1, \dots a_n)$ and $\beta = (b_1, \dots b_n)$ be two elements of $\square^n$; then $\alpha > \beta$ *and* $X^\alpha > X^\beta$ (lexicographic ordering) if, in the vector difference $\alpha - \beta \in \square$, the left most nonzero entry is positive. For example,

$XY^2 > Y^3 Z^4$; $X^3 Y^2 Z^4 > X^3 Y^2 Z$. Note that this isn't quite how the dictionary would order them: it would put *XXXYYZZZZ* after *XXXYYZ*. *Graded reverse lexicographic order (grevlex)*. Here monomials are ordered by total degree, with ties broken by reverse lexicographic ordering. Thus, $\alpha > \beta$ if $\sum a_i > \sum b_i$, or $\sum a_i = \sum b_i$ and in $\alpha - \beta$ the right most nonzero entry is negative. For example:

$X^4 Y^4 Z^7 > X^5 Y^5 Z^4$ *(total degree greater)*
$XY^5 Z^2 > X^4 YZ^3$, $X^5 YZ > X^4 YZ^2$.

Orderings on $k[X_1, \dots X_n]$. Fix an ordering on the monomials in $k[X_1, \dots X_n]$. Then we can write an element f of $k[X_1, \dots X_n]$ in a canonical fashion, by re-ordering its elements in decreasing order. For example, we would write
$f = 4XY^2 Z + 4Z^2 - 5X^3 + 7X^2 Z^2$
as
$f = -5X^3 + 7X^2 Z^2 + 4XY^2 Z + 4Z^2$ *(lex)*
or
$f = 4XY^2 Z + 7X^2 Z^2 - 5X^3 + 4Z^2$ *(grevlex)*
Let $\sum a_\alpha X^\alpha \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, in decreasing order:
$f = a_{\alpha_0} X^{\alpha_0} +_{\alpha_1} X^{\alpha_1} + \dots,$ $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \dots,$ $\alpha_0 \neq 0$
Then we define.

- The *multidegree* of f to be multdeg(f)$= \alpha_0$;
- The *leading coefficient of* f to be $LC(f) = a_{\alpha_0}$;
- The *leading monomial of* f to be $LM(f) = X^{\alpha_0}$;
- The *leading term of* f to be $LT(f) = a_{\alpha_0} X^{\alpha_0}$

For the polynomial $f = 4XY^2 Z + \dots$, the multidegree is $(1,2,1)$, the leading coefficient is 4, the leading monomial is $XY^2 Z$, and the leading term is $4XY^2 Z$. **The division algorithm in** $k[X_1, \dots X_n]$. Fix a monomial ordering in $\square^2$. Suppose given a polynomial f and an ordered set $(g_1, \dots g_s)$ of polynomials; the division algorithm then constructs polynomials $a_1, \dots a_s$ and r such that $f = a_1 g_1 + \dots + a_s g_s + r$ Where either $r = 0$ or no monomial in r is divisible by any of $LT(g_1), \dots, LT(g_s)$

Step 1: If $LT(g_1) | LT(f)$, divide g_1 into f to get
$$f = a_1 g_1 + h, \qquad a_1 = \frac{LT(f)}{LT(g_1)} \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$$

If $LT(g_1) | LT(h)$, repeat the process until $f = a_1 g_1 + f_1$ (different a_1) with $LT(f_1)$ not divisible by $LT(g_1)$. Now divide g_2 into f_1, and so on, until $f = a_1 g_1 + \dots + a_s g_s + r_1$ With $LT(r_1)$ not divisible by any $LT(g_1), \dots LT(g_s)$ **Step 2:** Rewrite $r_1 = LT(r_1) + r_2$, and repeat Step 1 with r_2 for f: $f = a_1 g_1 + \dots + a_s g_s + LT(r_1) + r_3$ (different $a_i's$)

Monomial ideals. In general, an ideal a will contain a polynomial without containing the individual terms of the polynomial; for example, the ideal $a = (Y^2 - X^3)$ contains $Y^2 - X^3$ but not Y^2 or X^3.

DEFINITION 1.5. An ideal a is *monomial* if
$$\sum c_\alpha X^\alpha \in a \Rightarrow X^\alpha \in a$$
all α with $c_\alpha \neq 0$.

PROPOSITION 1.3. Let a be a *monomial ideal,* and let $A = \{\alpha \mid X^\alpha \in a\}$. Then A satisfies the condition $\alpha \in A$, $\beta \in \square^n \Rightarrow \alpha + \beta \in$ (∗) And a is the k-subspace of $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ generated by the $X^\alpha, \alpha \in A$. Conversely, of A is a subset of $\square^n$ satisfying $(∗)$, then the k-subspace a of $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ generated by $\{X^\alpha \mid \alpha \in A\}$ is a monomial ideal.

PROOF. It is clear from its definition that a monomial ideal a is the k-subspace of $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$

generated by the set of monomials it contains. If $X^{\alpha} \in a$ and $X^{\beta} \in k\left[X_1,...,X_n\right]$.

If a permutation is chosen uniformly and at random from the $n!$ possible permutations in S_n, then the counts $C_j^{(n)}$ of cycles of length j are dependent random variables. The joint distribution of $C^{(n)} = (C_1^{(n)},...,C_n^{(n)})$ follows from Cauchy's formula, and is given by

$$P[C^{(n)} = c] = \frac{1}{n!}N(n,c) = 1\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}jc_j = n\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}(\frac{1}{j})^{c_j}\frac{1}{c_j!}, \qquad (1.1)$$

for $c \in \square_+^n$.

Lemma1.7 For nonnegative integers $m_{1,...,}m_n$,

$$E\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}(C_j^{(n)})^{[m_j]}\right) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(\frac{1}{j}\right)^{m_j}\right)1\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}jm_j \le n\right\} \qquad (1.4)$$

Proof. This can be established directly by exploiting cancellation of the form $c_j^{[m_j]}/c_j! = 1/(c_j-m_j)!$ when $c_j \ge m_j$, which occurs between the ingredients in Cauchy's formula and the falling factorials in the moments. Write $m = \sum jm_j$. Then, with the first sum indexed by $c = (c_1,...c_n) \in \square_+^n$ and the last sum indexed by $d = (d_1,...,d_n) \in \square_+^n$ via the correspondence $d_j = c_j - m_j$, we have

$$E\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}(C_j^{(n)})^{[m_j]}\right) = \sum_c P[C^{(n)} = c]\prod_{j=1}^{n}(c_j)^{[m_j]}$$

$$= \sum_{c:c_j \ge m_j \text{ for all } j}1\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}jc_j = n\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{(c_j)^{[m_j]}}{j^{c_j}c_j!}$$

$$= \prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{j^{m_j}}\sum_d 1\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}jd_j = n-m\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{j^{d_j}(d_j)!}$$

This last sum simplifies to the indicator $1(m \le n)$, corresponding to the fact that if $n-m \ge 0$, then $d_j = 0$ for $j > n-m$, and a random permutation in S_{n-m} must have some cycle structure $(d_1,...,d_{n-m})$. The moments of $C_j^{(n)}$ follow immediately as

$$E(C_j^{(n)})^{[r]} = j^{-r}1\{jr \le n\} \qquad (1.2)$$

We note for future reference that (1.4) can also be written in the form

$$E\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}(C_j^{(n)})^{[m_j]}\right) = E\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}Z_j^{[m_j]}\right)1\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}jm_j \le n\right\}, \qquad (1.3)$$

Where the Z_j are independent Poisson-distribution random variables that satisfy $E(Z_j) = 1/j$

The marginal distribution of cycle counts provides a formula for the joint distribution of the cycle counts C_j^n, we find the distribution of C_j^n using a combinatorial approach combined with the inclusion-exclusion formula.

Lemma 1.8. For $1 \le j \le n$,

$$P[C_j^{(n)} = k] = \frac{j^{-k}}{k!}\sum_{l=0}^{[n/j]-k}(-1)^l\frac{j^{-l}}{l!} \qquad (1.1)$$

Proof. Consider the set I of all possible cycles of length j, formed with elements chosen from $\{1,2,...n\}$, so that $|I| = n^{[j]/j}$. For each $\alpha \in I$, consider the "property" G_{α} of having α; that is, G_{α} is the set of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ such that α is one of the cycles of π. We then have $|G_{\alpha}| = (n-j)!$, since the elements of $\{1,2,...,n\}$ not in α must be permuted among themselves. To use the inclusion-exclusion formula we need to calculate the term S_r, which is the sum of the probabilities of the r-fold intersection of properties, summing over all sets of r distinct properties. There are two cases to consider. If the r properties are indexed by r cycles having no elements in common, then the intersection specifies how rj elements are moved by the permutation, and there are $(n-rj)!1(rj \le n)$ permutations in the intersection. There are $n^{[rj]}/(j^r r!)$ such intersections. For the other case, some two distinct properties name some element in common, so no permutation can have both these properties, and the r-fold intersection is empty. Thus

$$S_r = (n-rj)!1(rj \le n)$$

$$\times\frac{n^{[rj]}}{j^r r!}\frac{1}{n!} = 1(rj \le n)\frac{1}{j^r r!}$$

Finally, the inclusion-exclusion series for the number of permutations having exactly k properties is

$$\sum_{l \ge 0}(-1)^l\binom{k+l}{l}S_{k+l,}$$

Which simplifies to (1.1) Returning to the original hat-check problem, we substitute j=1 in (1.1) to obtain the distribution of the number of fixed points of a random permutation. For $k = 0,1,...,n,$

$$P[C_1^{(n)} = k] = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{l=0}^{n-k} (-1)^l \frac{1}{l!}, \qquad (1.2)$$

and the moments of $C_1^{(n)}$ follow from (1.2) with $j = 1$. In particular, for $n \geq 2$, the mean and variance of $C_1^{(n)}$ are both equal to 1. The joint distribution of $(C_1^{(n)}, ..., C_b^{(n)})$ for any $1 \leq b \leq n$ has an expression similar to (1.7); this too can be derived by inclusion-exclusion. For any $c = (c_1, ..., c_b) \in \Box_+^b$ with $m = \sum i c_i$,

$$P[(C_1^{(n)}, ..., C_b^{(n)}) = c]$$

$$= \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{b} \left(\frac{1}{i}\right)^{c_i} \frac{1}{c_i!} \right\} \sum_{\substack{l \geq 0 \text{ with} \\ \sum i l_i \leq n-m}} (-1)^{l_1 + ... + l_b} \prod_{i=1}^{b} \left(\frac{1}{i}\right)^{l_i} \frac{1}{l_i!} \qquad (1.3)$$

The joint moments of the first b counts $C_1^{(n)}, ..., C_b^{(n)}$ can be obtained directly from (1.2) and (1.3) by setting $m_{b+1} = ... = m_n = 0$

The limit distribution of cycle counts
It follows immediately from Lemma 1.2 that for each fixed j, as $n \to \infty$,

$$P[C_j^{(n)} = k] \to \frac{j^{-k}}{k!} e^{-1/j}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, ...,$$

So that $C_j^{(n)}$ converges in distribution to a random variable Z_j having a Poisson distribution with mean $1/j$; we use the notation $C_j^{(n)} \to_d Z_j$ where $Z_j \Box P_o(1/j)$ to describe this. Infact, the limit random variables are independent.

Theorem 1.6 The process of cycle counts converges in distribution to a Poisson process of $\Box$ with intensity j^{-1}. That is, as $n \to \infty$,

$$(C_1^{(n)}, C_2^{(n)}, ...) \to_d (Z_1, Z_2, ...) \qquad (1.1)$$

Where the $Z_j, j = 1, 2, ...,$ are independent Poisson-distributed random variables with $E(Z_j) = \frac{1}{j}$

Proof. To establish the converges in distribution one shows that for each fixed $b \geq 1$, as $n \to \infty$,

$$P[(C_1^{(n)}, ..., C_b^{(n)}) = c] \to P[(Z_1, ..., Z_b) = c]$$

Error rates
The proof of Theorem says nothing about the rate of convergence. Elementary analysis can be used to estimate this rate when $b = 1$. Using properties of alternating series with decreasing terms, for $k = 0, 1, ..., n$,

$$\frac{1}{k!}\left(\frac{1}{(n-k+1)!} - \frac{1}{(n-k+2)!}\right) \leq \left| P[C_1^{(n)} = k] - P[Z_1 = k] \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{k!(n-k+1)!}$$

It follows that

$$\frac{2^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \frac{n}{n+2} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left| P[C_1^{(n)} = k] - P[Z_1 = k] \right| \leq \frac{2^{n+1}-1}{(n+1)!} \quad (1.11)$$

Since

$$P[Z_1 > n] = \frac{e^{-1}}{(n+1)!}\left(1 + \frac{1}{n+2} + \frac{1}{(n+2)(n+3)} + ...\right) < \frac{1}{(n+1)!},$$

We see from (1.11) that the total variation distance between the distribution $L(C_1^{(n)})$ of $C_1^{(n)}$ and the distribution $L(Z_1)$ of Z_1

Establish the asymptotics of $P\left[A_n(C^{(n)})\right]$ under conditions (A_0) and (B_{01}), where

$$A_n(C^{(n)}) = \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \bigcap_{r_i'+1 \leq j \leq r_i} \left\{ C_{ij}^{(n)} = 0 \right\},$$

and $\zeta_i = (r_i'/r_{id}) - 1 = O(i^{-g'})$ as $i \to \infty$, for some $g' > 0$. We start with the expression

$$P[A_n(C^{(n)})] = \frac{P[T_{0m}(Z') = n]}{P[T_{0m}(Z) = n]}$$

$$\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ r_i'+1 \leq j \leq r_i}} \left\{ 1 - \frac{\theta}{ir_i}(1 + E_{i0}) \right\} \qquad (1.1)$$

$$P[T_{0n}(Z') = n]$$

$$= \frac{\theta d}{n} \exp\left\{ \sum_{i \geq 1} [\log(1 + i^{-1}\theta d) - i^{-1}\theta d] \right\}$$

$$\left\{ 1 + O(n^{-1}\varphi_{\{1,2,7\}}'(n)) \right\} \qquad (1.2)$$

and

$$P[T_{0n}(Z') = n]$$

$$= \frac{\theta d}{n} \exp\left\{ \sum_{i \geq 1} [\log(1 + i^{-1}\theta d) - i^{-1}\theta d] \right\}$$

$$\left\{ 1 + O(n^{-1}\varphi_{\{1,2,7\}}(n)) \right\} \qquad (1.3)$$

Where $\varphi_{\{1,2,7\}}'(n)$ refers to the quantity derived from Z'. It thus follows that $P[A_n(C^{(n)})] \Box K n^{-\theta(1-d)}$ for a constant

K, depending on Z and the r_i' and computable explicitly from (1.1) – (1.3), if Conditions (A_0) and (B_{01}) are satisfied and if $\zeta_i^* = O(i^{-g'})$ from some $g' > 0$, since, under these circumstances, both $n^{-1}\varphi_{\{1,2,7\}}'(n)$ and $n^{-1}\varphi_{\{1,2,7\}}(n)$ tend to zero as $n \to \infty$. In particular, for polynomials and square free polynomials, the relative error in this asymptotic approximation is of order n^{-1} if $g' > 1$.

For $0 \le b \le n/8$ and $n \ge n_0$, with n_0

$$d_{TV}(L(C[1,b]), L(Z[1,b]))$$

$$\le d_{TV}(L(\check{C}[1,b]), L(\check{Z}[1,b]))$$

$$\le \varepsilon_{\{7,7\}}(n,b),$$

Where $\varepsilon_{\{7,7\}}(n,b) = O(b/n)$ under Conditions $(A_0), (D_1)$ and (B_{11}) Since, by the Conditioning Relation,

$$L(\check{C}[1,b] \mid T_{0b}(C) = l) = L(\check{Z}[1,b] \mid T_{0b}(Z) = l),$$

It follows by direct calculation that

$$d_{TV}(L(\check{C}[1,b]), L(\check{Z}[1,b]))$$

$$= d_{TV}(L(T_{0b}(C)), L(T_{0b}(Z)))$$

$$= \max_A \sum_{r \in A} P[T_{0b}(Z) = r]$$

$$\left\{ 1 - \frac{P[T_{bn}(Z) = n - r]}{P[T_{0n}(Z) = n]} \right\} \qquad (1.4)$$

Suppressing the argument Z from now on, we thus obtain

$$d_{TV}(L(\check{C}[1,b]), L(\check{Z}[1,b]))$$

$$= \sum_{r \ge 0} P[T_{0b} = r] \left\{ 1 - \frac{P[T_{bn} = n - r]}{P[T_{0n} = n]} \right\}_+$$

$$\le \sum_{r > n/2} P[T_{0b} = r] + \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} \frac{P[T_{0b} = r]}{P[T_{0b} = n]}$$

$$\times \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{n} P[T_{0b} = s](P[T_{bn} = n - s] - P[T_{bn} = n - r]) \right\}_+$$

$$\le \sum_{r > n/2} P[T_{0b} = r] + \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = r]$$

$$\times \sum_{s=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = s] \frac{\{P[T_{bn} = n - s] - P[T_{bn} = n - r]\}}{P[T_{0n} = n]}$$

$$+ \sum_{s=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = r] \sum_{s=[n/2]+1}^{n} P[T = s]P[T_{bn} = n - s] / P[T_{0n} = n]$$

The first sum is at most $2n^{-1}ET_{0b}$; the third is bound by

$$(\max_{n/2 < s \le n} P[T_{0b} = s]) / P[T_{0n} = n]$$

$$\le \frac{2\varepsilon_{\{10.5(1)\}}(n/2, b)}{n} \frac{3n}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]},$$

$$\frac{3n}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]} 4n^{-2}\phi_{\{10.8\}}^*(n) \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = r] \sum_{s=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = s] \frac{1}{2}|r - s|$$

$$\le \frac{12\phi_{\{10.8\}}^*(n)}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]} \frac{ET_{0b}}{n}$$

Hence we may take

$$\varepsilon_{\{7,7\}}(n,b) = 2n^{-1}ET_{0b}(Z) \left\{ 1 + \frac{6\phi_{\{10.8\}}^*(n)}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]} \right\} P$$

$$+ \frac{6}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]} \varepsilon_{\{10.5(1)\}}(n/2, b) \qquad (1.5)$$

Required order under Conditions $(A_0), (D_1)$ and (B_{11}), if $S(\infty) < \infty$. If not, $\phi_{\{10.8\}}^*(n)$ can be replaced by $\phi_{\{10.11\}}^*(n)$ in the above, which has the required order, without the restriction on the r_i implied by $S(\infty) < \infty$. Examining the Conditions $(A_0), (D_1)$ and (B_{11}), it is perhaps surprising to find that (B_{11}) is required instead of just (B_{01}); that is, that we should need $\sum_{l \ge 2} l\varepsilon_{il} = O(i^{-a_1})$ to hold for some $a_1 > 1$. A first observation is that a similar problem arises with the rate of decay of ε_{i1} as well. For this reason, n_1 is replaced by $\check{n}_1$. This makes it possible to replace condition (A_1) by the weaker pair of conditions (A_0) and (D_1) in the eventual assumptions needed for $\varepsilon_{\{7,7\}}(n,b)$ to be of order $O(b/n)$; the decay rate requirement of order $i^{-1-\gamma}$ is shifted from ε_{i1} itself to its first difference. This is needed to obtain the right approximation error for the random mappings example. However, since all the classical applications make far more stringent assumptions about the $\varepsilon_{i1}, l \ge 2$, than are made in (B_{11}). The critical point of the proof is seen where the initial estimate of the difference

$P[T_{bn}^{(m)} = s] - P[T_{bn}^{(m)} = s+1]$. The factor $\varepsilon_{\{10.10\}}(n)$, which should be small, contains a far tail element from n_1 of the form $\phi_1^\theta(n) + u_1^*(n)$, which is only small if $a_1 > 1$, being otherwise of order $O(n^{1-a_1+\delta})$ for any $\delta > 0$, since $a_2 > 1$ is in any case assumed. For $s \geq n/2$, this gives rise to a contribution of order $O(n^{-1-a_1+\delta})$ in the estimate of the difference $P[T_{bn} = s] - P[T_{bn} = s+1]$, which, in the remainder of the proof, is translated into a contribution of order $O(tn^{-1-a_1+\delta})$ for differences of the form $P[T_{bn} = s] - P[T_{bn} = s+1]$, finally leading to a contribution of order $bn^{-a_1+\delta}$ for any $\delta > 0$ in $\varepsilon_{\{7.7\}}(n,b)$. Some improvement would seem to be possible, defining the function g by $g(w) = 1_{\{w=s\}} - 1_{\{w=s+t\}}$, differences that are of the form $P[T_{bn} = s] - P[T_{bn} = s+t]$ can be directly estimated, at a cost of only a single contribution of the form $\phi_1^\theta(n) + u_1^*(n)$. Then, iterating the cycle, in which one estimate of a difference in point probabilities is improved to an estimate of smaller order, a bound of the form $\left| P[T_{bn} = s] - P[T_{bn} = s+t] \right| = O(n^{-2}t + n^{-1-a_1+\delta})$ for any $\delta > 0$ could perhaps be attained, leading to a final error estimate in order $O(bn^{-1} + n^{-a_1+\delta})$ for any $\delta > 0$, to replace $\varepsilon_{\{7.7\}}(n,b)$. This would be of the ideal order $O(b/n)$ for large enough b, but would still be coarser for small b.

With b and n as in the previous section, we wish to show that
$$\left| d_{TV}(L(C[1,b]), L(Z[1,b])) - \frac{1}{2}(n+1)^{-1}|1-\theta|E|T_{0b} - ET_{0b}| \right|$$
$$\leq \varepsilon_{\{7.8\}}(n,b),$$
Where $\varepsilon_{\{7.8\}}(n,b) = O(n^{-1}b[n^{-1}b + n^{-\beta_{12}+\delta}])$ for any $\delta > 0$ under Conditions (A_0), (D_1) and (B_{12}), with β_{12}. The proof uses sharper estimates. As before, we begin with the formula
$$d_{TV}(L(\check{C}[1,b]), L(\check{Z}[1,b]))$$
$$= \sum_{r \geq 0} P[T_{0b} = r]\left\{1 - \frac{P[T_{bn} = n-r]}{P[T_{0n} = n]}\right\}_+$$
Now we observe that

$$\left| \sum_{r \geq 0} P[T_{0b} = r]\left\{1 - \frac{P[T_{bn} = n-r]}{P[T_{0n} = n]}\right\}_+ - \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} \frac{P[T_{0b} = r]}{P[T_{0n} = n]} \right|$$
$$\times \left| \sum_{s=[n/2]+1}^{n} P[T_{0b} = s](P[T_{bn} = n-s] - P[T_{bn} = n-r]) \right|$$
$$\leq 4n^{-2}ET_{0b}^2 + (\max_{n/2 < s \leq n} P[T_{0b} = s]) / P[T_{0n} = n]$$
$$+ P[T_{0b} > n/2]$$
$$\leq 8n^{-2}ET_{0b}^2 + \frac{3\varepsilon_{\{10.5(2)\}}(n/2, b)}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]}, \qquad (1.1)$$
We have
$$\left| \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} \frac{P[T_{0b} = r]}{P[T_{0n} = n]} \right.$$
$$\times \left(\left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = s](P[T_{bn} = n-s] - P[T_{bn} = n-r] \right\}_+ \right.$$
$$\left. - \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = s]\frac{(s-r)(1-\theta)}{n+1}P[T_{0n} = n] \right\}_+ \right) \right|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n^2 P[T_{0n} = n]}\sum_{r \geq 0} P[T_{0b} = r]\sum_{s \geq 0} P[T_{0b} = s]|s-r|$$
$$\times \left\{ \varepsilon_{\{10.14\}}(n,b) + 2(r \vee s)|1-\theta|n^{-1}\{K_0\theta + 4\phi_{\{10.8\}}^*(n)\} \right\}$$
$$\leq \frac{6}{\theta n P_\theta[0,1]}ET_{0b}\varepsilon_{\{10.14\}}(n,b)$$
$$+ 4|1-\theta|n^{-2}ET_{0b}^2\left\{K_0\theta + 4\phi_{\{10.8\}}^*(n)\right\}$$
$$\left(\frac{3}{\theta n P_\theta[0,1]}\right) \Big\}, \qquad (1.2)$$

The approximation in (1.2) is further simplified by noting that
$$\left| \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = r]\left| \left\{ \sum_{s=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = s]\frac{(s-r)(1-\theta)}{n+1} \right\}_+ \right. \right.$$
$$\left. \left. - \left\{ \sum_s P[T_{0b} = s]\frac{(s-r)(1-\theta)}{n+1} \right\}_+ \right| \right|$$
$$\leq \sum_{r=0}^{[n/2]} P[T_{0b} = r]\sum_{s > [n/2]} P[T_{0b} = s]\frac{(s-r)|1-\theta|}{n+1}$$
$$\leq |1-\theta|n^{-1}E(T_{0b}1\{T_{0b} > n/2\}) \leq 2|1-\theta|n^{-2}ET_{0b}^2, \qquad (1.3)$$

and then by observing that

$$\sum_{r>[n/2]} P[T_{0b}=r]\left\{\sum_{s\geq0} P[T_{0b}=s]\frac{(s-r)(1-\theta)}{n+1}\right\}$$

$$\leq n^{-1}|1-\theta|(ET_{0b}P[T_{0b}>n/2]+E(T_{0b}1\{T_{0b}>n/2\}))$$

$$\leq 4|1-\theta|n^{-2}ET_{0b}^2 \qquad (1.4)$$

Combining the contributions of (1.2) –(1.3), we thus find tha

$$\left| d_{TV}(L(\overset{\square}{C}[1,b]),L(\overset{\square}{Z}[1,b]))\right.$$

$$-(n+1)^{-1}\sum_{r\geq0} P[T_{0b}=r]\left\{\sum_{s\geq0} P[T_{0b}=s](s-r)(1-\theta)\right\}_+ \left.\right|$$

$$\leq \varepsilon_{\{7.8\}}(n,b)$$

$$= \frac{3}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]}\left\{\varepsilon_{\{10.5(2)\}}(n/2,b)+2n^{-1}ET_{0b}\varepsilon_{\{10.14\}}(n,b)\right\}$$

$$+2n^{-2}ET_{0b}^2\left\{4+3|1-\theta|+\frac{24|1-\theta|\phi^*_{\{10.8\}}(n)}{\theta P_\theta[0,1]}\right\} \qquad (1.5)$$

The quantity $\varepsilon_{\{7.8\}}(n,b)$ is seen to be of the order claimed under Conditions $(A_0),(D_1)$ and (B_{12}), provided that $S(\infty)<\infty$; this supplementary condition can be removed if $\phi^*_{\{10.8\}}(n)$ is replaced by $\phi^*_{\{10.11\}}(n)$ in the definition of $\varepsilon_{\{7.8\}}(n,b)$, has the required order without the restriction on the r_i implied by assuming that $S(\infty)<\infty$. Finally, a direct calculation now shows that

$$\sum_{r\geq0} P[T_{0b}=r]\left\{\sum_{s\geq0} P[T_{0b}=s](s-r)(1-\theta)\right\}_+$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}|1-\theta|E|T_{0b}-ET_{0b}|$$

Example 1.0. Consider the point $O=(0,...,0)\in \square^n$. For an arbitrary vector r, the coordinates of the point $x=O+r$ are equal to the respective coordinates of the vector $r: x=(x^1,...x^n)$ and $r=(x^1,...,x^n)$. The vector r such as in the example is called the position vector or the radius vector of the point x. (Or, in greater detail: r is the radius-vector of x w.r.t an origin O). Points are frequently specified by their radius-vectors. This presupposes the choice of O as the "standard origin". Let us summarize. We have considered $\square^n$ and interpreted its elements in two ways: as points and as vectors. Hence we may say that we leading with the two copies of $\square^n$: $\square^n=\{$points$\}$, $\square^n=\{$vectors$\}$
Operations with vectors: multiplication by a number, addition. Operations with points and vectors: adding a vector to a point (giving a point), subtracting two points (giving a vector). $\square^n$

treated in this way is called an *n-dimensional affine space. (*An "abstract" affine space is a pair of sets , the set of points and the set of vectors so that the operations as above are defined axiomatically). Notice that vectors in an affine space are also known as "free vectors". Intuitively, they are not fixed at points and "float freely" in space. From $\square^n$ considered as an affine space we can precede in two opposite directions: $\square^n$ as an Euclidean space $\Leftarrow$ $\square^n$ as an affine space $\Rightarrow$ $\square^n$ as a manifold.Going to the left means introducing some extra structure which will make the geometry richer. Going to the right means forgetting about part of the affine structure; going further in this direction will lead us to the so-called "smooth (or differentiable) manifolds". The theory of differential forms does not require any extra geometry. So our natural direction is to the right. The Euclidean structure, however, is useful for examples and applications. So let us say a few words about it:

Remark 1.0. *Euclidean geometry.* In $\square^n$ considered as an affine space we can already do a good deal of geometry. For example, we can consider lines and planes, and quadric surfaces like an ellipsoid. However, we cannot discuss such things as "lengths", "angles" or "areas" and "volumes". To be able to do so, we have to introduce some more definitions, making $\square^n$ a Euclidean space. Namely, we define the length of a vector $a=(a^1,...,a^n)$ to be

$$|a|:=\sqrt{(a^1)^2+...+(a^n)^2} \qquad (1)$$

After that we can also define distances between points as follows:

$$d(A,B):=\left|\overrightarrow{AB}\right| \qquad (2)$$

One can check that the distance so defined possesses natural properties that we expect: is it always non-negative and equals zero only for coinciding points; the distance from A to B is the same as that from B to A (symmetry); also, for three points, A, B and C, we have $d(A,B)\leq d(A,C)+d(C,B)$ (the "triangle inequality"). To define angles, we first introduce the scalar product of two vectors

$$(a,b):=a^1b^1+...+a^nb^n \qquad (3)$$

Thus $|a|=\sqrt{(a,a)}$. The scalar product is also denote by dot: $a.b=(a,b)$, and hence is often referred to as the "dot product". Now, for nonzero vectors, we define the angle between them by the equality

$$\cos\alpha:=\frac{(a,b)}{|a||b|} \qquad (4)$$

The angle itself is defined up to an integral multiple of 2π. For this definition to be consistent we have to ensure that the r.h.s. of (4) does not exceed 1 by the absolute value. This follows from the inequality

$$(a,b)^2 \le |a|^2 |b|^2 \qquad (5)$$

known as the Cauchy–Bunyakovsky–Schwarz inequality (various combinations of these three names are applied in different books). One of the ways of proving (5) is to consider the scalar square of the linear combination $a + tb$, where $t \in R$. As $(a + tb, a + tb) \ge 0$ is a quadratic polynomial in t which is never negative, its discriminant must be less or equal zero. Writing this explicitly yields (5). The triangle inequality for distances also follows from the inequality (5).

Example 1.1. Consider the function $f(x) = x^i$ (the i-th coordinate). The linear function dx^i (the differential of x^i) applied to an arbitrary vector h is simply h^i. From these examples follows that we can rewrite df as

$$df = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^1} dx^1 + \ldots + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^n} dx^n, \qquad (1)$$

which is the standard form. Once again: the partial derivatives in (1) are just the coefficients (depending on x); $dx^1, dx^2, \ldots$ are linear functions giving on an arbitrary vector h its coordinates $h^1, h^2, \ldots$, respectively. Hence

$$df(x)(h) = \partial_{hf(x)} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^1} h^1 +$$

$$\ldots + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^n} h^n, \qquad (2)$$

Theorem 1.7. Suppose we have a parametrized curve $t \mapsto x(t)$ passing through $x_0 \in \square^n$ at $t = t_0$ and with the velocity vector $x(t_0) = \upsilon$ Then

$$\frac{df(x(t))}{dt}(t_0) = \partial_\upsilon f(x_0) = df(x_0)(\upsilon) \qquad (1)$$

Proof. Indeed, consider a small increment of the parameter $t : t_0 \mapsto t_0 + \Delta t$, Where $\Delta t \mapsto 0$. On the other hand, we have $f(x_0 + h) - f(x_0) = df(x_0)(h) + \beta(h)|h|$ for an arbitrary vector h, where $\beta(h) \to 0$ when $h \to 0$. Combining it together, for the increment of $f(x(t))$ we obtain

$$f(x(t_0 + \Delta t) - f(x_0)$$
$$= df(x_0)(\upsilon.\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t)$$
$$+ \beta(\upsilon.\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t).|\upsilon\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t|$$
$$= df(x_0)(\upsilon).\Delta t + \gamma(\Delta t)\Delta t$$

For a certain $\gamma(\Delta t)$ such that $\gamma(\Delta t) \to 0$ when $\Delta t \to 0$ (we used the linearity of $df(x_0)$). By the definition, this means that the derivative of $f(x(t))$ at $t = t_0$ is exactly $df(x_0)(\upsilon)$. The statement of the theorem can be expressed by a simple formula:

$$\frac{df(x(t))}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^1} x^1 + \ldots + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^n} x^n \qquad (2)$$

To calculate the value Of df at a point x_0 on a given vector υ one can take an arbitrary curve passing Through x_0 at t_0 with υ as the velocity vector at t_0 and calculate the usual derivative of $f(x(t))$ at $t = t_0$.

Theorem 1.8. For functions $f, g : U \to \square$, $U \subset \square^n$,
$$d(f + g) = df + dg \qquad (1)$$
$$d(fg) = df.g + f.dg \qquad (2)$$

Proof. Consider an arbitrary point x_0 and an arbitrary vector υ stretching from it. Let a curve $x(t)$ be such that $x(t_0) = x_0$ and $x(t_0) = \upsilon$.

Hence $d(f + g)(x_0)(\upsilon) = \frac{d}{dt}(f(x(t)) + g(x(t)))$

at $t = t_0$ and

$$d(fg)(x_0)(\upsilon) = \frac{d}{dt}(f(x(t))g(x(t)))$$

at $t = t_0$ Formulae (1) and (2) then immediately follow from the corresponding formulae for the usual derivative Now, almost without change the theory generalizes to functions taking values in $\square^m$ instead of $\square$. The only difference is that now the differential of a map $F : U \to \square^m$ at a point x will be a linear function taking vectors in $\square^n$ to vectors in $\square^m$ (instead of $\square$). For an arbitrary vector $h \in |\square^n$,

$$F(x + h) = F(x) + dF(x)(h)$$

$$+\beta(h)|h| \qquad (3)$$

Where $\beta(h) \to 0$ when $h \to 0$. We have $dF = (dF^1,...,dF^m)$ and

$$dF = \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^1}dx^1 + ... + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^n}dx^n$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial F^1}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial F^1}{\partial x^n} \\ ... \quad ... \quad ... \\ \frac{\partial F^m}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial F^m}{\partial x^n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} dx^1 \\ ... \\ dx^n \end{pmatrix} \qquad (4)$$

In this matrix notation we have to write vectors as vector-columns.

Theorem 1.9. For an arbitrary parametrized curve $x(t)$ in $\Box^n$, the differential of a map $F : U \to \Box^m$ (where $U \subset \Box^n$) maps the velocity vector $x(t)$ to the velocity vector of the curve $F(x(t))$ in $\Box^m$:

$$\frac{dF(x(t))}{dt} = dF(x(t))(\dot{x}(t)) \qquad (1)$$

Proof. By the definition of the velocity vector,

$$x(t+\Delta t) = x(t) + \dot{x}(t).\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t \qquad (2)$$

Where $\alpha(\Delta t) \to 0$ when $\Delta t \to 0$. By the definition of the differential,

$$F(x+h) = F(x) + dF(x)(h) + \beta(h)|h| \qquad (3)$$

Where $\beta(h) \to 0$ when $h \to 0$. we obtain

$$F(x(t+\Delta t)) = F(x + \underbrace{\dot{x}(t).\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t}_{h})$$

$$= F(x) + dF(x)(\dot{x}(t)\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t) +$$

$$\beta(\dot{x}(t)\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t).\left|\dot{x}(t)\Delta t + \alpha(\Delta t)\Delta t\right|$$

$$= F(x) + dF(x)(\dot{x}(t)\Delta t + \gamma(\Delta t)\Delta t$$

For some $\gamma(\Delta t) \to 0$ when $\Delta t \to 0$. This precisely means that $dF(x)\dot{x}(t)$ is the velocity vector of $F(x)$. As every vector attached to a point can be viewed as the velocity vector of some curve passing through this point, this theorem gives a clear geometric picture of dF as a linear map on vectors.

Theorem 1.10 Suppose we have two maps $F : U \to V$ and $G : V \to W$, where $U \subset \Box^n, V \subset \Box^m, W \subset \Box^p$ (open domains). Let $F : x \mapsto y = F(x)$. Then the differential of the composite map $GoF : U \to W$ is the composition of the differentials of F and G:

$$d(GoF)(x) = dG(y)odF(x) \qquad (4)$$

Proof. We can use the description of the differential. Consider a curve $x(t)$ in $\Box^n$ with the velocity vector $\dot{x}$. Basically, we need to know to which vector in $\Box^p$ it is taken by $d(GoF)$. the curve $(GoF)(x(t) = G(F(x(t)))$. By the same theorem, it equals the image under dG of the Anycast Flow vector to the curve $F(x(t))$ in $\Box^m$. Applying the theorem once again, we see that the velocity vector to the curve $F(x(t))$ is the image under dF of the vector $\dot{x}(t)$.

Hence $d(GoF)(\dot{x}) = dG(dF(\dot{x}))$ for an arbitrary vector $\dot{x}$.

Corollary 1.0. If we denote coordinates in $\Box^n$ by $(x^1,...,x^n)$ and in $\Box^m$ by $(y^1,...,y^m)$, and write

$$dF = \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^1}dx^1 + ... + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^n}dx^n \qquad (1)$$

$$dG = \frac{\partial G}{\partial y^1}dy^1 + ... + \frac{\partial G}{\partial y^n}dy^n, \qquad (2)$$

Then the chain rule can be expressed as follows:

$$d(GoF) = \frac{\partial G}{\partial y^1}dF^1 + ... + \frac{\partial G}{\partial y^m}dF^m, \qquad (3)$$

Where dF^i are taken from (1). In other words, to get $d(GoF)$ we have to substitute into (2) the expression for $dy^i = dF^i$ from (3). This can also be expressed by the following matrix formula:

$$d(GoF) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial G^1}{\partial y^1} \cdots \frac{\partial G^1}{\partial y^m} \\ ... \quad ... \quad ... \\ \frac{\partial G^p}{\partial y^1} \cdots \frac{\partial G^p}{\partial y^m} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial F^1}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial F^1}{\partial x^n} \\ ... \quad ... \quad ... \\ \frac{\partial F^m}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial F^m}{\partial x^n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} dx^1 \\ ... \\ dx^n \end{pmatrix} \qquad (4)$$

i.e., if dG and dF are expressed by matrices of partial derivatives, then $d(GoF)$ is expressed by the product of these matrices. This is often written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial z^1}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial z^1}{\partial x^n} \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \\ \frac{\partial z^p}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial z^p}{\partial x^n} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial z^1}{\partial y^1} \cdots \frac{\partial z^1}{\partial y^m} \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \\ \frac{\partial z^p}{\partial y^1} \cdots \frac{\partial z^p}{\partial y^m} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial y^1}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial y^1}{\partial x^n} \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \\ \frac{\partial y^m}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial y^m}{\partial x^n} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (5)$$

Or

$$\frac{\partial z^\mu}{\partial x^a} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\partial z^\mu}{\partial y^i} \frac{\partial y^i}{\partial x^a}, \qquad (6)$$

Where it is assumed that the dependence of $y \in \square^m$ on $x \in \square^n$ is given by the map F, the dependence of $z \in \square^p$ on $y \in \square^m$ is given by the map G, and the dependence of $z \in \square^p$ on $x \in \square^n$ is given by the composition GoF.

Definition 1.6. Consider an open domain $U \subset \square^n$. Consider also another copy of $\square^n$, denoted for distinction $\square^n_y$, with the standard coordinates $(y^1 ... y^n)$. A system of coordinates in the open domain U is given by a map $F : V \rightarrow U$, where $V \subset \square^n_y$ is an open domain of $\square^n_y$, such that the following three conditions are satisfied :

(1) F is smooth;
(2) F is invertible;
(3) $F^{-1} : U \rightarrow V$ is also smooth

The coordinates of a point $x \in U$ in this system are the standard coordinates of $F^{-1}(x) \in \square^n_y$

In other words,

$$F : (y^1 ..., y^n) \mapsto x = x(y^1 ..., y^n) \qquad (1)$$

Here the variables $(y^1 ..., y^n)$ are the "new" coordinates of the point x

Example 1.2. Consider a curve in $\square^2$ specified in polar coordinates as

$$x(t) : r = r(t), \varphi = \varphi(t) \qquad (1)$$

We can simply use the chain rule. The map $t \mapsto x(t)$ can be considered as the composition of the maps $t \mapsto (r(t), \varphi(t)), (r, \varphi) \mapsto x(r, \varphi)$. Then, by the chain rule, we have

$$\dot{x} = \frac{dx}{dt} = \frac{\partial x}{\partial r}\frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{\partial x}{\partial \varphi}\frac{d\varphi}{dt} = \frac{\partial x}{\partial r}\dot{r} + \frac{\partial x}{\partial \varphi}\dot{\varphi} \qquad (2)$$

Here $\dot{r}$ and $\dot{\varphi}$ are scalar coefficients depending on t, whence the partial derivatives $\partial x / \partial r, \partial x / \partial \varphi$ are vectors depending on point in $\square^2$. We can compare this with the formula in the "standard" coordinates: $\dot{x} = e_1 \dot{x} + e_2 \dot{y}$. Consider the vectors $\partial x / \partial r, \partial x / \partial \varphi$. Explicitly we have

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial r} = (\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi) \qquad (3)$$

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial \varphi} = (-r\sin\varphi, r\cos\varphi) \qquad (4)$$

From where it follows that these vectors make a basis at all points except for the origin (where $r = 0$). It is instructive to sketch a picture, drawing vectors corresponding to a point as starting from that point. Notice that $\partial x / \partial r, \partial x / \partial \varphi$ are, respectively, the velocity vectors for the curves $r \mapsto x(r, \varphi)$ ($\varphi = \varphi_0$ *fixed*) and $\varphi \mapsto x(r, \varphi)$ ($r = r_0$ *fixed*). We can conclude that for an arbitrary curve given in polar coordinates the velocity vector will have components $(\dot{r}, \dot{\varphi})$ if as a basis we take $e_r := \partial x / \partial r, e_\varphi := \partial x / \partial \varphi$:

$$\dot{x} = e_r \dot{r} + e_\varphi \dot{\varphi} \qquad (5)$$

A characteristic feature of the basis e_r, e_φ is that it is not "constant" but depends on point. Vectors "stuck to points" when we consider curvilinear coordinates.

Proposition 1.3. The velocity vector has the same appearance in all coordinate systems.
Proof. Follows directly from the chain rule and the transformation law for the basis e_i. In particular, the elements of the basis $e_i = \partial x / \partial x^i$ (originally, a formal notation) can be understood directly as the velocity vectors of the coordinate

lines $x^i \mapsto x(x^1,...,x^n)$ (all coordinates but x^i are fixed). Since we now know how to handle velocities in arbitrary coordinates, the best way to treat the differential of a map $F : \square^n \to \square^m$ is by its action on the velocity vectors. By definition, we set

$$dF(x_0) : \frac{dx(t)}{dt}(t_0) \mapsto \frac{dF(x(t))}{dt}(t_0) \qquad (1)$$

Now $dF(x_0)$ is a linear map that takes vectors attached to a point $x_0 \in \square^n$ to vectors attached to the point $F(x) \in \square^m$

$$dF = \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^1} dx^1 + ... + \frac{\partial F}{\partial x^n} dx^n$$

$$(e_1,...,e_m) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial F^1}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial F^1}{\partial x^n} \\ ... \quad ... \quad ... \\ \frac{\partial F^m}{\partial x^1} \cdots \frac{\partial F^m}{\partial x^n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} dx^1 \\ ... \\ dx^n \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (2)$$

In particular, for the differential of a function we always have

$$df = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^1} dx^1 + ... + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x^n} dx^n, \qquad (3)$$

Where x^i are arbitrary coordinates. The form of the differential does not change when we perform a change of coordinates.

Example 1.3 Consider a 1-form in $\square^2$ given in the standard coordinates:

$A = -y\,dx + x\,dy$ In the polar coordinates we will have $x = r\cos\varphi, y = r\sin\varphi$, hence

$dx = \cos\varphi\,dr - r\sin\varphi\,d\varphi$

$dy = \sin\varphi\,dr + r\cos\varphi\,d\varphi$

Substituting into A, we get
$A = -r\sin\varphi(\cos\varphi\,dr - r\sin\varphi\,d\varphi)$

$+r\cos\varphi(\sin\varphi\,dr + r\cos\varphi\,d\varphi)$

$= r^2(\sin^2\varphi + \cos^2\varphi)d\varphi = r^2 d\varphi$

Hence $A = r^2 d\varphi$ is the formula for A in the polar coordinates. In particular, we see that this is again a 1-form, a linear combination of the differentials of coordinates with functions as coefficients. Secondly, in a more conceptual way, we can define a 1-form in a domain U as a linear function on vectors at every point of U :
$\omega(\upsilon) = \omega_1 \upsilon^1 + ... + \omega_n \upsilon^n, \qquad (1)$

If $\upsilon = \sum e_i \upsilon^i$, where $e_i = \partial x / \partial x^i$. Recall that the differentials of functions were defined as linear functions on vectors (at every point), and

$$dx^i(e_j) = dx^i \left(\frac{\partial x}{\partial x^j} \right) = \delta_j^i \qquad (2) \quad \text{at every point}$$

x .

Theorem 1.9. For arbitrary 1-form ω and path γ , the integral $\int_\gamma \omega$ does not change if we change parametrization of γ provide the orientation remains the same.

Proof: Consider $\left\langle \omega(x(t)), \frac{dx}{dt'} \right\rangle$ and $\left\langle \omega(x(t(t'))), \frac{dx}{dt'} \right\rangle$

As

$$\left\langle \omega(x(t(t'))), \frac{dx}{dt'} \right\rangle = \left| \left\langle \omega(x(t(t'))), \frac{dx}{dt''} \right\rangle \cdot \frac{dt''}{dt'}, \right.$$

Let p be a rational prime and let $K = \square(\zeta_p)$. We write ζ for ζ_p or this section. Recall that K has degree $\varphi(p) = p - 1$ over $\square$. We wish to show that $O_K = \square[\zeta]$. Note that ζ is a root of $x^p - 1$, and thus is an algebraic integer; since O_K is a ring we have that $\square[\zeta] \subseteq O_K$. We give a proof without assuming unique factorization of ideals. We begin with some norm and trace computations. Let j be an integer. If j is not divisible by p, then ζ^j is a primitive p^{th} root of unity, and thus its conjugates are $\zeta, \zeta^2, ..., \zeta^{p-1}$. Therefore

$$Tr_{K/\square}(\zeta^j) = \zeta + \zeta^2 + ... + \zeta^{p-1} = \Phi_p(\zeta) - 1 = -1$$

If p does divide j, then $\zeta^j = 1$, so it has only the one conjugate 1, and $Tr_{K/\square}(\zeta^j) = p - 1$ By linearity of the trace, we find that

$$Tr_{K/\square}(1-\zeta) = Tr_{K/\square}(1-\zeta^2) = ...$$

$$= Tr_{K/\square}(1-\zeta^{p-1}) = p$$

We also need to compute the norm of $1 - \zeta$. For this, we use the factorization

$$x^{p-1} + x^{p-2} + ... + 1 = \Phi_p(x)$$

$$= (x - \zeta)(x - \zeta^2)...(x - \zeta^{p-1});$$

Plugging in $x = 1$ shows that

$$p = (1 - \zeta)(1 - \zeta^2)...(1 - \zeta^{p-1})$$

Since the $(1 - \zeta^j)$ are the conjugates of $(1 - \zeta)$, this shows that $N_{K/\square}(1 - \zeta) = p$ The key result for determining the ring of integers O_K is the following.

LEMMA 1.9

$$(1 - \zeta)O_K \cap \square = p\square$$

Proof. We saw above that p is a multiple of $(1 - \zeta)$ in O_K, so the inclusion $(1 - \zeta)O_K \cap \square \supseteq p\square$ is immediate. Suppose now that the inclusion is strict. Since $(1 - \zeta)O_K \cap \square$ is an ideal of $\square$ containing $p\square$ and $p\square$ is a maximal ideal of $\square$, we must have $(1 - \zeta)O_K \cap \square = \square$ Thus we can write $1 = \alpha(1 - \zeta)$ For some $\alpha \in O_K$. That is, $1 - \zeta$ is a unit in O_K.

COROLLARY 1.1 For any $\alpha \in O_K$, $Tr_{K/\square}((1 - \zeta)\alpha) \in p.\square$

PROOF. We have

$$Tr_{K/\square}((1 - \zeta)\alpha) = \sigma_1((1 - \zeta)\alpha) + ... + \sigma_{p-1}((1 - \zeta)\alpha)$$
$$= \sigma_1(1 - \zeta)\sigma_1(\alpha) + ... + \sigma_{p-1}(1 - \zeta)\sigma_{p-1}(\alpha)$$
$$= (1 - \zeta)\sigma_1(\alpha) + ... + (1 - \zeta^{p-1})\sigma_{p-1}(\alpha)$$

Where the σ_i are the complex embeddings of K (which we are really viewing as automorphisms of K) with the usual ordering. Furthermore, $1 - \zeta^j$ is a multiple of $1 - \zeta$ in O_K for every $j \neq 0$. Thus $Tr_{K/\square}(\alpha(1 - \zeta)) \in (1 - \zeta)O_K$ Since the trace is also a rational integer.

PROPOSITION 1.4 Let p be a prime number and let $K = |\square(\zeta_p)$ be the pth cyclotomic field. Then $O_K = \square[\zeta_p] \cong \square[x]/(\Phi_p(x))$; Thus $1, \zeta_p, ..., \zeta_p^{p-2}$ is an integral basis for O_K.

PROOF. Let $\alpha \in O_K$ and write $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\zeta + ... + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2}$ With $a_i \in \square$. Then

$$\alpha(1 - \zeta) = a_0(1 - \zeta) + a_1(\zeta - \zeta^2) + ...$$
$$+ a_{p-2}(\zeta^{p-2} - \zeta^{p-1})$$

By the linearity of the trace and our above calculations we find that $Tr_{K/\square}(\alpha(1 - \zeta)) = pa_0$ We also have $Tr_{K/\square}(\alpha(1 - \zeta)) \in p\square$, so $a_0 \in \square$ Next consider the algebraic integer

$$(\alpha - a_0)\zeta^{-1} = a_1 + a_2\zeta + ... + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-3};$$

This is an algebraic integer since $\zeta^{-1} = \zeta^{p-1}$ is. The same argument as above shows that $a_1 \in \square$, and continuing in this way we find that all of the a_i are in $\square$. This completes the proof.

Example 1.4 Let $K = \square$, then the local ring $\square_{(p)}$ is simply the subring of $\square$ of rational numbers with denominator relatively prime to p. Note that this ring $\square_{(p)}$ is not the ring $\square_p$ of p-adic integers; to get $\square_p$ one must complete $\square_{(p)}$. The usefulness of $O_{K,p}$ comes from the fact that it has a particularly simple ideal structure. Let a be any proper ideal of $O_{K,p}$ and consider the ideal $a \cap O_K$ of O_K. We claim that $a = (a \cap O_K)O_{K,p}$; That is, that a is generated by the elements of a in $a \cap O_K$. It is clear from the definition of an ideal that $a \supseteq (a \cap O_K)O_{K,p}$. To prove the other inclusion, let α be any element of a. Then we can write $\alpha = \beta/\gamma$ where $\beta \in O_K$ and $\gamma \notin p$. In particular, $\beta \in a$ (since $\beta/\gamma \in a$ and a is an ideal), so $\beta \in O_K$ and $\gamma \notin p$. so $\beta \in a \cap O_K$. Since $1/\gamma \in O_{K,p}$, this implies that $\alpha = \beta/\gamma \in (a \cap O_K)O_{K,p}$, as claimed. We can use this fact to determine all of the ideals of $O_{K,p}$. Let a be any ideal of $O_{K,p}$ and consider the ideal factorization of $a \cap O_K$ in O_K. write it as $a \cap O_K = p^n b$ For some n and some ideal b, relatively prime to p. we claim first that $bO_{K,p} = O_{K,p}$. We now find that

$$a = (a \cap O_K)O_{K,p} = p^n bO_{K,p} = p^n O_{K,p}$$ Since $bO_{K,p}$.

Thus every ideal of $O_{K,p}$ has the form $p^n O_{K,p}$ for some n; it follows immediately that $O_{K,p}$ is noetherian. It is also now clear that $p^n O_{K,p}$ is the unique non-zero prime ideal in $O_{K,p}$. Furthermore, the inclusion $O_K \mapsto O_{K,p}/pO_{K,p}$ Since $pO_{K,p} \cap O_K = p$, this map is also surjection, since the residue class of $\alpha/\beta \in O_{K,p}$ (with $\alpha \in O_K$ and $\beta \notin p$) is

the image of $\alpha\beta^{-1}$ in $O_{K/p}$, which makes sense since β is invertible in $O_{K/p}$. Thus the map is an isomorphism. In particular, it is now abundantly clear that every non-zero prime ideal of $O_{K,p}$ is maximal. To show that $O_{K,p}$ is a Dedekind domain, it remains to show that it is integrally closed in K. So let $\gamma \in K$ be a root of a polynomial with coefficients in $O_{K,p}$; write this polynomial as

$$x^m + \frac{\alpha_{m-1}}{\beta_{m-1}} x^{m-1} + ... + \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}$$ With $\alpha_i \in O_K$ and $\beta_i \in O_{K-p}$.

Set $\beta = \beta_0 \beta_1 ... \beta_{m-1}$. Multiplying by β^m we find that $\beta\gamma$ is the root of a monic polynomial with coefficients in O_K. Thus $\beta\gamma \in O_K$; since $\beta \notin p$, we have $\beta\gamma / \beta = \gamma \in O_{K,p}$. Thus $O_{K,p}$ is integrally close in K.

COROLLARY 1.2. Let K be a number field of degree n and let α be in O_K then $N'_{K/\square}(\alpha O_K) = \left| N_{K/\square}(\alpha) \right|$

PROOF. We assume a bit more Galois theory than usual for this proof. Assume first that $K/\square$ is Galois. Let σ be an element of $Gal(K/\square)$. It is clear that $\sigma(O_K)/\sigma(\alpha) \cong O_{K/\alpha}$; since $\sigma(O_K) = O_K$, this shows that $N'_{K/\square}(\sigma(\alpha)O_K) = N'_{K/\square}(\alpha O_K)$. Taking the product over all $\sigma \in Gal(K/\square)$, we have $N'_{K/\square}(N_{K/\square}(\alpha)O_K) = N'_{K/\square}(\alpha O_K)^n$ Since $N_{K/\square}(\alpha)$ is a rational integer and O_K is a free $\square$-module of rank n,

$O_K / N_{K/\square}(\alpha)O_K$ Will have order $N_{K/\square}(\alpha)^n$; therefore

$$N'_{K/\square}(N_{K/\square}(\alpha)O_K) = N_{K/\square}(\alpha O_K)^n$$

This completes the proof. In the general case, let L be the Galois closure of K and set $[L:K] = m$.

G. Determining Lower and Upper Bound

We can draw the assumption that the conditional probability of P(B | A) is at least P(B), since the probability that a mechanism is cracked will not decrease under the condition that another one has been cracked. Usually however, the probability that a method is cracked is not independent from another method, especially when these two authentication methods are similar to each other. This means P(B | A) will be the higher, the more the occurrence of event A affects the occurrence of event B. The upper limit is one, which means that under the condition that mechanism A has been cracked, the probability that mechanism B is cracked is the certain event. In this case, the

upper bound of the joint probability function P(A \ B) is reached. This bound is the minimum function of P(A) and P(B), which can be derived directly from equation 1. With regard to the authentication methods, this result can be illustrated as follows: The authentication method with the lowest probability is the strongest one, since we consider the event that an authentication method has been cracked. This means, that the probability that both authentication methods fail is lower or equal than the probability that the strongest mechanism fails. Or to put it in other words: The authentication is at least as strong as the strongest mechanism which is used in the combination, since an attacker has to go though all authentication mechanisms. If the methods are very similar to each other it is possible that theweaker mechanism does not contribute to the total security anymore, since the attacker already knows how to crack it. To summarize, the function that we are looking for to calculate the effect of combining two authentication mechanism, is defined between the upper and lower bounds

H. Definition of Similarity Coefficients

So far, we have determined the upper and lower bound of the joint probability function (cf. equation 3). Within these boundaries, the joint probability function P(A\B) can vary. As already mentioned, the parameter which decides about whether P(A \ B) is closer to the upper or to the lower bound is the similarity between two mechanisms. If we have a look at the equation for the joint probability function as shown again in equation 4, such a similarity parameter directly influences the value for the conditional probability function P(B | A), since P(A) is given. As we can see from equation 4, if P(A) = 1, it depends completely on the second mechanism ˜B whether the combined authentication fails. The more secure the first mechanism is, which means the smaller P(A) is, the more should the failure of the first mechanism influence the second. Our idea is, that the similarity coefficient describes the maximum influence of the occurrence of event A on event B. This influence has its maximum when both probabilities P(A) and P(B) are very small. If both mechanisms are very strongwith a probability to fail of almost zero and one method gets still cracked, the probability that the second method is cracked as well raises to the value of the similarity coeeficient. Or to put it in other words: The value of the similarity coefficient corresponds to the probability that an almost unbreakable method is cracked under the condition that another almost unbreakable method has been cracked. If the similarity coefficient is zero, the event that method ˜ A is cracked does not effect the probability that method ˜B is cracked, which means that in this case P(B | A) = P(B). If the similarity coefficient is one, the event that method A˜ is cracked has a maximum influence on the occurrence of event B, which means that in this case P(B | A) is the upper bound. Our idea is that depending on the similarity coefficient, the conditional probability function is defined differently between the upper and the lower bound. We do not know the exact

curve of the function P(B | A), but the shown upper and lower bound of it. Therefore we approximate it by a function Ph(B | A) which lies in between both bounds. The parameter h can be used to adjust the approximation closer to either bound and corresponds to the similarity of the authentication mechanisms. In addition to the bounding constrains, P(B | A) and P(A | B) fulfill the symmetry expressed by equation 1. Therefore, this property should also hold for their approximation functions. It can easily be shown that the bounding and symmetry constrains are fulfilled by the definition of Ph(B | A) given below. Note, that any function fulfilling these constrains would be an appropriate approximation function for P(B | A). Based on this result and equation (1) and (2), we derive the following definition for the combined authentication trust level.

Definition 1.2. Let A be the event, that the authentication method Ã is cracked by an attacker and B the event, that method ˜B is cracked, P is the corresponding probability distribution. P(A) is the probability that the event A occurs, P(B) is the probability that the event B occurs. We define the combined authentication trust level of two authentication mechanisms ˜A and ˜B as follows: The parameter h is a value in the range [0,1], which is called the similarity coefficient. Depending on the value of the similarity coefficient, the curve of the function to calculate the combined authentication trust level of two methods is steeper or flatter, which shows P(A\B) for different values of h.

I. Determine the Similarity Coefficient

The similarity coefficient expresses how much two mechanisms are correlated because of their similarity. The idea is that if two authentication mechanisms are combined, which are very similar, the combined authentication trust level should increase less than if with these two mechanism a two factor authentication is achieved. In order to determine the similarity coefficient many approaches are possible. Here, we suggest a simple approach, which is based on the assumption that using more than one factor is considered as a strong way of authentication as opposed to authentication processes which are only based on one factor. Table 1 shows an example configuration for the similarity coefficient. Three cases are considered: The authentication methods belong to different categories, to the same category or they are the same method with different parameters as, for example, two passwords with different length. An approach like this, which just distinguishes between these three cases should be sufficient for many application scenarios. However, more complex approaches are possible and desired, which calculate the similarity between two mechanisms more exactly by using, for example, a distance function between authentication methods and a mapping of this distance to the similarity coefficient.

J. Calculating Trust Level

In the category of knowledge-based authentication, we choose as the first authentication method a PIN as it is often used with banking cards. A PIN is described by the following parameters: minimum length, alphabet, number of false attempts and whether the PIN was chosen by the user or generated automatically. We assume having a PIN which is comprised of five digits and which has a maximum number of failed attempts of five until access is completely blocked. In order to determine the authentication trust level, we can use classical probability theory. If we have a PIN of length n comprising the digits from 0 to 9, the probability that someone can crack the PIN by guessing is $1/10n$. However, this number is the probability that an attacker can guess the PIN in one attempt. We get the probability that a mechanism is not cracked after n attempts by multiplying the single probabilities for each attempt. Finally, we get the following formula for the probability P(X) that a PIN of a length of n digits is cracked after k attempts:

The second knowledge-based example is an image-based authentication method called Passfaces [28]. Passfaces uses pictures of people, which the user has to recognize in order to authenticate. The parameters for this method are the total number of images and the number of faces which the user has to choose as his password. The formula for the calculation of the probability is the same as for the PIN, since the methods work the same way apart from the fact that instead of digits from zero to nine, images of faces needs to be remembered by the user. We choose the following parameters:

A is the event that the authentication has been cracked. Using the same formula as before the probability that the authentication with the Passfaces fails is :

As a third authentication method, we choose a fingerprint reader, which belongs to the biometric authentication methods. For this method, we assume a false acceptance rate of 0.00005, which leads to an authentication trust level of levelFP = −log(0.00005) = 5.3. If we have a look at performance studies like the "Fingerprint Vendor Technology Evaluation 2003" [20], we will find that this value is already far over the usual rates for the FAR. However, we have chosen this value to have a direct comparison between the combination of two knowledge-based methods and the combination of a knowledge-based method and the biometric method.

K. Calculating the Combined Trust Level

We want to calculate the authentication trust level for two combinations. The first one is the combination of the two knowledge-based mechanisms: the PIN with an authentication trust level f 4.3 and the Passfaces method with an authentication trust level of 5.3. After this, we want to show the effect of a two factor combination by combining the PIN with the biometric method, the fingerprint reader. Our calculation is based on the derived formula in

Definition 1.3 Regarding the first combination, the PIN with the Passfaces method, both mechanisms belong to the same category, namely what you know. As can be seen from Table 1, the similarity coefficient of two methods which belong to the same category is 0.6. Given this and the two single authentication trust If we compare this result with the two single authentication levels 4.3 and 5.3 as shown in Definition 3.2, we can see that the combined authentication is approximately 60% more secure than the Passfaces method alone. Now, we want to do the same calculation for the combination of the PIN with the fingerprint reader. This time, we have a two-factor authentication which leads to a similarity coefficient of 0.1 as can be seen from Table 1. The calculation is similar to the precious one, since in our example the fingerprint method is as secure as the Passfaces method to demonstrate the effect of the similarity coefficient. The calculation of the combined authentication trust level leads to the following result:

If we compare this result with the one from the first example, we can see that the multi-factor authentication achieves a much higher combined authentication trust level even though the single authentication methods provide the same level of security. In the first example the combined authentication trust level is 5.5, while in the second example the level is 6.3, which is more than six times more secure than the first combination which was not a two-factor authentication and about ten times more secure than the fingerprint reader alone.

L. Authors and Affiliations

Dr Akash Singh is working with IBM Corporation as an IT Architect and has been designing Mission Critical System and Service Solutions; He has published papers in IEEE and other International Conferences and Journals.

He joined IBM in Jul 2003 as a IT Architect which conducts research and design of High Performance Smart Grid Services and Systems and design mission critical architecture for High Performance Computing Platform and Computational Intelligence and High Speed Communication systems. He is a member of IEEE (Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers), the AAAI (Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence) and the AACR (American Association for Cancer Research). He is the recipient of numerous awards from World Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering and Applied Computing 2010, 2011, and IP Multimedia System 2008 and Billing and Roaming 2008. He is active research in the field of Artificial Intelligence and advancement in Medical Systems. He is in Industry for 18 Years where he performed various role to provide the Leadership in Information Technology and Cutting edge Technology.

V. REFERENCES

[1] Dynamics and Control of Large Electric Power Systems. Ilic, M. and Zaborszky, J. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. © 2000, p. 756.
[2] Modeling and Evaluation of Intrusion Tolerant Systems Based on Dynamic Diversity Backups. Meng, K. et al. Proceedings of the 2009 International Symposium on Information Processing (ISIP'09). Huangshan, P. R. China, August 21-23, 2009, pp. 101–104
[3] Characterizing Intrusion Tolerant Systems Using A State Transition Model. Gong, F. et al., April 24, 2010.
[4] Energy Assurance Daily, September 27, 2007. U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Infrastructure Security and Energy Restoration Division. April 25, 2010.
[5] CENTIBOTS Large Scale Robot Teams. Konoledge, Kurt et al. Artificial Intelligence Center, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA 2003.
[6] Handling Communication Restrictions and Team Formation in Congestion Games, Agogino, A. and Tumer, K. Journal of Autonomous Agents and Multi Agent Systems, 13(1):97–115, 2006.
[7] Robotics and Autonomous Systems Research, School of Mechanical, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, College of Engineering, Oregon State University
[8] D. Dietrich, D. Bruckner, G. Zucker, and P. Palensky, "Communication and computation in buildings: A short introduction and overview," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 3577–3584, Nov. 2010.
[9] V. C. Gungor and F. C. Lambert, "A survey on communication networks for electric system automation," *Comput. Networks*, vol. 50, pp. 877–897, May 2006.
[10] S. Paudyal, C. Canizares, and K. Bhattacharya, "Optimal operation of distribution feeders in smart grids," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 4495–4503, Oct. 2011.
[11] D. M. Laverty, D. J. Morrow, R. Best, and P. A. Crossley, "Telecommunications for smart grid: Backhaul solutions for the distribution network," in *Proc. IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting*, Jul. 25–29, 2010, pp. 1–6.
[12] L. Wenpeng, D. Sharp, and S. Lancashire, "Smart grid communication network capacity planning for power utilities," in *Proc. IEEE PES, Transmission Distrib. Conf. Expo.*, Apr. 19–22, 2010, pp. 1–4.
[13] Y. Peizhong, A. Iwayemi, and C. Zhou, "Developing ZigBee deployment guideline under WiFi interference for smart grid applications," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 110–120, Mar. 2011.
[14] C. Gezer and C. Buratti, "A ZigBee smart energy implementation for energy efficient buildings," in *Proc. IEEE 73rd Veh. Technol. Conf. (VTC Spring)*, May 15–18, 2011, pp. 1–5.
[15] R. P. Lewis, P. Igic, and Z. Zhongfu, "Assessment of communication methods for smart electricity metering in the U.K.," in *Proc. IEEE PES/IAS Conf. Sustainable Alternative Energy (SAE)*, Sep. 2009, pp. 1–4.
[16] A. Yarali, "Wireless mesh networking technology for commercial and industrial customers," in *Proc. Elect. Comput. Eng., CCECE*, May 1–4, 2008, pp. 000047–000052.
[17] M. Y. Zhai, "Transmission characteristics of low-voltage distribution networks in China under the smart grids environment," *IEEE Trans. Power Delivery*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 173–180, Jan. 2011.
[18] V. Paruchuri, A. Durresi, and M. Ramesh, "Securing powerline communications," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Power Line Commun. Appl., (ISPLC)*, Apr. 2–4, 2008, pp. 64–69.
[19] Q.Yang, J. A. Barria, and T. C. Green, "Communication infrastructures for distributed control of power distribution networks," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Inform.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 316–327, May 2011.
[20] T. Sauter and M. Lobashov, "End-to-end communication architecture for smart grids," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 1218–1228, Apr. 2011.
[21] K. Moslehi and R. Kumar, "Smart grid—A reliability perspective," *Innovative Smart Grid Technologies (ISGT)*, pp. 1–8, Jan. 19–21, 2010.
[22] Southern Company Services, Inc., "Comments request for information on smart grid communications requirements," Jul. 2010
[23] R. Bo and F. Li, "Probabilistic LMP forecasting considering load uncertainty," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 24, pp. 1279–1289, Aug. 2009.
[24] *Power Line Communications*, H. Ferreira, L. Lampe, J. Newbury, and T. Swart (Editors), Eds. New York: Wiley, 2010.

[25] G. Bumiller, "Single frequency network technology for fast ad hoc communication networks over power lines," WiKu-Wissenschaftsverlag Dr. Stein 2010.

[31] G. Bumiller, L. Lampe, and H. Hrasnica, "Power line communications for large-scale control and automation systems," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 106–113, Apr. 2010.

[32] M. Biagi and L. Lampe, "Location assisted routing techniques for power line communication in smart grids," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Smart Grid Commun.*, 2010, pp. 274–278.

[33] J. Sanchez, P. Ruiz, and R. Marin-Perez, "Beacon-less geographic routing made partical: Challenges, design guidelines and protocols," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 85–91, Aug. 2009.

[34] N. Bressan, L. Bazzaco, N. Bui, P. Casari, L. Vangelista, and M. Zorzi, "The deployment of a smart monitoring system using wireless sensors and actuators networks," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Smart Grid Commun. (SmartGridComm)*, 2010, pp. 49–54.

[35] S. Dawson-Haggerty, A. Tavakoli, and D. Culler, "Hydro: A hybrid routing protocol for low-power and lossy networks," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Smart Grid Commun. (SmartGridComm)*, 2010, pp. 268–273.

[36] S. Goldfisher and S. J. Tanabe, "IEEE 1901 access system: An overview of its uniqueness and motivation," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 150–157, Oct. 2010.

[37] V. C. Gungor, D. Sahin, T. Kocak, and S. Ergüt, "Smart grid communications and networking," Türk Telekom, Tech. Rep. 11316-01, Apr 2011.