

Mechanisms for Generating Power-Law Size Distributions, Part 4


Last updated: 2024/10/14, 18:18:32 EDT

Principles of Complex Systems, Vols. 1, 2, & 3D
CSYS/MATH 6701, 6713, & a pretend number, 2024–2025

Prof. Peter Sheridan Dodds

Computational Story Lab | Vermont Complex Systems Center
Santa Fe Institute | University of Vermont



Licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) 

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
1 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References



These slides are brought to you by:

Sealie & Lambie
Productions



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
2 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell



References



These slides are also brought to you by:

Special Guest Executive Producer



 On Instagram at [pratchett_the_cat](https://www.instagram.com/pratchett_the_cat) 

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
3 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Outline

The PoCVerse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
4 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell


References

Nutshell

References



The Boggoracle Speaks:



Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model


Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References





Outline

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
7 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model


Analysis





And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References





-  Mandelbrot = father of fractals
-  Mandelbrot = almond bread
-  Bonus Mandelbrot set action: [here](#) .

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot

 Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
9 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell


References



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot

 Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]

 **Idea:** Language is efficient

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
9 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?




Nutshell


References



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot


-  Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]
-  **Idea:** Language is efficient
-  Communicate as **much information as possible** for **as little cost**



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot


- Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]
- Idea:** Language is efficient
- Communicate as **much information as possible** for **as little cost**
- Need measures of information (H) and average cost (C)...



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot


- Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]
- Idea:** Language is efficient
- Communicate as **much information as possible** for **as little cost**
- Need measures of information (H) and average cost (C)...
- Language evolves to maximize H/C , the amount of information per average cost.



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot


- Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]
- Idea:** Language is efficient
- Communicate as **much information as possible** for **as little cost**
- Need measures of information (H) and average cost (C)...
- Language evolves to maximize H/C , the amount of information per average cost.
- Equivalently: minimize C/H .



Another approach:

Benoît Mandelbrot

- Derived Zipf's law through optimization [8]
- Idea:** Language is efficient
- Communicate as **much information as possible** for **as little cost**
- Need measures of information (H) and average cost (C)...
- Language evolves to maximize H/C , the amount of information per average cost.
- Equivalently: minimize C/H .
- Recurring theme:** what role does optimization play in complex systems?



Outline

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
10 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Nutshell

References



The Quickenings ↗ — Mandelbrot v. Simon:

There Can Be Only One: ↗



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
11 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



The Quickenings — Mandelbrot v. Simon:

There Can Be Only One: 



Things there should be only one of: Theory, Highlander Films.

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
11 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



The Quickening ↗ — Mandelbrot v. Simon:

There Can Be Only One: ↗



🧱 Things there should be only one of: Theory, Highlander Films.

🧱 Feel free to play Queen's It's a Kind of Magic ↗ in your head (funding remains tight).

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
11 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Now let us “enjoy” the Trailer for Highlander:  



Or: Two theories enter, one theory leaves 

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell


References



We were born to be Princes of the Universe



VS.



Mandelbrot vs. Simon:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
13 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell


References



We were born to be Princes of the Universe



VS.



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
13 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model


Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Mandelbrot vs. Simon:


 Mandelbrot (1953): “An Informational Theory of the Statistical Structure of Languages” [8]



We were born to be Princes of the Universe



vs.



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
13 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model



Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Mandelbrot vs. Simon:

-  Mandelbrot (1953): “An Informational Theory of the Statistical Structure of Languages” [8]
-  Simon (1955): “On a class of skew distribution functions” [14]



Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell




References




vs.




Mandelbrot vs. Simon:

-  Mandelbrot (1953): “An Informational Theory of the Statistical Structure of Languages” [8]
-  Simon (1955): “On a class of skew distribution functions” [14]
-  Mandelbrot (1959): “A note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a paper by H.A. Simon” [9]










vs.



Mandelbrot vs. Simon:


-  Mandelbrot (1953): “An Informational Theory of the Statistical Structure of Languages” [8]
-  Simon (1955): “On a class of skew distribution functions” [14]
-  Mandelbrot (1959): “A note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a paper by H.A. Simon” [9]
-  Simon (1960): “Some further notes on a class of skew distribution functions” [15]



I have no rival, No man can be my equal



VS.



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
14 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model


Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Mandelbrot vs. Simon:


 Mandelbrot (1961): “Final note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a model due to H.A. Simon” [10]



I have no rival, No man can be my equal



VS.



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
14 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model



Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Mandelbrot vs. Simon:


-  Mandelbrot (1961): “Final note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a model due to H.A. Simon” [10]
-  Simon (1961): “Reply to ‘final note’ by Benoit Mandelbrot” [17]



I have no rival, No man can be my equal



VS.



The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
14 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model




Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Mandelbrot vs. Simon:


-  Mandelbrot (1961): “Final note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a model due to H.A. Simon” [10]
-  Simon (1961): “Reply to ‘final note’ by Benoit Mandelbrot” [17]
-  Mandelbrot (1961): “Post scriptum to ‘final note’” [11]







I have no rival, No man can be my equal




VS.



Mandelbrot vs. Simon:

-  Mandelbrot (1961): “Final note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a model due to H.A. Simon” [10]
-  Simon (1961): “Reply to ‘final note’ by Benoit Mandelbrot” [17]
-  Mandelbrot (1961): “Post scriptum to ‘final note’” [11]
-  Simon (1961): “Reply to Dr. Mandelbrot’s post scriptum” [16]



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:

“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
15 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:

“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

Simon:

“Dr. Mandelbrot has proposed a new set of objections to my 1955 models of the Yule distribution. Like his earlier objections, these are invalid.” [17]

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
15 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:

“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

Simon:

“Dr. Mandelbrot has proposed a new set of objections to my 1955 models of the Yule distribution. Like his earlier objections, these are invalid.” [17]

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
15 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:

“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

Simon:

“Dr. Mandelbrot has proposed a new set of objections to my 1955 models of the Yule distribution. Like his earlier objections, these are invalid.” [17]

Plankton:



Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:


“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

Simon:

“Dr. Mandelbrot has proposed a new set of objections to my 1955 models of the Yule distribution. Like his earlier objections, these are invalid.” [17]

Plankton:

“You can’t do this to me, **I WENT TO COLLEGE!**”



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:

“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

Simon:

“Dr. Mandelbrot has proposed a new set of objections to my 1955 models of the Yule distribution. Like his earlier objections, these are invalid.” [17]

Plankton:



“You can’t do this to me, **I WENT TO COLLEGE!**”
“You weak minded fool!”

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
15 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



I am immortal, I have inside me blood of kings

Mandelbrot:

“We shall restate in detail our 1959 objections to Simon’s 1955 model for the Pareto-Yule-Zipf distribution. Our objections are valid quite irrespectively of the sign of $p-1$, so that most of Simon’s (1960) reply was irrelevant.” [10]

Simon:

“Dr. Mandelbrot has proposed a new set of objections to my 1955 models of the Yule distribution. Like his earlier objections, these are invalid.” [17]

Plankton:



“You can’t do this to me, **I WENT TO COLLEGE!**”
“You weak minded fool!”
“You just lost your brain privileges,” etc.

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
15 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Outline

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
16 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
17 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:

 Language contains n words: w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n .

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
17 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell


References




Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:




 Language contains n words: w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n .


 i th word appears with probability p_i



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:


-  Language contains n words: w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n .
-  i th word appears with probability p_i
-  Words appear randomly according to this distribution (obviously not true...)



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:


- Language contains n words: w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n .
- i th word appears with probability p_i
- Words appear randomly according to this distribution (obviously not true...)
- Words = composition of letters is important



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:


- Language contains n words: w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n .
- i th word appears with probability p_i
- Words appear randomly according to this distribution (obviously not true...)
- Words = composition of letters is important
- Alphabet contains m letters



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Mandelbrot's Assumptions:

- Language contains n words: w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n .
- i th word appears with probability p_i
- Words appear randomly according to this distribution (obviously not true...)
- Words = composition of letters is important
- Alphabet contains m letters
- Words are ordered by length (shortest first)



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Word Cost

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
18 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Word Cost

 Length of word (plus a space)

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
18 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
18 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model


Analysis


And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References

Word Cost

 Length of word (plus a space)

 Word length was irrelevant for Simon's method



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
18 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell


References

Word Cost

- Length of word (plus a space)
- Word length was irrelevant for Simon's method

Objection

- Real words don't use all letter sequences



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Word Cost


- Length of word (plus a space)
- Word length was irrelevant for Simon's method

Objection

- Real words don't use all letter sequences

Objections to Objection

- Maybe real words roughly follow this pattern (?)



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Word Cost


- Length of word (plus a space)
- Word length was irrelevant for Simon's method

Objection

- Real words don't use all letter sequences

Objections to Objection

- Maybe real words roughly follow this pattern (?)
- Words can be encoded this way



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Word Cost


- Length of word (plus a space)
- Word length was irrelevant for Simon's method

Objection

- Real words don't use all letter sequences

Objections to Objection

- Maybe real words roughly follow this pattern (?)
- Words can be encoded this way
- Na na na-na naaaaa...



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
19 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

Binary alphabet plus a space symbol

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
word	1	10	11	100	101	110	111	1000
length	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	4
$1 + \log_2 i$	1	2	2.58	3	3.32	3.58	3.81	4



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
19 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References

Binary alphabet plus a space symbol

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
word	1	10	11	100	101	110	111	1000
length	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	4
$1 + \log_2 i$	1	2	2.58	3	3.32	3.58	3.81	4

 Word length of 2^k th word: = $k + 1$



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCVerse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
19 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is...?


Nutshell

References

Binary alphabet plus a space symbol

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
word	1	10	11	100	101	110	111	1000
length	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	4
$1 + \log_2 i$	1	2	2.58	3	3.32	3.58	3.81	4


 Word length of 2^k th word: $= k + 1 = 1 + \log_2 2^k$





Zipfarama via Optimization:

Binary alphabet plus a space symbol

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
word	1	10	11	100	101	110	111	1000
length	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	4
$1 + \log_2 i$	1	2	2.58	3	3.32	3.58	3.81	4

 Word length of 2^k th word: $= k + 1 = 1 + \log_2 2^k$


 Word length of i th word $\simeq 1 + \log_2 i$





Zipfarama via Optimization:


Binary alphabet plus a space symbol

i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
word	1	10	11	100	101	110	111	1000
length	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	4
$1 + \log_2 i$	1	2	2.58	3	3.32	3.58	3.81	4

 Word length of 2^k th word: $= k + 1 = 1 + \log_2 2^k$

 Word length of i th word $\simeq 1 + \log_2 i$

 For an alphabet with m letters,
word length of i th word $\simeq 1 + \log_m i$.



Outline

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
20 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

.....
Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Total Cost C

 Cost of the i th word: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m i$

The PoCVerse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
21 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

.....
Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell


References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Total Cost C

 Cost of the i th word: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m i$

 Cost of the i th word plus space: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m (i + 1)$

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
21 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell


References





Zipfarama via Optimization:

Total Cost C

 Cost of the i th word: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m i$


 Cost of the i th word plus space: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m (i + 1)$


 Subtract fixed cost: $C'_i = C_i - 1 \simeq \log_m (i + 1)$





Zipfarama via Optimization:

Total Cost C

 Cost of the i th word: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m i$

 Cost of the i th word plus space: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m (i + 1)$

 Subtract fixed cost: $C'_i = C_i - 1 \simeq \log_m (i + 1)$

 Simplify base of logarithm:

$$C'_i \simeq \log_m (i + 1) = \frac{\log_e (i + 1)}{\log_e m}$$

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Total Cost C

- Cost of the i th word: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m i$
- Cost of the i th word plus space: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m (i + 1)$
- Subtract fixed cost: $C'_i = C_i - 1 \simeq \log_m (i + 1)$
- Simplify base of logarithm:

$$C'_i \simeq \log_m (i + 1) = \frac{\log_e (i + 1)}{\log_e m} \propto \log_e (i + 1)$$

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell


References





Zipfarama via Optimization:

Total Cost C


 Cost of the i th word: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m i$

 Cost of the i th word plus space: $C_i \simeq 1 + \log_m (i + 1)$

 Subtract fixed cost: $C'_i = C_i - 1 \simeq \log_m (i + 1)$

 Simplify base of logarithm:

$$C'_i \simeq \log_m (i + 1) = \frac{\log_e (i + 1)}{\log_e m} \propto \log_e (i + 1)$$

 Total Cost:

$$C \sim \sum_{i=1}^n p_i C'_i \propto \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e (i + 1)$$

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Information Measure

 Use Shannon's Entropy (or Uncertainty):

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_2 p_i$$

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
22 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References




Zipfarama via Optimization:

Information Measure

Use Shannon's Entropy (or Uncertainty):


$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_2 p_i$$

(allegedly) von Neumann suggested 'entropy'...





Zipfarama via Optimization:


Information Measure

 Use Shannon's Entropy (or Uncertainty):

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_2 p_i$$


 (allegedly) von Neumann suggested 'entropy'...

 Proportional to average number of bits needed to encode each 'word' based on frequency of occurrence





Zipfarama via Optimization:


Information Measure


 Use Shannon's Entropy (or Uncertainty):

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_2 p_i$$

 (allegedly) von Neumann suggested 'entropy'...

 Proportional to average number of bits needed to encode each 'word' based on frequency of occurrence

 $-\log_2 p_i = \log_2 1/p_i =$ minimum number of bits needed to distinguish event i from all others




Zipfarama via Optimization:

Information Measure

- Use Shannon's Entropy (or Uncertainty):

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_2 p_i$$

- (allegedly) von Neumann suggested 'entropy'...
- Proportional to average number of bits needed to encode each 'word' based on frequency of occurrence
- $-\log_2 p_i = \log_2 1/p_i =$ minimum number of bits needed to distinguish event i from all others
- If $p_i = 1/2$, **need only 1 bit** ($\log_2 1/p_i = 1$)




Zipfarama via Optimization:

Information Measure

- Use Shannon's Entropy (or Uncertainty):

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_2 p_i$$

- (allegedly) von Neumann suggested 'entropy'...
- Proportional to average number of bits needed to encode each 'word' based on frequency of occurrence
- $-\log_2 p_i = \log_2 1/p_i =$ minimum number of bits needed to distinguish event i from all others
- If $p_i = 1/2$, **need only 1 bit** ($\log_2 1/p_i = 1$)
- If $p_i = 1/64$, **need 6 bits** ($\log_2 1/p_i = 6$)



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
23 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model


Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References

Information Measure

 Use a slightly simpler form:

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e p_i / \log_e 2$$



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
23 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model


Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell


References

Information Measure


 Use a slightly simpler form:

$$H = - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e p_i / \log_e 2 = -g \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e p_i$$

where $g = 1/\log_e 2$




Zipfarama via Optimization:

 Minimize


$$F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = C/H$$

subject to constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$$




Zipfarama via Optimization:

 Minimize


$$F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = C/H$$

subject to constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$$

 Tension:

(1) Shorter words are cheaper



Zipfarama via Optimization:



Minimize

$$F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = C/H$$


subject to constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$$



Tension:

- (1) Shorter words are cheaper
- (2) Longer words are more informative (rarer)



Outline

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

The PoCSverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
25 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Time for Lagrange Multipliers:

 Minimize

$$\Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) + \lambda G(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$$

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
26 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Time for Lagrange Multipliers:

 Minimize


$$\Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) + \lambda G(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$$

where

$$F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = \frac{C}{H} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e (i+1)}{-g \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e p_i}$$


and the constraint function is

$$G(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - 1 (= 0)$$



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Time for Lagrange Multipliers:

 Minimize

$$\Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) + \lambda G(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$$

where

$$F(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = \frac{C}{H} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e (i+1)}{-g \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log_e p_i}$$

and the constraint function is

$$G(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i - 1 (= 0)$$

Insert assignment question 

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Some mild suffering leads to:



$$p_j = e^{-1-\lambda H^2/gC} (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
27 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
27 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References

Some mild suffering leads to:



$$p_j = e^{-1-\lambda H^2/gC} (j+1)^{-H/gC} \propto (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$



Zipfarama via Optimization:


Some mild suffering leads to:



$$p_j = e^{-1-\lambda H^2/gC} (j+1)^{-H/gC} \propto (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$



A power law appears [applause]: $\alpha = H/gC$



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Some mild suffering leads to:




$$p_j = e^{-1-\lambda H^2/gC} (j+1)^{-H/gC} \propto (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$



A power law appears [applause]: $\alpha = H/gC$



Next: sneakily deduce λ in terms of g , C , and H .



Sifarama via Optimization:

Some mild suffering leads to:



$$p_j = e^{-1-\lambda H^2/gC} (j+1)^{-H/gC} \propto (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$



A power law appears [applause]: $\alpha = H/gC$




Next: sneakily deduce λ in terms of g , C , and H .




Find

$$p_j = (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Finding the exponent

 Now use the normalization constraint:

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j$$

The PoCVerse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
28 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References




Zipfarama via Optimization:

Finding the exponent


 Now use the normalization constraint:

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-H/gC}$$



Zipfarama via Optimization:

Finding the exponent

 Now use the normalization constraint:

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-H/gC} = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-\alpha}$$

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References




Zipfarama via Optimization:

Finding the exponent

 Now use the normalization constraint:

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-H/gC} = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-\alpha}$$

 As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we end up with $\zeta(H/gC) = 2$
where ζ is the Riemann Zeta Function

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:


Finding the exponent

Now use the normalization constraint:

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-H/gC} = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-\alpha}$$


As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we end up with $\zeta(H/gC) = 2$
where ζ is the Riemann Zeta Function

Gives $\alpha \simeq 1.73$ (> 1 , too high) or $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \simeq 1.58$ (very wild)





Zipfarama via Optimization:


Finding the exponent


 Now use the normalization constraint:

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-H/gC} = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-\alpha}$$

 As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we end up with $\zeta(H/gC) = 2$
where ζ is the Riemann Zeta Function


 Gives $\alpha \simeq 1.73$ (> 1 , too high) or $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \simeq 1.58$ (very wild)

 If cost function **changes** ($j+1 \rightarrow j+a$) then exponent is tunable




Zipfarama via Optimization:


Finding the exponent


 Now use the normalization constraint:


$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-H/gC} = \sum_{j=1}^n (j+1)^{-\alpha}$$


 As $n \rightarrow \infty$, we end up with $\zeta(H/gC) = 2$

where ζ is the Riemann Zeta Function

 Gives $\alpha \simeq 1.73$ (> 1 , too high) or $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \simeq 1.58$ (very wild)

 If cost function **changes** ($j+1 \rightarrow j+a$) then exponent is tunable

 Increase a , decrease α



Zipfarama via Optimization:

All told:



Reasonable approach: Optimization is at work in evolutionary processes

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
29 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCSverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
29 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References


All told:



Reasonable approach: Optimization is at work in evolutionary processes



But optimization can involve many incommensurate elephants: monetary cost, robustness, happiness,...



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
29 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

All told:




Reasonable approach: Optimization is at work in evolutionary processes



But optimization can involve many incommensurate elephants: monetary cost, robustness, happiness,...



Mandelbrot's argument is not super convincing



Zipfarama via Optimization:

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
29 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model





Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

All told:

-  Reasonable approach: Optimization is at work in evolutionary processes
-  But optimization can involve many incommensurate elephants: monetary cost, robustness, happiness,...
-  Mandelbrot's argument is not super convincing
-  Exponent depends too much on a loose definition of cost





Optimization

Minimal Cost
Mandelbrot vs. Simon
Assumptions
Model


Analysis
And the winner is ...?


Nutshell


References



From the discussion at the end of Mandelbrot's paper:


 A. S. C. Ross: “M. Mandelbrot states that ‘the actual direction of evolution (sc. of language) is, in fact, towards fuller and fuller utilization of places’. We are, in fact, completely without evidence as to the existence of any ‘direction of evolution’ in language, and it is axiomatic that we shall remain so. Many philologists would deny that a ‘direction of evolution’ could be theoretically possible; thus I myself take the view that a language develops in what is essentially a purely random manner.”

 Mandelbrot: “As to the ‘fundamental linguistic units being the least possible differences between pairs of utterances’ this is a logical consequence of the fact that two is the least integer greater than one.”



More:

Reconciling Mandelbrot and Simon

 Mixture of local optimization and randomness

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
32 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References




Reconciling Mandelbrot and Simon


 Mixture of local optimization and randomness


 Numerous efforts...

1. Carlson and Doyle, 1999:
Highly Optimized Tolerance (HOT)—Evolved/Engineered
Robustness ^[2, 3]




Reconciling Mandelbrot and Simon


 Mixture of local optimization and randomness


 Numerous efforts...

1. Carlson and Doyle, 1999:
Highly Optimized Tolerance (HOT)—Evolved/Engineered
Robustness ^[2, 3]
2. Ferrer i Cancho and Solé, 2002:
Zipf's Principle of Least Effort ^[6]




Reconciling Mandelbrot and Simon

 Mixture of local optimization and randomness


 Numerous efforts...

1. Carlson and Doyle, 1999:
Highly Optimized Tolerance (HOT)—Evolved/Engineered
Robustness ^[2, 3]
2. Ferrer i Cancho and Solé, 2002:
Zipf's Principle of Least Effort ^[6]
3. D'Souza et al., 2007:
Scale-free networks ^[4]



More

Other mechanisms:

 Much argument about whether or not monkeys typing could produce Zipf's law... (Miller, 1957) ^[12]

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
33 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Other mechanisms:

- ❏ Much argument about whether or not monkeys typing could produce Zipf's law... (Miller, 1957) ^[12]
- ❏ Miller gets to slap Zipf rather rudely in an introduction to a 1965 reprint of Zipf's "Psycho-biology of Language" ^[13, 18]

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Other mechanisms:

- ❏ Much argument about whether or not monkeys typing could produce Zipf's law... (Miller, 1957) ^[12]
- ❏ Miller gets to slap Zipf rather rudely in an introduction to a 1965 reprint of Zipf's "Psycho-biology of Language" ^[13, 18]
- ❏ Let us now slap Miller around by simply reading his words out (see next slides):



Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Other mechanisms:

- ❏ Much argument about whether or not monkeys typing could produce Zipf's law... (Miller, 1957) [12]
- ❏ Miller gets to slap Zipf rather rudely in an introduction to a 1965 reprint of Zipf's "Psycho-biology of Language" [13, 18]
- ❏ Let us now slap Miller around by simply reading his words out (see next slides):



- ❏ Side note: Miller mentions "Genes of Language."

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



Other mechanisms:

- ❏ Much argument about whether or not monkeys typing could produce Zipf's law... (Miller, 1957) [12]
- ❏ Miller gets to slap Zipf rather rudely in an introduction to a 1965 reprint of Zipf's "Psycho-biology of Language" [13, 18]
- ❏ Let us now slap Miller around by simply reading his words out (see next slides):



- ❏ Side note: Miller mentions "Genes of Language."
- ❏ Still fighting: "Random Texts Do Not Exhibit the Real Zipf's Law-Like Rank Distribution" [5] by Ferrer-i-Cancho and Elvevåg, 2010.

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



INTRODUCTION

The Psycho-Biology of Language is not calculated to please every taste. Zipf was the kind of man who would take roses apart to count their petals; if it violates your sense of values to tabulate the different words in a Shakespearean sonnet, this is not a book for you. Zipf took a scientist's view of language — and for him that meant the statistical analysis of language as a biological, psychological, social process. If such analysis repels you, then leave your language alone and avoid George Kingsley Zipf like the plague. You will be much happier reading Mark Twain: “There are liars, damned liars, and statisticians.” Or W. H. Auden: “Thou shalt not sit with statisticians nor commit a social science.”

However, for those who do not flinch to see beauty murdered in a good cause, Zipf's scientific exertions yielded some wonderfully unexpected results to boggle the mind and tease the imagination. Language *is* — among other things — a biological, psychological, social process; to apply statistics to it merely acknowledges its essential unpredictability, without which it would be useless. But who would have thought that in the very heart of all the freedom language allows us Zipf would find an invariant as solid and reliable as the law of gravitation?

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
34 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References



Put it this way. Suppose that we acquired a dozen monkeys and chained them to typewriters until they had produced some very long and random sequence of characters. Suppose further that we defined a “word” in this monkey-text as any sequence of letters occurring between successive spaces. And suppose finally that we counted the occurrences of these “words” in just the way Zipf and others counted the occurrences of real words in meaningful texts. When we plot our results in the same manner, we will find exactly the same “Zipf curves” for the monkeys as for the human authors. Since we are not likely to argue that the poor monkeys were searching for some equilibrium between uniformity and diversity in expressing their ideas, such explanations seem equally inappropriate for human authors.

A mathematical rationalization for this result has been provided by Benoit Mandelbrot. The crux of it is that if we assume that word-boundary markers (spaces) are scattered randomly through a text, then there will necessarily be more occurrences of short than long words. Add to this fact the further observation that the variety of different words available increases exponentially with their length and the phenomenon Zipf reported becomes inescapable: a few short words will be used an enormous number of times while a vast number of longer words will occur infrequently or not at all.

So Zipf was wrong. His facts were right enough, but not his explanations. In a broader sense he was right, however, for he called attention to a stochastic process that is frequently seen in the social sciences, and by accumulating statistical data that cried out for some better explanation he challenged his colleagues and his successors to explore an important new type of probability distribution. Zipf belongs among those rare but stimulating men whose failures are more profitable than most men’s successes.

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References



Outline

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

The PoCVerse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
36 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References



So who's right?

Bornholdt and Ebel (PRE), 2001:

“World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon’s 1955 model” [1].

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
37 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References



So who's right?

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
37 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is...?


Nutshell

References

Bornholdt and Ebel (PRE), 2001:

“World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon’s 1955 model” [1].


 Show Simon’s model fares well.





So who's right?

Bornholdt and Ebel (PRE), 2001:

“World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon’s 1955 model” [1].

 Show Simon’s model fares well.





 Recall ρ = probability new flavor appears.




So who's right?

Bornholdt and Ebel (PRE), 2001:

“World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon’s 1955 model” [1].






-  Show Simon’s model fares well.
-  Recall ρ = probability new flavor appears.
-  Alta Vista  crawls in approximately 6 month period in 1999
give $\rho \approx 0.10$




So who's right?

Bornholdt and Ebel (PRE), 2001:

“World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon’s 1955 model” [1].







-  Show Simon’s model fares well.
-  Recall ρ = probability new flavor appears.
-  Alta Vista  crawls in approximately 6 month period in 1999
give $\rho \simeq 0.10$
-  Leads to $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{1-\rho} \simeq 2.1$ for in-link distribution.




So who's right?

Bornholdt and Ebel (PRE), 2001:

“World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon’s 1955 model” [1].

-  Show Simon’s model fares well.
-  Recall ρ = probability new flavor appears.
-  Alta Vista  crawls in approximately 6 month period in 1999
give $\rho \simeq 0.10$
-  Leads to $\gamma = 1 + \frac{1}{1-\rho} \simeq 2.1$ for in-link distribution.
-  Cite direct measurement of γ at the time: 2.1 ± 0.1 and 2.09
in two studies.



So who's right?

Recent evidence for Zipf's law...




FIG. 1 (color online). (Color Online) Log-log plot of the number of packages in four Debian Linux Distributions with more than C in-directed links. The four Debian Linux Distributions are Woody (19.07.2002) (orange diamonds), Sarge (06.06.2005) (green crosses), Etch (15.08.2007) (blue circles), Lenny (15.12.2007) (black+'s). The inset shows the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) of the exponent μ together with two boundaries defining its 95% confidence interval (approximately given by $1 \pm 2/\sqrt{n}$, where n is the number of data points using in the MLE), as a function of the lower threshold. The MLE has been modified from the standard Hill estimator to take into account the discreteness of C .

Maillart et al., PRL, 2008:

“Empirical Tests of Zipf's Law Mechanism in Open Source Linux Distribution” [7]

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
38 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References



So who's right?

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References





FIG. 2. Left panel: Plots of ΔC versus C from the Etch release (15.08.2007) to the latest Lenny version (05.05.2008) in double logarithmic scale. Only positive values are displayed. The linear regression $\Delta C = R \times C + C_0$ is significant at the 95% confidence level, with a small value $C_0 = 0.3$ at the origin and $R = 0.09$. Right panel: same as left panel for the standard deviation of ΔC .



Red line added.



Rough, approximately linear relationship between C number of in-links and ΔC .¹



¹Breaks down for large C . Tick marks are odd.

So who's right?

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is...?

Nutshell

References




FIG. 2. Left panel: Plots of ΔC versus C from the Etch release (15.08.2007) to the latest Lenny version (05.05.2008) in double logarithmic scale. Only positive values are displayed. The linear regression $\Delta C = R \times C + C_0$ is significant at the 95% confidence level, with a small value $C_0 = 0.3$ at the origin and $R = 0.09$. Right panel: same as left panel for the standard deviation of ΔC .




Red line added.



Rough, approximately linear relationship between C number of in-links and ΔC .¹



More complicated mechanism: Packages are deleted, merge, get renamed.



¹Breaks down for large C . Tick marks are odd.

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis


And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References


Talking points:

- Simonish random 'rich-get-richer' models agree in detail with empirical observations.







Talking points:

- 🧱 Simonish random 'rich-get-richer' models agree in detail with empirical observations.
- 🧱 **Power-lawfulness:** Mandelbrot's optimality is still apparent.



Talking points:

-  Simonish random 'rich-get-richer' models agree in detail with empirical observations.
-  **Power-lawfulness:** Mandelbrot's optimality is still apparent.
-  Optimality arises for free in **Random Competitive Replication** models.



Neural reboot: Walking with a baby robin



Tsubasa.

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions


Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?


Nutshell

References





References I

- [1] S. Bornholdt and H. Ebel.
World Wide Web scaling exponent from Simon's 1955 model.
[Phys. Rev. E, 64:035104\(R\), 2001.](#) pdf ↗
- [2] J. M. Carlson and J. Doyle.
Highly optimized tolerance: A mechanism for power laws in designed systems.
[Phys. Rev. E, 60\(2\):1412–1427, 1999.](#) pdf ↗
- [3] J. M. Carlson and J. Doyle.
Complexity and robustness.
[Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 99:2538–2545, 2002.](#) pdf ↗




References II

- [4] R. M. D'Souza, C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, N. Berger, and R. D. Kleinberg.
Emergence of tempered preferential attachment from optimization.
[Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 104:6112–6117, 2007. pdf](#) 
- [5] R. Ferrer-i-Cancho and B. Elvevåg.
Random texts do not exhibit the real Zipf's law-like rank distribution.
[PLoS ONE, 5:e9411, 03 2010.](#)
- [6] R. Ferrer-i-Cancho and R. V. Solé.
Zipf's law and random texts.
[Advances in Complex Systems, 5\(1\):1–6, 2002.](#)




References III

- [7] T. Maillart, D. Sornette, S. Spaeth, and G. von Krogh.
Empirical tests of Zipf's law mechanism in open source Linux distribution.
[Phys. Rev. Lett.](#), 101(21):218701, 2008. pdf ↗
- [8] B. B. Mandelbrot.
An informational theory of the statistical structure of languages.
In W. Jackson, editor, [Communication Theory](#), pages 486–502. Butterworth, Woburn, MA, 1953. pdf ↗
- [9] B. B. Mandelbrot.
A note on a class of skew distribution function. Analysis and critique of a paper by H. A. Simon.
[Information and Control](#), 2:90–99, 1959.




References IV

- [10] B. B. Mandelbrot.
Final note on a class of skew distribution functions: analysis and critique of a model due to H. A. Simon.
[Information and Control](#), 4:198–216, 1961.
- [11] B. B. Mandelbrot.
Post scriptum to 'final note'.
[Information and Control](#), 4:300–304, 1961.
- [12] G. A. Miller.
Some effects of intermittent silence.
[American Journal of Psychology](#), 70:311–314, 1957. pdf ↗
- [13] G. A. Miller.
Introduction to reprint of G. K. Zipf's "The Psycho-Biology of Language." MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1965. pdf ↗



References V

- [14] H. A. Simon.
On a class of skew distribution functions.
[Biometrika](#), 42:425–440, 1955. [pdf](#) ↗
- [15] H. A. Simon.
Some further notes on a class of skew distribution functions.
[Information and Control](#), 3:80–88, 1960.
- [16] H. A. Simon.
Reply to Dr. Mandelbrot's post scriptum.
[Information and Control](#), 4:305–308, 1961.
- [17] H. A. Simon.
Reply to 'final note' by Benoît Mandelbrot.
[Information and Control](#), 4:217–223, 1961.



References VI

- [18] G. K. Zipf.
The Psycho-Biology of Language.
Houghton-Mifflin, New York, NY, 1935.

The PoCverse
Power-Law
Mechanisms, Pt. 4
47 of 47

Optimization

Minimal Cost

Mandelbrot vs. Simon

Assumptions

Model

Analysis

And the winner is ...?

Nutshell

References

