

# Exercise takeaways

April 21, 2026

**From approximate condensation to approximate weak natural latent (Exercises 1 and 2).** Given an  $\varepsilon$ -approximate condensation  $(Y_A)$  of observables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , fix any subset  $A \subseteq I$  and construct  $\Lambda = (Y_B : B \cap A \neq \emptyset, |B| > 1)$ , the collection of all latent variables contributing to more than one observable in  $A$ . Exercise 1 shows that  $\Lambda$  satisfies approximate mediation over  $X_A$ : the latent variable model condition implies that each  $X_i$  is a deterministic function of the latents above it, which bounds the residual dependence among observables after conditioning on  $\Lambda$ . Exercise 2 shows that  $\Lambda$  satisfies weak redundancy: each  $Y_B$  contributing to  $\Lambda$  is approximately recoverable from all-but-one observable in  $A$ , since the condensation score bounds how much information can fail to be captured by any large subset of observables. Together, these give an approximate weak natural latent from any condensation.

**From approximate condensation to approximate strong natural latent (Exercise 3).** If additionally there is no lower-level structure within  $A$  — formally,  $Y_{\{i\}} \approx \text{const}$  for all singletons  $\{i\} \subseteq A$ , meaning the only shared information among observables in  $A$  flows through  $\Lambda$  rather than through pair-level latents — then weak redundancy upgrades to strong redundancy:  $\Lambda$  is approximately recoverable from any single observable in  $A$ , not just from all-but-one. This gives a full approximate natural latent.

**From natural latent to condensation, and the agreement theorem (Exercises 4 and 5).** Exercise 4 runs the construction in reverse: given any  $\varepsilon$ -approximate natural latent  $\Lambda$  over  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ , setting  $Y_I = \Lambda$  and all other  $Y_A = \text{const}$  produces a  $2\varepsilon$ -approximate condensation (error doubles because both mediation and redundancy each contribute  $\varepsilon$ ). Exercise 5 uses a hierarchical structure: if observables admit a chain of natural latents  $\Lambda^0 \supseteq \Lambda^1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \Lambda^n$  at successive levels of coarseness, the corresponding LVM forms a perfect (or approximate) condensation. The key point is that the Bayes net structure of the hierarchy — where each  $\Lambda_B^k$  is a parent of  $\Lambda_{B'}^{k-1}$  whenever  $B \supset B'$  — is precisely the structure required by Theorem 5.10 of the condensation paper for perfect condensation, and the strong redundancy condition at each level ensures each  $Y_A$  is recoverable from the upward cone  $Y_{\supseteq A}$ .

**Why hierarchical natural latents form a perfect condensation.** The condensation paper's Theorem 5.10 gives two necessary and sufficient conditions for a perfect condensation: (i) every  $Y_A$  is a deterministic function of any single observable  $X_i$  with  $i \in A$ , and (ii) the latent variables satisfy a Bayes net structure where  $Y_B$  is a parent of  $Y_{B'}$  if and only if  $B \supset B'$ . A hierarchy of natural latents satisfies both. Condition (i) is just strong redundancy:  $H(\Lambda_A^k | X_i) \approx 0$  for all  $i \in A$  is exactly what it means for  $\Lambda_A^k$  to be a natural latent over  $X_A$ . Condition (ii) is satisfied by construction, since the hierarchy is indexed by nested subsets. The conditioned score  $\chi(A)$  then collapses to  $H(X_A)$  because the chain rule expansion telescopes:  $H(\Lambda_A^0 | \Lambda_A^1, \dots) + H(\Lambda_A^1 | \Lambda_A^2, \dots) + \dots$  collapses to  $H(X_A)$  once strong redundancy at each level is used to show each conditional entropy term contributes negligibly beyond the bottom level.