Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

The first equality is a consequence of the fundamental multi-valued function theorem. 

\[\text{calligraphic}: \quad ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ\]

\[\text{greek}: \quad \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Psi\Omega\]

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let

\[ \gamma \text{ is a closed rectifiable curve in } \mathbb{C} \text{ which does not pass through any of the points } a_k \text{ and if } \gamma \approx 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{C} \text{ then} \]

\[ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \]

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Xi \Lambda \Xi \Omega \) greek: \( \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \epsilon \zeta \theta \delta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \xi \pi \rho \sigma \tau \varphi \chi \psi \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1990), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systemically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hsufljord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hühnleffy, 2003). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots
\]
These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time. By the standard rationality assumptions, the standard expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hübner, 2004) differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hübner, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(3.1)

calligraphic: $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G}\mathcal{H}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}\mathcal{K}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{V}\mathcal{W}\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{Z}$
greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüffeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufnagel, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: firstly by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Huffledjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$. If $y$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $y \neq 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^n n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.141592\ldots$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1985), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufflieford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

[3.1]

calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggiv (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülfejord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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**Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)** Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.141592 \ldots$$

**Calligraphic:** ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

**Greek:** \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Xi \Pi \Sigma \Upsilon \Phi \Psi \Omega

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin [1988; 1982] and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler [1987], reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviors often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Huflejt, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \, \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \text{for} \quad \gamma \approx 0 \quad \text{in} \quad G \quad \text{and if} \quad n(\gamma; a_k) \neq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, m.$$

(3.1)

calligraphic: $ABCD\, EF\, GH\, IJ\, KL\, MN\, NOP\, QR\, ST\, UV\, WXYZ$
greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Xi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega$ $\alpha\beta\gamma, \delta\varepsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa, \lambda\mu\nu\xi\pi\rho\sigma\tau\varphi\chi\psi\omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufthelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

Theorem (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

calligraphic: $ABCD\text{EFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ}\\\text{abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz}$

greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Upsilon\Phi\Omega$ $\alpha\beta\gamma, \delta\epsilon\zeta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\pi\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\psi\omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hühffelford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$ (3.1)

calligraphic: \text{ABCDEFGLHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZWXY}Z
greek: \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Psi\Omega \alpha\beta\gamma\delta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\xi\pi\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\chi\psi\omega

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981) and for subjectively distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then
\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \pi = 3.1415926... \tag{3.1}
\]

blackboard: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
calligraphic: \( \mathcal{ABCDEFHJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ} \)
greek: \( ΓΔΘΙΛΞΠΣΥΦΨΩ \)
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$ (3.1)

calligraphic: $ABC\{DFGIJKLM\{NOPQRSTUVWXYZVWXYZ\{\}\}$
greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Omega\alpha\beta\gamma, \delta\varepsilon\zeta\theta\iota\kappa, \lambda\mu\nu\xi\pi\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\psi\omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\gamma} f(z) dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülffefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( \mathcal{ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ} \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Xi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( y \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( y \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_y f = \sum_{k=1}^m a(y, a_k) \text{Res}(f, a_k)
\]

(3.1)
calligraphic: ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Sigma\Xi\Psi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1980), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

\( \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \) \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

calligraphic: \( \text{ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ} \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1982; 1989) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1983), reconfigure p to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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\begin{verbatim}
\texttt{Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)}
\texttt{Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{align}
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int \gamma f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots
\end{align}

\begin{verbatim}
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\texttt{greek: \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Xi \Psi \Phi \Omega \alpha \beta \gamma \delta \epsilon \zeta \eta \theta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu \xi \rho \sigma \tau \upsilon \phi \chi \psi\}
\end{verbatim}

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hübelfeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

Let \( M = \oint_C \frac{f(z)}{z-a} \, dz \) for \( f(z) \) analytic in the region \( C \), except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma = 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C f \left( \frac{1}{z} \right) \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)}{z-a_k} \, dz = -1.3415926 \ldots
\]

(3.1)

The proof is given by integrating the functions \( f(z) \) and \( f(1/z) \) and using the Cauchy integral formula for \( f(z) \) and the change of variables for \( f(1/z) \).

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure the probability weights to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by classical expected utility theories and second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then
\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

\[
\pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
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\text{Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)} & \quad \text{Let } f \text{ be analytic in the region } G \text{ except for the isolated singularities } a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m. \text{ If } \gamma \text{ is a closed rectifiable curve in } G \text{ which does not pass through any of the points } a_k \text{ and if } \gamma \approx 0 \text{ in } G \text{ then}
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\begin{align}
&\quad \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \quad (3.1)
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\text{Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure } p \text{ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein \& Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.}
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure

\( p \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure

\( p \)
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma, a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]  

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Húfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
$$

$\pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Footnotes

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots (3.1)
\]

calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
$$

(3.1)

calligraphic: $\text{ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ}$
greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Let
\[ f(z) \] be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then
\[ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \ \text{Res}(f; a_k) \]
\[ \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \] (3.1)
calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \) greek: \( \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Xi \Sigma \Upsilon \Phi \Psi \Omega \)
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) = \pi \cdot 3.1415926 \ldots
\]  

(3.1)
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greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Psi\Omega\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\pi\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\chi\psi \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmidtler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviour often differs systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H"uflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.141592 \ldots$$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theory, introduced for objective probabilistic by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distribution by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviour often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theory (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hübner, 2004). The theory affirm three in two interrelated ways first by discarding "the linearity of the probabilistic" interpretation imposed by the standard rationality assumption, second by employing more of the information available to individual at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \quad (3.1)$$

calligraphic: \(ABCDEFHJKL\MNOPQRSTUVWXYZ\)
greek: \(\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega\)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H"ufelfeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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**Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)** Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(3.1)

**Calligraphic**: $ABCDEFGIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ$

**Greek**: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\varepsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\xi\pi\rho\sigma\tau\varphi\psi\chi\omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hühlefeldt, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
**Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)** Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
$$

(3.1)

**calligraphic:** ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

**greek:** ΓΔΘΛΞΠΣΤΦΨΩ αβγδεζηθικλμνξπρστυφχψω

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Huflefford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \operatorname{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Xi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left( \frac{n(\gamma; a_k)}{a_k} \right) \operatorname{Res}(f; a_k) = \pi \cdot 3.1415926 \ldots
$$

(3.1)

Calligraphic: $\mathcal{ABCDFGHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ}$

Greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höffeleffod, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \not\equiv 0$ in $G$, then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_G f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

$$\text{Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)} \quad \text{Let } f \text{ be analytic in the region } G \text{ except for the isolated singularities } a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m. \text{ If } \gamma \text{ is a closed rectifiable curve in } G \text{ which does not pass through any of the points } a_k \text{ and if } \gamma \not\equiv 0 \text{ in } G \text{ then}$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_G f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma f(z) \sum_{k=1}^m n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) = 3.1415926 \ldots
$$

Footnotes (smallcaps):

Greek: Γάλακτος Ελείου Φωτός

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1981), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüffelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi \)
greek: \( \alpha\beta\gamma,\delta\varepsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\pi\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\chi\psi \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure p to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hübtlefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( G \) be a closed rectifiable curve in \( \mathbb{C} \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \tag{3.1}
\]

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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\section*{Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)}

Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \tag{3.1}$$
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufleiford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots (3.1)
\]

where \( n(\gamma; a_k) \) is the number of times \( \gamma \) winds around \( a_k \) counterclockwise. This theorem is a fundamental result in complex analysis and is used in the evaluation of certain integrals.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma, a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\gamma \approx 0$$
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hübaffles, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k),$$

where $n(\gamma; a_k)$ is the number of times $\gamma$ winds around $a_k$ in the positive direction.

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_G f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) = \pi \approx 3.1415926 \ldots
$$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let f be analytic in the region G except for the isolated singularities a₁, a₂, ..., aₘ. If y is a closed rectifiable curve in G which does not pass through any of the points aₖ and if y ≈ 0 in G then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_c f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926...$$  

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure p to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H kullanım, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by Schmeidler (𝐺).

Schmeidler (2013) and if (TS1) and for subjective distributions by 𝑅𝑒𝑠(𝐺).

Hüfflefjord, (2013).

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let 𝑓 be analytic in the region 𝐺 except for the isolated singularities 𝑎₁, 𝑎₂, ..., 𝑎ₘ. If 𝑦 is a closed rectifiable curve in 𝐺 which does not pass through any of the points 𝑎ₖ and if 𝑦 ≈ 0 in 𝐺 then

\[ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(y, a_k) \text{Res}(f, a_k) \]

\( \pi = 3.1415926... \)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981, 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1989), reconfigure 𝑝 to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufieljord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(3.1)
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greek: $ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ$
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $y$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $y \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981: 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \to 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z)dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Alais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Huflejtford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \not\equiv 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_G f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
$$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höffliford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülffeljorde, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots (3.1)
\]
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure p to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H"{u}ffelford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
$$

(3.1)

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
$$

(3.1)

blackboard: $ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ$ abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

calligraphic: $ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ$ abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Huflelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Reduction Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \operatorname{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)

blackboard: $\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}\mathbb{C}\mathbb{D}\mathbb{E}\mathbb{F}\mathbb{G}\mathbb{H}\mathbb{I}\mathbb{J}\mathbb{K}\mathbb{L}\mathbb{M}\mathbb{N}\mathbb{O}\mathbb{P}\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{R}\mathbb{S}\mathbb{T}\mathbb{U}\mathbb{V}\mathbb{W}\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}\mathbb{Z}$

calligraphic: $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{F}\mathcal{G}\mathcal{H}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{J}\mathcal{K}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{V}\mathcal{W}\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{Z}$

fraktur: $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{D}\mathfrak{E}\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{K}\mathfrak{L}\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{O}\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{R}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{U}\mathfrak{V}\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{X}\mathfrak{Y}\mathfrak{Z}$

greek: ΓΔΘΞΠognito\(\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\omega\\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\xi\\phi\chi\psi\$
Let

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

Formally, if \( f \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( y \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

Theorem 1 (TS1): Residue Theorem

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

\[
\text{acemnpsruwxyzacemnpsruwxyzacemnpsruwxyzacemnpsruwxyzbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijklbdhijkstra
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)

Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint \gamma f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) = \pi.31415926 \ldots \tag{3.1}
\]

Calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)

Greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Psi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggan (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure the restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]  

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( \Delta \Theta \Xi \iota \Sigma \Upsilon \Psi \Omega \) \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \zeta, \eta, \theta, \iota, \kappa, \lambda, \mu, \nu, \pi, \rho, \sigma, \tau, \varphi, \chi, \psi \)

Greek: \( \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Xi \iota \Sigma \Upsilon \Psi \Omega \) \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \zeta, \eta, \theta, \iota, \kappa, \lambda, \mu, \nu, \pi, \rho, \sigma, \tau, \varphi, \chi, \psi \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Huijffeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

(3.1)

blackboard: $\text{ABCDEFHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ}$

calligraphic: $\text{ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ}$

greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höfflerfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $y$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $y$ is in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_y f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)

blackboard: $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_y f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$

calligraphic: $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_y f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$

fraktur: $\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\xi\pi\rho\sigma\tau\phi\chi\psi$

greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Pi\Sigma\Phi\Psi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ significantly from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hürffeldt, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $G$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{n} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) = \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

(3.1)

blackboard: $\text{ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ} \times \text{abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz}$
calligraphic: $\text{ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ} \times \text{abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz}$
greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega$
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $y$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $y = 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_y f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure probability statements in a way that is more accessible to individuals at decision-making time. These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \neq 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$ (3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
The linearity of the probabilities restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of

\textbf{Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)} Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots
\]  

(3.1)
Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\int_{\gamma} f = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) = \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(Remote Theorem)}
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H"ufflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Húffefeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $\rho$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma, a_k) \text{Res}(f, a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüpf Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by G. A. Edgar and P. J. Yerger, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots$$

(3.1)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüpf Schmeidler, 2004).
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)  Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( y \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüllefeldt, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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This concludes the first section of the document, introducing the theoretical framework of the theories under discussion.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$
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by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time. These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure.

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then
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\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\alpha; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual behaviour often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülffelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then
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calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höffelefnd, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Haffesfeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots
\]

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.

\[ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \]
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schneider (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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\]
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufelfjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höffefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( y \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_i \) and if \( y = \infty \) in then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigglin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellberger, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_i \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\gamma f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \pi(n; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

(3.1)

\[
\pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höffler, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \text{for } \gamma \approx 0 \text{ in } G
$$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüllefeldjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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\textbf{Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)}

Let \(f\) be analytic in the region \(G\) except for the isolated singularities \(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m\). If \(y\) is a closed rectifiable curve in \(G\) which does not pass through any of the points \(a_k\) and if \(y \circ 0 \in G\) then

\[ \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(y, a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \]

\[ \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \]

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quigg\(1981; 1982\) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \(p\) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Al\(ais, 1953\); Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H\äufle\(fod\, 2004)\). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearization of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $y$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $y = 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_G f = \sum_{k=1}^m n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)

blackboard: $ABCDEFGHJKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ$

calligraphic: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Lambda\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Psi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from those predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hyperford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad (3.1)$$
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greek: $\Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Omega$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f(z) \, dz = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüllefeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then
\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots
\]
Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

(3.1)
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1982; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1965; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüffelford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure p to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Höffeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_\gamma f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \operatorname{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.141592 \ldots
\]

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma, \Delta, \Theta, \Xi, \Psi, \Omega, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon, \zeta, \theta, \iota, \kappa, \lambda, \mu, \nu, \pi, \rho, \sigma, \tau, \phi, \chi, \psi \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviors often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hufreiford, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Let

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let \( f \) be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( \gamma \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( \gamma \approx 0 \) in \( G \) then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

(3.1)

calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Sigma\Upsilon\Phi\Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure \( p \) to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1965; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; H"uflefeld, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the "linearity of the probabilities" restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
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Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem)  Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma;a_k) \text{Res}(f;a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926\ldots$$

\text{calligraphic:  } ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

\text{greek:  } \Gamma\Delta\Theta\Xi\Pi\Sigma\Tau\Phi\Psi\Omega\quad \alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu\pi\rho\sigma\tau\upsilon\phi\chi\psi\omega

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumption, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \approx 0$ in $G$ then

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k) \quad \pi = 3.1415926 \ldots \tag{3.1}
$$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hülfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let
\[ f \]
be analytic in the region \( G \) except for the isolated singularities \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \). If \( y \) is a closed rectifiable curve in \( G \) which does not pass through any of the points \( a_k \) and if \( y \neq 0 \) in \( G \) then
\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(y; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)
\]

(3.1)

blackboard: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
calligraphic: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
fraktur: \( ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ \)
greek: \( \Gamma \Delta \Sigma \Phi \Psi \Omega \)

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein \\& Slovic, 1971; Hüffeldjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.
These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure

Theorem 1 (Residue Theorem) Let $f$ be analytic in the region $G$ except for the isolated singularities $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$. If $\gamma$ is a closed rectifiable curve in $G$ which does not pass through any of the points $a_k$ and if $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ in $G$ then

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} f = \sum_{k=1}^{m} n(\gamma; a_k) \text{Res}(f; a_k)$$

$$\pi = 3.1415926$$

Rank-dependent utility theories, introduced for objective probabilities by Quiggin (1981; 1982) and for subjective distributions by Schmeidler (1989), reconfigure $p$ to accommodate findings that actual choice behaviours often differ systematically from that predicted by classical expected utility theories (for example, see Allais, 1953; Ellsberg, 1961; Lichtenstein & Slovic, 1971; Hüfflefjord, 2004). These theories accomplish their task in two interrelated ways: first by discarding the “linearity of the probabilities” restriction imposed by the standard rationality assumptions, second by employing more of the information available to individuals at decision-making time.