

**Tutorial 10 Solutions**  
**December 2, 2011**

1. (a) No. Since  $X_i$  for any  $i \geq 1$  is uniformly distributed between -1.0 and 1.0.  
(b) Yes, to 0. Since for  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|Y_i - 0| > \epsilon) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\left|\frac{X_i}{i} - 0\right| > \epsilon\right) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} [\mathbf{P}(X_i > i\epsilon) + \mathbf{P}(X_i < -i\epsilon)] = 0.\end{aligned}$$

- (c) Yes, to 0. Since for  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|Z_i - 0| > \epsilon) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|(X_i)^i - 0| > \epsilon) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} [\mathbf{P}(X_i > \epsilon^{\frac{1}{i}}) + \mathbf{P}(X_i < -(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{i}}))] \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon^{\frac{1}{i}}) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \epsilon^{\frac{1}{i}}) \right] = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \sqrt[i]{\epsilon}) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

2. Note that  $n$  is deterministic and  $H$  is a random variable.

- (a) Use  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  to denote the (random) measured heights.

$$\begin{aligned}H &= \frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n}{n} \\ \mathbf{E}[H] &= \frac{\mathbf{E}[X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n]}{n} = \frac{n\mathbf{E}[X]}{n} = h \\ \sigma_H &= \sqrt{\text{var}(H)} = \sqrt{\frac{n \text{var}(X)}{n^2}} \quad (\text{var of sum of independent r.v.s is sum of vars}) \\ &= \frac{1.5}{\sqrt{n}}\end{aligned}$$

- (b) We solve  $\frac{1.5}{\sqrt{n}} < 0.01$  for  $n$  to obtain  $n > 22500$ .

- (c) Apply the Chebyshev inequality to  $H$  with  $\mathbf{E}[H]$  and  $\text{var}(H)$  from part (a):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(|H - h| \geq t) &\leq \left(\frac{\sigma_H}{t}\right)^2 \\ \mathbf{P}(|H - h| < t) &\geq 1 - \left(\frac{\sigma_H}{t}\right)^2\end{aligned}$$

To be “99% sure” we require the latter probability to be at least 0.99. Thus we solve

$$1 - \left(\frac{\sigma_H}{t}\right)^2 \geq 0.99$$

with  $t = 0.05$  and  $\sigma_H = \frac{1.5}{\sqrt{n}}$  to obtain

$$n \geq \left(\frac{1.5}{0.05}\right)^2 \frac{1}{0.01} = 90000.$$

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science  
**6.041/6.431: Probabilistic Systems Analysis**  
(Fall 2011)

---

- (d) Since  $H = \frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n}{n}$ , where  $X_i$  is the measured height of the  $i$ th Canadian,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(|H - h| < 0.05) &= \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{-0.05}{1.5/\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{H - h}{1.5/\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{0.05}{1.5/\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\approx \Phi\left(\frac{0.05}{1.5/\sqrt{n}}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{-0.05}{1.5/\sqrt{n}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The normal distribution is symmetric and hence,  $\Phi(x) - \Phi(-x) \geq 0.99$  implies  $\Phi(x) \geq 0.995$ . From the table, we see that this means  $x \geq 2.575$ . Now,

$$\frac{0.05}{1.5/\sqrt{n}} \geq 2.575 \implies n \geq 5968.$$

- (e) Intuitively, the variance of a random variable  $X$  that takes values in the range  $[0, b]$  is maximum when  $X$  takes the value 0 with probability 0.5 and the value  $b$  with probability 0.5, in which case the variance of  $X$  is  $b^2/4$  and its standard deviation is  $b/2$ .

More formally, we have for any random variable  $X$  taking values in  $[0, b]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}(X) &= \text{var}\left(X - \frac{b}{2}\right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\left(X - \frac{b}{2}\right)^2\right] - \mathbf{E}\left[X - \frac{b}{2}\right]^2 \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}\left[\left(X - \frac{b}{2}\right)^2\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[X^2] - b\mathbf{E}[X] + \frac{b^2}{4} \\ &= \mathbf{E}[X(X - b)] + \frac{b^2}{4} \\ &\leq 0 + \frac{b^2}{4},\end{aligned}$$

since  $0 \leq X \leq b \implies X(X - b) \leq 0$ . Thus  $\sigma_X \leq b/2$ .

In our example, we have  $b = 3$ , so  $\sigma_X \leq 3/2$ .

3. (a) The MAP estimate is type A if:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathbf{P}[A|T_1 = t_1]}{f_{T_1|A}(t_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(A)} &\geq \frac{\mathbf{P}[B|T_1 = t_1]}{f_{T_1|B}(t_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(B)} \\ \frac{\mathbf{P}(A)}{f_{T_1|A}(t_1)} &\geq \frac{\mathbf{P}(B)}{f_{T_1|B}(t_1)}\end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, we decide that the bulb is of type A if:

$$\begin{aligned}f_{T_1|A}(t_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(A) &\geq f_{T_1|B}(t_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(B) \\ \lambda e^{-\lambda t_1} \cdot \frac{2}{3} &\geq \mu e^{-\mu t_1} \cdot \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{\lambda}{\mu} e^{(\mu - \lambda)t_1} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \\ (\mu - \lambda)t_1 &\geq \ln\left(\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Thus, since  $(\mu - \lambda) > 0$ , the MAP estimate is A if

$$t_1 \geq \ln\left(\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda},$$

and B otherwise.

- (b) Let  $\hat{A}$  be the event that the MAP estimate is A, and  $\hat{B}$  be the event that the MAP estimate is B. An error occurs whenever the MAP estimate is different from the actual type of the bulb.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\text{error}) &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{A} \cap B) + \mathbf{P}(\hat{B} \cap A) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{A}|B) \cdot \mathbf{P}(B) + \mathbf{P}(\hat{B}|A) \cdot \mathbf{P}(A) \\ &= \mathbf{P}\left(T_1 \geq \ln\left(\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} \mid B\right) \cdot \frac{1}{3} + \mathbf{P}\left(T_1 < \ln\left(\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} \mid A\right) \cdot \frac{2}{3} \\ &= e^{-\mu\left(\ln\left(\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}\right)} \cdot \frac{1}{3} + \left(1 - e^{-\lambda\left(\ln\left(\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}\right)}\right) \cdot \frac{2}{3} \end{aligned}$$

- (c) The LMS estimator of  $T_2$  based on observing  $T_1$  is  $\mathbf{E}[T_2|T_1]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[T_2|T_1 = t_1] &= \mathbf{E}[T_2|T_1 = t_1, A] \cdot \mathbf{P}(A|T_1 = t_1) + \mathbf{E}[T_2|T_1 = t_1, B] \cdot \mathbf{P}(B|T_1 = t_1) \\ &= \mathbf{E}[T_2|A] \cdot \mathbf{P}(A|T_1 = t_1) + \mathbf{E}[T_2|B] \cdot \mathbf{P}(B|T_1 = t_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \left(\frac{f_{T_1|A}(t_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(A)}{f_{T_1}(t_1)}\right) + \frac{1}{\mu} \cdot \left(\frac{f_{T_1|B}(t_1) \cdot \mathbf{P}(B)}{f_{T_1}(t_1)}\right) \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{2}{3} \lambda e^{-\lambda t_1} + \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{1}{3} \mu e^{-\mu t_1}}{\frac{2}{3} \lambda e^{-\lambda t_1} + \frac{1}{3} \mu e^{-\mu t_1}} \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\mathbf{E}[T_2|T_1] = \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{2}{3} \lambda e^{-\lambda T_1} + \frac{1}{\mu} \frac{1}{3} \mu e^{-\mu T_1}}{\frac{2}{3} \lambda e^{-\lambda T_1} + \frac{1}{3} \mu e^{-\mu T_1}}$$