```
For us prob spale, finite set I & pmf p or PD P.

"In school" — finite set I & P(A) = (A) = ff passwable outlooms

Rob. of A

Such a P as above is what we call as uniform PD on "Equally likely outlooms."

For eg. by soying I is a forob spale with equally (itsely outlooms means that the PD P on I is uniform PD.

Why go from "Gr. (ik outlooms" to more gen for spales?

— In reality, not all outcomes are equally likely.

Eg.: In I is go "eq lik out:" then p(w) = p(x) = 1/2.

Eg.: I Sampling with replacement].
```

```
Equally likely outcomes -> p(w) = 1 = 1, w \in S2
[2] nk w=(w, ..., wk).

(22, p) on (2, p) is said as "sampling with reparement from (n) k-many times".

Fg 5:3: (Itashing) There are ke individuals & each individual is assigned a code. There are in distinct codes/labels.
          For proper identification, codes of k ind- should be distinct.
          Keeping track of previousles isn't easy.
       Say a lazy person assigns (hash) codes randomly.

Sample spale = set of all, (hash) lodes for k individuals
                     = \{(h_1, \dots, h_R) : h_i \in [n] \neq i\}
= [n]^R \qquad h_i - hash (ode of ith | zerson.)
          All assignments are equally likely.
              \Rightarrow p(\omega) = \frac{1}{n^k} \quad \omega = (\omega_0, \ldots, \omega_k) \in [n]^k
     (Error) E = shi, -. he's are not distinct is
     (Good) G= (E) = { his are distinct y
                                    = \{(h_i, -, h_k) \in \Omega; h_i \neq h_j \forall i \neq j \}
          Prob. (lazy hush code is good) = IP(G) (defin of G)
                                                      = [G1] (Sq. likely outcomes)
                                                        |\Omega|
                                                     = |&|
              |\mathcal{C}_{1}| = \gamma(n+1) - (n-k+1) = \pi 
|\mathcal{C}_{1}| = \gamma(n+1) - (n-k+1) = \pi 
|\mathcal{C}_{2}| = \frac{k+1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{2}\right)
```

Eg 5.4 (Birthday booklen) - gt there are k' people in a room what is the chance a fewer shares same birthday? [Von Mise] label days as 1, - , 365. - Set n= 365. bi = birthday of ith berson. I = all possible birthdays of k' people = { (b) - , bk): be E (n) +ig (Same as the reble)

and rollability of 1.1. or hashing) Assume any ordering of bi's is equally likely. $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{W}) = \frac{1}{n^R} \qquad \mathcal{W} = (\mathcal{W}_1, \dots, \mathcal{W}_R) \subset \mathcal{S}_{\infty}$ (P(F, one pour showing same birthlay) = [P({(bi) - , bk): bi = bi for some itily) (from computation) $= 1 - \frac{1}{10} \left(1 - \frac{1}{10}\right) = 0.000$ = 0.000 = 0.000 = 0.000 = 0.000 = 0.000M = 365C(2) = 0.002, C(5) = 0.027, C(10) = 0.016, C(23) = 0.507Of there are 23 people, P(2) people share same) > /2. C(40) > 0.8 $C(50) \approx 1$. IP (person 1 shows a hirthday with one another) = 1 - P(person 1 doesn't share a hirthday with anybody) $=1-P((b_1,-,b_R):b_1+b_1+1)$ $=1-12(b_1,...,b_R): b_1 + b_2 + j + 13$ $-\frac{m}{m^{k}} = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{k-1} = b(k)$

```
b(40) \ge 0.11, c(40) > 0.89.
                 \approx 40
                  365
THM 4.1/ Let (I, P) be a fin prob space. Then
(i) P(A) & P(B) + A & B & \( \int \).
                                                                          [Monotonicity]
(ii) P(A) \leq 1 \forall A \subseteq \Omega
(P(\phi) = 0)
(iv) (P(A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} (P(A_i)) \forall A_1, \cdots, A_n \subseteq \Omega. [hinter subadditivity]
(V) P(AUB) = P(A) + P(B) - P(ANB) [Indusin-Gallerian]
\frac{\text{Drof:}}{\text{WeA}} \text{ (i)} \quad \text{(P(A) = } \underbrace{\text{Sp(w)}}_{\text{WEA}} \text{(Sw)} \text{(} \underbrace{\text{ASB}}_{\text{WEB}} \text{(} \text{S(w)} \text{20 } \text{4w)} \text{)}
                                        = P(B) \quad (defn)
      (ii) Set B = \Omega. (i) =) P(A) \leq P(\Omega) = 1

\Rightarrow (prop. of P)
      (iii) P(AU\phi) = P(A) + P(\phi)  w An \rho = \phi.
               =) P(A) = P(A) + P(\phi) as A \cup \phi = A.
                 80 (P(\phi) = 0.
      (iv) we'll prove by induction.
                 n=1 is trivially true. IP(A1) < IP(A1)
        Let n=2. Then A, WA2 =
                                                             A_1 \sqcup (A_2 \backslash A_1)
                    = P(A_1 \cup (A_2 \setminus A_1))
= P(A_1) + P(A_2 \setminus A_1) 
\leq (P(A_1) + P(A_2))
       P(A_1 \cup A_2) = P(A_1 \cup (A_2 \setminus A_1))
```

Assume finite subadd. Novals for $n-1 \ge 2$.

Convider A_1, \dots, A_n . We've to brove fin. sundd for n. $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n = A_1 \sqcup \left((A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n)/A_1 \right)$ $P(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n) = P(A_1) + P(A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n)/A_1 \right) \binom{hind}{hold}$ $\leq P(A_1) + P(A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n) \pmod{hold}$ $\leq P(A_1) + P(A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n)$ $\leq P(A_1) + P(A_$