P1

Let T denote the total number of points in the game from both players A and B combined once a game ends with a clear winner.

Scenario 1: A and B are tied in points.

Scenario 2: A or B have a 1-point lead over the other player.

Scenario 3: A or B have a 2-point lead over the other player.

Scenario 4: A or B have more than 2 points more than the other player.

Given that a game ended due to a clear winner as recognized by the rules, scenarios 1 and 2 are not considered when computing T by not satisfying the game rules. In theory, both scenarios 3 and 4 satisfy the rules to declare a winner. However, scenario 3 is a prerequisite for scenario 4. Once scenario 3 occurs, the game immediately ends with a specific value for T before scenario 4 can happen. Therefore, a game with a winner always ends with points, where *k* is the number of points of the losing player (player with lower points). In simple words, the winning player always has exactly 2 more points than the losing player once the game ends with a clear winner.

is divisible by 2 because *T* can be expressed as a product of 2 and another integer. By definition of an even integer, *T* is also an even integer. Note that , because no player can possibly have negative points on any step of the game.

Regardless of who wins, 2*k* trials are played before the winning 2-point lead occurs at the end. In each pair of trials e.g. (trial 1, trial 2), (trial 3, trial 4), …, either A can win on the earlier trial followed by B or vice versa. This means the pre-win 2*k* trials can have unique historical sequences of how points are earned by A and B, regardless of who wins at the end.

Consider these denotations to be used in expressing probability.

1) *n* can also be expressed with *k*, being .

2) Let and denote the number of points under players A and B, respectively, that together sum to *T* at game ending.

Player A winning is simply the first term in the above probability after distribution of .

P2

Base case:

Induction:  
Assume

Let *Z* denote as a short-hand way.

P3 The sample space is the set of all possible samples of *k* balls, regardless of color distribution. This assumes that each ball is unique (like having an ID), meaning a sample of *i* white balls and black balls does not necessarily equate to the same outcome as a second sample with the same color counts. A specific event, such as 3 white balls and 9 black balls for , contains all possible samples of 12 unique balls with 3:9 white-to-black ratio. Therefore, .

There are possible combinations of *i* white balls. Similarly, there are possible combinations of black balls. Therefore, the number of unique samples of size *k* containing *i* white balls is simply the product . The probability of an event specified by this specific distribution of colors is the previous product over the sample space size for samples of *k* balls.

P4

Choose 13 cards out of deck of 52 cards such that exactly 1 of 4 aces is included.

Choose 13 cards out of remaining 39 cards such that exactly 1 of 3 remaining aces is included.

Choose 13 cards out of remaining 26 cards such that exactly 1 of 2 remaining aces is included.

Choose final 13 cards out of remaining 13 cards such that exactly 1 of 1 remaining aces (last ace not yet chosen) is included.

P5

Let *A*, *B*, and *C*, denote the event that the chosen coin is two-headed, fair, and comes up heads 75% of the time, respectively. Let *H* denote the event of getting heads, and let *T* denote the event of getting tails.

P6

When using quicksort on the sequence of *n* numbers , let the sorted version of that sequence be denoted as .

Let *X* be the number of comparisons made throughout quicksort, computed below.

where

The maximum number of times any two elements, and , can be compared is once, and that only happens when one of the elements is a pivot. After that pivot’s particular subarray becomes partitioned, the pivot will never be compared to another number for the rest of sorting. If and are from the same subarray but become separated into two different partitions, these two elements are never compared at all during sorting. These two possible paths for each pair of elements explain the usage of a binary indicator variable *I* to indicate whether a comparison occurs or not for each pair of unique elements.

The expression is structured after the worst-case scenario of the original sequence already being sorted and iteratively choosing the pivot from left to right. We need to examine the expectation of every possible comparison that may take place during sorting. In this scenario, every possible comparison occurring implies for the entire sorting process, leading the sum of the first positive integers, .

As is an independent random variable,

Note that and are compared if and only if one of the two elements are chosen as the pivot. If a pivot is chosen to be less than or greater than , then the two elements will remain in the same partitioned subarray after splitting the current subarray but will not be compared during this recursion step. If the pivot happens to be in between and , then the two values will be separated into different partitioned subarrays, never to be compared at all. Therefore, only when one of the two elements in a subarray is chosen as pivot will they be compared to each other. That probability is given below by choosing the pivot from the two endpoints of a subarray of elements.

Plug this back as .

Note that the substitution has been made to more tersely represent the number of elements in the subarray enclosed by and .

The inner summation can be approximated with an integral for large *n*.

Note that in many fields, log is symbolically synonymous with ln.

P7

(i) As a property of subsets, .

To ensure disjoint subsets, let . Sets *A* and *C* are disjoint. The equality holds.

Under the *countable additivity* property of measure, .

Since always maps to a nonnegative value i.e. range is , and .

the sum of a nonnegative number (in this case ) and another nonnegative (in this case ) is always at least the first number . Expressed more simply, adding a number with another number that is at least zero (0) yields a sum that is at minimum equal to the first number.

Replacing the right-hand side of the inequality, , with the equivalent , we have

(ii) Given the premise where *X* and *Y* are sets, we know that *Y* can be expressed as a union of disjoint subsets, namely . By *countable additivity* property of measure, we also know that , since and *X* are disjoint sets for which the union is *Y*.

We will use this later.

Given that , the union of all non-decreasing subsets given above can be re-expressed as a union of disjoint subsets of .

where for and . Note that subsets are disjoint.

Under *countable additivity* property of measure:

(iii) Since for some *n*, and , we can conclude that .

// equivalent expression for set difference

// DeMorgan’s laws

// distributive property of intersection

// equivalent expression for set difference

Now, apply measure over *A*.

// measure of difference between set and subset, derived in earlier parts of problem

From two lines earlier, we see that the equality can be expressed by while also by , we can see that together:

Note that a property of subsets is that if , then .

By induction, given that .

(iv) A function that is additive, which a measure serves as an example, is also strongly additive. Let a measure be defined by .

If A and B are disjoint, then .

Suppose there is a collection of possibly infinite sets . Then by extension of strongly additive functions for two sets as previously stated,

Let second term on the right-hand side be denoted by *S*. if any non-empty intersections exist between elements of *U*, otherwise , indicating that all elements of *U* are mutually disjoint.

It is clear that holds.

Replace the right-hand side with a single summation to conclude