

# STATS310A - Lecture 13

Persi Diaconis  
Scribed by Michael Howes

11/04/21

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>References and notation</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Law of small numbers</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	“Approximately”	2
2.2	“Not too dependent”	2
2.3	“Small”	3
<b>3</b>	<b>Examples</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Poisson’s original example	3
3.2	Magic factor	3
3.3	Birthday problem	3
3.4	Homework	4
<b>4</b>	<b>Stein’s method</b>	<b>5</b>

## 1 References and notation

Today we will study Poisson approximation and Stein’s method. This is not in the textbook but two references are

- “Poisson Approximation and the Chen-Stein Method” by Arratia, Goldstein and Gord.
- “Exchangeable pairs and Poisson approximation” by Chatterjee, Diaconis and Meckes.

Through out this lecture we will use  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  to denote the Poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda \geq 0$ . That is  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  is a probability measure on  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\{j\}) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^j}{j!}.$$

If  $Z$  is a random variable with distribution  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$ , we will say that  $Z$  is Poisson( $\lambda$ ). If  $Z$  is Poisson( $\lambda$ ), then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Z] &= \lambda, \\ \text{Var}(Z) &= \lambda \text{ and,} \\ \mathbb{E}[Z(Z-1)\dots(Z-k+1)] &= \lambda^k.\end{aligned}$$

Also if  $Z_1 \sim \mathcal{P}(\lambda_1)$  and  $Z_2 \sim \mathcal{P}(\lambda_2)$  are independent, then  $Z_1 + Z_2 \sim \mathcal{P}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$ .

## 2 Law of small numbers

Let  $I$  be a finite set and let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a collection of 0-1 random variables with expected value  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = p_i$ . Define

$$\lambda = \sum_{i \in I} p_i,$$

and

$$W = \sum_{i \in I} X_i.$$

If  $p_i$  are “small” and  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  are “not too dependent”, then  $W$  is “approximately”  $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ . We will start this lecture by defining the three terms in quotes.

### 2.1 “Approximately”

To define “approximately” we need to put a topology on the space of probability measures.

**Definition 1.** If  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  is a measurable space and  $P, Q$  are probabilities on  $\Omega$ , then we define the *total variation distance* between  $P$  and  $Q$  to be

$$\|P - Q\|_{TV} = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |P(A) - Q(A)|.$$

We occasionally drop the subscript and simply write  $\|P - Q\|$  for  $\|P - Q\|_{TV}$ .

**Exercise 1.** This is will be on the upcoming homework.

(1) For a function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , let  $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} |f(\omega)|$ . Then show

$$\|P - Q\| = \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left| \int f dP - \int f dQ \right| : \|f\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}.$$

(2) If  $\mu$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  such that

$$P(A) = \int_A f d\mu \quad \text{and} \quad Q(A) = \int_A g d\mu,$$

then

$$\|P - Q\|_{TV} = \frac{1}{2} \int |f(\omega) - g(\omega)| d\mu.$$

Note that  $P$  and  $Q$  always have densities with respect to  $\mu = \frac{1}{2}P + \frac{1}{2}Q$ .

### 2.2 “Not too dependent”

A simple undirected graph is a collection of vertices and a collection of edges between the vertices such that there are no loops (edges that start and end at the same vertex) and no multiple edges between vertices.

**Definition 2.** Given a collection of random variables  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ , a *dependency graph* for  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  is a simple undirected graph  $\Gamma$  with vertices  $I$  and edges  $E$  such that for all  $I_1, I_2 \subseteq I$ , if  $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$  and there are no edges in  $\Gamma$  between  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , then

$$\{X_i\}_{i \in I_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \{X_j\}_{j \in I_2},$$

are independent of each other.

**Example 1.** If  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  are independent, then the empty graph on  $I$  is a dependency graph for  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ .

**Definition 3.** If  $\Gamma$  is a dependency graph for  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ , then for  $i \in I$ , we define the *neighbourhood of  $i$*  to be the set

$$N_i = \{i\} \cup \{j \in I : (i, j) \in E\}.$$

## 2.3 “Small”

The meaning behind  $p_i$  “small” can be seen in the statement of the Poisson approximation.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $I$  be a finite set and let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  be 0-1 random variables and let  $\Gamma$  be a dependency graph for  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$ . As before let  $p_i = \mathbb{E}[X_i]$ ,  $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$  and  $W = \sum_{i \in I} X_i$ . Also define  $p_{ij}$  to be  $\mathbb{P}(X_i = X_j = 1)$ . If we define  $\mathbb{P}_W(A) = \mathbb{P}(W \in A)$  for  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ , Then*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_W - \mathcal{P}_\lambda\| \leq \min\{3, 1/\lambda\} \left( \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in N_i \setminus \{i\}} p_{ij} + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in N_i} p_i p_j \right).$$

## 3 Examples

### 3.1 Poisson’s original example

Suppose  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $X_i$  are i.i.d. with  $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = p$ . Then  $W = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ ,  $\lambda = np$  and we can take  $\Gamma$  to be the empty graph. Then the bound becomes

$$\|\mathbb{P}_W - \mathcal{P}_\lambda\| \leq \min\{3, 1/np\} \times np^2.$$

If we take  $p = \frac{1}{n}$ , then  $\frac{1}{\lambda} = 1 < 3$  and so

$$\|\mathbb{P}_W - \mathcal{P}_\lambda\| \leq n \frac{1}{n^2} = \frac{1}{n}.$$

### 3.2 Magic factor

We call the  $1/\lambda$  term “the magic factor.” Suppose again that  $X_i$  are independent and  $\Gamma$  is the empty graph but now  $\mathbb{P}(X_i = 1) = \frac{1}{i}$ . This is equivalent to the ESP problem of guessing cards from a deck of  $n$  cards with complete feedback. We can take  $X_i = 1$  if and only if the  $(n - i + 1)^{th}$  guess is correct. In this example

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i} = \log(n) - \gamma + O(1/n).$$

Since the dependency graph is again empty, the first double sum is zero and the second is

$$\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in N_i} p_i p_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i^2} = \log(n) - \gamma + O(1/n).$$

For large  $n$ ,  $\frac{1}{\log(n)} \leq 3$  and we have the bound

$$\|\mathbb{P}_W - \mathcal{P}_\lambda\| \leq \frac{1}{\log n} \frac{\pi^2}{6}.$$

### 3.3 Birthday problem

Suppose we have  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  people,  $C \in \mathbb{N}$  colors and we are interested in matches of size  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Define

$$I = \{\alpha : \alpha \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}, |\alpha| = k\}.$$

Thus  $I$  consists of all group of  $k$  people and  $|I| = \binom{n}{k}$ . Color  $i = 1, \dots, n$  with a colour in  $\{1, 2, \dots, C\}$  uniformly and independently. For  $\alpha \in I$ , define

$$X_\alpha = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if all elements of } \alpha \text{ have the same color,} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Define  $W = \sum_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha$ . Then  $W > 0$  if and only if there exists a  $k$ -set that has the same colour. Also

$$p_\alpha = \mathbb{E}[X_\alpha] = C^{1-k}.$$

Thus  $\lambda = \binom{n}{k} C^{1-k}$ . The Poisson approximation suggests that for fixed  $C$  and  $k$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}(W > 0) \approx 1 - \mathbb{P}_\lambda(\{0\}) = 1 - e^{-\lambda} = 1 - e^{-\binom{n}{k} C^{1-k}}.$$

Thus we can set the above equal to  $1/2$  and answer the question of how many people do we need for there to be even odds that at least one group of size  $k$  has all the same color.

- If  $k = 2$  and  $C = 365$ , then we have the usual birthday problem and  $\binom{23}{2} \frac{1}{365} = \log(2)$  to 4 d.p. so  $e^{-\binom{23}{2} \frac{1}{365}} \approx 1/2$  and we recover our previous answer of 23.
- If  $k = 3$  and  $C = 365$ , then  $n = 84$  given  $\lambda \approx 0.7152$  and  $e^{-\lambda} = 0.489$ . Thus in a group of 84 there are roughly equal odds that a group of 3 have the same birthday.
- Taking  $C = 60$  you can ask questions about the odds that a group of  $k$  people have the seconds-hands on their watch in the same position.
- We can also ask other questions. The Poisson approximation tells us how many matches of size  $k$  we should expect.

Let's calculate the error bound in this example. If  $I$  and  $X_\alpha$  are as above, then  $X_\alpha$  and  $X_\beta$  are independent if and only if  $\alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset$ . Thus we can define a dependency graph  $\Gamma$  where we join  $\alpha$  to  $\beta$  if and only if  $\alpha \cap \beta \neq \emptyset$ .

**Proposition 1.** *With notation and definitions as above we have*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_W - \mathcal{P}_\lambda\| \leq \min\{3, 1/\lambda\} \left( \binom{n}{k} \sum_{a=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{a} \binom{n-k}{n-a} C^{1-(2k-a)} + \binom{n}{k} \sum_{a=1}^k \binom{k}{a} \binom{n-k}{n-a} C^{2-2k} \right).$$

*Proof.* In the first double sum of the Poisson approximation we have  $\beta \in N_\alpha \setminus \{\alpha\}$  if and only if  $|\alpha \cap \beta| = a$  for some  $a = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ . The number of such  $\beta$  is precisely  $\binom{k}{a} \binom{n-k}{n-a}$  since we must choose  $a$  elements of  $\alpha$  to be in  $\beta$  and  $n-a$  elements of  $\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \alpha$  to be in  $\beta$ . Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\alpha, \beta} &= \mathbb{P}(\text{everyone in } \alpha \cup \beta \text{ has the same color}) \\ &= C^{1-|\alpha \cup \beta|} \\ &= C^{1-|\alpha| - |\beta| + |\alpha \cap \beta|} \\ &= C^{1-k-k+a} \\ &= C^{1-(2k-a)}. \end{aligned}$$

The calculation for the second double sum. □

### 3.4 Homework

Consider the boys and girls birthday problem. Say we have  $n$  boys and  $n$  girls. We can then ask what is the chance that there is at least one boy-girl pair with the same birthday? We can then ask how large does  $n$  need to be for this probability to equal  $\frac{1}{2}$ . There are many generalizations:

- We can consider any graph that describes how the  $n$  people are connected. We can then ask questions about the probability that there is a collection of  $k$  people that are all connected in the graph and all have the same colour.
- The colours  $i$  can be chosen with probability  $p_i$ .

## 4 Stein's method

When we prove the Poisson approximation, we will use Stein's method and Stein's equation. We will use the following fact:

**Proposition 2.** *A random variable  $Z$  has  $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$  distribution if and only if for every bounded function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[Zf(Z)] = \lambda \mathbb{E}[f(Z+1)]. \quad (1)$$

The equation (1) is called *Stein's equation*. As an exercise one can check that if  $Z$  is  $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ , then Stein's equation does indeed hold. The essence of Stein's method is to show that  $W$  approximately satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \lambda \mathbb{E}[f(W+1)],$$

and show that this implies  $W$  is approximately  $\text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ . To prove the above Proposition we will prove the following analytic lemma:

**Lemma 1.** *Given  $\lambda > 0$  and  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a unique function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(0) = 0$  and for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $|f(j)| \leq 1.25$ ,  $|f(j+1) - f(j)| \leq \min\{3, 1/\lambda\}$  and*

$$\lambda f(j+1) - jf(j) = \delta_A(j) - \mathcal{P}_\lambda(A).$$