

APPENDIX A  
PROOF OF THEOREM 1

**Theorem 1** *The total size of files can be stored in FileInsurer is*

$$\min \left\{ \frac{N_s \times \minCapacity}{2r_1 k}, \frac{N_s \times \minCapacity}{r_2} \right\},$$

where

$$r_1 = \frac{\sum_f f.size \times f.value}{\minValue \times \sum_f f.size}, \quad (1)$$

$$r_2 = \frac{\minCapacity \times \sum_f f.value}{\minValue \times \sum_f f.size \times capPara}. \quad (2)$$

*Proof:* There are two restrictions on the total size of raw files. One is the restriction of total capacity. The other is the restriction of the maximal total value of stored files.

Under the former restriction, each file  $f$  is stored as  $f.cp$  replicas. Due to the assumption of redundant capacity, The total size of all replicas can not exceed  $\frac{1}{2}$  of total capacity. That is,

$$\sum_f (f.size \times f.cp) \leq \frac{1}{2} N_s \times \minCapacity.$$

Because  $f.cp = k \times \frac{f.value}{\minValue}$ , we have

$$\sum_f (f.size \times k \times \frac{f.value}{\minValue}) \leq \frac{1}{2} N_s \times \minCapacity.$$

Then we have

$$k \times \frac{\sum_f (f.size \times f.value)}{\minValue \times \sum_f f.size} \leq \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{N_s \times \minCapacity}{\sum_f f.size}.$$

Let  $r_1 = \frac{\sum_f f.size \times f.value}{\minValue \times \sum_f f.size}$  we have

$$\frac{k}{r_1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{N_s \times \minCapacity}{\sum_f f.size}.$$

Then

$$\sum_f f.size \leq \frac{N_s \times \minCapacity}{2r_1 k}.$$

Under the latter restriction, the total value of files can't exceed  $S_v^m \times \minValue$ . That is,

$$\sum_f f.value \leq n \times \minValue.$$

Because  $n = Cap\_Para \times m$ ,

$$\frac{\sum_f f.value}{\sum_f f.size} \leq \frac{Cap\_Para \times N_s \times \minValue}{\sum_f f.size}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_f f.size \leq \frac{N_s \times \minCapacity}{r_2},$$

where

$$r_2 = \frac{\minCapacity \times \sum_f f.value}{\minValue \times \sum_f f.size \times Cap\_Para}.$$

APPENDIX B  
PROOF OF THEOREM 2

**Theorem 2** *If all files have the same size  $f.size$ , for a sector  $s$  with total capacity  $s.capacity$  and free capacity  $s.freeCap$ , then*

$$\Pr \left[ \exists s, s.freeCap \leq \frac{1}{8} s.capacity \right] \leq N_s \exp \left\{ -0.144 \frac{s.capacity}{f.size} \right\}.$$

*Proof:* In the special case, all files have the same size  $f.size$ . For a sector  $s$  with capacity  $s.capacity$ , it can store

$\frac{s.capacity}{f.size}$  backups. We define  $N_{cp} = kN_v$  as the number of file backups in total because  $N_{cp} = \sum_f f.cp = \sum_f \frac{f.value}{\minValue} \times k = kN_v$ . Additionally, let  $X_i$  be the event that the backup  $i$  is stored in this sector and  $S = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{cp}} X_i$ . Because the assumption of redundant capacity, we have  $E[S] \leq \frac{s.capacity}{2f.size}$ . By multiplicative Chernoff bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr \left[ s.freeCap \leq \frac{1}{8} s.capacity \right] \\ &= \Pr \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{N_{cp}} X_i \geq \frac{7}{8} \frac{s.capacity}{f.size} \right] \\ &\leq \Pr \left[ S \geq \frac{7}{4} E[S] \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ \left( \log \frac{e}{4} \right) \frac{3}{4} E[S] \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ \left( \log \frac{e}{4} \right) \frac{3s.capacity}{8f.size} \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ -0.144 \frac{s.capacity}{f.size} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

By applying union bound, we obtain

$$\Pr \left[ \exists s, s.freeCap \leq \frac{1}{8} s.capacity \right] \leq N_s \exp \left\{ -0.144 \frac{s.capacity}{f.size} \right\}. \quad \square$$

APPENDIX C  
PROOF OF THEOREM 3

We define the state of a FileInsurer network as  $(F, S, A, C)$  consisting of files  $F$ , sectors  $S$ , all allocations  $A$ , and corrupted bits  $C$  in the network. Also, we define  $V_{lost}^{(F, S, A, C)}$  as the sum of values of the lost files and  $V_{confiscated}^{(F, S, A, C)}$  as the confiscated deposits of the corrupted sectors.

**Lemma 1** *For a specific state  $(F, S, A, C)$ , keeping the content and availability of each physical disk in the network unchanged, it can be viewed as another state  $(F', S, A', C)$  where the value of each file is  $\minValue$ . State  $(F', S, A', C)$  satisfies  $V_{lost}^{(F, S, A, C)} \leq V_{lost}^{(F', S, A', C)}$ .*

*Proof:* We divide each file descriptor  $f$  to  $\frac{f.value}{\minValue}$  different file descriptors. These file descriptors all have the value  $\minValue$  and the same Merkle root as that of  $f$ . Divide the  $f.cp$  allocations of  $f$  equally among these new file descriptors, so each file descriptor have exactly  $k$  allocations. By defining  $F'$  as all these new file descriptors,  $A'$  as these new file allocations, we construct a state  $(F', S, A', C)$  such that the value of each file is  $\minValue$ .  $\square$

The content and availability of each physical disk in the network are same in state  $(F, S, A, C)$  and state  $(F', S, A', C)$ . Since we do not change the state of sectors, we simply obtain  $V_{confiscated}^{(F, S, A, C)} = V_{confiscated}^{(F', S, A', C)}$ . For each file  $f$  lost in state  $(F, S, A, C)$ , since all its backups are lost, every new file descriptor generated by  $f$  in state  $(F', S, A', C)$  also lost. The value of the file  $f$  is equal to the sum of the values of the file descriptors it generates, so  $V_{lost}^{(F, S, A, C)} \leq V_{lost}^{(F', S, A', C)}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2**  $\forall 0 < p \leq \frac{1}{5}$  and  $5p \leq x \leq 1$ ,  $D(x||p) \geq \frac{1}{2}x \log \frac{x}{p}$ .

*Proof:* In the proof below, we will use  $x \geq p$  unspecified. Let

$$\begin{cases} f(x) = x^2 \log \frac{x}{p} - (1-x)^2 \log \frac{1-x}{1-p} \\ g(x) = \log \frac{x-1}{p-1} \left( -\log \frac{x}{p} + x - 1 \right) - x \log \frac{x}{p} \\ h(x) = \frac{x \log \frac{x}{p}}{-(1-x) \log \frac{1-x}{1-p}} \end{cases}$$

whose domain is  $x \in [p, 1]$ . First, we have  $f(x) \geq 0$  because  $\frac{df}{dx} = 1 + 2D(x||p) \geq 0$  and  $f(p) = 0$ . Then, we have  $g(x) \geq 0$  because  $\frac{dg}{dx} = \frac{f(x)}{x(1-x)} \geq 0$  and  $g(p) = 0$ . Finally, we obtain  $h(x)$  is monotonically increasing because  $\frac{dh}{dx} = \frac{g(x)}{(x-1)^2 \log^2 \frac{1-x}{1-p}} \geq 0$ .

Because  $h(x)$  is monotonically increasing,  $\forall x \geq 5p$ ,  $h(x) \geq h(5p) = \frac{5p \log 5}{(1-5p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-5p}}$ . We can find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dp} \frac{5p \log 5}{(1-5p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-5p}} &= \frac{5 \log 5 \left( (1-p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-5p} - 4p \right)}{(1-5p)^2 (1-p) \log^2 \left( \frac{1-p}{1-5p} \right)} \\ &\geq \frac{5 \log 5 \left( (1-p) \left( 1 - \frac{1-5p}{1-p} \right) - 4p \right)}{(1-5p)^2 (1-p) \log^2 \left( \frac{1-p}{1-5p} \right)} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

When  $p \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\frac{5p \log 5}{(1-5p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-5p}} > 2$ , so  $\forall 0 < p \leq \frac{1}{5}$ ,  $\frac{5p \log 5}{(1-5p) \log \frac{1-p}{1-5p}} > 2$ , that is  $\forall x \geq 5p, h(x) > 2$ . At last,

$$\begin{aligned} D(x||p) &= x \log \frac{x}{p} + (1-x) \log \frac{1-x}{1-p} \\ &= x \log \frac{x}{p} \left( 1 + \frac{(1-x) \log \frac{1-x}{1-p}}{x \log \frac{x}{p}} \right) \\ &= x \log \frac{x}{p} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{h(x)} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} x \log \frac{x}{p} \end{aligned}$$

□

Because of lemma 1, we can make the relaxation of that each file has value  $\minValue$  in subsequent analysis. Under the relaxations, the setting of the problem can be simplified as follow: there are  $N_v$  files and  $N_s$  sectors, each file has the same value  $\minValue$  and needs to be stored in  $k$  sectors. Each storage location of each file is generated independent and identically distributed from all sectors.

For any certain scheme that the adversary corrupts  $\lambda$  ratio of capacity, which means that the total size of corrupted sectors is  $\lambda N_s \times \minCapacity$ , define random variable  $X_i$  as the indicator variable of that the file  $f_i$  is lost. By our protocol, all  $X_i$  are independent events and  $\Pr[X_i] = \lambda^k$ .

**Lemma 3** Assume that the total size of corrupted sectors is  $\lambda N_s \times \minCapacity$ . Denote the total value of lost files to be  $V_{lost}$ . Then, with a probability of not less than  $1-c$ ,  $V_{lost}$  satisfies

$$V_{lost} \leq \minValue \times \max \left\{ 5N_v \lambda^k, N_v \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}}, 4 \frac{\log(\frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s}) - \log c}{k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} \right\}$$

*Proof:* Denote  $\gamma = \frac{V_{lost}^v}{\minValue}$ . By Chernoff bound and lemma 2, when  $\gamma \geq 5N_v \lambda^k$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \sum_i X_i \geq \gamma \right] &\leq \exp \left\{ -N_v \left( \frac{\gamma}{N_v} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} + \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma}{N_v} \right) \log \frac{N_v - \gamma}{N_v - N_v \lambda^k} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{2} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

For the adversary, it can corrupt  $\lambda N_s$  sectors at will and wants to manufacture  $\gamma$  lost files. It has  $\binom{N_s}{\lambda N_s}$  options to corrupt  $\lambda N_s$  sectors.

Consider the number of scenarios in which an adversary can corrupt sectors with capacity  $\lambda N_s \times \minCapacity$ . Here we do a simple scaling that treat a sector with  $s.capacity$  capacity as  $\frac{s.capacity}{\minCapacity}$  sectors with capacity  $\minCapacity$ . After this scaling, the adversary has  $\binom{N_s}{\lambda N_s}$  options to corrupt sectors. Therefore, for the original situation, the number of scenarios in which an adversary can corrupt sectors with capacity  $\lambda N_s \times \minCapacity$  does not exceed  $\binom{N_s}{\lambda N_s}$ .

By union bound, the probability it cannot manufacture  $\gamma$  lost files is at least

$$1 - \binom{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \exp \left\{ -\frac{N_v \lambda^k \gamma \log \gamma}{2} \right\}.$$

Thus, when  $\gamma \geq 5N_v \lambda^k$ , we have the probability that an adversary cannot manufacture  $\gamma$  lost files is at least

$$1 - \binom{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{2} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \right\}.$$

As  $\gamma \geq N_v \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}}$ ,  $\log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \geq \log \left( \lambda^{-\frac{k}{2}} \right) = -\frac{k}{2} \log \lambda$ .

$$\gamma \geq 4 \frac{\log \left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right) - \log c}{k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \gamma \frac{k}{4} \log \frac{1}{\lambda} \geq -\log \frac{c}{\left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\gamma}{2} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \geq -\log \frac{c}{\left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow -\frac{\gamma}{2} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \leq \log \frac{c}{\left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{2} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \right\} \leq \frac{c}{\left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right) \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma}{2} \log \frac{\gamma}{N_v \lambda^k} \right\} \leq c$$

Then with a probability of no less than  $1-c$ ,  $\gamma$  satisfies

$$\gamma \leq \max \left\{ 5\lambda^k N_v, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}} N_v, 4 \frac{\log \left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right) - \log c}{k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} \right\}$$

Therefore, with a probability of no less than  $1-c$ ,  $V_{lost}^v$  satisfies

$$V_{lost}^v \leq \minValue \times \max \left\{ 5N_v \lambda^k, N_v \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}}, 4 \frac{\log \left( \frac{N_s}{\lambda N_s} \right) - \log c}{k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} \right\}$$

□

**Theorem 3** Assume that the total size of corrupted sectors is  $\lambda N_s \times \minCapacity$ . Denote the total value of lost files to be  $V_{lost}$ , and  $\gamma_{lost}^v = \frac{V_{lost}^v}{s_v \times \minValue}$  represents the ratio of the

value of lost files to the total value of all files. Then with a probability of not less than  $1-c$ ,  $\gamma_{lost}^v$  satisfies

$$\gamma_{lost}^v \leq \max \left\{ 5\lambda^k, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}}, \frac{4 \left( \frac{\log \frac{e}{2\pi} - \log c}{N_s} - \log(\lambda^\lambda (1-\lambda)^{1-\lambda}) \right)}{\gamma_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda} \times capPara} \right\}.$$

*Proof:* Now we use an upper bound of the binomial number via Stirling's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{N_s}{\lambda N_s} &= \frac{N_s!}{(\lambda N_s)!(N_s - \lambda N_s)!} \\ &\leq \frac{e}{2\pi} \frac{N_s^{N_s + \frac{1}{2}}}{(\lambda N_s)^{\lambda N_s + \frac{1}{2}} (N_s - \lambda N_s)^{N_s - \lambda N_s + \frac{1}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{e}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_s \lambda (1-\lambda)}} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^\lambda (1-\lambda)^{1-\lambda}} \right)^{N_s} \\ &\leq \frac{e}{2\pi} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^\lambda (1-\lambda)^{1-\lambda}} \right)^{N_s} \end{aligned}$$

Using this upper bound, we can have a simpler version of

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{lost}^v &\leq \max \left\{ 5\lambda^k, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}}, 4 \frac{\log \frac{e}{2\pi} - N_s \log(\lambda^\lambda (1-\lambda)^{1-\lambda}) - \log c}{N_v k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ 5\lambda^k, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}}, 4 \frac{\frac{\log \frac{e}{2\pi} - \log c}{N_s} - \log(\lambda^\lambda (1-\lambda)^{1-\lambda})}{capPara \cdot \gamma_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

#### APPENDIX D PROOF OF THEOREM 4

**Theorem 4** Assume that the total size of corrupted sectors is no more than  $\lambda N_s \times \min Capacity$ . If the deposit ratio satisfies

$$\gamma_{deposit} \geq \max \left\{ 5\lambda^{k-1}, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}-1}, \frac{4}{k \times capPara} \left( \frac{\log N_s}{\log \frac{1}{\lambda}} + \frac{\log \frac{1}{c}}{\log N_s} \right) \right\},$$

then full compensation can be achieved with a probability of not less than  $1-c$ .

*Proof:* By assumption, the total size of corrupted sectors is no more than  $\lambda N_s \times \min Capacity$ . Because the deposit of corrupted sectors should always cover the file loss,  $\forall \frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda$  we shall have  $\lambda' \gamma_{deposit} N_v^m \geq \gamma$ , which is equivalent to

$$\gamma_{deposit} \geq \max_{\frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda} \left\{ \frac{\gamma}{\lambda' N_v^m} \right\}.$$

Then with probability no less than  $1-c$ , the following  $\gamma_{deposit}$  is enough for full compensation

$$\gamma_{deposit} \geq \max_{\frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda} \max \left\{ 5(\lambda')^{k-1}, (\lambda')^{\frac{k}{2}-1}, 4 \frac{\log \binom{N_s}{\lambda' N_s} - \log c}{\lambda' N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda'}} \right\}.$$

Considering the third part, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &4 \frac{\log \binom{N_s}{\lambda' N_s} - \log c}{\lambda' N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda'}} \\ &\leq \max_{\frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda} \frac{4 \log \left( N_s^{\lambda' N_s} \right) - 4 \log c}{\lambda' N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda'}} \\ &= \max_{\frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda} \frac{4 \lambda' N_s \log N_s - 4 \log c}{\lambda' N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda'}} \\ &\leq \left( \max_{\frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda} \frac{4 N_s \log N_s}{N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda'}} \right) + \left( \max_{\frac{1}{N_s} \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda} \frac{-4 \log c}{\lambda' N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda'}} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4 N_s \log N_s}{N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} + \frac{-4 N_s \log c}{N_v^m k \log N_s}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\gamma_{deposit} \geq \max \left\{ 5\lambda^{k-1}, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}-1}, \frac{4 N_s \log N_s}{N_v^m k \log \frac{1}{\lambda}} + \frac{-4 N_s \log c}{N_v^m k \log N_s} \right\}.$$

As  $capPara = \frac{N_v^m}{N_s}$ ,

$$\gamma_{deposit} \geq \max \left\{ 5\lambda^{k-1}, \lambda^{\frac{k}{2}-1}, \frac{4}{k \times capPara} \left( \frac{\log N_s}{\log \frac{1}{\lambda}} + \frac{\log \frac{1}{c}}{\log N_s} \right) \right\}. \quad \square$$

#### APPENDIX E EXPERIMENT

Recall that  $N_{cp} = k N_v$  is the number of file backups and each file  $f$  needs to store  $f \cdot cp$  backups on the network. Table IV shows the result of the capacity usage of the most loaded sector in the experiment. We run the experiment under two different settings. In the first setting, we reallocate all file backups in one go for 100 times. In the second setting, we allocate each file backup and then randomly refresh the location of a file backup  $100 N_{cp}$  times. In the experiment, we record the maximum value of capacity usage at any time. The results are shown in table IV. That the maximum capacity usage is less than 1 means that no file backups are allocated to sectors with insufficient capacity. We can find that under the distributions we test in the experiments, the probability of that file backups are allocated to sectors with insufficient capacity is sufficiently small.

□

TABLE IV  
EXPERIMENT RESULT: MAXIMUM CAPACITY USAGE OF SECTORS

reallocate all file backups 100 times						
parameter		maximum capacity usage				
$N_{cp}$	$N_s$	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
$10^5$	5	0.511	0.508	0.514	0.511	0.509
$10^5$	10	0.519	0.518	0.521	0.518	0.515
$10^5$	20	0.525	0.524	0.536	0.530	0.529
$10^5$	50	0.565	0.539	0.558	0.549	0.548
$10^5$	100	0.571	0.566	0.584	0.572	0.569
$10^6$	50	0.515	0.513	0.517	0.515	0.513
$10^6$	100	0.522	0.523	0.530	0.530	0.521
$10^6$	200	0.538	0.530	0.542	0.534	0.533
$10^6$	500	0.558	0.548	0.569	0.570	0.557
$10^6$	1000	0.591	0.571	0.598	0.594	0.576
$10^7$	500	0.516	0.515	0.522	0.521	0.518
$10^7$	1000	0.524	0.521	0.531	0.528	0.524
$10^7$	2000	0.540	0.534	0.544	0.545	0.534
$10^7$	5000	0.562	0.554	0.581	0.573	0.560
$10^7$	10000	0.589	0.576	0.609	0.606	0.585
$10^8$	5000	0.520	0.518	0.522	0.520	0.517
$10^8$	10000	0.526	0.525	0.537	0.529	0.524
$10^8$	20000	0.541	0.534	0.550	0.547	0.538
$10^8$	50000	0.562	0.555	0.580	0.571	0.559
$10^8$	$10^5$	0.591	0.582	0.614	0.599	0.586
refresh the location of a file backup $100N_{cp}$ times						
parameter		maximum capacity usage				
$N_{cp}$	$N_s$	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
$10^5$	5	0.517	0.511	0.519	0.515	0.514
$10^5$	10	0.524	0.523	0.529	0.522	0.519
$10^5$	20	0.532	0.529	0.538	0.535	0.531
$10^5$	50	0.550	0.551	0.566	0.554	0.557
$10^5$	100	0.588	0.571	0.599	0.595	0.581
$10^6$	50	0.518	0.516	0.521	0.519	0.517
$10^6$	100	0.525	0.522	0.532	0.529	0.526
$10^6$	200	0.536	0.535	0.546	0.542	0.541
$10^6$	500	0.565	0.563	0.582	0.575	0.562
$10^6$	1000	0.592	0.581	0.610	0.605	0.589
$10^7$	500	0.520	0.518	0.525	0.523	0.522
$10^7$	1000	0.533	0.527	0.534	0.533	0.531
$10^7$	2000	0.542	0.535	0.553	0.549	0.540
$10^7$	5000	0.565	0.562	0.586	0.582	0.569
$10^7$	10000	0.610	0.591	0.626	0.613	0.599
$10^8$	5000	0.529	0.527	0.539	0.532	0.529
$10^8$	10000	0.542	0.536	0.543	0.546	0.537
$10^8$	20000	0.551	0.547	0.560	0.558	0.548
$10^8$	50000	0.575	0.569	0.599	0.584	0.577
$10^8$	$10^5$	0.611	0.604	0.639	0.628	0.611

[1]: Uniform distribution in interval  $[0,1]$

[2]: Uniform distribution in interval  $[1,2]$

[3]: Exponential distribution

[4]: Normal distribution with  $\mu = \sigma^2$

[5]: Normal distribution with  $\mu = 2\sigma^2$