

# DAI Assignment-2

Aditya Neeraje, Balaji Karedla, Moulik Jindal

September 8, 2024

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Mathemagic</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Task A . . . . .	1
1.2	Task B . . . . .	1
1.3	Task C . . . . .	1
1.4	Task D . . . . .	2
1.5	Task E . . . . .	3
1.6	Task F . . . . .	3
1.7	Task G . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Normal Sampling</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Task A . . . . .	5
2.2	Task B . . . . .	5
2.3	Task C . . . . .	6
2.4	Task D . . . . .	6
2.5	Task E . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Quality in Inequalities</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Task A . . . . .	9
3.2	Task B . . . . .	9
3.3	Task C . . . . .	10
3.4	Task D . . . . .	11
3.5	Task E . . . . .	13
<b>4</b>	<b>A Pretty “Normal” Mixture</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	Task A . . . . .	14
4.2	Task B . . . . .	15
4.2.1	Part 1 . . . . .	15
4.2.2	Part 2 . . . . .	15
4.2.3	Part 3 . . . . .	16
4.3	Task C . . . . .	16
4.3.1	Part 1 . . . . .	16
4.3.2	Part 2 . . . . .	16
4.3.3	Part 3 . . . . .	16

4.3.4	Part 4 . . . . .	16
4.3.5	Part 5 . . . . .	16
4.3.6	Part 6 . . . . .	17
4.4	Task D . . . . .	17

# 1 Mathemagic

## 1.1 Task A

For a Bernoulli random variable  $X \sim Ber(p)$ ,  $P[X = 0] = 1 - p$ ,  $P[X = 1] = p$  and  $P[X = n] = 0 \forall n \geq 2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} G_{Ber}(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P[X = n] z^n \\ &= P[X = 0] + P[X = 1]z \\ G_{Ber} &= (1 - p) + pz \end{aligned}$$

## 1.2 Task B

When  $X \sim Bin(n, p)$ ,  $P[X = k] = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1 - p)^{n-k} \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq k \leq n$ .  $P[X = k] = 0 \forall k > n$ .

$$\begin{aligned} G_{Bin}(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P[X = k] z^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} p^k (1 - p)^{n-k} z^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (pz)^k (1 - p)^{n-k} \\ &= (pz + (1 - p))^n \\ G_{Bin}(z) &= G_{Ber}(z)^n \end{aligned}$$

## 1.3 Task C

Let  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  be two random variables which take up non-negative integers and let  $X = X_1 + X_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
G_X(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P[X = n]z^n \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^n (P[X_1 = i]P[X_2 = n - i])z^n \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=i}^{\infty} (P[X_1 = i]P[X_2 = n - i])z^n \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=i}^{\infty} (P[X_1 = i]z^i)(P[X_2 = n - i]z^{n-i}) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P[X_1 = i]z^i \sum_{n=i}^{\infty} P[X_2 = n - i]z^{n-i} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P[X_1 = i]z^i \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P[X_2 = n]z^n \\
G_X(z) &= G_{X_1}(z)G_{X_2}(z)
\end{aligned}$$

For  $k = 1$ ,  $G_{\Sigma}(z) = G(z)^k$ .

If for  $k = n - 1$ ,  $G_{\Sigma}(z) = G(z)^k$ , then for  $k = n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\Sigma}(z) &= G_{X_1+X_2+\dots+X_{n-1}}(z)G_{X_n}(z) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n G_{X_i}(z)G_{\Sigma}(z) = G(z)^k
\end{aligned}$$

From the *Principle of Mathematical Induction*, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $G_{\Sigma}(z) = G(z)^k$

## 1.4 Task D

When  $X \sim \text{Geo}(p)$ ,  $P[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p$  and  $P[X = 0] = 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\text{Geo}}(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P[X = n]z^n \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - p)^{n-1}pz^n \\
&= pz \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((1 - p)z)^{n-1} \\
&= \frac{pz}{1 - (1 - p)z}
\end{aligned}$$

### 1.5 Task E

$X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$  and  $Y \sim \text{NegBin}(n, p)$ .  $Y = \sum_{k=1}^n Y_k$  where  $Y_k \sim \text{Geo}(p)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(Y) &= G(Y_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_n) \\
 &= G(Y_1)G(Y_2) \dots G(Y_n) \\
 &= \left( \frac{pz}{1 - (1-p)z} \right)^n \\
 G_Y^{(n,p)}(z) &= \left( \frac{pz}{1 - (1-p)z} \right)^n \\
 &= \left( \frac{1}{\frac{1}{pz} + (1 - \frac{1}{p})} \right)^n \\
 G_X^{(n,p^{-1})}(z^{-1}) &= \left( \frac{1}{pz} + (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \right)^n \\
 \implies G_Y^{(n,p)}(z) &= \left( G_X^{(n,p^{-1})}(z^{-1}) \right)^{-1}
 \end{aligned}$$

### 1.6 Task F

$$P[Y = k] = \binom{k-1}{n-1} p^n (1-p)^{k-n}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_Y^{(n,p)}(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P[Y = k] z^k \\
 &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{n-1} p^n (1-p)^{k-n} z^k \\
 \left( \frac{1}{pz} + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) \right)^{-n} &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{n-1} p^n (1-p)^{k-n} z^k
 \end{aligned}$$

Substitute  $x = z$ ,  $p = 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{-n} &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{n-1} 2^n (-1)^{k-n} x^k \\
x^n (1+x)^{-n} &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{n-1} (-1)^{k-n} x^k \\
(1+x)^{-n} &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{n-1} (-1)^{k-n} x^{k-n} \\
(1+x)^{-n} &= \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+r-1}{n-1} (-1)^r x^r \\
(1+x)^{-n} &= \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+r-1}{r} (-1)^r x^r
\end{aligned}$$

## 1.7 Task G

$$\begin{aligned}
G(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P[X = n] z^n \\
G'(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n P[X = n] z^{n-1} \\
G'(1) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n P[X = n] \\
G'(1) &= E[X]
\end{aligned}$$

For Bernoulli random variable  $X \sim \text{Ber}(p)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\text{Ber}}(z) &= (1-p) + pz \\
G'_{\text{Ber}}(z) &= p \\
G'_{\text{Ber}}(1) &= p \\
E[X] &= p
\end{aligned}$$

For Binomial random variable  $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\text{Bin}}(z) &= (pz + (1-p))^n \\
G'_{\text{Bin}}(z) &= np(pz + (1-p))^{n-1} \\
G'_{\text{Bin}}(1) &= np \\
E[X] &= np
\end{aligned}$$

For Geometric random variable  $X \sim Geo(p)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{Geo}(z) &= \frac{pz}{1 - (1-p)z} \\ G'_{Geo}(z) &= \frac{p}{(1 - (1-p)z)^2} \\ G'_{Geo}(1) &= \frac{p}{p^2} \\ E[X] &= \frac{1}{p} \end{aligned}$$

For Negative Binomial random variable  $X \sim NegBin(n, p)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{NegBin}(z) &= \left( \frac{pz}{1 - (1-p)z} \right)^n \\ G'_{NegBin}(z) &= n \left( \frac{pz}{1 - (1-p)z} \right)^{n-1} \frac{p}{(1 - (1-p)z)^2} \\ G'_{NegBin}(1) &= n \left( \frac{p}{p} \right)^{n-1} \frac{p}{p^2} \\ E[X] &= \frac{n}{p} \end{aligned}$$

## 2 Normal Sampling

### 2.1 Task A

To prove that  $Y$  is uniformly distributed in  $[0,1]$ , we need to prove that for an arbitrary interval  $[a,b]$  in  $[0, 1]$ ,  $Y$  lies in  $[a, b]$  with probability  $b - a$ .

The probability that  $a \leq Y \leq b$  is the probability that the randomly chosen  $X$  is such that  $a \leq F_X(x) \leq b$ . The cumulative probability of  $x$  being in the interval  $[a_0, b_0]$  such that  $F_X(a_0) = a$  and  $F_X(b_0) = b$  is  $b - a$ , since the cumulative probability that  $x \leq b_0$  is  $b$ , and the cumulative probability of  $x \leq a_0$  is  $a$ , hence probability that  $a_0 \leq x \leq b_0$  is  $b - a$ . Our condition that  $F_X()$  is invertible guarantees that the  $\leq$  can be replaced with  $<$ , since it cannot be that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow a_0^-} \neq \lim_{x \rightarrow a_0^+}$ , otherwise between  $a_0^-$  and  $a_0^+$ , all elements would be mapped to by  $a_0$ .

### 2.2 Task B

Given a sample  $y$ , let us return  $F_X^{-1}(y)$ . To prove that this has the same CDF as  $X$ , we need to prove that if  $F_X(a_0) = a$  and  $F_X(b_0) = b$ , the probability of getting  $a_0 \leq F_X^{-1}(y) \leq b_0$  is  $b - a$ .

But this is fairly straightforward, since  $a_0 \leq F_X^{-1}(y) \leq b_0 \iff a \leq y \leq b$ , and the probability of getting  $a \leq y \leq b$  is  $b - a$ .

Thus, this is the required function.

## 2.3 Task C

Code provided in 2c.ipynb.




Figure 1: Histogram of the samples generated

## 2.4 Task D

Code provided in 2d.ipynb.






Figure 2:  $h=10$




Figure 3:  $h=50$




Figure 4:  $h=100$

For  $h=100$  alone, for better visibility, I have also written code with bins set to increment every 2 pockets. To observe the property of only even indexed bins being filled, simply replace `range(-100, 102, 2)` with `range(-100, 102, 1)`.

## 2.5 Task E

$$P_h[X = 2i] = \frac{\binom{2k}{i+k}}{2^{2k}}$$

Since the likelihood of a ball arriving at pocket  $i$  is equal to the likelihood of having  $i+k$  collisions which move it to the right within the  $2k$  possible collisions overall.

Applying Stirling's approximations,

$$\begin{aligned} P_h[X = 2j] &\approx \frac{k^{2k} \sqrt{4\pi k}}{(k+j)^{k+j} \sqrt{2\pi(k+j)} (k-j)^{k-j} \sqrt{2\pi(k-j)}} \\ &\approx \frac{k^{2k} \sqrt{2k} (k-j)^j}{(k^2 - j^2)^k \sqrt{2\pi(k^2 - j^2)} (k+j)^j} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi k}} \frac{k^{2k} (k-j)^j}{(k^2)^k (k+j)^j} && \text{(By approximating } k^2 - j^2 \approx j^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi k}} \left(1 - \frac{2j}{k+j}\right)^j \end{aligned}$$

Now, we independently approximate  $\left(1 - \frac{2j}{k+j}\right)^j$  by taking its logarithm and using the property that for small  $x$ ,  $\ln(1-x) \approx -x$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left( \left(1 - \frac{2j}{k+j}\right)^j \right) &= j \ln \left(1 - \frac{2j}{k+j}\right) \\ &\approx -\frac{2j^2}{k+j} \\ \left(1 - \frac{2j}{k+j}\right)^j &\approx e^{-\frac{2j^2}{k}} \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $i = 2j$  as required, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P_h[X = i] &\approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi k}} e^{-\frac{i^2}{2k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi k}} e^{-\frac{i^2}{h}} \end{aligned}$$

As required.

### 3 Quality in Inequalities

#### 3.1 Task A

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X] &= \int_0^\infty X P(X) dX \\
&= \int_0^a X P(X) dX + \int_a^\infty X P(X) dX \\
&\geq \int_0^a X P(X) dX + \int_a^\infty a P(X) dX \\
&\geq \int_0^a X P(X) dX + a P[X \geq a] \\
&\geq a P[X \geq a]
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used the fact that  $\int_0^a X P(X) dX$  is  $\geq 0$  since  $X \geq 0$  and  $P(X) \geq 0$  everywhere in that interval.

From the above result, we get

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{a} \geq P[X \geq a]$$

Intuitively, this corresponds to saying that if there is a high probability that  $X \geq a$ , then we can also expect that a random sample will give us a value greater than  $a$ .

#### 3.2 Task B

First, we will prove a result which is useful later

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(X - \mathbb{E}[X] + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2\right] = \text{Var}(X - \mathbb{E}[X] + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}) + \left(E[X - \mathbb{E}[X] + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}]\right)^2$$

Now, since the variance of a distribution does not change on adding a constant to the distribution, and since the expectation value of the sum of terms is the sum of expectations of the terms, we get that this is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(X - \mathbb{E}[X] + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2\right] = \sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2$$

Now, we notice that whenever  $X - \mu \geq \tau$ , it also holds that  $\left(X - \mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2 \geq \left(\tau + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2$ . Since we are assuming that  $x - \mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau} \geq \tau + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau} \geq 0$ , this result is proven by the fact that  $x^2$  is an increasing function over the non-negative reals.

Thus,  $P[X - \mu \geq \tau] \leq P\left[\left(X - \mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2 \geq \left(\tau + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2\right]$ .

Using Markov's inequality on the above result, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P[X - \mu \geq \tau] &\leq P\left[\left(X - \mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2 \leq \left(\tau + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2\right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2}{\left(\tau + \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau}\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma^2 + \tau^2} \end{aligned}$$

Thus proving our desired result.

### 3.3 Task C

$$P[X \geq x] = \int_x^\infty P(X) dX$$

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-tx} E[e^{tx}] &= e^{-tx} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{tX} P(X) dX \\ &= e^{-tx} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{tX} P(X) dX + e^{-tx} \int_x^\infty e^{tX} P(X) dX \\ &\geq e^{-tx} \int_x^\infty e^{tX} P(X) dX && \text{(since both } P(X) \text{ and } e^{tX} \text{ are positive for all } X) \\ &\geq e^{-tx} e^{tx} \int_x^\infty P(X) dX && \text{(since } e^{tX} \text{ is increasing if } t \geq 0) \\ &= e^{-tx} e^{tx} P[X \geq x] \\ &= P[X \geq x] \end{aligned}$$

This proves that

$$P[X \geq x] \leq e^{-tx} E[e^{tx}] \tag{1}$$

Similarly,

$$P[X \leq x] = \int_{-\infty}^x P(X) dX$$

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-tx} E[e^{tx}] &= e^{-tx} \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{tX} P(X) dX \\ &= e^{-tx} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{tX} P(X) dX + e^{-tx} \int_x^\infty e^{tX} P(X) dX \\ &\geq e^{-tx} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{tX} P(X) dX && \text{(since both } P(X) \text{ and } e^{tX} \text{ are positive for all } X) \\ &\geq e^{-tx} \cdot e^{tx} \cdot \int_{-\infty}^x P(X) dX && \text{(since } e^{tx} \leq e^{tx'} \text{ where } x \geq x' \text{ when } t \text{ is negative)} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^x P(X) dX \\ &= P[X \leq x] \end{aligned}$$

as required.

### 3.4 Task D

1. We know, by the linearity of expectation, that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$$

2. For this question, we make use of the first result proved in Task C above.

$$\begin{aligned} P[Y \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{tY}]}{e^{(1+\delta)\mu t}} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{(t \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)}]}{e^{(1+\delta)\mu t}} \end{aligned}$$

We will now prove that for independent random variables,  $\mathbb{E}[e^{(t \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)}] = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{tX_i}]$ . To prove that, we prove the simpler result that for independent variables,  $\mathbb{E}[XY] = \mathbb{E}[X]\mathbb{E}[Y]$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[XY] &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (xy) p_{X,Y}(x, y) dy dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (xy) p_X(x) p_Y(y) dy dx && \text{(For independent RVs, } p(xy)=p(x)p(y)) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x p_X(x) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y p_Y(y) dy dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x p_X(x) dx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y p_Y(y) dy \\ &= \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[Y] \end{aligned}$$

Since above, all  $X_i$ 's are independent, so are  $e^{tX_i}$  for all  $i$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} E[e^{(t \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)}] &= \mathbb{E}[e^{tX_1}] E[e^{(t \sum_{i=2}^n X_i)}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[e^{tX_1}] \mathbb{E}[e^{tX_2}] \mathbb{E}[e^{(t \sum_{i=3}^n X_i)}] \\ &\dots \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{tX_i}] \end{aligned}$$

For each Bernoulli random variable  $X_i$ , it is easily observed that  $E[e^{tX_i}] = 1 + (e^t - 1)p_i$ . Using this result,

$$E[e^{(t \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)}] = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + (e^t - 1)p_i)$$

We will now prove  $\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + x_i) \leq e^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}$  for positive  $x_i$ 's.

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left( \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + x_i) \right) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \ln(1 + x_i) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \quad (\text{Well known result that } \ln(1 + x) \leq x) \\ &= \ln \left( e^{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since our initial assumption in using 1 required  $t > 0$  and hence  $e^t > 1$ , all  $(e^t - 1)p_i$  values are positive and we can use the above result. Hence,  $\mathbb{E}[e^{tY}] \leq e^{\mu(e^t - 1)}$ . Plugging this into ??, we get

$$P[Y \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq \frac{e^{\mu(e^t - 1)}}{e^{(1 + \delta)t\mu}}$$

as required.

3. Since this holds for arbitrary positive  $t$ , we can find the  $t$  for which the value of  $e^{\mu(e^t - 1 - (1 + \delta)t)}$  is minimum. By differentiation, we observe the minima of the function is when  $t = \ln(1 + \delta)$ . At the minima, we have

$$e^t - 1 - (1 + \delta)t = \delta - (1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta)$$

Using the expansion  $\ln(1 + \delta) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^i (-1)^{i-1}}{i}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta - (1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta) &= \delta + (1 + \delta) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^i (-1)^i}{i} \right) \\ &= \delta + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^i (-1)^i}{i} + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^i (-1)^{i-1}}{i-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\delta^i (-1)^{i-1}}{i(i-1)} \end{aligned}$$

This is approximately  $-\frac{\delta^2}{2} + \frac{\delta^3}{6}$  for small delta. Thus we get a good upper bound of  $e^{-\frac{\mu\delta^2(3-\delta)}{6}}$  for  $P[Y \geq (1 + \delta)\mu]$ .

If  $\delta > 0$ , this can be simplified further, in a way that is more useful for us in question 5. Observe that for  $x > 0$

$$\ln(1 + x) \geq \frac{2x}{2 + x}$$

This can be seen by observing that at  $x=0$ ,  $\ln(1 + x) - \frac{2x}{2+x}$  evaluates to 0 and that its derivative,  $\frac{4}{(1+x)(2+x)^2}$  is always non-negative.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\delta - (1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta)) &\leq \mu(\delta - \frac{2\delta(1 + \delta)}{2 + \delta}) \\ &= \frac{-\mu\delta^2}{2 + \delta}\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get,

$$P[Y \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq e^{\frac{-\mu\delta^2}{2 + \delta}} \quad (2)$$

For the last few steps of simplification, <https://math.mit.edu/~goemans/18310S15/bernoff-notes.pdf> was used as a guide.

### 3.5 Task E

First, let us consider the corner cases where  $\mu = 0$  or  $\mu = 1$ . In these cases,  $A_n = 0$  or  $A_n = 1$  always, and the result is trivial.

Now we can consider  $0 < \mu < 1$ .

Consider the random variable  $B_n = nA_n$ .

We need to prove  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P[|B_n - n\mu| > n\epsilon] = 0$ .

Note that we are done if we prove  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P[B_n - n\mu \geq n\epsilon] = 0$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P[n\mu - B_n \geq n\epsilon] = 0$ .

We will prove the first part first, assuming  $\mu$  is not 0.

$$P[B_n \geq n\epsilon + n\mu] \leq e^{-\frac{n\epsilon^2}{2\mu + \epsilon}}$$

For a positive  $\mu$  (since the distribution is the sum of Bernoulli RVs) and  $\epsilon$  (given),  $\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\mu + \epsilon}$  is a positive coefficient.  $e^{-n}$  tends to 0 as  $n$  tends to  $\infty$ , which we will use henceforth.

Note that the result that  $P[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq e^{\frac{-\mu\delta^2}{2 + \delta}}$  was not proven without referring to the internet, so I will prove the claim above using an alternative method which assumes only what has been proven by me.

$$P[X \geq (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq e^{\mu(\delta - (1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta))}$$

We want to prove that  $f(\delta) = \delta - (1 + \delta) \ln(1 + \delta)$  is strictly negative if  $\delta$  is positive. For that, notice that  $f(0) = 0$  and  $f'(\delta) = -\ln(1 + \delta)$ , which is non-positive for all non-negative  $\delta$ . Thus,  $f(\delta)$  is strictly negative for all positive  $\delta$ .

This again means that  $P[B_n \geq n\epsilon + n\mu] \leq e^{-nk}$  for some positive coefficient  $k$ . Thus,  $P[B_n \geq n\epsilon + n\mu]$  tends to 0 as  $n$  tends to  $\infty$ .

Similarly,  $P[B_n \leq n\mu - n\epsilon]$  also tends to 0 as  $n$  tends to  $\infty$ .

We can prove this by considering the RV  $1 - A_n$  instead of  $A_n$  and using the same logic as above.  $P[n - B_n - n - n\mu \geq n\delta] = P[n\mu - nB_n \geq n\delta] \leq e^{-nk}$  for some positive coefficient  $k$ .

Now, combining the two results,

$$\begin{aligned} P[|B_n - n\mu| > n\epsilon] &\leq P[B_n - n\mu \geq n\epsilon] + P[n\mu - B_n \geq n\epsilon] \\ &\leq e^{-nk} + e^{-nk'} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{for some positive coefficients } k \text{ and } k')$$

If we get any positive value  $\sigma$  for the value of  $P[|B_n - n\mu| > n\epsilon]$ , simply set  $n > \max(\frac{\ln(\frac{2}{\sigma})}{k}, \frac{\ln(\frac{2}{\sigma})}{k'})$  and we have

$$\begin{aligned} P[|B_n - n\mu| > n\epsilon] &\leq e^{-nk} + e^{-nk'} \\ &< \frac{\sigma}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2} \\ &= \sigma \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Thus, we have proven that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P[|B_n - n\mu| > n\epsilon] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P[|A_n - \mu| > \epsilon] = 0$ .

## 4 A Pretty “Normal” Mixture

### 4.1 Task A

Let  $A_i$  be the event in which you choose  $i$  in the first step of the algorithm. Then the set of all the  $A_i$ s is a valid partition, since they are completely disjoint and their union represents all the possibilities.

Hence we can use the *law of Total Probability* to get,

$$\begin{aligned} P[\mathcal{A} = x] &= \sum_{i=1}^K P[A_i] \cdot P[X_i = x] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \cdot P[X_i = x] \\ &= P[X = x] \\ \implies f_{\mathcal{A}}(x) &= f_X(x) \end{aligned}$$



## 4.2 Task B

### 4.2.1 Part 1

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X] &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( x \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \cdot P[X_i = x] \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K \left( p_i \cdot \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} x \cdot P[X_i = x] \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_i]) = \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \cdot \mu_i)\end{aligned}$$

### 4.2.2 Part 2

- Calculating  $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X^2] &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( x^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \cdot P[X_i = x] \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K \left( p_i \cdot \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} x^2 \cdot P[X_i = x] \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_i^2]) = \sum_{i=1}^K \left( p_i \cdot \left( \text{Var}(X_i) + (\mathbb{E}[X_i])^2 \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \cdot (\sigma_i^2 + \mu_i^2))\end{aligned}$$

- Calculating  $(\mathbb{E}[X])^2$

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbb{E}[X])^2 &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_i] \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_i])^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} (p_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_i] \cdot p_j \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_j]) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \mu_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} (p_i \mu_i p_j \mu_j)\end{aligned}$$

- Calculating  $\text{Var}[X]$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Var}[X] &= (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 - \mathbb{E}[X^2] \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \mu_i)^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq K} (p_i \mu_i p_j \mu_j) \right) - \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \cdot (\sigma_i^2 + \mu_i^2))\end{aligned}$$

### 4.2.3 Part 3

$$\begin{aligned} M_X(t) &= G(e^t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{xt} P[X = x] dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{xt} \sum_{i=1}^K p_i P[X_i = x] dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^K e^{xt} p_i P[X_i = x] dx = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{xt} P[X_i = x] dx \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K p_i M_{X_i} = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i e^{\mu_i t + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_i^2 t^2} \end{aligned}$$

## 4.3 Task C

### 4.3.1 Part 1

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^K p_i X_i \right] = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \sum_{i=1}^K (p_i \mu_i)$$

### 4.3.2 Part 2

$$Var(Z) = Var \left( \sum_{i=1}^K p_i X_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^K Var(p_i X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i^2 Var(X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^K p_i^2 \sigma_i^2$$

### 4.3.3 Part 3

Since we already calculated  $\mu_Z$  and  $\sigma_Z = \sqrt{Var(Z)}$  We can just use the expression for Gaussian Random Variable (See Part 6 for the proof that Z is a Gaussian random variable)

$$f_Z(u) = \frac{1}{\sigma_Z \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(u - \mu_Z)^2}{2\sigma_Z^2}}$$

### 4.3.4 Part 4

Using the expression for Moment generating function of a Gaussian Random Variable (See Part 6 for the proof that Z is a gaussian random variable)

$$M_Z(t) = e^{\mu_Z t + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_Z^2 t^2}$$

### 4.3.5 Part 5

No, It can be seen that even though the expected value is the same in both the case, The values of both variance and MGF are different for both X and Z hence these are different random variables

#### 4.3.6 Part 6

We can show that linear combination of independent random variables is also a random variable. For any random Gaussian variable  $X$  is given by  $M_X(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] = e^{\mu t + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t^2}$ . Let  $Y = \sum_{i=1}^K a_i X_i$  where each  $X_i$  is an independent Gaussian random variable. Then

$$\begin{aligned} M_Y(t) &= \mathbb{E}[e^{tY}] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{t \sum_{i=1}^K a_i X_i}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^K e^{ta_i X_i}\right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^K \mathbb{E}[e^{ta_i X_i}] \quad , \text{Since all the } X_i \text{ are mutually independent} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^K M_{a_i X_i}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^K \left(e^{a_i \mu_i t + \frac{1}{2}(a_i \sigma_i)^2 t^2}\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^K (a_i \mu_i) t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K ((a_i \sigma_i)^2) t^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

If we define  $\mu_y = \sum_{i=1}^K (a_i \mu_i)$  and  $\sigma_y^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K ((a_i \sigma_i)^2)$  Then we get

$$M_y(t) = e^{\mu_y t + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_y^2 t^2} \quad (3)$$

This is just the Moment generating function of a Gaussian random variable, Hence  $Y$  is a Gaussian random variable. Hence  $Z$  is also a Gaussian random variable.

#### 4.4 Task D

To prove that a PDF uniquely determines the MGF, we simply use the construction of the MGF. The MGF is defined as

$$M_X(t) = \mathbb{E}[e^{tX}] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{tx} p_X(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{tx_i} p(x_i)$$

where the support of the PDF is  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ .

To prove the other direction, let us assume that we can find two distinct solutions  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  and  $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$  from an arbitrary MGF which we know is of a finite discrete PDF. Then, by the above result, we know that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n e^{tx_i} p(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m e^{ty_j} p(y_j)$$

If any of the  $x_i$ 's are not equal to any of the  $y_j$ 's, and given that all  $p(x_i)$ 's and  $p(y_j)$ 's are non-zero, then we can rearrange the terms to get that for some  $a_i$ 's

$$e^{a_0 t} b_0 = \sum_{i=1}^k e^{a_i t} b_i$$

for some non-zero coefficients  $b_0$  and for some  $k$ , and all  $a_i$ 's being distinct. Now, note that the LHS has an annihilating polynomial  $D - a_0$ , where  $D$  is the derivative operator w.r.t  $t$ . The RHS

has an annihilating polynomial  $(D - a_1) \cdots (D - a_k)$ . Since the LHS equals the RHS, if an operator makes the LHS 0, it also makes the RHS zero. Thus, the LHS  $(e^{a_0 t} b_0)$  is also annihilated by the annihilator of the RHS.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (D - a_1) \cdots (D - a_k)(e^{a_0 t} b_0) = 0 \\
\implies & (D - a_1) \cdots (D - a_{k-1})(a_0 - a_k)e^{a_0 t} b_0 = 0 \\
\implies & (D - a_1) \cdots (D - a_{k-2})(a_0 - a_{k-1})(a_0 - a_k)e^{a_0 t} b_0 = 0 \\
& \quad \quad \quad \dots \\
\implies & (a_0 - a_1) \cdots (a_0 - a_k)e^{a_0 t} b_0 = 0
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $e_{a_0 t}$  is never 0, and we know  $b_0 \neq 0$ ,  $(a_0 - a_1) \cdots (a_0 - a_k) = 0$ . But this is only possible if  $a_0 = a_i$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . But that contradicts our assumption that the  $a_i$ 's are distinct.