

## Problem Set #1

Math, Dr. Karl Schmedders

Bryan Chia

### Problem 1 - 3.6

*Proof.* Since  $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset \forall i, j \in I$ , it is trivial to show that  $(A \cap B_i) \cap (A \cap B_j) = \emptyset \forall i, j \in I$ , each of the sets are disjoint. Thus, we can use the third axiom of the discrete probability measure which gives us the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i P(A \cap B_i) &= P\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} (A \cap B_i)\right) \\ &= P[(A \cap B_1) \cup (A \cap B_2) \cup (A \cap B_3) \cup \dots] \\ &= P[(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2)) \cup (A \cap B_3) \cup \dots] \\ &= P[(A \cap (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3)) \cup \dots] \\ &= P[A \cap \Omega] \\ &= P(A)\end{aligned}$$

□

### Problem 1 - 3.8

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}1 - \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - P(E_k)) &= (1 - P(E_1))(1 - P(E_2))(1 - P(E_3)) \dots (1 - P(E_n)) \\ &= 1 - [(1 - P(E_1) - P(E_2) + P(E_1)P(E_2))(1 - P(E_3)) \dots (1 - P(E_n))] \\ &= 1 - [(1 - P(E_1) - P(E_2) + P(E_1 \cap E_2))(1 - P(E_3)) \dots (1 - P(E_n))] \\ &= 1 - [(1 - P(E_1 \cup E_2))(1 - P(E_3)) \dots (1 - P(E_n))] \\ &= 1 - [(1 - P(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup \dots \cup E_n))] \\ &= P(E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3 \cup \dots \cup E_n) \\ &= P\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^n (E_k)\right)\end{aligned}$$

□

### Problem 1 - 3.11

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(s = \text{crime} | \text{testedt}) &= \frac{P(s = \text{crime} \cap \text{testedt})}{P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{crime})P(s = \text{crime}) + P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{inn.})P(s = \text{inn.})} \\
 &= \frac{P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{crime})P(s = \text{crime})}{P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{crime})P(s = \text{crime}) + P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{inn.})P(s = \text{inn.})} \\
 &= \frac{P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{crime})P(s = \text{crime})}{P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{crime})P(s = \text{crime}) + P(\text{testedt} | s = \text{inn.})(1 - P(s = \text{crime}))} \\
 &= \frac{1 * \frac{1}{250\text{mil}}}{1 * \frac{1}{250\text{mil}} + \frac{1}{3\text{mil}} * (1 - \frac{1}{250\text{mil}})} \\
 &= 0.0118577
 \end{aligned}$$

### Problem 1 - 3.12

*Proof.* Let:

$A_1$ : Car is behind door 1

$A_2$ : Car is behind door 2

$A_3$ : Car is behind door 3

B: Monty opens door 2

Suppose the player chooses door 1 initially, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(A_1 | B) &= \frac{P(B | A_1) * P(A_1)}{P(B)} \\
 &= \frac{\frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{3}}{\frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{3} + 0 * \frac{1}{3} + 1 * \frac{1}{3}} \\
 &= \frac{1}{3} \\
 P(A_2 | B) &= 0 \\
 P(A_3 | B) &= \frac{2}{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Thus, his odds are better if he switches doors. For 10 doors, the odds are  $\frac{1}{10}$  if he doesn't switch doors and  $\frac{9}{10}$  if he switches doors. As the probability that he chose the right door the first time doesn't change.

**Problem 1 - 3.16***Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
Var[X] &= E[(X - \mu)^2] \\
&= E[X^2 - 2\mu X + \mu^2] \\
&= E[X^2] - 2\mu E[X] + E[\mu^2] \text{ by 3.3.12} \\
&= E[X^2] - 2E[X]^2 + \mu^2 \\
&= E[X^2] - \mu^2
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Problem 1 - 3.33***Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
Var\left[\frac{B}{n}\right] &= \frac{1}{n^2} Var(B) \\
&= \frac{p(1-p)}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

By Chebyshev's Inequality,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{B}{n} - p\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

□

**Problem 1 - 3.36**

$Var[X] = (0.801)(0.199)$  due to properties of the Bernoulli distribution. Thus, calculating the Z score, we get  $\frac{5500 - 5000}{\sqrt{6242 * 0.801 * 0.199}} = 15.85$  which gives us a probability of 0%

### Problem 2

(a) Let  $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$

Let  $A = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

Let  $B = \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$

Let  $C = \{3, 4, 7, 8\}$

(b) Let  $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$

Let  $A = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

Let  $B = \{1, 2, 5, 6\}$

Let  $C = \{1, 3, 7, 8\}$

### Problem 3

*Proof.* Let  $d_1 = d_2$ . We want to show that  $P(d_1) = P(d_2)$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{d_1} &= \frac{1}{d_2} \\ 1 + \frac{1}{d_1} &= 1 + \frac{1}{d_2} \\ \log_{10}\left(1 + \frac{1}{d_1}\right) &= \log_{10}\left(1 + \frac{1}{d_2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

The last line is true given that  $\log_{10}$  is a 1-1 function and well-defined on  $1 + \frac{1}{d}$  as long as  $d$  is discrete and within the specified range of numbers 1 to 9.  $\square$

*Proof.* We want to show that the probabilities of all possible events add up to 1.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d=1}^9 \log_{10}\left(1 + \frac{1}{d}\right) &= \log_{10}(2) + \log_{10}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) + \log_{10}\left(\frac{4}{3}\right) + \dots + \log_{10}\left(\frac{10}{9}\right) \\ &= \log_{10}\left(2 * \frac{3}{2} * \frac{4}{3} * \dots * \frac{10}{9}\right) \\ &= \log_{10}(10) \\ &= 1\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### Problem 4

(a)

$$\begin{aligned}E[X] &= \frac{1}{2} * 2 + \frac{1}{2^2} * 2^2 + \dots \\ &= 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots \\ &= \infty\end{aligned}$$

(b)

$$\begin{aligned} E[\ln X] &= \frac{1}{2} * \ln 2 + \frac{1}{2^2} * \ln 2^2 + \dots \\ &= 1.38629 \end{aligned}$$

### Problem 5

For the US investor:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\frac{USD}{CHF}\right] &= 0.5 * \frac{5}{4} + 0.5 * \frac{4}{5} \\ &= 1.025 \end{aligned}$$

For the Swiss investor:

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\frac{CHF}{USD}\right] &= 0.5 * \frac{5}{4} + 0.5 * \frac{4}{5} \\ &= 1.025 \end{aligned}$$

Since both expect their currency to be stronger than the other country's, both would invest in the other country right now.

### Problem 6

(a) A pareto distribution of the following specification:

$$P(X > x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(x+1)^2}, & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- (b) The pdf of X takes the form  $f(x) = 2x$ , while Y is a uniformly distributed variable with the following specifications:  $Y = U[0.685, 0.695]$
- (c) We can use three uniformly distributed variables, with the pdfs of Z nested in Y, which is nested in X. For example,  $X = U[-3, 3]$ ,  $Y = U[-2, 2]$ ,  $Z = U[-1, 1]$ .

**Problem 7**

(a) True.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
pdf(Y) &= 0.5 * \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} + 0.5 * \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(-x)^2}{2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} \\
&= pdf(X)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Y is also normally distributed with a mean of 0 and variance 1. □

(b) True. The proof follows from above.

(c) True. Since  $P(Y \geq c|X = x) = P(Y \geq c)$  as Y does not depend on X, they are independent.

(d) True.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
Cov[X, Y] &= E[XY] - E[X]E[Y] \\
&= E[XXZ] - 0 \\
&= E[Z]E[XX] \text{ since Z and X are independent} \\
&= 0 \text{ since the mean of Z is 0}
\end{aligned}$$

□

(e) False from this problem.

**Problem 8**

Looking at the random variable M, we know that the cdf  $F(x) = P(M \leq x)$  is simply equal to  $x$  by the property of the uniform distribution. Since each distribution is i.i.d., the probability that M remains above  $x$  for every draw is equal to  $x^n$ . Thus,  $F(x) = x^n$ . To find the pdf, we differentiate to get  $f(x) = nx^{n-1}$ . The calculated expected value using integration is  $\frac{n}{n+1}$ .

Looking at the random variable m, we know that the cdf of m,  $F(x) = P(m < x) = 1 - P(m > x) = 1 - (1 - P(X_i > x))^n$ , which gives us  $F(x) = 1 - (1 - x)^n$ . Differentiating the cdf to get the pdf gives us  $f(x) = n(1 - x)^{n-1}$ . Calculating the expected value, we get  $\frac{n}{n+1} - 1$

**Problem 9**

(a)

$$\frac{510 - 500}{\sqrt{1000/4}} = 0.63246$$

$$\frac{490 - 500}{\sqrt{1000/4}} = -0.63246$$

Using a normal distribution table, we get 0.4729. Thus, 47.29% is the probability that the good states differ from 500 by at most 2%.

(b) Using the Weak Law of Large Numbers,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n}{n} - 0.5\right| \geq 0.5 * 0.01\right) \leq \frac{0.5^2}{n(0.005)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{0.25}{0.01 * 0.005^2}$$

$$= 1,000,000$$

**Problem 10**

*Proof.* Since  $e^{\theta x}$  is always convex, by the Jensen's inequality,

$$E[e^{\theta x}] - e^{\theta E[x]} \geq 0$$

$$1 - e^{\theta E[x]} \geq 0$$

$$1 \geq e^{\theta E[x]}$$

$$\ln(1) = 0 \geq \theta E[x]$$

Since  $E[x] < 0$ , it implies that  $\theta > 0$  as  $\theta \neq 0$

□