```
B1=6.2446
        g,(x) = mi+ms+ma+my-sh <0
1,
              > m,+m2+m4+m4 -250 = 0, = (-0.6915,-0.5051,-0.1267,-0.384,-0.3247)
    \underline{U}_{1}^{*} = (-4.3118, -3.040, -0.0911, -2.3804, -2.0211)^{T}
                                                                     Pfa = 2.1243 ×10-10
    K, = ( 62-7465, 62-7465, 85-3752, 62-7465, 62-7465)
                                                  B= 4.1523
      92(X)= m2+2m3+m4-52 50
                                                   Q= (-0.4090, -0.4640, -0.669, -0.3303, 0).
             > M1+2m3 +m4-30050
  X= (101-17221, 80,9974, 69,0026, 80,9714, 101-19221) T
        93 (X) = m, + 2m3 + 2m4+m5 - thety <=
              -> m,+2m3+2m4+mf-5to 50 (3=(-0.6093,-0.2603,-0.4503,-0.4464,-0.2012)
  U3" = (-2.0682, -0.8834, -1.86ng, -1.542, -0.1712) T.
  ≥3 = (39. blt1, 109. 9241, 88.6944, 88.6944, 89.6151) Pf, = 3.44+2×10-4.
Foilure of the frame can be described, letting E1: 9.(x) =0, E2: 92(x) =0,
   G: 93(×)≤0, E,UE,UE, (Stries System)
    : Pr = p ( 0 Ex) = p ( 0 9(x) =0) = p ( 0 pi- 2 u ≤0).
       = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \beta_{\lambda} \leq Z_{\lambda} \right) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} Z_{\lambda} \leq \beta_{\lambda} \right) \left( Z_{\lambda} = \lambda_{\lambda} \cup N(0, 4^{2}) \right)
  and Z = \begin{pmatrix} Z_1 \\ Z_2 \\ Z_3 \end{pmatrix} ~ N(0, R) and R = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_1 \cdot \hat{x}_3 \end{bmatrix}

R = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.7743 & 0.8674 \\ 0.7743 & 1 & 0.894 \\ 0.8694 & 0.0011 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
P_f = 1 - \underbrace{A_3} \left( \underbrace{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, R}_{1} \right)
    · Pf = 0.0003446 < 0.02644 (used muncaff.m) FORH approximation
   It is lower Probability derived is conditional probability of When h= to and v=60
     one given. But original pubability is just probability of system failure is FORH
    approximation. So design point by conditional probability is much for from
    origin comparing to design point by FORH approximation of Systan failure
     Therefore, Jiving much smaller value of probability
   This difference of design point is due to dimination of uncertainty in hand v.
```

FER HW#9.

```
(a) Haximum likelihood estimate of Hs Con be computed by
      Hs - argmax L(X) Hs) where x is observed dota.
     and L(x; Hs) & P(x 10) = P(x 1 μs) assumming each observations
     independent, L(xi fis) & P(xi fis) x P(Xi fis) x -- x P(Xr fis)
    getting logarithm doscut change their inequality relationship.
     : Us = argnax } log & ( X1-Hs ) +log & ( X+Hs ) +- +log & (X+Hs ) }
   : HS & 153.01
  (b) As RNH() and SNH() R-SNH(30-45, 1704-452)
          P(R-S <0) = P(Z < \frac{\mu_s-300}{\sum_2 + 44^2}) = P(\frac{\mu_s-300}{\sum_2 + 44^2})
      \beta = -\frac{\mu_{s-300}}{\sqrt{22\mu_{s}^{2}}} \quad \beta \left(\mu_{s}^{\text{NE}}\right) = 2.0108.
  (c) N=5, \bar{X}=153.0120 G^2=1960.5271 H_{\mu}^{\prime}=170, G_{\mu}^{\prime}=85^2
              \mu_{\mu}^{"} = 153.8865 \qquad \beta_{\mu}^{211} = 371.9210 \qquad \text{o.} \quad \beta_{\mu}^{"} = 19.2853.
                     (6 = (44.2978) = 1960. F291)
  (d) .. µs ~ N (1+3.8865, 19.28+3°)
       P_{f} = E_{\theta}[P_{f}(\theta)] = \int_{\mu_{s}}^{\infty} (\mu_{s}) \cdot f_{\mu_{s}}(\mu_{s}) d\mu_{s} = \int_{\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\mu_{s}} \left(\frac{\mu_{s-1}}{\mu_{s-1}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\mu_{s-1}}{\mu_{s}}\right) d\mu_{s}
    \hat{\beta} = \vec{p} \cdot (1 - \hat{p}_{f}) = 2.5447
(e) from postorior mean and standard deviation derlined at (0).
        ne am get \mu_{\beta} = \mu_{\lambda}^{Fo} = \beta(\mu_{o}) = \frac{\mu_{\mu} - 300}{\sqrt{2n^{2} + 4t^{2}}} = 2.7016
          OB = (Oa) Fo = Vo B (Ho). I OB POB (Ho) = (- Interes). Of (- Interes)
              = 0.1272
            2. B N (2.7016, D. 3H62)
        :. (B) noy. = 2.7016 1 1.04 × 0.3766 = [2,3308,3.0727]
           <β>95, = 27016 ± 1.96×0.3566 = [2.0029, 3.4005]
```

using β instead of $\mu_{\rm F}^{\rm FO}$, ne'll get $\langle \beta \rangle_{\rm No.Y.} = .[2.0138, 2.3155]$ $\langle \beta \rangle_{\rm Sty.} = [1.8458, 3.2436]$.