

CS365 Written Assignment 1

Khoa Cao

Due

Question 1

Proof. First, since we pick the largest number from the k numbers we sampled, if at least one of the k numbers is larger than the median, then the largest number we picked must be larger than the median.

Since we are sampling without replacement, the number of ways to sample k numbers from n numbers is:

$$|S| = \binom{n}{k}$$

The number of numbers, out of the n numbers, that are smaller than or equal to the median is:

$$|E| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$$

Note that if $k > \lceil n/2 \rceil$, then we are guaranteed to select a number larger than the median, since there are only $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ numbers that are smaller than or equal to the median.

Let E be the event that all k numbers we examined are smaller than or equal to the median of the n numbers. Then, the probability of us selecting a number larger than the median is:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(E^c) &= 1 - Pr(E) && \text{complement rule} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{|E|}{|S|} & \text{if } k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \\ 1 & \text{if } k > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \end{cases} && \text{definition of probability} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\binom{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} & \text{if } k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \\ 1 & \text{if } k > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \end{cases} && \text{substituting in } |E| \text{ and } |S| \end{aligned}$$

□

Problem 2

Proof. Let X be the RV representing the number of successes we get. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \sum_{i=1}^n X_i && \text{definition of } X \\ X &\sim \text{Binomial}(n, p) && \text{since each coin flip is i.i.d. Bernoulli trial} \end{aligned}$$

Examining \bar{X} , the average number of successes, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i && \text{definition of } \bar{X} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} X && \text{definition of } X \end{aligned}$$

Using the linearity of expectation, we can compute the expected value of \bar{X} :

$$\begin{aligned} E(\bar{X}) &= E\left(\frac{1}{n} X\right) && \text{definition of } \bar{X} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} E(X) && \text{linearity of expectation} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} (np) && X \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p) \\ &= p && \text{simplifying} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we can compute the variance of \bar{X} :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\bar{X}) &= \text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n} X\right) && \text{definition of } \bar{X} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^2 \text{Var}(X) && \text{property of variance} \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} (np(1-p)) && X \sim \text{Binomial}(n, p) \\ &= \frac{p(1-p)}{n} && \text{simplifying} \end{aligned}$$

Using Chebyshev's inequality, we can give an upper bound on how likely the value of \bar{X} differs from the bias of the coin p by at least $\frac{p}{10}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Pr(|\bar{X} - E(\bar{X})| \geq \frac{p}{10}) &\leq \frac{Var(\bar{X})}{(p/10)^2} && \text{Chebyshev's inequality} \\
 \Rightarrow Pr(|\bar{X} - p| \geq \frac{p}{10}) &\leq \frac{Var(\bar{X})}{(p/10)^2} && \text{substituting in } E(\bar{X}) \\
 &= \frac{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}{(p/10)^2} && \text{substituting in } Var(\bar{X}) \\
 &= \frac{100(1-p)}{np} && \text{simplifying}
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$Pr(|\bar{X} - p| \geq \frac{p}{10}) \leq \frac{100(1-p)}{np}$$

□

Problem 3

Claim. Let f and g be valid probability distributions defined over the same domain, S . Then, the convex combination of f and g

$$h := \lambda f + (1 - \lambda)g$$

for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is also a valid probability distribution.

Proof. To show that h is a valid probability distribution, we need to show that:

$$(i) \quad h(x) \geq 0 \forall x \in S$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{x \in S} h(x) = 1$$

Since the domains of f and g are the same, h is also defined over the same domain, S .

For (i), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)g(x) && \text{definition of } h \\ \sum_{x \in S} h(x) &= \sum_{x \in S} \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)g(x) && \text{applying summation} \\ &= \sum_{x \in S} \lambda f(x) + \sum_{x \in S} (1 - \lambda)g(x) && \text{linearity of summation} \\ &= \lambda \sum_{x \in S} f(x) + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{x \in S} g(x) && \text{linearity of summation} \\ &= \lambda(1) + (1 - \lambda)(1) && \text{since } f \text{ and } g \text{ are valid probability distributions} \\ &= \lambda + 1 - \lambda && \text{simplifying} \\ &= 1 && \text{simplifying} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, h satisfies (i).

For (ii), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda f(x) &\geq 0 && \text{since } \lambda \in [0, 1] \text{ and } f(x) \geq 0 \\ (1 - \lambda)g(x) &\geq 0 && \text{since } (1 - \lambda) \in [0, 1] \text{ and } g(x) \geq 0 \\ \Rightarrow h(x) &= \lambda f(x) + (1 - \lambda)g(x) \geq 0 + 0 && \text{adding the two inequalities} \\ &= 0 && \text{simplifying} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, h satisfies (ii).

Since h satisfies both (i) and (ii), h is a valid probability distribution. □

Problem 4

To find the MLE for p^* and μ^* , we will optimize the log-likelihood function:

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_{ij} \left(\log \pi_j + \log f(x_i; \vec{\theta}_j) \right)$$

$$s.t. \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j = 1$$

Using the Langrangian multiplier method, we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_{ij} \left(\log \pi_j + \log f(x_i; \vec{\theta}_j) \right) - \lambda \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j - 1 \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\theta}_w} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^k \gamma_{ij} \left(\log \pi_j + \log f(x_i; \vec{\theta}_j) \right) - \lambda \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j - 1 \right) \right] = 0 \quad \text{differentiating w.r.t. } \vec{\theta}_w$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial \vec{\theta}_w} \log (Pr[x_i | \theta_w]) \quad \text{derived in lecture}$$

For the Geometric distribution, we have:

$$Pr[x_i | p] = (1 - p)^{x_i - 1} p$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_w} \log (Pr[x_i | \theta_w]) && \text{above} \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \log ((1-p)^{x_i-1} p) && \text{substituting in } Pr[x_i | p] \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} ((x_i - 1) \log(1-p) + \log(p)) && \text{log property} \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \left(-(x_i - 1) \frac{1}{1-p} + \frac{1}{p} \right) && \text{differentiating} \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \left(\frac{(1-p) - (x_i - 1)p}{p(1-p)} \right) && \text{combining the two fractions} \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \left(\frac{1 - px_i}{p(1-p)} \right) && \text{simplifying} \\
& = \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (1 - px_i) && \text{factoring out } \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \\
& \frac{1}{p(1-p)} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (1 - px_i) = 0 && \text{setting equal to 0} \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (1 - px_i) = 0 && \text{multiplying both sides by } p(1-p) \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} - \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} px_i = 0 && \text{distributing the summation} \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} = p \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i && \text{moving the second term to the right side} \\
& \Rightarrow p^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i} && \text{dividing both sides by } \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i
\end{aligned}$$

For the Borel distribution, we have:

$$Pr[x_i | \mu] = \frac{e^{-\mu x_i} (\mu x_i)^{x_i-1}}{x_i!}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_w} \log (Pr[x_i|\theta_w]) && \text{above} \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \log \left(\frac{e^{-\mu x_i} (\mu x_i)^{x_i-1}}{x_i!} \right) && \text{substituting in } Pr[x_i|\mu] \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} (-\mu x_i + (x_i - 1) \log(\mu x_i) - \log(x_i!)) && \text{log property} \\
& = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \left(-x_i + (x_i - 1) \frac{1}{\mu} \right) && \text{differentiating} \\
& \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} \left(-x_i + (x_i - 1) \frac{1}{\mu} \right) && \text{setting equal to 0} \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (x_i - 1) \frac{1}{\mu} - \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i = 0 && \text{splitting the summation and rearranging} \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (x_i - 1) \frac{1}{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i && \text{moving the second term to the right side} \\
& \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\mu} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (x_i - 1)} && \text{dividing both sides by } \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (x_i - 1) \\
& \Rightarrow \mu^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (x_i - 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i} && \text{taking the reciprocal of both sides}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the MLEs are:

$$\begin{aligned}
p^* &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i} \\
\mu^* &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} (x_i - 1)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iw} x_i}
\end{aligned}$$

Problem 5

Proof. Let X be the RV representing the total number of successes we get after repeating the experiment n times. Since each coin flip is i.i.d., we have: $X \sim \text{Binomial}(N, p)$.

Here, $N = nm$, since we have n experiments, each with m coin flips. Let x_{ij} be the outcome of the j^{th} coin flip in the i^{th} experiment, then:

$$x_{ij} = \begin{cases} x_{ij} = 1 & \text{if the } j^{\text{th}} \text{ coin flip in the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ experiment is success} \\ x_{ij} = 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$x_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ each coin flip is i.i.d. Bernoulli trial

$$\Rightarrow X_i = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij} \quad \text{definition of } X_i$$

$$\Rightarrow X_i \sim \text{Binomial}(m, p) \quad \text{since each } x_{ij} \text{ is i.i.d. Bernoulli trial}$$

$$\Rightarrow X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \quad \text{definition of } X$$

$$\Rightarrow X = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij} \quad \text{substituting in } X_i$$

$$\Rightarrow X \sim \text{Binomial}(nm, p) \quad \text{since each } X_i \text{ is i.i.d. Binomial trial}$$

Let k be the total number of successes we observed:

$$k = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m x_{ij}$$

Then, we can use the likelihood function to derive the MLE for p :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(p) &= Pr[X = k|p] && \text{definition of likelihood function} \\
&= \binom{nm}{k} p^k (1-p)^{nm-k} && X \sim \text{Binomial}(nm, p) \\
\mathcal{LL}(p) &= \log \left(\binom{nm}{k} p^k (1-p)^{nm-k} \right) && \text{taking the log of the likelihood function} \\
&= \log \left(\binom{nm}{k} \right) + k \log(p) + (nm-k) \log(1-p) && \text{log property} \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial p} \mathcal{LL}(p) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \left[\log \left(\binom{nm}{k} \right) + k \log(p) + (nm-k) \log(1-p) \right] && \text{differentiating} \\
&= 0 + k \frac{1}{p} - (nm-k) \frac{1}{1-p} && \text{differentiating} \\
&= k \frac{1}{p} - (nm-k) \frac{1}{1-p} && \text{simplifying} \\
k \frac{1}{p} - (nm-k) \frac{1}{1-p} &= 0 && \text{setting equal to 0} \\
\Rightarrow \frac{k}{p} &= \frac{nm-k}{1-p} && \text{moving the second term to the right side} \\
\Rightarrow \frac{1-p}{p} &= \frac{nm-k}{k} && \text{cross-multiplying} \\
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{p} - 1 &= \frac{nm-k}{k} && \text{rewriting the left side} \\
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{p} &= \frac{nm-k}{k} + 1 && \text{adding 1 to both sides} \\
\Rightarrow \frac{1}{p} &= \frac{nm}{k} && \text{combining the right side} \\
\Rightarrow p^* &= \frac{k}{nm} && \text{taking the reciprocal of both sides}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the MLE for p is:

$$p^* = \frac{k}{nm}$$

where k is the total number of successes we observed after repeating the experiment n times, each with m coin flips. \square