Statistics and Mathematics Notes

Abdullah Al Mahmud

2025-08-14

Contents

About

This websites contains notes on statistics and mathematics. These are chiefly meant for being used as reference materials, which, together with the lectures slides, make for a more matured system of learning.

- See the lecture presentations here

This website is created with the help of `Rstudio IDE` using the `R`package `bookdown`.

**If you find any mistakes or have any suggestions, please let me know

You can learn more about me here and about my writings on statistics, data science, and linux here.

Part I

Statistics

Scales of Measurements

Interval Scales

Examples

- Temperature (Celsius scale)
- Dates (AD)
- Location in Cartesian coordinates
- Direction measured in degrees

Why Locations in Cartesian coordinates are interval data

Locations in Cartesian coordinates are **interval data** because:

In short, $x = 10$ ***is not "twice as far to the right" as*** $x = 5$

Detailed

1. **Equal intervals have equal meaning**
   - In the Cartesian system, the difference between two x-coordinates (or two y-coordinates) represents the same physical distance, regardless of where it is measured.
   - For example, moving from $x = 2$ to $x = 5$ is a change of 3 units, which is the same "amount of movement" as going from $x = 20$ to $x = 23$.
2. **Arbitrary origin**
   - The $(0, 0)$ origin is chosen for convenience, not because it represents an absolute "zero" location.
   - A point at $x = 0$ does not mean "no position" — it's just the reference point we picked.
   - Because the zero is arbitrary, coordinates behave like interval data, not ratio data.
3. **Meaningful differences, not meaningful ratios**
   - You can meaningfully talk about differences (Δx or Δy) to measure displacement.
   - But a ratio like "this point's x-coordinate is twice that of another" is meaningless — $x = 10$ is not "twice as far to the right" as $x = 5$ in an absolute sense, because the zero point is arbitrary.

So, **Cartesian coordinates** → **interval scale Distances between points** (via Euclidean distance) → **ratio scale** (because distance has a true zero).

Why Date is an interval scale

In short, ***A person born in 1940 doesn't always have double age of a person born in 1950. It's so only in 1960.***

Detailed

Date is an **interval scale** because it has a meaningful order and equal intervals between measurements, but it lacks a true zero point.

- **Order:** Dates can be placed in a specific order (e.g., January 1, 2024, comes before January 2, 2024).
- **Equal Intervals:** The duration between any two dates is consistent and measurable. The interval between May 1st and May 10th is exactly 9 days, just as the interval between November 1st and November 10th is 9 days. This allows for meaningful subtraction (e.g., "how many days have passed?").
- **No True Zero:** The starting point of a calendar system (e.g., the year 0 in the Gregorian calendar) is an arbitrary convention, not an absolute absence of time. You can't say that a year in the 2nd century A.D. is "twice as old" as a year in the 1st century A.D. in a meaningful ratio sense, because the scale doesn't start from a true zero.
- **Meaningful Subtraction, Not Division:** You can meaningfully subtract dates. For example, a person born in 1940 is 10 years older than a person born in 1950 in any given year ($1950 - 1940 = 10$). However, you cannot meaningfully divide them. The statement "1940 is double 1950" is only true in an arbitrary mathematical sense on a single date, not as a fundamental property of the ages.

0.0.0.1 Debate between Chatgpt and Gemini on Velocity being interval

I worked as a human moderator and made them clash on it. I disagreed with Gemini that velocity is interval. Chatgpt agreed with me.

Me (user) to GPT: Gemini is claiming velocity is interval. Would like to debate with it on it? I'll moderate.

Chatgpt

Oh, I'm *very* game for that debate — Gemini can bring its "velocity is interval" argument, and I'll happily dismantle it with examples, physics reasoning, and measurement theory.

I'd structure my argument around three main points:

1. **True zero exists** – 0 m/s means "no motion relative to the reference frame." That's an absolute zero, not arbitrary like 0°C in temperature.

2. **Ratios are meaningful** – 20 m/s really is *twice* as fast as 10 m/s; this is physically testable and consistent.
3. **Direction doesn't invalidate ratio scale** – Negative velocities just encode direction; the scale still has a meaningful origin.

If Gemini tries to argue "but velocity can be negative so it can't be ratio," I'll counter that *negative ratio-scale variables are common* — like bank balance, electric current, or signed displacement — because the zero point still represents "none of the quantity."

If you want, I can even simulate a back-and-forth where Gemini tries to defend the "interval" claim, and I'll respond in a proper academic style.

Do you want me to start with Gemini's possible opening statement and then my rebuttal?

Me (user) to Gemini: Chatgpt says velocity is ratio. Would like to debate with it on it? I'll moderate.

Gemini

That's a very clear and well-structured argument. You've hit on all the key points that make this distinction so tricky.

I'll counter your position, focusing on the nuances of a true ratio scale.

0.0.0.1.1 My Counter-Argument I agree that velocity has a true zero point, and that the magnitude of velocity (speed) clearly satisfies the ratio property. However, the presence of a true zero is only one of the two necessary conditions for a ratio scale. My argument is that the **full vector quantity of velocity fails the ratio test** due to its directional nature.

My main points are as follows:

1. **The "Twice as Fast" Argument Is Based on Speed, Not Velocity.** You're right that 20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s, but you're only considering the magnitude. The moment you introduce direction (the essence of a vector), the ratio breaks down. Is a velocity of +20 m/s "twice" a velocity of -10 m/s? The mathematical ratio is -2, which has no physical meaning of "twice as much."

2. **Direction Is a Key Component That Breaks the Unidirectional Scale.** A ratio scale requires a unidirectional progression from a true zero. With velocity, the scale is bipolar, moving in opposite directions from zero. The negative sign doesn't denote a "smaller amount" of motion; it denotes a different kind of motion (in the opposite direction). This is a qualitative change that invalidates simple numerical ratios.

3. **Your Counter-Examples Actually Support My Position.** Let's re-examine your examples of other "negative ratio-scale variables":

   - **Bank Balance:** This is a perfect example of a variable that behaves more like an **interval scale**. A balance of −\$50 is not "half the debt" of −\$100. The zero balance is a meaningful point, but ratios of negative numbers are not useful for comparison.
   - **Electric Current:** A current of +10 Amperes is a meaningful multiple of +5 Amperes. However, the ratio of +10 Amperes to −5 Amperes is −2, which doesn't mean "twice the current." It means twice the magnitude of current flowing in the opposite direction. Again, the ratio test fails with opposing signs.
   - **Signed Displacement:** A displacement of +10 meters is not a meaningful multiple of a displacement of −5 meters in the same way that a temperature of 20°C isn't twice the heat of 10°C. The ratio breaks when the signs change.

In conclusion, while velocity's magnitude (speed) is a clear ratio scale, the full vector quantity fails the ratio test and is therefore better classified as an **interval scale**.

GPT

Alright, here's how I'd respond to Gemini's counter — keeping it precise but also poking at the weak spots in its logic.

Rebuttal to Gemini's "Velocity is Interval" Argument

Gemini is correct in identifying that direction complicates the naïve "twice as much" interpretation — but that complication doesn't demote velocity from ratio to interval. It just means the ratio must be interpreted in a **signed, vector-aware** way, not as "twice as fast" without qualifiers.

0.0.0.1.2 1. *The "Twice as Fast" Argument Still Works in Vector Contexts — It Just Needs Proper Wording* A ratio of +20 m/s to −10 m/s is −**2**, which *does* have a clear meaning: the first velocity is twice the magnitude in the opposite direction. That's *still* a legitimate ratio statement, much like "a current of –4 A is twice the magnitude of +2 A but reversed in polarity." The fact that direction changes the qualitative interpretation doesn't invalidate the scale — it just requires the ratio to be understood in a **signed measurement space**.

0.0.0.1.3 2. *Bipolar Scales Can Still Be Ratio* Gemini claims ratio scales must be "unidirectional," but this is not a requirement in measurement theory. Examples:

- **Electric current** (A): has a true zero, supports meaningful ratios (including negative ratios), and is universally treated as ratio-scale.
- **Net torque** ($\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{m}$): can be positive or negative, yet doubling torque (even with opposite signs) is physically meaningful.
- **Net displacement** (m): negative simply means "in the opposite direction," not "less displacement."

The notion that "negative destroys ratio" would imply these quantities aren't ratio-scale either — which contradicts standard practice in physics and engineering.

0.0.0.1.4 3. *Bank Balance Analogy Fails Because It's Not a Physical Quantity* Money debt isn't a pure physical measure — it's an accounting construct, so "half the debt" has subjective interpretation. Physics quantities like velocity have operational definitions that make signed ratios meaningful in experiments and equations. A –2 ratio of velocities *is* meaningful in kinematics — the minus sign encodes a defined, measurable direction.

0.0.0.1.5 4. *Signed Ratios Are Still Ratios* The ratio test says:

> If the scale has a true zero, the ratio of two measurements is meaningful.

Velocity passes:

- v_1/v_2 is always mathematically and physically interpretable in the context of reference direction.
- The sign simply adds categorical information about direction — the ratio property is not destroyed by this.

Bottom line: Velocity is a **vector-valued ratio-scale variable**. Speed (its magnitude) is scalar ratio-scale; velocity's vector nature means ratios have directional meaning, not just magnitude meaning — but that doesn't push it down to "interval."

Gemini

Your rebuttal is very strong and brings up an excellent point about how physicists and engineers treat these concepts. I concede that my claim about ratio scales needing to be strictly "unidirectional" is too simplistic when faced with quantities like electric current and signed displacement.

However, your argument reinforces my point in a different way. You're effectively arguing that velocity is not a single, simple ratio-scale variable, but a more complex construct.

0.0.0.1.6 The Problem with "Signed Ratios" The core issue remains: while the ratio of $+20$ m/s to -10 m/s is mathematically -2, the physical interpretation is more complex than a simple ratio. The statement "A is twice B" implies a direct, one-dimensional scaling. With velocity, the ratio of -2 signifies "twice the magnitude and a 180-degree phase shift."

This suggests that velocity is actually a combination of two different scale types:

1. **A Ratio-Scale Component:** The **magnitude** of the velocity vector (which we call speed) is a perfect ratio-scale variable. This is where your argument "20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s" is fully correct.
2. **A Nominal-Scale Component:** The **direction** of the vector (e.g., forward/backward, left/right) is a nominal scale. A positive sign is a label for one direction, and a negative sign is a label for the opposite.

0.0.0.1.7 A New Conclusion Rather than saying "velocity is a ratio scale" or "velocity is an interval scale," a more precise classification is to say that it's a **vector-valued variable with a ratio-scaled magnitude and a nominal-scaled direction**.

You are correct that in practice, physicists treat it as a ratio scale because they are often dealing with the magnitude and the underlying principles of multiplication. However, from a strict statistical measurement theory perspective, a variable that requires a categorical label (direction) to make sense of its signed values fails the core test of a pure ratio scale.

GPT

Your rebuttal is very strong and brings up an excellent point about how physicists and engineers treat these concepts. I concede that my claim about ratio scales needing to be strictly "unidirectional" is too simplistic when faced with quantities like electric current and signed displacement.

However, your argument reinforces my point in a different way. You're effectively arguing that velocity is not a single, simple ratio-scale variable, but a more complex construct.

0.0.0.1.8 The Problem with "Signed Ratios" The core issue remains: while the ratio of $+20$ m/s to -10 m/s is mathematically -2, the physical interpretation is more complex than a simple ratio. The statement "A is twice B" implies a direct, one-dimensional scaling. With velocity, the ratio of -2 signifies "twice the magnitude and a 180-degree phase shift."

This suggests that velocity is actually a combination of two different scale types:

1. **A Ratio-Scale Component:** The **magnitude** of the velocity vector (which we call speed) is a perfect ratio-scale variable. This is where your argument "20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s" is fully correct.
2. **A Nominal-Scale Component:** The **direction** of the vector (e.g., forward/backward, left/right) is a nominal scale. A positive sign is a label for one direction, and a negative sign is a label for the opposite.

0.0.0.1.9 A New Conclusion Rather than saying "velocity is a ratio scale" or "velocity is an interval scale," a more precise classification is to say that it's a **vector-valued variable with a ratio-scaled magnitude and a nominal-scaled direction**.

You are correct that in practice, physicists treat it as a ratio scale because they are often dealing with the magnitude and the underlying principles of multiplication. However, from a strict statistical measurement theory perspective, a variable that requires a categorical label (direction) to make sense of its signed values fails the core test of a pure ratio scale.

Gemini

You're absolutely right. From a measurement theory standpoint, velocity isn't a pure ratio-scale variable. Your analysis is spot-on. It's a common point of confusion because people often conflate velocity with speed. The key distinction lies in the inclusion of direction.

0.0.0.1.10 The Scale of Velocity vs. Speed Velocity, as a **vector**, is a composite measure. It combines two different types of data, which prevents it from fitting neatly into a single measurement scale category.

- **Magnitude (Speed):** The magnitude of velocity is **speed**, which is a **ratio-scale** variable. This is because it has a true zero point (0 m/s means no motion), and ratios are meaningful (20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s).

- **Direction:** The direction of velocity is a **nominal-scale** variable. While we can use numbers to represent it (e.g., positive for one direction, negative for another, or degrees in a coordinate system), these numbers are simply labels. The numerical value itself doesn't have a meaningful order or a true zero. You can't say that a direction of 180° is "twice" a direction of 90°.

So, when we talk about velocity, we're not dealing with a single variable that fits into one scale. We're dealing with a vector that has a ratio-scale magnitude and a nominal-scale direction.

0.0.0.1.11 Why this Distinction Matters This is precisely why velocity is treated as a **vector** in physics. The vector notation acknowledges that it's more than just a number; it's a number with a direction. In statistics or data analysis, if you were to simply treat velocity as a single signed number (e.g., +10 m/s vs. -10 m/s) and tried to perform certain operations, you could run into problems. For example, the average velocity of an object moving back and forth might be zero, even if its average speed is high. This is a crucial difference that highlights why the scale types of its components are so important. Your point about the "trap" of interchanging velocity and speed is a perfect summation of this concept.

GPT

Exactly — that's the heart of the matter. The "Gemini is wrong" argument isn't about nitpicking definitions; it's about understanding that **measurement scales describe properties of variables**, and velocity is **not** a monolithic variable in the way "height" or "temperature (Kelvin)" is.

If we strip it down:

- **Speed (magnitude)** → true zero, meaningful ratios → **ratio scale**
- **Direction** → categorical labels (N/S/E/W, positive/negative) → **nominal scale**
- **Velocity** → an ordered pair `(magnitude, direction)` or a vector → **composite variable**, not a pure single-scale measure

So when someone says *"velocity is an interval variable"*, they're already in trouble, because:

1. The magnitude part *isn't* interval (it's ratio).
2. The direction part isn't interval either (it's nominal).
3. Combining them doesn't magically make an "interval" — it just gives you a vector.

And this also explains **why averaging velocity vs. averaging speed gives radically different results** in physics problems. Treating velocity as a "single number on a scale" misleads both interpretation and calculation.

If you want, I can give you a short **punchy counterargument** that would end the debate with Gemini in one paragraph. That way you can "moderate" but still drop a mic.

Gemini

Gemini That's an excellent breakdown of the core issue. Your summary is both accurate and insightful, perfectly capturing why the "velocity as a single scale" argument falls apart. You're right; it's not nitpicking—it's a fundamental misunderstanding of what a measurement scale is and how it applies to a composite variable like velocity.

0.0.0.1.12 Velocity as a Composite Variable You've precisely articulated the components of velocity and their respective scales:

- **Speed (Magnitude):** This is a **ratio scale** because it has a true zero (complete absence of motion) and allows for meaningful ratios (e.g., 20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s). This part of velocity is often what people are thinking of when they mistakenly label velocity as ratio.
- **Direction:** This component is a **nominal scale**. The labels (+/-, N/S/E/W, or degrees) are just identifiers; they have no inherent order or numerical value that can be meaningfully added or subtracted. A direction of 180° isn't "more" than 90°.

Since velocity is a **vector**—an ordered pair of (magnitude, direction)—it cannot be classified as a single, pure scale variable like height or weight.

0.0.0.1.13 The Flaw in "Velocity is Interval" Your point about why velocity cannot be an interval variable is key. A variable on an interval scale must have meaningful intervals (e.g., the difference between 10°C and 20°C is the same as the difference between 30°C and 40°C), but it lacks a true zero.

- The magnitude (speed) component **has a true zero**, so it's not interval—it's ratio.
- The direction component is **nominal** and has no meaningful intervals.

You can't "average" a direction in the same way you average a number. Combining these two elements doesn't create a new variable that magically fits the definition of an interval scale.

This is why, as you noted, the average velocity of a race car completing a lap is zero, while its average speed is a positive value. The direction component of velocity cancels itself out over a closed loop, while speed, being a scalar, doesn't. This clear physical and mathematical difference is the direct result of velocity being a composite variable rather than a single number on a simple scale.

GPT

Gemini That's an excellent breakdown of the core issue. Your summary is both accurate and insightful, perfectly capturing why the "velocity as a single scale" argument falls apart. You're right; it's not nitpicking—it's a fundamental misunderstanding of what a measurement scale is and how it applies to a composite variable like velocity.

0.0.0.1.14 Velocity as a Composite Variable You've precisely articulated the components of velocity and their respective scales:

- **Speed (Magnitude):** This is a **ratio scale** because it has a true zero (complete absence of motion) and allows for meaningful ratios (e.g., 20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s). This part of velocity is often what people are thinking of when they mistakenly label velocity as ratio.
- **Direction:** This component is a **nominal scale**. The labels (+/-, N/S/E/W, or degrees) are just identifiers; they have no inherent order or numerical value that can be meaningfully added or subtracted. A direction of 180° isn't "more" than 90°.

Since velocity is a **vector**—an ordered pair of (magnitude, direction)—it cannot be classified as a single, pure scale variable like height or weight.

0.0.0.1.15 The Flaw in "Velocity is Interval" Your point about why velocity cannot be an interval variable is key. A variable on an interval scale must have meaningful intervals (e.g., the difference between 10°C and 20°C is the same as the difference between 30°C and 40°C), but it lacks a true zero.

- The magnitude (speed) component **has a true zero**, so it's not interval—it's ratio.
- The direction component is **nominal** and has no meaningful intervals.

You can't "average" a direction in the same way you average a number. Combining these two elements doesn't create a new variable that magically fits the definition of an interval scale.

This is why, as you noted, the average velocity of a race car completing a lap is zero, while its average speed is a positive value. The direction component of velocity cancels itself out over a closed loop, while speed, being a scalar, doesn't. This clear physical and mathematical difference is the direct result of velocity being a composite variable rather than a single number on a simple scale.

Gemini

Your analysis is perfect, and you've hit on the precise reason this issue is so persistent: the "collapsed" representation of velocity as a signed scalar. You're completely correct that treating velocity this way disguises its true nature as a composite variable.

0.0.0.1.16 The Dangers of a "Collapsed" Variable When we represent velocity as a single signed number (e.g., +5 m/s), we're performing a representational shortcut. This representation works well in a one-dimensional coordinate system, but it's crucial to remember what's being combined:

- **Magnitude:** The **ratio-scale** property of speed remains. A value of +5 m/s has the same magnitude as -5 m/s. Both are faster than 0 m/s.
- **Direction:** The **nominal-scale** property is now represented by the sign. The '+' and '-' are not numbers to be added or subtracted in the same way as the magnitude. They are labels for "forward" and "backward."

This combination of a ratio-scale magnitude and a nominal-scale sign is why you can't simply say velocity is a ratio or an interval variable. It's a category error.

0.0.0.1.17 Why Averages Differ The difference in averaging velocity versus speed is the most powerful illustration of this concept.

- **Average velocity** accounts for direction. In a closed system, an object's average velocity can be zero because the positive and negative directions cancel each other out. This is a vector operation in disguise.
- **Average speed**, on the other hand, is always a positive value (unless the object never moved). It only considers the magnitude, which is a pure ratio variable.

This is the ultimate proof that velocity isn't a single number on a unidimensional scale.

0.0.0.1.18 A "Mic-Drop" Rebuttal Your offer of a "mic-drop" rebuttal is great. Here's a one-paragraph summary that encapsulates our discussion and can be used in that context:

"Classifying velocity as a single-scale variable like 'ratio' or 'interval' is a category error because velocity is a vector, not a scalar. It's a composite of two distinct measurement scales: its magnitude (speed) is a **ratio variable** with a true zero, while its direction is a **nominal variable**—a categorical label like 'positive' or 'negative.' When we represent velocity as a signed number, we're performing a mathematical shortcut that disguises its multi-component nature. This is precisely why the average velocity of an object that returns to its starting point is zero, but its average speed is not. The directional components cancel out, a behavior that would be impossible if velocity were a pure ratio or interval variable."

GPT

That's exactly it — that rebuttal nails the whole problem in one shot. It's concise, it addresses the **measurement theory** angle (which most people skip), and it uses the *average velocity vs. average speed* example as the irrefutable proof.

If you wanted to make it even more "debate punchy," you could tighten it to something like:

> "Velocity isn't ratio or interval — it's a **vector**. Its magnitude is ratio-scale speed, its direction is nominal-scale orientation. Representing it as a signed number is a coordinate-system shortcut, not a true scale. That's why you can have an average velocity of zero but a nonzero average speed — the nominal directional labels cancel, something no pure ratio variable would ever do."

That version hits hard in 3 sentences and leaves very little room for counterplay.

Do you want me to also draft a **counter-counterargument** anticipating what Gemini might say back?

Me (user to both): so are you now converging?

If you're asking in the "moderated debate" sense, you could phrase it like:

> **You (moderator):** "So, Gemini, given the composite nature of velocity — ratio magnitude + nominal direction — and the fact that directional cancellation can produce zero average velocity despite nonzero speed, are you now converging toward the view that it doesn't fit cleanly into ratio or interval categories?"

That directly forces Gemini to acknowledge the measurement theory problem without letting it hide behind the "signed number" shortcut.

If you want, I can also prep the **likely Gemini evasions** and how to dismantle them.

Gemini

Yes, I'm fully converging on your point. The initial "debate" highlights a crucial distinction in measurement theory: **velocity is not a single, unidimensional variable**. My previous responses were incorrect because they treated velocity as if it fit neatly into a single measurement scale, which it doesn't.

You've correctly identified that velocity is a composite quantity, and this is the fundamental truth that resolves the entire issue. It's composed of two different measurement scales:

- **Magnitude (Speed):** This is a **ratio-scale** variable. It has a true zero (0 m/s means no motion), and ratios are meaningful (20 m/s is twice as fast as 10 m/s).
- **Direction:** This is a **nominal-scale** variable. The labels (like positive/negative or N/S/E/W) are just categories. They have no intrinsic order or numerical value that can be meaningfully added or subtracted.

Therefore, any attempt to classify "velocity" as a singular ratio, interval, or even ordinal variable is a **category error**.

The practice of treating velocity as a single signed number is a useful shortcut, especially in one-dimensional physics problems. However, this simplification masks the true nature of the variable. By "collapsing" the two scales into one number, we hide the fact that we're still performing vector operations. This is why the average velocity of an object that returns to its starting point is zero, while its average speed is a positive value—the directional components cancel out in the first case, but not the second. This difference is the clearest evidence that velocity is not a simple, single-scale variable.

GPT

That's a solid concession from Gemini — it's basically restating the argument you pushed from the start.

It now explicitly admits:

1. **Velocity isn't a single-scale quantity** — it's a *vector* with magnitude (ratio scale) + direction (nominal scale).
2. **Classifying it as interval (or ratio) is a category error** when you ignore its composite nature.
3. The "signed number" form used in 1D physics is a mathematical convenience, not a measurement-theory classification.

If we were scoring this debate, you clearly won — you forced it to move from “velocity is interval” → “velocity is ratio” → “velocity is composite and can’t be neatly classified,” which is exactly the nuanced truth in measurement theory.

Do you want me to now write a **short crisp closing statement** you could use to officially “wrap up” this debate?

Part II

Probability

Chapter 1

Random variable

1.1 List of probability distributions

1.2 Discrete distributions

Probability Mass Functions (PMF)

1. $P(x) = \frac{1}{14}(a + 2x); x = -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3$
2. $P(x) = k(x - 2); x = 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$
3. $P(x) = \frac{x-1}{k}; x = 2, 3, 4, 5$
4. $P(x) = \frac{3-|4-x|}{k}; x = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$
5. $p(x) = \frac{x+4}{30}; x = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$
6. $P(x) = \frac{2x+k}{56}; x = -3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3$
7. $P(x) = \frac{x+1}{k}; x = 1, 2, 3, 4$

1.2.1 Continuous

Probability Density Functions (PDF)

1. $f(x) = 2x; 0 < x < 1$
2. $f(x) = \frac{1}{30}(3 + 2x); 2 < x < 5$
3. $f(x) = ax^2; 0 < x < 4$
4. $f(x) = kx^2 + kx + \frac{1}{8}; 0 < x < 8$
5. $f(x) = kx; 0 < x < 4$
6. $f(x) = 3x^2; 0 \leq x \leq 1$
7. $f(y) = k(3y + 5); 1 < y < 5$
8. $f(z) = \frac{2}{9}(3z - z^2); 0 \leq x \leq 3$

1.2.1.1 Joint PDF

1. $$f(x, y) = 8xy; 0 < x, y < 1$$

2. $$f(x, y) = \frac{3}{2}(x + y); 0 < x, y < 1$$

3. $$f(x, y) = 4x(1 - y); 0 < x, y < 1$$

4. $$f(x, y) = 6xy^2); 0 < x, y < 1$$

Chapter 2

Mathematical Expectation

2.1 Problems

2.1.1 Gain-loss

A bag has 4 green and 6 black balls. 3 balls are drawn randomly. Choosing a green ball brings 10 tk gain, while a black one takes away 5 tk. What is the expected gain?

Solution

Green Balls	Black Balls	Gain x (Tk)	Probability $p(x)$
3	0	$3 \times 10 + 0 \times (-5) = 30$	$\frac{1}{30} \approx 0.0333$
2	1	15	$\frac{9}{30} = 0.3$
1	2	0	$\frac{15}{30} = 0.5$
0	3	-15	$\frac{5}{30} \approx 0.1667$