# Assignment 2

## Section a

We have n independent samples  $X_1, ..., X_n$  from a distribution with expectation  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , and the relative sample mean  $S = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . In order to compute Var(S), leveraging on the independence of the samples, we can apply the following basic properties

$$Var(X + Y) = Var(X) + Var(Y)$$

$$Var(aX) = a^2 Var(X)$$

Thus we have

$$Var(S) = Var\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^{2}}Var\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n^{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}Var(X_{i})$$

$$= \frac{n\sigma^{2}}{n^{2}} = \frac{\sigma^{2}}{n}$$

### Section b

Now, considering the sample variance  $Z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - S)^2$ , we must compute E[Z]. The steps of the computation are based on the linearity of expectation, the values of E[S] and Var[S] and the following consideration:

$$Var(X) = E[X^2] - (E[X])^2$$
  
 $E[X^2] = Var(X) + (E[X])^2$ 

The derivation of E[Z] is the following

$$E[Z] = E\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i} - S)^{2}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i}^{2} - 2X_{i}S + S^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}(X_{i}^{2} - 2X_{i}S + S^{2})\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}^{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{n}2X_{i}S + \sum_{i=1}^{n}S^{2}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}^{2} - 2S\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i} + nS^{2}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}^{2} - 2nS^{2} + nS^{2}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}^{2} - nS^{2}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\left(E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}^{2}\right] - E\left[nS^{2}\right]\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\left(nE\left[X_{1}^{2}\right] - nE\left[S^{2}\right]\right)$$

$$= E[X_{1}^{2}] - E[S^{2}]$$

$$= Var[X_{1}] + (E[X_{1}])^{2} - Var[S] - (E[S])^{2}$$

$$= \sigma^{2} + \mu^{2} - \frac{\sigma^{2}}{n} - \mu^{2} = \frac{n-1}{n}\sigma^{2}$$

# Assignment 3

Let  $T_i$  be the variable that corresponds to the blood test of the *i*-th subject, and it is equal to 1 if the subject is positive and 0 otherwise. Hence we have n independent random variables, from which we can define their sum and the estimated fraction  $\hat{p}$ , given respectively by  $T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i$  and  $\hat{p} = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i)/n = T/n$ .

Knowing that  $P(T_i = 1) = p$ , we have  $E[T_i] = p$  and, by linearity of expectation, we obtain E[T] = np and  $E[\hat{p}] = np/n = p$ .

We can now apply the Chernoff bound. The general version of Chernoff bounds for the upper and the lower tails when  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  are given by

$$P(\hat{p} \ge (1+\epsilon)p) \le e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}p}$$
$$P(\hat{p} \le (1-\epsilon)p) \le e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}p}$$

and we can easily combine them into one simple formula

$$P(|\hat{p} - p| \ge \epsilon p) \le 2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}p}$$

In order to solve the question, we must make explicit the dependence on n

$$P(|\hat{p} - p| \ge \epsilon p) = P\left(\left|\frac{T}{n} - p\right| \ge \epsilon p\right)$$
$$= P(|T - pn| \ge \epsilon pn)$$
$$< 2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}pn}$$

Finally, we can derive the minimum value of n

$$2e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}pn} < \delta$$

$$e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}pn} < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

$$e^{\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}pn} > \frac{2}{\delta}$$

$$\frac{\epsilon^2}{3}pn > \ln \frac{2}{\delta}$$

$$n > \frac{3}{\epsilon^2 p} \ln \frac{2}{\delta}$$

If we consider  $\theta$  as the accuracy of our estimation and we take  $\theta = \epsilon p$ , the constraint  $p > \theta$  holds and we obtain

$$n > \frac{3}{\epsilon \theta} \ln \frac{2}{\delta} = \frac{3p}{\theta^2} \ln \frac{2}{\delta}$$

# Assignment 4

### Section a

The information obtained by the 200 tested subjects is the interval [160, 190] inside which the heights vary and their average value is equal to 180. To settle the argument between Professor Cooper and Professor Wolowitz we can set up a statistical hypothesis test. In particular, Professor Cooper supports the hypothesis that the heights are uniformly distributed in the interval, and it defines the null hypothesis  $H_0$  of our test. On the contrary, Professor Wolowoitz states that the results are inconsistent with the former idea, and it defines the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ . In other words,

$$H_0: X \sim U(160, 190)$$
  
 $H_1: X \nsim U(160, 190)$ 

These hypotheses can be translated into a simpler form. If the distribution of the heights were truly uniform, the theoretical mean would be  $\mu = (160 + 190)/2 = 175$ . It means that we can rewrite the test in this new form

$$H_0: \mu = 175$$
  
 $H_1: \mu \neq 175$ 

### Section b

Before actually performing the test we must define the significance level  $\alpha$ , used to reject or not reject the null hypothesis, and we set it to  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Now we can use a two-tailed Z-test

$$Z = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{\sigma / \sqrt{n}}$$

For our uniform distribution the value of the standard deviation is  $\sigma = \sqrt{(190-160)^2/12}$ , so we have

$$Z = \frac{180 - 175}{\sqrt{75}/\sqrt{200}} = 8.165$$

Finally, we can compare the result with the critical values for the chosen confidence level. In this case, we are using a two-tailed test, so we have to consider  $\alpha/2=0.025$ . The corresponding critical values are  $\pm 1.96$ .

Since 8.165 > 1.96, we reject the null hypothesis  $H_0$ .

Z	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08
-2.1	0.01786	0.01743	0.01700	0.01659	0.01618	0.01578	0.01539	0.01500	0.01463
-2.0	0.02275	0.02222	0.02169	0.02118	0.02068	0.02018	0.01970	0.01923	0.01876
-1.9	0.02872	0.02807	0.02743	0.02680	0.02619	0.02559	0.02500	0.02442	0.02385
-1.8	0.03593	0.03515	0.03438	0.03362	0.03288	0.03216	0.03144	0.03074	0.03005
-1.7	0.04457	0.04363	0.04272	0.04182	0.04093	0.04006	0.03920	0.03836	0.03754

Figure 1: Z-table

As an addendum to the hypothesis test, here are a few lines of code that reproduce the computation of the Z-test and empirically show how, taking 200 samples uniformly at random from [160, 190] multiple times, we don't come up with a sample mean of 180.