

Notes on Mathematics

Alex Nelson*

Email: pqnelson@gmail.com

December 16, 2012

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Probability	3
2.1	Examples	4
2.2	Conditional Probability	7
2.3	Independent Events	10
2.4	Product Space	11
2.4.1	Completeness	12
2.5	Worked Examples	12
3	Elements of Combinatorial Analysis	18
3.1	Permutations	18
3.2	Sampling	19
3.3	Binomial Coefficients	20
3.4	Multinomial Coefficient	22
3.5	Hat Check Problem	22
4	Random Variables	25
5	Calculus of Formal Distributions	27
5.1	Locality	29
5.2	Taylor's Formula	33
5.3	Current Algebras	34
A	Set Theory	37
B	References	39

1 Introduction

1.1. Definition. The set of all possible outcomes of an experiment is called the “**Sample Space**” and denoted Ω . An “**Elementary Event**” is an element of Ω , whereas a “**Event**” is a subset of Ω .

CAUTION: We will abuse notation, and mix up the singleton $\{x\}$ with the element x . So $\{x\}$ is an elementary event, and usually just referred to as x .

*This is a page from <http://code.google.com/p/notebk/>
Compiled: December 16, 2012 at 8:54am (PST)

1.2. Example. Flipping a coin has two results: heads H , tails T . The sample space is

$$\Omega = \{H, T\}. \quad (1.1)$$

What's an event? Well, let's consider a few:

1. We flip the coin and get a heads.
2. We get either a heads or a tails.
3. The outcome is both a heads and tails.
4. The outcome is not a heads.

Note that the first and last examples are elementary events, the others are not elementary.

1.3. Remark. This process “flipping a coin”, is generalized in mathematics to any experiment with two outcomes: either heads or tails; the baby is either a boy or a girl; the cat is either dead or alive¹. This experiment is called a “**Bernoulli trial**”, and it's the foundation of most (all?) of probability theory.

1.4. Example. Not all sample spaces are finite. For example, consider an experiment describing the decay of an unstable particle. How long does it take? Well, the sample space would be

$$\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}. \quad (1.2)$$

This is quite infinite!

1.5. Definition. We want to think of subsets of the sample space as *events*. The sample space is a “certain event”: something's *definitely* going to happen. So now we want to define the “collection of all events (of our sample space)”... but not every subset is an event! So we need some axioms/specifications.

We define a “ **σ -Field**” (or *σ -Algebra*) \mathcal{F} to be the set of events of our sample space Ω . But that's not the end of the story: we have a bunch of axioms to consider.

First, it seems sound to suggest for any pair of events A and B (i.e., $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$), we can form new events “ A and B ” as well as “ A or B ”. These correspond to the operations

$$A \text{ and } B = A \cap B, \quad \text{and} \quad A \text{ or } B = A \cup B.$$

Good, well, so what?

Axiom (Closed under pair-wise “And”, “Or”). If $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$ and $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$.

Under a similar vein of reasoning, if we have an event $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then its complement A^c (read “The event that A does not occur”) should also be an event: $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$. So, we have

Axiom (Closed under complements). If $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$.

The last axiom is quite simple: nothing is an event. What's “nothing”? The empty set:

Axiom (Nothing is an event). We have $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$.

¹When observed!

Is this really the last axiom? No, we weren't honest with our first axiom. We have something *more*: we could have an infinite number of “and” (but not an infinite number of “or”).

Axiom. If $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \mathcal{F}$

When is this useful? Suppose we want to flip a coin, and keep flipping until we get a heads. What's the sample space look like? Well, it'd be

$$\Omega = \{H, TH, TTH, TTTH, \dots\}. \quad (1.3)$$

The event that we flip the coin an even number of times is

$$E = \{TH, TTTH, TTTTTH, \dots\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Unless we have this last axiom, we couldn't construct it!

1.6. Example. The smallest σ -algebra associated to any sample space Ω is

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}. \quad (1.5)$$

It “obviously” satisfies the four axioms.

1.7. Example. The next smallest algebra associated to Ω is, if A is any subset of Ω , then

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, A, A^c, \Omega\}. \quad (1.6)$$

Although a little trickier to show, it also satisfies the axioms.

1.8. Example. When Ω is finite², its powerset (the set of all subsets) of Ω is a σ -algebra. This is the most common σ -algebra used when working with finite sample spaces.

2 Probability

2.1. There are two interpretations to probability. Avoiding philosophical arguments, we suggest probability is a function $\Pr(-)$ that assigns to each event in our sample space $X \in \Omega$ a number $\Pr(X)$ such that a bunch of axioms hold.

2.1.1 Remark. The “Objectivist” interpretation suggests

$$\Pr(X) = \frac{\text{number of trials where } X \text{ is the value}}{\text{total number of trials}} = \frac{N(X)}{N(\Omega)} \quad (2.1)$$

whereas Bayesian probability theorists suggest probability is really “belief” that X is the outcome of a trial. In either event, we can deduce a number of axioms from Equation (2.1).

2.2. Probability. First we should note we cannot have more outcomes taking value X than there are outcomes:

$$N(X) \leq N(\Omega) \quad (2.2)$$

²For *infinite* sample spaces, things get tricky because we're really going to do “integration” on our set. For the real numbers, for example, its powerset includes the natural numbers... but an integral over the natural numbers embedded in the reals is zero! We get strange results like that: where things should have some probability, they instead have none.

Consequently, when we divide through both sides we get

$$\frac{N(X)}{N(\Omega)} \leq 1. \quad (2.3)$$

Similarly cannot have a “negative number” of events occur, so

$$0 \leq N(X) \quad (2.4)$$

for any X . Thus we see

$$0 \leq \Pr(X) \leq 1 \quad \text{for any } X \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (2.5)$$

This is one axiom.

Axiom. We have $\Pr(X) \in [0, 1]$, i.e., $0 \leq \Pr(X) \leq 1$ for any $X \in \mathcal{F}$.

Observe, we can deduce from this another specification. Namely,

$$\Pr(\Omega) = \frac{N(\Omega)}{N(\Omega)} = 1. \quad (2.6)$$

Similar reasoning suggests

$$\Pr(\emptyset) = \frac{0}{N(\Omega)} = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

These form another axiom.

Axiom (Certainty Something Happens, Nothing Happens). We have $\Pr(\Omega) = 1$ and $\Pr(\emptyset) = 0$.

When we consider events $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{F}$ which are disjoint (so $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$), what happens to the probability? We have

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_i X_i\right) = \sum_i \Pr(X_i).$$

Does this make sense? The intuition should be “The probability that one of the X_i ’s occur is the sum of the probability of each event” which makes sense if they’re disjoint events (there’s “no overlap”). This gives us our last axiom:

Axiom (Disjoint Events). If $X_i \in \mathcal{F}$ is a (possibly infinite) family of disjoint events, then

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_i X_i\right) = \sum_i \Pr(X_i). \quad (2.8)$$

2.1 Examples

2.3. Coin Tossing. We flip a coin once. The coin may be biased or fair. We take $\Omega = \{H, T\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, H, T, \Omega\}$. A possible probability measure³

$$\Pr: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

given by

$$\Pr(H) = p, \quad \Pr(T) = 1 - p \quad (2.9)$$

where $0 \leq p \leq 1$, and the “obvious values” $\Pr(\emptyset) = 0$, $\Pr(\Omega) = 1$. When $p = 1/2$, then we call the coin “fair” or “unbiased.”

³There are many different acceptable probability measures, if we are being honest. But this is the measure the reader probably has in mind.

2.4. Dice. A six-sided die is thrown once. We have the possible outcomes be $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ (where $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is the power set of X). The probability measure \Pr is given by

$$\Pr(A) = \sum_{i \in A} p_i \quad \text{for any } A \subseteq \Omega \quad (2.10)$$

where p_1, \dots, p_6 are specified numbers in the unit interval $[0, 1]$ whose sum is 1. Note that p_k is the probability we roll a k . The die is “fair” if

$$\Pr(A) = \frac{|A|}{6} \quad \text{for any } A \subseteq \Omega \quad (2.11)$$

where $|A|$ is the Cardinality of A .

2.5. Definition. A “**Probability Space**” consists of a sample space Ω equipped with its σ -algebra \mathcal{F} and probability measure $\Pr: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

We will often simply state “Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr), \dots$ ” with the understanding what each component means.

Note that a probability space represents one experiment. It’s the outcomes (i.e., the sample space) equipped with the events (i.e., the σ -algebra \mathcal{F}) and a description of outcomes (i.e., probability measure).

2.6 Lemma. *Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr)$, and $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then the following hold:*

1. For any $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\Pr(A^c) = 1 - \Pr(A)$.
2. If $A \subseteq B$, then $\Pr(B) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B \setminus A) \geq \Pr(A)$.
3. $\Pr(A \cup B) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B) - \Pr(A \cap B)$

Proof. (1) We see that $A^c \cup A = \Omega$ and $A^c \cap A = \emptyset$. So these are disjoint events, and by our axioms we have $\Pr(A \cup A^c) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(A^c) = 1$. Thus $\Pr(A^c) = 1 - \Pr(A)$.

(2) We see that $A \cap (B \setminus A) = \emptyset$, which implies

$$\Pr(A \cup (B \setminus A)) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B \setminus A).$$

But $A \cup (B \setminus A) = B$, which implies the result.

(3) We see $A \cup B = A \cup (B \setminus A)$. Then

$$\Pr(A \cup B) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B \setminus A)$$

since the right hand side is disjoint. We then note that

$$B \setminus A = B \setminus (A \cap B)$$

which allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A \cup B) &= \Pr(A) + \Pr(B \setminus A) \\ &= \Pr(A) + \Pr(B \setminus (A \cap B)) \end{aligned}$$

and using result (2) we have

$$\Pr(A \cup B) = \Pr(A) + \Pr(B) - \Pr(A \cap B) \quad (2.12)$$

as desired. \square

2.7 Lemma. For A_1, \dots, A_n events (not necessarily disjoint), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\right) &= \sum_i \Pr(A_i) - \sum_{i < j} \Pr(A_i \cap A_j) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i < j < k} \Pr(A_i \cap A_j \cap A_k) + \dots \\ &\quad + (-1)^{n+1} \Pr(A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Note this is a more general result than lemma 2.6's. We prove it by induction.

Proof. **Base Case** ($n = 2$): this is precisely lemma 2.6's result.

Inductive Hypothesis: assume this works for arbitrary n .

Inductive Case: When we have A_1, \dots, A_n, A_{n+1} , we have

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} A_i\right) = \Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \cup A_{n+1}\right) \quad (2.14)$$

Let $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$, then we rewrite this equation as

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} A_i\right) = \Pr(B \cup A_{n+1}) \quad (2.15)$$

which is *precisely* the base case! \square

2.8. Proposition. Let A_k be a sequence of increasing events, i.e.,

$$A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq A_3 \subseteq \dots \quad (2.16)$$

Let

$$A = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} A_k, \quad (2.17)$$

then

$$\Pr(A) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(A_k). \quad (2.18)$$

Similarly, if B_j is a decreasing sequence of events, so $B_1 \supseteq B_2 \supseteq B_3 \supseteq \dots$, then

$$B = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} B_j = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} B_j \quad (2.19)$$

satisfies

$$\Pr(B) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(B_j). \quad (2.20)$$

Proof. For the first statement, it's easy to see

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^N A_k \subseteq A_N \quad (2.21)$$

We can take the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides to get the desired relation. We also see that

$$A_1 \cup \bigcup_{k=2}^N (A_k \setminus A_{k-1}) = \bigcup_{k=1}^N A_k. \quad (2.22)$$

Thus we find

$$\Pr(A) = \Pr(A_1) + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=2}^N \Pr(A_k) - \Pr(A_{k-1}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(A_N). \quad (2.23)$$

Similar reasoning holds for the second statement. \square

2.2 Conditional Probability

2.9. Suppose we have two events A, B . What's the probability, if B occurs, that A will occur? These sort of conditional statements we're interested in, usually in scientific fields. What would the probability look like? Let's denote $\Pr(A|B)$ be the probability of A given B . Then the probability of A and B happening would be

$$\Pr(A|B) \Pr(B) = \Pr(A \cap B). \quad (2.24)$$

If we accept this, then

$$\Pr(A|B) = \frac{N(A \cap B)}{N(B)} = \frac{\Pr(A \cap B)}{\Pr(B)} \quad (2.25)$$

where we implicitly divide both the numerator and denominator by $N(\Omega)$ to get the fraction of probabilities.

2.10. Definition. If $\Pr(B) > 0$, then the “**Conditional Probability**” that A occurs given B definitely occurs is defined as

$$\Pr(A|B) = \frac{\Pr(A \cap B)}{\Pr(B)}. \quad (2.26)$$

2.11. Example (Children). Suppose a couple has two children. The sample space is

$$\Omega = \{BB, BG, GB, GG\} \quad (2.27)$$

where each element of the sample space indicates what the children are (so BG indicates the first is a boy, while the second is a girl). What's the probability, given one child is a boy, that both children are boys?

Solution: Well, we see that the event one is a boy X is really

$$X = \{BG, GB, BB\} \quad (2.28)$$

We suppose for simplicity that the probability of each outcome in the sample space is equal, so

$$\Pr(GG) = \Pr(GB) = \Pr(BG) = \Pr(BB) = 1/4. \quad (2.29)$$

Thus we see

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(BB|X) &= \frac{\Pr(BB \cap X)}{\Pr(X)} \\ &= \frac{\Pr(BB)}{\Pr(X)} \\ &= \frac{1/4}{3/4} = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Note this is contrary to popular intuition, which would vaguely suggest the solution is $1/4$.

2.12 Lemma. *Let A and B be events, $0 < \Pr(B) < 1$. Then*

$$\Pr(A) = \Pr(A|B) \Pr(B) + \Pr(A|B^c) \Pr(B^c). \quad (2.31)$$

The proof is direct.

Proof. We substitute the definition of conditional probability

$$\Pr(A) = \Pr(A|B) \Pr(B) + \Pr(A|B^c) \Pr(B^c) \quad (2.32a)$$

$$= \frac{\Pr(A \cap B)}{\Pr(B)} \Pr(B) + \frac{\Pr(A \cap B^c)}{\Pr(B^c)} \Pr(B^c) \quad (2.32b)$$

$$= \Pr(A \cap B) + \Pr(A \cap B^c) \quad (2.32c)$$

But look, the events $A \cap B$ and $A \cap B^c$ are disjoint. So we have

$$\Pr(A \cap B) + \Pr(A \cap B^c) = \Pr((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap B^c)). \quad (2.32d)$$

Look, this is quite simply

$$\Pr((A \cap B) \cup (A \cap B^c)) = \Pr(A) \quad (2.32e)$$

precisely as desired. \square

2.13 Lemma. *Let B_i be a family of disjoint events such that*

$$\bigcup_i B_i = \Omega. \quad (2.33)$$

Then

$$\Pr(A) = \sum_i \Pr(A|B_i) \Pr(B_i). \quad (2.34)$$

The proof is similar to the previous lemma.

Proof. We begin by using the definition of conditional probability

$$\sum_i \Pr(A|B_i) \Pr(B_i) = \sum_i \frac{\Pr(A \cap B_i)}{\Pr(B_i)} \Pr(B_i) \quad (2.35a)$$

$$= \sum_i \Pr(A \cap B_i). \quad (2.35b)$$

But look, the events $A \cap B_i$ are disjoint since B_i is a family of *disjoint* events. So we can write this as

$$\sum_i \Pr(A \cap B_i) = \Pr\left(\bigcup_i A \cap B_i\right) \quad (2.35c)$$

Using set theoretic properties of set union and intersection, we can write this as

$$\Pr\left(\bigcup_i A \cap B_i\right) = \Pr\left(A \cap \bigcup_i B_i\right) \quad (2.35d)$$

By hypothesis, the union of all B_i is the sample space, so we have

$$\Pr\left(A \cap \bigcup_i B_i\right) = \Pr(A \cap \Omega) = \Pr(A) \quad (2.35e)$$

precisely as desired. \square

2.14. Remark on Examples: Inheritance from Past. In probability, a lot of examples involve drawing items (e.g., colored balls, slips of paper, etc) from urns. This is because the Bernoulli family, who pioneered most of probability theory in 18th century France, were using then-contemporary situations. You would cast ballots in an urn, etc. Even today in France, the phrase “going to vote” is *aller aux urnes*.

2.15. Example (Balls from Urn). Given two urns, each containing colored balls. Urn I contains two white and three blue balls, urn II contains three white and four blue balls. A ball is drawn randomly from urn I and put into urn II, then a ball is picked at random from urn II and examined. What is the probability the examined ball is blue?

Solution: Really, this is two events going on. Event 1 is transferring a ball from urn I to urn II, and event 2 is the color of the ball drawn from urn II.

So, let B be the event that a white ball is transferred from urn I to urn II. Then B^c is the event it's a blue ball transferred. The event A is the examined ball is blue. So

$$\Pr(A) = \Pr(A|B) \Pr(B) + \Pr(A|B^c) \Pr(B^c) \quad (2.36)$$

But look, we can start calculating some stuff out:

$$\Pr(B) = \frac{2}{5}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(B^c) = \frac{3}{5}. \quad (2.37)$$

The conditional probabilities are easier to compute now:

$$\Pr(A|B) = \frac{4b}{4w + 4b} = \frac{1}{2} \quad (2.38)$$

where w stands for “white ball”, b for “blue ball”, and

$$\Pr(A|B^c) = \frac{5b}{3w + 5b} = \frac{5}{8}. \quad (2.39)$$

Thus we see

$$\Pr(A) = \Pr(A|B) \Pr(B) + \Pr(A|B^c) \Pr(B^c) \quad (2.40a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{2}{5} + \frac{5}{8} \cdot \frac{3}{5} = \frac{23}{40}. \quad (2.40b)$$

2.16. Example (Elbonian Widgets). In the tiny country of Elbonia⁴, there are two widget factories. But 20% of the widgets produced by factory I are defective, whereas 5% from factory II are defective. Factory I produces twice as many widgets as factory II. What's the probability a given Elbonian widget is satisfactory?

Solution: Let A be the event the widget is satisfactory, and B the event it's from factory I. We see

$$\Pr(B) = \frac{2}{3} \quad (2.41)$$

and so

$$\Pr(A) = \Pr(A|B) \Pr(B) + \Pr(A|B^c) \Pr(B^c). \quad (2.42)$$

⁴A fictional country from the comic strip “Dilbert.”

The conditional probabilities are given, or at least easily deduced

$$\Pr(A|B) = 1 - \frac{1}{5} \quad (2.43a)$$

$$\Pr(A|B^c) = 1 - \frac{1}{20}. \quad (2.43b)$$

We see then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(A) &= \frac{4}{5} \cdot \frac{2}{3} + \frac{19}{20} \cdot \frac{1}{3} \\ &= \frac{51}{60}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

This concludes our example (roughly 5 out of 6 Elbonian widgets are satisfactory).

2.3 Independent Events

2.17. Suppose we have two events X and Y . If Y does not depend on X , we expect

$$\Pr(Y|X) = \Pr(Y). \quad (2.45)$$

Lets try to consider a slightly more general situation. If we multiply both sides of Eq (2.45) by $\Pr(X)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(Y|X) \Pr(X) &= \Pr(X \cap Y) \\ &= \Pr(Y) \Pr(X) \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

which gives us the desired condition for “independence.”

2.18. Definition. Let X, Y be events. We call them “**Independent Events**” if and only if

$$\Pr(X \cap Y) = \Pr(X) \Pr(Y). \quad (2.47)$$

More generally, for a family of events X_i , they are independent iff

$$\Pr\left(\bigcap_j X_j\right) = \prod_j \Pr(X_j) \quad (2.48)$$

Why is this a good definition? If X or Y has probability zero, we avoid the risk of dividing by zero. This could not have been avoided using Eq (2.45). But notice our condition for independence implies Eq (2.45)!

Caution: Do not make the rookie mistake thinking, for a family of events X_j , independence holds iff for each $i \neq j$ we have $\Pr(X_i \cap X_j) = \Pr(X_i) \Pr(X_j)$. This is *pairwise independence*, and not necessarily the same as implying the family consists of independent events.

2.19. Example (Pairwise Independence Problems). Suppose we have

$$\Omega = \{abc, acb, cab, cba, bac, bca, aaa, bbb, ccc\} \quad (2.49)$$

and they are all equal probable outcomes. Let A_k be the event the k th letter is a .

We claim $\{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$ is a family of pairwise independent events. Observe each A_k has three events. For example, $A_1 = \{abc, acb, aaa\}$. Then we see

$$\Pr(A_i \cap A_j) = \Pr(aaa) = \frac{1}{9} \quad (2.50)$$

and

$$\Pr(A_i) \Pr(A_j) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} = \frac{1}{9}. \quad (2.51)$$

Thus we see

$$\Pr(A_i \cap A_j) = \Pr(A_i) \Pr(A_j) \quad (2.52)$$

for $i \neq j$. This is the definition of pair-wise independent.

However, observe

$$\Pr(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) = \Pr(aaa) = \frac{1}{9} \quad (2.53)$$

whereas

$$\Pr(A_1) \Pr(A_2) \Pr(A_3) = \frac{1}{27}. \quad (2.54)$$

So we have

$$\Pr(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) \neq \Pr(A_1) \Pr(A_2) \Pr(A_3). \quad (2.55)$$

That is to say, our family of pairwise-independent events is not a family of independent events!

2.4 Product Space

2.20. Proposition. Let \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G} be σ -algebras over Ω . Then $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ is also a σ -algebra over Ω .

More generally, if \mathcal{F}_i is a family of σ -algebras over Ω , then

$$\bigcap_i \mathcal{F}_i = \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \quad (2.56)$$

is a σ -algebra over Ω .

2.21. Problem: We claim that, if \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are σ -algebras over Ω , then $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$ is *not* a σ -algebra over Ω . No!

But we can *uniquely extend* $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$ to a “smallest” σ -algebra containing both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} as subalgebras. What to do? We simply consider the collection

$$\{\mathcal{H}_i : \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_i, \text{ and } \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_i\} \quad (2.57)$$

then we construct

$$\bigcap_i \mathcal{H}_i = \mathcal{H}. \quad (2.58)$$

This is the smallest such σ -algebra containing both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} .

2.22. Recall we describe an experiment using a probability space. But what if we want to have a “composite” experiment? Say, flip a coin *and* draw a card from a deck. How can we describe this experiment? Let us try to consider it!

We want to combine $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \Pr_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2, \Pr_2)$. What to do?

First lets construct the sample space. We expect, correctly, that

$$\Omega = \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \quad (2.59)$$

is our sample space.

Next the σ -algebra. This is more subtle, and requires some justification (given in our discussion of “completeness”). The set $\mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2$ is *not* a σ -algebra. But we can construct the smallest σ -algebra containing it! We use this “smallest” σ -algebra. We use the same process outlined in §2.21.

The probability measure is simply $\Pr_{12}(A_1 \times A_2) = \Pr_1(A_1) \Pr_2(A_2)$, where $A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $A_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

2.4.1 Completeness

Caution: For a “first read”, this discussion of “completeness” may be skipped. It’s only useful when dealing with Ω that’s infinitely large (something uncountably infinite like $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$).

2.23. Probability is a special form of “measure theory”, i.e., probability assigns some “volume” to an event. The “volume” is just the likelihood the event will occur, i.e., the “volume” is the event’s probability. There are some subtle measure theoretic topics that needs to be discussed. Consequently, this bit on “completeness” can be skipped on the first read. But the motivation will be given, and should be read.

2.24. Motivation: Suppose we have \mathbb{R} with a Lebesgue measure μ . So $\mu(x) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the length of a point is zero. Then we can try to naively construct the product space \mathbb{R}^2 with the measure $\mu^2(A \times B) = \mu(A)\mu(B)$. This has the merit that for any measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mu^2(\{0\} \times A) = \mu(0)\mu(A) = 0 \quad (2.60)$$

but only if A is measurable. What if A is not measurable? Well, we *expect* the result to be the same: zero. But instead we get “This is an undefined question!”

2.25. For probability, this is saying if we have a product probability space $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ and some event $A \times B$, when A is a subset of a null event we expect $\Pr(A \times B) = 0$. This is a technical condition that appears unclear,

2.5 Worked Examples

2.26. Overview. Tools. We will consider some examples, to solidify understanding of the concepts of probability.

Note that one can get a good handle on approximating probability by taking Ω and considering its elements as equi-probable, i.e., $\Pr(x) = 1/N$ where $x \in \Omega$ and $N = |\Omega|$. Then any $A \subseteq \Omega$ has probability $\Pr(A) = |A|/N$. This relieves the reader from determining the σ -algebra and the probability measure on it.

There are three basic techniques we will use:

1. Combinatorics: there are $n!$ ways to permute n objects, and $\binom{n}{r}$ different ways to choose r objects (without replacement) from n possible.
2. Set theory: recall we can partition the sample space, and work with the partitions for probability.
3. Independence: don’t forget independent events!

2.27. Example (Poker). Every player is dealt 5 cards. For simplicity, suppose each player receives their 5 cards all at once. What is the probability that you, the first to receive cards, will get four-of-a-kind?

Solution: There are 52 cards in a deck, we partition it into the 13 sets of “kinds” (that is, by rank). One approximate solution would suggest that the probability is

$$\Pr(K) \approx \frac{1}{\binom{13}{1}} = \frac{1}{13} \approx 0.076923 \quad (2.61)$$

We can refine this slightly by considering the events.

Let X be the first card drawn. We will consider strings of the form $XYNYN$ where Y indicates the card is the same rank as X , N indicates a different rank. The desired events are

$$A = \{XNYYYY, XYNYYY, XYNYNY, XYYYYN\} \quad (2.62)$$

These are, needless to say, independent events. The probabilities are

$$\Pr(XNYYYY) = \frac{48 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1}{51 \cdot 50 \cdot 49 \cdot 48} = \frac{1}{20825}, \quad (2.63)$$

and since all five cards are dealt at once, the other probabilities are the same. So we have

$$\Pr(A) = \frac{1}{4165} \approx 0.00024 \quad (2.64)$$

which is *considerably worse* than our first approximation!

Variations: What if we have n players, and each player is dealt only one card at a time until each player has 5 cards? What's the probability of obtaining a four-of-a-kind?

What if we have k decks? What's the probability getting four-of-a-kind?

2.28. Example. There are three cities: A , B , C . Two roads connect A and B , and two roads connect B and C . In Winter, each road has probability p being closed due to snow. This probability is independent of other roads being closed. What is the probability there is an open road connecting A to C ?

Solution: Let X be the event there is an open road connecting A and B , Y be the event there is an open road connecting B and C . Then we want to find $\Pr(X \cap Y)$. Luckily, these events are independent, so we have

$$\Pr(X \cap Y) = \Pr(X) \Pr(Y). \quad (2.65)$$

The probability that there is an open road connecting A and B is simply

$$\Pr(X) = 1 - \Pr(X^c) \quad (2.66a)$$

where X^c is the event both roads connecting A and B are closed. Since both roads being closed are independent of each other, we find

$$\Pr(X^c) = p^2 \quad (2.66b)$$

and thus

$$\Pr(X) = 1 - p^2. \quad (2.66c)$$

The probability for Y is the same

$$\Pr(Y) = 1 - p^2. \quad (2.67)$$

Thus the probability that some road is open is

$$\Pr(X \cap Y) = (1 - p^2)^2 = 1 - 2p^2 + p^4. \quad (2.68)$$

For example, if $p = 0.5$, then $\Pr(X \cap Y) = 0.5625$.

Variations: What if the probability that both roads (connecting two given cities) is closed becomes dependent on each other?

What if we let there be n cities: A_1, \dots, A_n , and “neighboring” cities A_{j-1}, A_j are connected by precisely 2 roads. What is the probability there exists an open route (sequence of roads) connecting A_1 to A_n ?

What if we let each neighboring cities be connected by $k \in \mathbb{N}$ roads? Or have $f(A_i, A_j) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ roads connecting A_i and A_j ? That is, we have a completely general undirected graph, what’s the probability that any two given cities are connected?

2.29. Example. A man is saving up to a buy a car. His banker advises the man to take up gambling. The man has k units of money, but he needs N . So he goes to a casino, and plays a game with the following rules: the man flips a coin, if it’s head the man gets 1 unit of money, and if it’s tails the man pays 1 unit of money. What’s the probability the man gets N units of money?

Assume it’s a fair coin.

Solution: Let B be the event the man goes bankrupt. Let H be the event the first flip is a heads. We will write \Pr_k to indicate that we are working with the condition the amount of money the man has is k units. We use lemma 2.12 to write

$$\Pr_k(B) = \Pr_k(B|H) \Pr_k(H) + \Pr_k(B|H^c) \Pr_k(H^c) \quad (2.69a)$$

but we can note $\Pr_*(H) = \Pr_*(H^c) = 1/2$, thus

$$\Pr_k(B) = \frac{\Pr_k(B|H) + \Pr_k(B|H^c)}{2}. \quad (2.69b)$$

Note that $\Pr_k(B|H) = \Pr_{k+1}(B)$ and $\Pr_k(B|H^c) = \Pr_{k-1}(B)$ allows us to write this as

$$\Pr_k(B) = \frac{\Pr_{k+1}(B) + \Pr_{k-1}(B)}{2}. \quad (2.69c)$$

Let $p_k = \Pr_k(B)$, then we have a recurrence relationship

$$p_k = \frac{p_{k+1} + p_{k-1}}{2} \quad (2.69d)$$

where $0 < k < N$. Note that $p_0 = 1$ (if the man has no money, he’s definitely bankrupt), and $p_N = 0$ (the man stops when he has N units, and hence cannot go bankrupt).

Let $q_k = p_k - p_{k-1}$. We claim

$$q_k = q_{k-1}. \quad (2.70)$$

Subtract $(p_k + p_{k-1})/2$ from both sides of Eq (2.69d) gives us

$$p_k - \frac{1}{2}(p_k + p_{k-1}) = \frac{(p_{k+1} + p_k) - p_k - p_{k-1}}{2} \quad (2.71a)$$

which reduces to

$$\frac{p_k - p_{k-1}}{2} = \frac{p_{k+1} - p_k}{2} \quad (2.71b)$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{q_k}{2} = \frac{q_{k+1}}{2} \quad (2.71c)$$

which proves the claim.

Thus $q_k = q_1$ for any k . But more importantly

$$p_k = q_k + q_{k-1} + \cdots + q_1 + p_0 = kq_1 + p_0. \quad (2.72)$$

Thus we have, using our conditions $p_0 = 1$ and $p_N = 0$

$$q = \frac{-1}{N}, \quad \text{and} \quad p_k = 1 - \frac{k}{N}. \quad (2.73)$$

What does that mean? As the price increases (i.e., as $N \rightarrow \infty$), the probability of bankruptcy $p_k \rightarrow 1$.

The moral of the story is, of course, avoid bankers.

Variations: What's the probability of bankruptcy if the man uses a biased coin?

2.30. Example (Court). The court investigates whether some event X has happened. There are two witnesses, Tisias and Corax. Given some event, Tisias describes it reliably with probability τ . Likewise, Corax is reliable with probability γ . Let T be the event Tisias asserts X happened, C be the event Corax asserts X happened. Assuming the events C and T are independent (i.e., no collusion between Tisias and Corax), and given both testify X occurred, what is the probability that X really did occur?

Solution: Let $\Pr(X) = x$. Then we note the reliability condition for Corax implies

$$\Pr(C|X) = \gamma, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pr(C|X^c) = 1 - \gamma. \quad (2.74)$$

Then

$$\Pr(C) = \Pr(C|X) \Pr(X) + \Pr(C|X^c) \Pr(X^c) \quad (2.75a)$$

$$= \gamma \cdot x + (1 - \gamma)(1 - x) \quad (2.75b)$$

$$= 1 - \gamma - x + 2\gamma x. \quad (2.75c)$$

A similar expression holds for $\Pr(T)$.

Observe, we want to find

$$P(X|T \cap C) = ??? \quad (2.76)$$

We need to find $\Pr(X \cap T \cap C)$ and $\Pr(T \cap C)$. Since T and C are independent ("no collusion"), we have

$$\Pr(T \cap C) = \Pr(T) \Pr(C) \quad (2.77)$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X \cap T \cap C) &= \Pr((X \cap T) \cap (X \cap C)) \\ &= \Pr(X \cap T) \Pr(X \cap C). \end{aligned} \quad (2.78)$$

which implies

$$\Pr(X|T \cap C) = \frac{\Pr(X \cap T) \Pr(X \cap C)}{\Pr(T) \Pr(C)} = \Pr(X|T) \Pr(X|C). \quad (2.79)$$

Wonderful.

We have to find $\Pr(X|C)$. We see

$$\Pr(X|C) = \frac{\Pr(X \cap C)}{\Pr(C)} \quad (2.80a)$$

by definition, and

$$\Pr(X \cap C) = \Pr(C|X) \Pr(X) = \gamma x. \quad (2.80b)$$

Thus we have

$$\Pr(X|C) = \frac{\gamma x}{1 - \gamma - x + 2\gamma x} \quad (2.80c)$$

which is one part of the puzzle. (A similar expression holds for Tisias.)

We conclude by writing the entire probability out

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(X|C \cap T) &= \Pr(X|C) \Pr(X|T) \\ &= \frac{\gamma x}{1 - \gamma - x + 2\gamma x} \cdot \frac{\tau x}{1 - \tau - x + 2\tau x} \end{aligned} \quad (2.81)$$

which is completely different than the expected solution!

So, if $\gamma = \tau = 9/10$ and $x = 1/1000$, then

$$\Pr(X|C \cap T) = \left(\frac{9}{1017} \right)^2 \approx 0.00007831466. \quad (2.82)$$

But, on the other hand, the probability that Corax would say X has happened would be

$$\Pr(C) = \frac{1017}{10^4} = 0.1017, \quad (2.83)$$

which is astoundingly high. The moral of *this* story is: don't go to court.

Alternate Solution: It would actually be easier to write up the σ -algebra. We will write the elements of the sample space as triples (a, b, c) where a is 1 if X occurs, 0 otherwise; b is 1 if Tisias asserts X occurred, 0 otherwise; c is 1 if Corax asserts X has occurred, 0 otherwise. So $\Omega = \mathbb{Z}_2^3$. Then the relevant events are

$$X = \{(1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\} \quad (2.84a)$$

$$C = \{(0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1)\} \quad (2.84b)$$

$$T = \{(0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}. \quad (2.84c)$$

We find, moreover, that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(C) &= (1 - x)\tau(1 - \gamma) + (1 - x)(1 - \tau)(1 - \gamma) + x(1 - \tau)\gamma + x\tau\gamma \\ &= \gamma \end{aligned} \quad (2.85)$$

which we expect. We also find

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(C \cap T) &= (1 - x)(1 - \gamma)(1 - \tau) + x\gamma\tau \\ &= 1 - x - \gamma - \tau + x\gamma + x\tau + \gamma\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (2.86)$$

We then find

$$\Pr(X \cap T \cap C) = x\gamma\tau \quad (2.87)$$

and thus

$$\Pr(X|C \cap T) = \frac{x\gamma\tau}{1 - x - \gamma - \tau + x\gamma + x\tau + \gamma\tau} \quad (2.88)$$

When we set $\gamma = \tau = 9/10$ and $x = 1/1000$ we find $\Pr(X|C \cap T) = 81/1080$. Although slim, it's 75 times greater than if Tisias and Corax said nothing.

2.31. Example. What's the probability that flipping a coin an infinite number of times will result in a heads "sooner or later"?

Solution: We begin by considering the events

$$A_1 = H, \quad A_2 = TH, \quad A_3 = TTH, \quad (2.89)$$

etc. So A_n has $n - 1$ tails followed by a heads. Write A for the event that a heads turns up “sooner or later”. Then

$$\Pr(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Pr(A_n). \quad (2.90)$$

We see that

$$\Pr(A_1) = 1/2, \quad (2.91a)$$

and

$$\Pr(A_2) = 1/4 \quad (2.91b)$$

or more generally

$$\Pr(A_n) = 2^{-n}. \quad (2.91c)$$

Thus we have

$$\Pr(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} = 1. \quad (2.92)$$

So the probability of eventually flipping a heads is 1.

Alternate Solution: Let B_n be the event that we have no heads appear in the first n trials. Then

$$B_1 \supseteq B_2 \supseteq \dots \quad (2.93)$$

So B_1 describes all events starting with 1 tails, B_2 all events starting with 2 tails (which necessarily must include all events starting with 1 tail), and so on.

We use proposition 2.8, let

$$B = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \quad (2.94)$$

then

$$\Pr(B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(B_n). \quad (2.95)$$

But

$$\Pr(B_n) = 2^{-n} \quad (2.96)$$

implies

$$\Pr(B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2^{-n} = 0. \quad (2.97)$$

So the probability a head *won't* appear “sooner or later” is 0.

Sample Code. Here’s a simple ANSI C program which will simply flip a coin and print out the number of tails.

```
#include <time.h>
#include <stdlib.h>
#include <stdio.h>

int main(void)
{
    int n;
```

```

// warm up the random number generator
srand(time(NULL));
for(n = 0; n < 100; n++)
    rand();

// flip the coin
n = 0;
while (rand() % 2 == 0)
    printf("Tail number %d\n", ++n);

printf("There were %d tails.\n", n);

return 0;
}

```

3 Elements of Combinatorial Analysis

3.1. Probability amounts to calculate

$$\Pr(A) = \frac{\left(\begin{array}{c} \text{number of} \\ \text{elements in } A \end{array} \right)}{|\Omega|}. \quad (3.1)$$

This is both a blessing and a curse: for we change probability into counting, yet counting can be difficult! We will review elements of combinatorics (“the art of counting”).

3.1 Permutations

3.2. Suppose we want to consider how many ways we can order n elements. What to do?

We first say “We have n slots to fill with our n elements.” Then we pick some element, and note how many possible slots we may choose. We may pick any one of our n slots. Then pick our second element, and we may place it in any of the remaining $(n - 1)$ slots. We continue, and there are

$$n(n - 1)(n - 2)(\cdots)(1) = n! \quad (3.2)$$

different methods of ordering our n elements. Thus there are $n!$ different permutations.

Convention: We set $0! = 1$.

3.3. Factorial grows quite rapidly. For example

$$3! = 6 \quad (3.3a)$$

$$6! = 720 \quad (3.3b)$$

$$12! = 479\,001\,600 \quad (3.3c)$$

We may approximate it using “**Stirling’s Approximation**”

$$n! \sim \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n. \quad (3.4)$$

We may derive this from the Gamma function

$$\Gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt, \quad \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(x) > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

We take $\Gamma(n+1)$ and integrate by parts n times, we find

$$\Gamma(n+1) = n! \quad (3.6)$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Integrating $\Gamma(x+1)$ by parts merely once will give us the functional equation

$$\Gamma(x+1) = x\Gamma(x). \quad (3.7)$$

Calculus students around the world prove everyday that

$$\Gamma(1/2) = \sqrt{\pi} \quad (3.8)$$

without ever realizing it!

3.2 Sampling

3.4. Given some collection of elements (or a “population”), we would like to pick a finite number of elements (a “sample”). A population with n elements $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, any *ordered* arrangement of r symbols a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_r} is an “**Ordered Sample of Size r** ” drawn from the population. Note when $r = n$, an ordered sample is just a permutation of the population.

Sampling with Replacement: The elements are drawn from the entire population, so we may pick the same element twice (or more).

Sampling Without Replacement: Once we choose an element, we cannot pick it again. We reduce the possible choices, and hence more limited than sampling with replacement.

Choosing r elements with replacement from a population of n can be done in n^r different ways. The proof is obvious: you have r choices, and each choice has n possibilities. So there are

$$\underbrace{n \cdot (\dots) \cdot n}_{r \text{ times}} = n^r \quad (3.9)$$

different ways to sample.

How many different ways can we sample r elements without replacement from a population with n elements?

3.5. Since ordering matters, we have

$$n(n-1)(\dots)(n-(r-1)) = (n)_r \quad (3.10)$$

This defines the “**Falling Factorial**” $(n)_r$.

How can we be certain about this? Well, for the first choice there are n possibilities. The second has $(n-1)$ possibilities. The k^{th} has $(n-(k-1))$ possible choices. We then multiply these together to get the result.

3.6. Theorem. For a population with $n > 1$ elements and a prescribed sample size $r \leq n$, there exists n^r different samples with replacement, and $(n)_r$ samples without replacement.

3.7. Birthday Problem. How many people do we need in a room to make a favorable bet (i.e., a bet with probability of success greater than $1/2$) that 2 people in the room will have the same birthday?

Solution: Let r be the number of people in the room, we want to find it. We will compute the probability of no repetition in our data (i.e., the probability no one in the room shares a birthday). The population, for this example, is the 365 days of the year.

Then

$$p_r = \frac{(365)_r}{365^r} \quad (3.11)$$

describes the probability that no one shares a birthday. We want to find the smallest r such that $p_r < 0.5$. This can be done by exhaustion, we find

$$p_{23} = \frac{36997978566217959340182499134166757044383351847256064}{75091883268515350125426207425223147563269805908203125} \approx 0.49270276 \quad (3.12)$$

So only make this bet when there are at least 23 people in the room!

3.3 Binomial Coefficients

3.8. How many samples of size r exist in a population of n elements, without regard to ordering? That is, how many ways can we choose r guys from n elements? We count this using binomial coefficients

$$\binom{n}{r} = \frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!} \quad (3.13)$$

and read it as “ n choose r ”. Why is this true? Great question: we have $(n)_r$ subpopulations, and $r!$ different orderings of each subpopulation, so we have

$$\binom{n}{r} = \frac{(n)_r}{r!}. \quad (3.14)$$

But this is precisely what we have written!

Convention. If $k \geq n$, then

$$\binom{n}{k} = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

3.9. Theorem. A population with n elements has $\binom{n}{r}$ different subpopulations of size $r \leq n$.

3.10. Theorem (Properties of the Binomial Coefficients). Let $0 \leq k \leq n$. Then

$$1. \quad \binom{n}{0} = \binom{n}{n} = 1$$

$$2. \quad \binom{n}{k} = \binom{n}{n-k}$$

$$3. \text{ Pascal's triangle } \binom{n}{k} + \binom{n}{k+1} = \binom{n+1}{k+1}$$

3.10.1 Corollary. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\binom{n}{-k} = 0. \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. By statement 2 of the previous theorem, we have

$$\binom{n}{-k} = \binom{n}{n+k} \quad (3.17)$$

Since $k > 0$, our convention implies that

$$\binom{n}{n+k} = 0 \quad (3.18)$$

as desired. \square

3.11. Example. A deck of cards has 52 cards, a poker hand has 5 cards. How many different poker hands are there?

Solution: We see there are

$$\binom{52}{5} = 2\,598\,960 \quad (3.19)$$

different poker hands.

3.12. Example. Consider a random distribution of r balls in n urns. Find the probability p_k that a specified cell contains exactly k balls.

Solution: We want to find

$$p_k = \frac{\binom{\text{Number of ways to choose } k \text{ balls from } r \text{ balls}}{\text{Number of ways to choose } k \text{ balls from } r \text{ balls}} \binom{\text{number of ways to put remaining } (r-k) \text{ balls in } (n-1) \text{ cells}}{\text{number of ways to put remaining } (r-k) \text{ balls in } (n-1) \text{ cells}}}{\binom{\text{number of different ways placing } r \text{ balls in } n \text{ cells}}{\text{number of different ways placing } r \text{ balls in } n \text{ cells}}} \quad (3.20)$$

There are n^r different ways placing r balls in n cells. This gives us the denominator. We see that

$$\binom{\text{Number of ways to choose } k \text{ balls from } r \text{ balls}}{\text{Number of ways to choose } k \text{ balls from } r \text{ balls}} = \binom{r}{k} \quad (3.21)$$

and what of the remaining $(r-k)$ balls? They can be placed in the remaining cells in $(n-1)^{r-k}$ ways. Thus we plug this all back into our equation to find

$$\begin{aligned} p_k &= \frac{\binom{r}{k} (n-1)^{r-k}}{n^r} \\ &= \binom{r}{k} \frac{1}{n^k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{r-k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

This is an example of the famous *binomial distribution*, which we'll soon study.

3.13. Example. The US Senate has 100 Senators (a pair represents each state). If a committee is formed with 50 senators, then:

- (a) What's the probability a given state is represented?
- (b) What's the probability each state is represented?

Solution. (a) Well, we first consider the *negation* of this statement: what's the probability not every state is represented? There are

$$\binom{98}{50} = d_k \quad (3.23)$$

ways to choose the committee so some state is not represented. But there is

$$\binom{100}{50} = n_k \quad (3.24)$$

different ways to choose the committee. Thus the probability a given state is not represented is

$$q = \frac{\binom{98}{50}}{\binom{100}{50}} = \frac{49}{198} \approx 0.24747 \dots \quad (3.25)$$

and hence the probability a given state is represented is

$$1 - q = \frac{149}{198} \approx 0.7525 \dots \quad (3.26)$$

That concludes the first question.

(b) We pick one senator from each state. We have two possibilities for each state, and 50 states, hence we have 2^{50} possibilities. Thus we have

$$p = \frac{2^{50}}{\binom{100}{50}} \approx 1.11 \times 10^{-14} \quad (3.27)$$

is the probability every state is represented.

3.4 Multinomial Coefficient

3.14. Suppose we have a population with n elements. How many different ways can we partition the population into subpopulations with k_1 members, \dots , k_m members?

► **Exercise 1.** Prove that $k_1 + \dots + k_m = n$.

We have the following number of such partitions:

$$\binom{n}{k_1, \dots, k_m} = (k_1, \dots, k_m)! = \frac{(k_1 + \dots + k_m)!}{k_1! \dots k_m!} \quad (3.28)$$

These quantities are called “**Multinomial Coefficients**”. The notation varies according to the text.

3.5 Hat Check Problem

3.15. Problem Statement. At a restaurant, n people check their hats. The hat checker completely loses track of who owns which hat, and begins handing the hats randomly to the owners. What's the probability no one receives their hat back?

3.16. We really want to consider the permutations

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & \dots & n \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \dots & a_N \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.29)$$

such that there are *no fixed points* (i.e., $a_k \neq k$ for every k).

3.17. Solution. Let A_i be the event the i^{th} element is fixed. Then

$$A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n = \begin{pmatrix} \text{event there exists} \\ \text{at least one} \\ \text{fixed point} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.30)$$

then

$$\Pr(\text{no fixed pt}) = 1 - \Pr(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n). \quad (3.31)$$

We just have to compute $\Pr(A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_n)$. What to do? Use inclusion-exclusion!

3.18. So we consider the event A_i . The permutation would look like

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & \dots & i & \dots & n \\ & & & \dots & i & \dots & \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.32)$$

where the blank entries are arbitrary (we don't care where they go). How many different such permutations are there? Well, it's as though we permute the $(n-1)$ elements other than i , so there are $(n-1)!$ such permutations. The probability of this event is then

$$\Pr(A_i) = \frac{(n-1)!}{n!} = \frac{1}{n}. \quad (3.33)$$

There are n such events (since we can let $i = 1, \dots, n$). Thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(A_i) = n \cdot \frac{1}{n} = 1. \quad (3.34)$$

Wonderful.

3.19. Consider the event $A_i \cap A_j$, which has the permutation

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & n \\ & & \dots & i & \dots & j & \dots & \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.35)$$

How many such permutations are there? Well, we fix two points while permuting the others, so there are $(n-2)!$ such permutations. Thus the probability is

$$\Pr(A_i \cap A_j) = \frac{(n-2)!}{n!} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \quad (3.36)$$

How many such "fix two point" events are there? It's simply

$$\binom{n}{2} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \quad (3.37)$$

thus

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \Pr(A_i \cap A_j) = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{n(n-1)} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (3.38)$$

This will be our second term.

3.20. Consider the event $A_i \cap A_j \cap A_k$. We see

$$\Pr(A_i \cap A_j \cap A_k) = \frac{(n-3)!}{n!} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)}. \quad (3.39)$$

There are $\binom{n}{3}$ such terms. Thus

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq n} \Pr(A_i \cap A_j \cap A_k) = \frac{1}{3!} \quad (3.40)$$

and inductively we find

$$\Pr(A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n) = \frac{1}{n!} \quad (3.41)$$

Thus

$$\Pr(\text{no fixed pt}) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{3!} + \frac{1}{4!} + \dots + \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \quad (3.42)$$

We should note the Taylor series for e^x is

$$e^x = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \dots + \frac{x^n}{n!} + \dots \quad (3.43)$$

so

$$e^{-1} = 1 - 1 + \frac{(-1)^2}{2!} + \dots + \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} + \dots \quad (3.44)$$

implies

$$\Pr(\text{no fixed pt}) \rightarrow e^{-1} \quad (3.45)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We will construct a table, let p_n be the probability there are no fixed points among permutations of n elements. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} p_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \approx 0.5 \\ p_3 &= \frac{1}{3} \approx 0.33333334 \\ p_4 &= \frac{3}{8} \approx 0.375 \\ p_5 &= \frac{11}{30} \approx 0.36666667 \\ p_6 &= \frac{53}{144} \approx 0.36805555 \\ p_7 &= \frac{103}{280} \approx 0.36785713 \\ p_8 &= \frac{2119}{5760} \approx 0.36788195 \\ p_9 &= \frac{16687}{45360} \approx 0.36787918 \end{aligned} \quad (3.46)$$

We should note that $1/e \approx 0.36787944117144233$, so we are getting a decent approximation with $n = 8$ (five digits!).

4 Random Variables

4.1. We have introduced rudiments of probability theory, but let's consider situations when we use randomness in life. Consider this motivating example: flip a coin twice. The sample space is

$$\Omega = \{HH, HT, TH, TT\}. \quad (4.1)$$

You bet \$1. If you get HH , you get \$2 back; otherwise you lose. How do we describe this game?

Why not introduce a function $W: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$W(HH) = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad W(HT) = W(TH) = W(TT) = 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Can we do this? Why not! But what is this function? We call it a “**Random Variable**”.

4.2. Definition. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr)$ be a probability space. We define a “**Random Variable**” to be a function $W: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have the set

$$X = \{\omega \in \Omega : W(\omega) \leq x\} \quad (4.3)$$

be an element of \mathcal{F} , or in symbols $X \in \mathcal{F}$.

4.2.1 Remark. We will consider the simpler case of “**Discrete Random Variables**” $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

4.3. Example/Definition. Let X be a random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr)$. The “**Distribution Function**” of X is the function

$$F: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad (4.4)$$

defined by

$$F(x) = \Pr(X \leq x) \quad (4.5)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Note we use an abbreviation

$$\Pr(X \leq x) = \Pr(\{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) \leq x\}). \quad (4.6)$$

This is a subtle point, but an important one!

4.4. Example. Suppose we consider the situation flipping a coin twice, with the random variable

$$W(HH) = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad W(HT) = W(TH) = W(TT) = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

What is the distribution of W ?

Solution: We see that

$$\Pr(W \leq 1) = \frac{3}{4} \quad (4.8a)$$

and

$$\Pr(W \leq 2) = 1. \quad (4.8b)$$

The latter makes intuitive sense since $W(\Omega) = \{0, 2\}$.

4.5. Lemma. A distribution function F for the random variable X has the following properties:

1. $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x) = 0$
2. $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} F(x) = 1$
3. If $x < y$, then $F(x) \leq F(y)$
4. We have F be right-continuous, i.e., $F(x+h) \rightarrow F(x)$ as $h \downarrow 0$.

Proof. We will prove each proposition.

1. Consider the sequence of sets $B_n = \{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) \leq -n\}$. We see then that $\dots \subseteq B_{n+1} \subseteq B_n \subseteq \dots \subseteq B_0$ and obviously \emptyset is the limit of this sequence. We have

$$B = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n \quad (4.9)$$

satisfy

$$\Pr(B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(B_n). \quad (4.10)$$

Then we see $\Pr(B) = \Pr(\emptyset) = 0$.

2. The proof is similar, we just have $B_0 \subseteq B_1 \subseteq \dots$ which has its limit be Ω . Thus $\Pr(B) = \Pr(\Omega) = 1$.

3. We see that

$$F(x) = \Pr(A) \quad (4.11a)$$

where

$$A = \{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) \leq x\} \quad (4.11b)$$

and similarly

$$F(y) = \Pr(B) \quad (4.11c)$$

where

$$B = \{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) \leq y\}. \quad (4.11d)$$

We see, since $x < y$, that $A \subseteq B$. Moreover this implies

$$\Pr(A) \leq \Pr(B) \quad (4.11e)$$

which proves the statement.

4. Consider the sequence of sets

$$B(h) = \{\omega \in \Omega : X(\omega) \leq x + h\} \quad (4.12a)$$

We want to prove as $h \downarrow 0$ that $\Pr(B(h)) \rightarrow \Pr(B(0))$. We see that, if we write

$$\Delta(h) = B(h) \setminus B(0) \quad (4.12b)$$

then we have $B(0)$ and $\Delta(h)$ be disjoint. Thus

$$\Pr(B(0) \cup \Delta(h)) - \Pr(B(0)) = \Pr(\Delta(h)) \quad (4.12c)$$

by lemma 2.6. But look, for any sequence $h_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, write $\Delta_n = \Delta(h_n)$, then we have a strictly decreasing sequence

$$\cdots \subseteq \Delta_{n+1} \subseteq \Delta_n \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \Delta_0. \quad (4.12d)$$

This has its limit be \emptyset , and again this implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\Delta_n) = 0 \quad (4.12e)$$

which proves right-continuity. \square

5 Calculus of Formal Distributions

5.1. Let U be a vector space over \mathbb{C} . A series of the form

$$\sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{mn} z^m \omega^n \quad (5.1)$$

where $a_{mn} \in U$ we call a “**Formal Distribution**” in the indeterminates z, ω taking values in U . They form a vector space denoted $U[[z, z^{-1}, \omega, \omega^{-1}, \dots]]$.

5.2. Given a formal distribution (or more weakly, a formal Laurent polynomial) $a(z) = \sum a_n z^n$ we define its “**Residue**” by the usual formula

$$\text{Res}_z a(z) = a_{-1}. \quad (5.2)$$

Since

$$\text{Res}_z \partial a(z) = 0 \quad (5.3)$$

we have the usual integration by parts formula

$$\text{Res}_z \partial a(z) b(z) = -\text{Res}_z a(z) \partial b(z) \quad (5.4)$$

where $\partial a(z) = \sum n a_n z^{n-1}$.

5.3. Let

$$\mathbb{C}(z) = \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}] \quad (5.5)$$

be the algebra of Laurent polynomials in z . We have a nondegenerate pairing

$$\langle -, - \rangle : U[[z, z^{-1}]] \times \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}] \rightarrow U \quad (5.6)$$

defined by

$$\langle f, \varphi \rangle = \text{Res}_z f(z) \varphi(z) \quad (5.7)$$

Hence Laurent polynomials should be seen as “test functions” for the formal distributions.

5.4. We introduce the most famous of distributions: the Dirac Delta function. We define it as

$$\delta(z - \omega) = z^{-1} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (z/\omega)^n \quad (5.8)$$

5.4.1 Remark. Kac has some confusing reasoning for $\partial^k \delta(z - \omega)$ that I don’t quite follow. But using our given definition, it makes more sense.

- **Exercise 2.** Prove $\delta(z - \omega) = \delta(\omega - z)$.
- **Exercise 3.** What is $\text{Res}_z(z - \omega)^n$?
- **Exercise 4.** Prove $\partial_z^k \delta(z - \omega) = (-\partial_\omega)^k \delta(z - \omega)$.
- **Exercise 5.** Prove $(z - \omega) \partial_\omega^{k+1} \delta(z - \omega) = \partial_\omega^k \delta(z - \omega)$.
- **Exercise 6.** Prove $(z - \omega)^{k+1} \partial_\omega^k \delta(z - \omega) = 0$.

5.5. Proposition. Let $f(z) \in U[[z, z^{-1}]]$ be any formal distribution, then

$$\text{Res}_z f(z) \delta(z - \omega) = f(\omega). \quad (5.9)$$

5.6. When does a formal distribution

$$a(z, \omega) = \sum_{m, n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{mn} z^m \omega^n \quad (5.10)$$

has an expansion of the form

$$a(z, \omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c^j(\omega) \partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega)? \quad (5.11)$$

Well, multiplying both sides by $(z - \omega)^n$ and taking the residue, we find

$$c^n(\omega) = \text{Res}_z a(z, \omega) \cdot (z - \omega)^n \quad (5.12)$$

Can we do this for any formal distribution? Not really. But we can construct a transformation π such that

$$\pi a(z, \omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} [\text{Res}_z a(z, \omega) \cdot (z - \omega)^j] \partial_{\omega}^j (z - \omega). \quad (5.13)$$

What is this transformation π ?

5.7 Proposition. The transformation π is a projection (i.e., $\pi^2 = \pi$). Moreover

$$\ker(\pi) = \{a(z, \omega) \mid a(z, \omega) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{mn} z^m \omega^n\}. \quad (5.14)$$

5.7.1 Corollary. Any formal distribution $a(z, \omega)$ may be represented uniquely as

$$a(z, \omega) = b(z, \omega) + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c^j(\omega) \partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega) \quad (5.15)$$

where $b(z, \omega) \in \ker(\pi)$.

5.7.2 Corollary. Let μ_N be the multiplication operator by $(z - \omega)^N$. Then its nullspace in $U[[z, z^{-1}, \omega, \omega^{-1}]]$ is

$$\ker(\mu_N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega) U[[\omega, \omega^{-1}]]. \quad (5.16)$$

Any element $a(z, \omega) \in \ker(\mu_N)$ is uniquely written of the form

$$a(z, \omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} c^j(\omega) \partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega) \quad (5.17)$$

where $c^j(\omega)$ is the “usual coefficients”.

Proof. By exercise 6, we see

$$(z - \omega)^{j+1} \partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega) = 0, \quad (5.18)$$

proving $\partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega)$ lives in the nullspace. But observe multiplying through by $c^j(\omega)$ changes *nothing*. So $\partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega)$ acts like a basis for $\ker(\mu_N)$. \square

5.7.3 *Remark.* The coefficients $c^j(\omega)$ are like Fourier coefficients.

Notation. Often formal distributions will be written as

$$a(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{(n)} z^{-n-1} \quad (5.19)$$

where

$$a_{(n)} = \text{Res}_z a(z) z^n. \quad (5.20)$$

Using this notation, the expansion in Corollary 5.7.2 is equivalent to

$$a_{(m,j)} = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \binom{m}{j} c_{(m+n-j)}^j. \quad (5.21)$$

5.1 Locality

5.8. We are interested when U is an associative superalgebra (i.e., a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded associative algebra). This happens when V is a superlinear space, and we have

$$U = \text{End}(V) \quad (5.22)$$

We denote the superbracket as

$$[a, b] = ab - (-1)^{\alpha\beta} ba. \quad (5.23)$$

where $\alpha = \deg(a)$, $\beta = \deg(b)$.

5.9. Definition. Two formal distributions $a(z)$, $b(z)$ with values in an associative superalgebra U are called “**Mutually Local**” if in $U[[z, z^{-1}, \omega, \omega^{-1}]]$ one has

$$(z - \omega)^N [a(z), b(z)] = (z - \omega)^N [b(z), a(z)] = 0 \quad (5.24)$$

for $N \gg 0$.

NB: the parity of a formal distribution is the parity of all its coefficients.

► **Exercise 7.** Prove or find a counter-example: if $a(z)$, $b(\omega)$ are mutually local, then $\partial_z a(z)$ and $b(\omega)$ are mutually local.

5.10. We introduce notation. Let

$$a(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{(n)} z^{-n-1}, \quad (5.25)$$

then we denote

$$a(z)_- = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_{(n)} z^{-n-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad a(z)_+ = \sum_{n < 0} a_{(n)} z^{-n-1}. \quad (5.26)$$

This is not the only way to decompose $a(z)$ into “positive” and “negative” parts, but it is the *only* way which also satisfies

$$(\partial a(z))_{\pm} = \partial(a(z)_{\pm}) \quad (5.27)$$

Given formal distributions $a(z)$, $b(\omega)$, we define

$$:a(z)b(\omega): = a(z)_+ b(\omega) + (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b(\omega) a(z)_-, \quad (5.28)$$

where $\alpha = \deg(a)$, $\beta = \deg(b)$. We borrow terminology from physicists, and call this the “**Normal Ordering**” of $a(z)b(\omega)$.

- **Exercise 8.** Is it true that $:a(z)b(\omega): = :b(\omega)a(z):$?
- **Exercise 9.** Prove $a(z)b(\omega) = [a(z)_-, b(\omega)] + :a(z)b(\omega):$.
- **Exercise 10.** Prove $(-1)^{\alpha\beta}b(\omega)a(z) = -[a(z)_+, b(\omega)] + :a(z)b(\omega):$.
- **Exercise 11.** Find $\text{Res}_z :a(z)b(\omega):$ and $\text{Res}_\omega :a(z)b(\omega):$.

5.11. Theorem. Let U be an associative super algebra. The following properties are equivalent

$$1. [a(z), b(\omega)] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} c^j(\omega) \partial_\omega^j \delta(z - \omega) \text{ where } c^j(\omega) \in U[[\omega, \omega^{-1}]].$$

2.

$$[a(z)_-, b(\omega)] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (i_{z\omega}(z - \omega)^{-j-1}) c^j(\omega)$$

$$[a(z)_+, b(\omega)] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (i_{\omega z}(z - \omega)^{-j-1}) c^j(\omega)$$

where $i_{z\omega}(z - \omega)^{j+1} = \sum_m z^{-m-1} \binom{m}{j} \omega^{m-j}$ and $\partial_\omega^j \delta(z - \omega) - i_{z\omega}(z - \omega)^{-j-1} = i_{\omega z}(z - \omega)^{-j-1}$.

$$3. a(z)b(\omega) = \left[\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} i_{z\omega}(z - \omega)^{-j-1} c^j(\omega) \right] + :a(z)b(\omega):, \text{ and } (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b(\omega)a(z) =$$

$$\left[\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} c^j(\omega) i_{\omega z}(z - \omega)^{-j-1} \right] + :a(z)b(\omega):.$$

$$4. [a_{(m)}, b_{(n)}] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \binom{m}{j} c_{(m+n-j)}^j$$

$$5. [a_{(m)}, b(\omega)] = \sum_{j=0} \binom{m}{j} c^j(\omega) \omega^{m-j}$$

$$6. [a_{(m)}, b_{(n)}] = \sum_{j=0} p_j(m) d_{m+n}^j \text{ where } p_j(x) \text{ are some polynomial, } d_{m+n}^j \in U.$$

$$7. a(z)b(\omega) = [i_{z\omega}(z - \omega)^{-N}] c(z, \omega) \text{ and } (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b(\omega)a(z) = [i_{\omega z}(z - \omega)^{-N}] c(z, \omega) \text{ for some formal distribution } c(z, \omega).$$

5.12. Physicists abuse notation writing

$$[a(z), b(\omega)] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} c^j(\omega) \partial_\omega^j \delta(z - \omega) \quad (5.29)$$

instead of

$$[a(z), b(\omega)] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{c^j(\omega)}{(z - \omega)^{j+1}} + :a(z)b(\omega): \quad (5.30)$$

or often just the singular part

$$[a(z), b(\omega)] \sim \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{c^j(\omega)}{(z-\omega)^{j+1}}. \quad (5.31)$$

Either case is called the “**Operator Product Expansion**”. The previous theorem tells us the singular part of the operator product expansion encodes the brackets between all the coefficients of mutually local formal distributions $a(z)$ and $b(\omega)$.

5.13. We introduce (for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$) the n^{th} product $a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega)$ on the space of formal distributions by the formula

$$a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = \text{Res}_z[a(z), b(\omega)](z-\omega)^n \quad (5.32)$$

Observe the operator product expansion becomes

$$a(z)b(\omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{a(\omega)_{(j)}b(\omega)}{(z-\omega)^{j+1}} + :a(z)b(\omega):. \quad (5.33)$$

5.14. Proposition. (a) For any two formal distributions $a(\omega)$ and $b(\omega)$, and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\partial a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = -na(\omega)_{(n-1)}b(\omega). \quad (5.34)$$

Moreover ∂ is a derivation of all n^{th} products.

(b) For any mutually local formal distributions $a(\omega)$ and $b(\omega)$, and for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^{j+n+1} \partial^j (b(\omega)_{(n+j)}a(\omega)). \quad (5.35)$$

(c) For any three formal distributions $a(\omega)$, $b(\omega)$ and $c(\omega)$, and for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a(\omega)_{(m)}(b(\omega)_{(n)}c(\omega)) &= \sum_{j=0}^m \binom{m}{j} (a(\omega)_{(j)}b(\omega))_{(m+n-j)}c(\omega) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{\alpha\beta} b(\omega)_{(n)}(a(\omega)_{(m)}c(\omega)). \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

Proof. (a) We want to prove

$$\partial a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = -na(\omega)_{(n)}\partial b(\omega). \quad (5.37)$$

We see that the left hand side is equal to

$$\partial a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = \partial_\omega \text{Res}_z[a(z), b(\omega)] \cdot (z-\omega)^n \quad (5.38a)$$

$$= \text{Res}_z[a(z), \partial b(\omega)] \cdot (z-\omega)^n - n \text{Res}_z[a(z), b(\omega)] \cdot (z-\omega)^{n-1} \quad (5.38b)$$

$$= a(\omega)_{(n)}\partial b(\omega) - na(\omega)_{(n-1)}b(\omega) \quad (5.38c)$$

$$= a(\omega)_{(n)}\partial b(\omega) + (\partial a(\omega)_{(n)})b(\omega) \quad (5.38d)$$

where the last step is just Leibniz's rule.

(b) We have

$$a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = \text{Res}_z[a(z), b(\omega)](z - \omega)^n \quad (5.39)$$

using the definition of the n^{th} product. Using the definition of the super bracket we have

$$\text{Res}_z[a(z), b(\omega)](z - \omega)^n = -(-1)^{\alpha\beta} \text{Res}_z[a(\omega), a(z)] \cdot (z - \omega)^n. \quad (5.40)$$

Using corollary 5.7.2 we have

$$\text{Res}_z[a(\omega), a(z)] \cdot (z - \omega)^n = \text{Res}_z \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-1)^j \partial_{\omega}^j \delta(z - \omega) b(z)_{(j)} a(z) (z - \omega)^{n-1}. \quad (5.41)$$

Exercise 5 and the definition of the n^{th} product gives us

$$a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \text{Res}_z \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{j+1} \partial_{\omega}^{j+1} \delta(z - \omega) b(z)_{(j)} a(z) \quad (5.42a)$$

$$= (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \text{Res}_z \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} \partial_z^j \delta(z - \omega) b(z)_{(j+n)} a(z) \quad (5.42b)$$

We integrate by parts and use proposition 5.5 to find

$$a(\omega)_{(n)}b(\omega) = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \text{Res}_z \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{j+1+n} \delta(z - \omega) \partial_z^j (b(z)_{(j+n)} a(z)) \quad (5.43a)$$

$$= (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{j+1+n} \partial^j (b(\omega)_{(j+n)} a(\omega)) \quad (5.43b)$$

which is what we wanted!

(c) We recall the definition of the n^{th} product, which tells us

$$a(\omega)_{(m)}(b(\omega)_{(n)}c(\omega)) = a(\omega)_{(m)} \text{Res}_u[b(u), c(\omega)] \cdot (u - \omega)^n \quad (5.44a)$$

and applying it again

$$a(\omega)_{(m)}(b(\omega)_{(n)}c(\omega)) = \text{Res}_z \text{Res}_u[a(z), [b(u), c(\omega)]](u - \omega)^n (z - \omega)^m. \quad (5.44b)$$

Using the super-Jacobi super identity gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Res}_z \text{Res}_u[a(z), [b(u), c(\omega)]](u - \omega)^n (z - \omega)^m \\ &= \text{Res}_z \text{Res}_u[[a(z), b(u)], c(\omega)](u - \omega)^n (z - \omega)^m \\ &+ (-1)^{\alpha\beta} \text{Res}_z \text{Res}_u[b(u), [a(z), c(\omega)]](u - \omega)^n (z - \omega)^m \end{aligned} \quad (5.45)$$

Observe

$$\text{Res}_z \text{Res}_u = b(\omega)_{(n)}(a(\omega)_{(m)}c(\omega)) \quad (5.46)$$

Combinatorics tells us

$$(z - \omega)^m (u - \omega)^n = \sum_{j=0}^m \binom{m}{j} (z - u)^j (u - \omega)^{m-j+n}. \quad (5.47)$$

When we substitute this back into Eq (5.45) and this proves (c). \square

5.14.1 Corollary. (a) If $a(z)$ and $b(z)$ are formal distributions, then $[a_{(n)}, b(z)] = 0$ if and only if $a(z)_{(n)}b(z) = 0$.

(b) If $a(z)$ is an odd formal distribution, then $a_{(n)}^2 = 0$ if and only if $\text{Res}_z a(z)_{(n)}a(z) = 0$.

(c) Let \mathcal{A} be a space consisting of mutually local formal U -valued distributions in ω which is ∂ -invariant and closed with respect to the 0^{th} product. Then with respect to the 0^{th} product, $\partial\mathcal{A}$ is a 2-sided ideal of \mathcal{A} , and $\mathcal{A}/\partial\mathcal{A}$ is a Lie superalgebra. Moreover the 0^{th} product defines on \mathcal{A} the structure of a left $(\mathcal{A}/\partial\mathcal{A})$ -module.

5.2 Taylor's Formula

5.15. Taylor's formula helps compute operator product expansions. We have some notation first: given some formal distribution

$$a(z) = \sum_n a_n z^n \quad (5.48)$$

we may construct a formal distribution in z and ω :

$$i_{z,\omega}a(z-\omega) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_n a_n i_{z,\omega}(z-\omega)^n. \quad (5.49)$$

Simplifying notation further, we consider the formal distribution $a(z-\omega)$ in z and ω in the domain $|z| > |\omega|$.

5.16 Proposition (Taylor's Formula). Let $a(z)$ be a formal distribution. Then we have the following equality of formal distributions in z and ω in the domain $|z| > |\omega|$

$$a(z+\omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \partial_z^j a(z) \omega^j. \quad (5.50)$$

Proof. We have $a(z) = \sum a_n z^n$, then

$$\partial_z^j a(z) = \sum_n \binom{n}{j} a_n z^{n-j}. \quad (5.51)$$

We plug $(z+\omega)$ into $a(-)$, first recalling the Binomial theorem states

$$(z+\omega)^n = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \binom{n}{j} z^{n-j} \omega^j \quad (5.52)$$

thus we obtain the desired result. \square

5.16.1 Remark. We see that $a(\omega) = \sum \partial^j a(z)(\omega-z)^j$, which proves another result (for free)!

5.17 Theorem. Let $a(z)$ be a formal distribution and N be a non-negative integer. Then the following equality of formal distributions in z and ω

$$\partial_{\omega}^N \delta(z-\omega)a(z) = \partial_{\omega}^N \delta(z-\omega) \sum_{j=0}^N \partial^j a(\omega)(z-\omega)^j. \quad (5.53)$$

Proof. To prove this, we need to see how each side of Eq (5.53) acts on an arbitrary Laurent polynomial $f(z)$. We see

$$\text{Res}_z \partial_z^N \delta(z - \omega) a(z) f(z) = \sum \partial^j a(\omega) \text{Res}_z \partial_z^N \delta(z - \omega) \cdot (z - \omega)^j f(z); \quad (5.54)$$

integrate by parts N times gives us

$$\text{Res}_z \delta(z - \omega) \partial^N (a(z) f(z)) = \sum \partial^j a(\omega) \text{Res}_z \delta(z - \omega) \partial_z^N ((z - \omega)^j f(z)) \quad (5.55)$$

which, using the Leibniz rule, is

$$\partial^N (a(z) f(z)) = \sum \partial^j a(\omega) \binom{N}{j} \partial^{N-j} f(\omega). \quad \square$$

5.3 Current Algebras

5.18. Consider the oscillator algebra \mathfrak{s} . This is a Lie algebra with basis α_n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$), K with commutation relations

$$[\alpha_m, \alpha_n] = m \delta_{m, -n} K, \quad \text{and} \quad [K, \alpha_m] = 0. \quad (5.56)$$

Let $U = U(\mathfrak{s})$ be its universal enveloping algebra.

5.19. Consider the formal distribution in U

$$\alpha(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \alpha_n z^{-n-1}. \quad (5.57)$$

We find

$$[\alpha(z), \alpha(\omega)] = \partial_\omega \delta(z - \omega) K. \quad (5.58)$$

This means α is local with respect to itself, with the operator product expansion

$$\alpha(z) \alpha(\omega) \sim \frac{K}{(z - \omega)^2}. \quad (5.59)$$

The even formal distribution is called a “**Free Boson**”.

5.20. Let \mathcal{G} be a Lie superalgebra equipped with an invariant supersymmetric bilinear form $(-|-)$. “Invariant” means

$$([a, b]|c) = (a|[b, c]) \quad (5.60)$$

for all $a, b, c \in \mathcal{G}$, and “supersymmetric” means

$$(a|b) = (-1)^{\alpha\beta} (b|a). \quad (5.61)$$

The “**Affinization**” of \mathcal{G} is the Lie superalgebra

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}} = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{G} + \mathbb{C}[K] \quad (5.62)$$

with a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading extending that of \mathcal{G} by

$$p(t) = p(K) = 0 \quad (5.63)$$

and commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [a_m, b_n] &= [a, b]_{m+n} + m(a|b) \delta_{m, -n} K \\ [K, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.64)$$

We abbreviate $at^m = a \otimes t^m$ as a_m . Also note that $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$ is the loop algebra, and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ its central extension.

5.21. We introduce formal distributions with values in $U(\widehat{\mathcal{G}})$ which are “**Currents**”

$$a(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n z^{-n-1} \quad (5.65)$$

for $a_* \in \mathcal{G}$. Then we find

$$[a(z), b(\omega)] = \delta(z - \omega)[a, b](\omega) + \partial_\omega \delta(z - \omega) \cdot (a|b) \cdot K \quad (5.66)$$

hence all the currents are mutually local with respect to the operator product expansion:

$$a(z)b(\omega) \sim \frac{[a, b](\omega)}{z - \omega} + \frac{(a|b)K}{(z - \omega)^2} \quad (5.67)$$

5.22. We generalize this process (or “super-size” it), obtaining a “**Superaffinization**”, which is a central extension of the super loop super-algebra:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{super}} = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}, \theta] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{G} + \mathbb{C}[K] \quad (5.68)$$

where $\theta^2 = 0$ and $p(\theta) = 1$, and the remaining operator product expansions are as follows: For $a \in \mathcal{G}$ we define the “**Super-Current**”

$$\bar{a}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{n+1/2} z^{-n-1} \quad (5.69)$$

where $a_{n+1/2} = t^n \theta \otimes a$. The super currents $\bar{a}(z)$ are pair-wise local and also local with respect to the currents, and the remaining operator product expansions are

$$a(z)\bar{b}(\omega) \sim \frac{\overline{[a, b]}(\omega)}{z - \omega}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{a}(z)\bar{b}(\omega) \sim \frac{(a|b)K}{z - \omega}. \quad (5.70)$$

They form a subalgebra.

5.23. Lets consider a different construction. Let A be a superspace with a skew-supersymmetric bilinear form, i.e.,

$$(\varphi|\psi) = (-1)^{p(\varphi)}(\psi|\varphi) \quad (5.71)$$

which implies $(\text{odd}|\text{even}) = 0$. The “**Clifford Affinization**” of $(A, (-|-))$ is the Lie superalgebra

$$C_A = \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} A + \mathbb{C}[K] \quad (5.72)$$

with the commutation relations (letting $m, n \in \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$ and $\varphi, \psi \in A$)

$$[\varphi_m, \psi_n] = (\varphi|\psi)\delta_{m, -n}K \quad (5.73)$$

and

$$[C_A, K] = 0 \quad (5.74)$$

where $\varphi_m = t^{m-1/2} \otimes \varphi$. The formal distribution

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi_{n+1/2} z^{-n-1} \quad (5.75)$$

are mutually local with respect to their operator product expansion

$$\varphi(z)\psi(\omega) \sim \frac{(\varphi|\psi)K}{(z - \omega)}. \quad (5.76)$$

5.24. Example. Let A be the odd 1-dimensional superspace $\mathbb{C}\varphi$ with bilinear form $(\varphi|\varphi) = 1$. Let $K = 1$. Then C_A turns into the algebra

$$\varphi_m \varphi_n + \varphi_n \varphi_m = \delta_{m,-n} \quad (5.77)$$

for $m, n \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$. The (odd) formal distribution

$$\varphi(z) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi_{m+1/2} z^{-m-1} \quad (5.78)$$

is called a “**Free Neutral Fermion**”. Its operator product expansion is

$$\varphi(z)\varphi(\omega) \sim \frac{1}{z-\omega}. \quad (5.79)$$

5.25. Example. Let A be the odd 2-dimensional superspace $\mathbb{C}\varphi^+ \oplus \mathbb{C}\varphi^-$ with the supersymmetric bilinear form

$$(\varphi^+|\varphi^-) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad (\varphi^\pm|\varphi^\pm) = 1. \quad (5.80)$$

Again let $K = 1$. Then we obtain the algebra

$$\varphi_m^\pm \varphi_n^\mp + \varphi_n^\mp \varphi_m^\pm = \delta_{m,-n} \quad (5.81)$$

and

$$\varphi_m^\pm \varphi_n^\pm + \varphi_n^\pm \varphi_m^\pm = 0. \quad (5.82)$$

The odd formal distributions

$$\varphi^\pm(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \varphi_{n+1/2}^\pm z^{-n-1} \quad (5.83)$$

are called “**Charged Free Fermions**” and their operator product expansion is

$$\varphi^\pm(z)\varphi^\mp(\omega) \sim \frac{1}{z-\omega} \quad (5.84)$$

and

$$\varphi^\pm(z)\varphi^\pm(\omega) \sim 0. \quad (5.85)$$

A Set Theory

A.1. Overview. This section is just to establish the notation used for set theory. We use a “naive set theory”, which — for the author — is really just ZF+GC.

A.2. Global Choice. Recall we have quantifiers \forall and \exists . We can also have a quantifier ε which has the form

$$\varepsilon x : P(x) \tag{A.1}$$

and it returns the object x which satisfies the predicate $P(x)$, if one exists. If there is no such x (e.g., $P(x)$ is a contradiction), then it returns an arbitrary object.

This ε operator is called the “**Global Choice Operator**”.

A.3. Definition. A “**Set**” is a well-defined collection of “stuff” without duplicates.

A.4. Definition. If X is a set, and x is an object, if x lives in the collection X we write $x \in X$ and call it a “**Element**” or “**Member**” of X . We will write sets using capital Latin letters unless otherwise indicates. If y does not belong to X , we write $y \notin X$.

Note *any type of object* can belong to a set. For example, we can have a set of selected sets, the set of integers (usually denoted \mathbb{Z}), etc.

CAUTION: It is illegal (“meaningless”) to write $X \in X$ or $X \notin X$.

A.5. Example. The empty collection is a set, denoted \emptyset and called the “**Empty Set**”. It is defined by the condition, for any x , we have $x \notin \emptyset$.

A.6. Example. The collection of natural numbers $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, the natural numbers with zero $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. The integers $\mathbb{Z} = \{\dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots\}$. These are all sets.

A.7. Non-Example (Universe). Consider \mathcal{U} the well-defined collection of all sets. It is not a set, since it is illegal to write $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{U}$. No, the universe is usually something “bigger” than a set (it’s a *class*). We usually don’t work with classes, and so we won’t worry about them. But we’d like to note the collection of all sets \mathcal{U} is called the “**Universe**”.

A.8. Definition. Let X and Y be sets. If every element $x \in X$ belongs to Y , and every $y \in Y$ belongs to X , then we say the two sets are “**Equal**” and write $X = Y$.

A.9. Definition. Let X and Y be sets. If every element $x \in X$ belongs to Y , then we write $X \subseteq Y$ and call X a “**Subset**” of Y .

A.10. Theorem. We have $X = Y$ if and only if $X \subseteq Y$ and $Y \subseteq X$.

A.11. Definition. Let Y be a set. A “**Proper Subset**” X of Y consists of a subset that is not equal to Y . That is: $X \subseteq Y$ and $X \neq Y$. We indicate proper subsets by writing $X \subset Y$.

A.12. Examples. Observe we have $\mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{N}_0 \subset \mathbb{Z}$.

A.13. Example. For any set X , we have $X \subseteq X$ but $X \not\subset X$.

A.14. Definition. Let X be any set. Then the “**Power Set**” of X is the collection $\mathcal{P}(X)$ of subsets $Y \subseteq X$. Note this implies $X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$.

A.15. Proposition. Let X be any set. Then $\emptyset \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$.

A.16. Definition. An “**Ordered Tuple**” (a, b) is a pair of mathematical objects a, b . The first slot a is the first component (sometimes called the *first coordinate*).

We write $(a, b) = (x, y)$ if and only if $a = x$ and $b = y$.

More generally, if we have n objects, we can form the ordered n -tuple (x_1, \dots, x_n) . Again, equality is defined component-wise.

A.17. Definition. Let X and Y be sets. Then their “**Cartesian Product**” is a set $X \times Y$ consisting of ordered pairs $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ where $x \in X, y \in Y$.

Again, we can generalize this to the Cartesian product of any number of sets $X_1 \times \dots \times X_n$ consisting of ordered n -tuples.

A.18. Definition. A “**Function**” $f: X \rightarrow Y$ associates to each $x \in X$ precisely one $y \in Y$ usually denoted $y = f(x)$.

Sometimes mathematicians assert functions are sets. Well, a function f is a subset $f \subseteq X \times Y$ with the property for each $x \in X$, we have precisely one ordered pair $(x, y) \in f$.

A.19. Example. Let X be any set. The identity function $\text{id}: X \rightarrow X$ defined by $\text{id}(x) = x$ is a function on X .

B References

- [1] Geoffrey Grimmet and David Stirzaker,
Probability and Random Processes.
Third ed., Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [2] Kyle Siegrist,
“Virtual Laboratories in Probability and Statistics.”
Eprint math.utah.edu/stat/, accessed November 9, 2012.
- [3] Tom E (mathoverflow.net/users/3200),
“What’s the use of a complete measure?”
Eprint mathoverflow.net, January 12, 2010.
- [4] Victor G. Kac,
“Formal distribution algebras and conformal algebras.”
Eprint [arXiv:q-alg/9709027](http://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9709027), 20 pages.
- [5] Victor G. Kac,
Vertex Algebras for Beginners.
Second ed., American Mathematical Society, 1998.
- [6] C. Nozaradan,
“Introduction to Vertex Algebras,”
Eprint [arXiv:0809.1380](http://arxiv.org/abs/0809.1380) [[math.QA](#)].
- [7] T. Gannon,
“Much ado about Mathieu,”
Eprint [arXiv:1211.5531](http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.5531) [[math.RT](#)].
- [8] S. H. -L. Carnahan,
“Generalized Moonshine IV: Monstrous Lie algebras,”
Eprint [arXiv:1208.6254](http://arxiv.org/abs/1208.6254) [[math.RT](#)].