(a) >> normcdf(50,mu,sigma) =

(b) >> 1-normcdf(70,mu,sigma) =

>> norminv(0.9,mu,sigma) =

(c) >> norminv(0.1,mu,sigma) =

3.
>> lambda=0.75;
(a) >> poisspdf(0,lambda) = 0.4724
(b) >> 1-poisscdf(1,lambda) = 0.1734
(c) >> 1-poisscdf(4,lambda) = 0.0011
(d) >> x = [0:10];
>> y = poisspdf(x,lambda);
>> bar(x,y)

0.2190

45.0408

70.1592

0.1029

[underweight]

(overweight)

5. (a) x=[131, 119, 138, 125, 129, 126, 131, 132, 126, 128, 128, 131];

>> mu = mean(x) = 128.6667

>> S = std(x) = 4.6384

(b) Since n = 12, the degree of freedom is 11.

Lower bound of the 95% CI based on t-distribution is:

mu + tinv(0.025, 11)\*S/sqrt(12) = 125.7195.

The upper bound is:

mu + tinv(0.975, 11)\*S/sqrt(12) = 131.6138.

(c) y = [136, 130, 126, 126, 139, 141, 137, 138, 133, 131, 134, 129]

mean(y) = 133.3333.

Note that this mean value of male bears is outside of the upper bound of 95% CI of female bears. This suggests that male skulls are not having a comparable size as the female skulls. In fact, the male head size is bigger.

(d) >> t=(133.3333-mu)/(S/sqrt(12)) = 3.4852.

This is to the very right of the tail, suggesting that the male size is drifting away from the female statistics.

(e) >> 1-tcdf(t,11) = 0.0026.

Remember we are testing whether the two sizes are the same. In other words, this is a 2-tailed test, which would give a p-value twice the amount of 0.0026, which is **0.0052**. Still this is smaller than 0.05, suggesting a rejection of the null hypothesis. That is, the head size differs significantly.

(f) mu + tinv(0.975, 11)\*S/sqrt(12) = 131.6138.
This is the limit that male size will not be considered significantly away from the female statistics. 
[ Same as found in part (b) ]