1. Each of the 200 ENGG2430 students shows up to class independently with probability 0.9 and asks Poisson(0.05) questions in there. Let S be the number of students in class and Q the total number of questions asked. Find (a) E[S], (b) E[Q|S], (c) E[Q], (d) Var[E[Q|S]], (e) Var[Q|S], (f) E[Var[Q|S]], (g) Var[Q].

Solution: Let Q_i be the number of question asked by the *i*-th student present in class; $Q = Q_1 + \cdots + Q_S$.

- (a) $E[S] = 200 \cdot 0.9 = 180.$
- (b) $\mathbf{E}[Q|S] = \sum_{i=1}^{S} \mathbf{E}[Q_i] = S \cdot 0.05 = 0.05S$ by linearity of expectation.
- (c) $E[Q] = E[E[Q|S]] = E[0.05S] = 0.05 \cdot 180 = 9$ by (b).
- (d) $\operatorname{Var}[E[Q|S]] = \operatorname{Var}[0.05S] = 0.05^2 \operatorname{Var}[S] = 0.05^2 \cdot (200 \cdot 0.9 \cdot 0.1) = 0.045$ by (b).
- (e) $\operatorname{Var}[Q|S] = \sum_{i=1}^{S} \operatorname{Var}[Q_i] = S \cdot 0.05 = 0.05S$ by independence of Q_i 's.
- (f) E[Var[Q|S]] = E[0.05S] = 9 by (e).
- (g) $\operatorname{Var}[Q] = \operatorname{Var}[\operatorname{E}[Q|S]] + \operatorname{E}[\operatorname{Var}[Q|S]] = 9.00045$ by (d) and (f).
- 2. You flip a coin with unknown probability of heads p. You want to learn the value of p.
 - (a) Alice suggests the following estimator \hat{P}_A : Keep flipping the coin until you see the first head in the N-th flip. Set $\hat{P}_A = 1/N$.
 - (b) Bob suggests another estimator \hat{P}_B : Flip the coin 10 times, count the number of heads Y and set $\hat{P}_B = Y/10$.

What is the expectation of each estimator in terms of p? Which one is better?

Solution: \hat{P}_A has expectation

$$\mathbf{E}[\hat{P}_A] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \cdot (1-p)^{n-1} p = \frac{p}{1-p} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-p)^n}{n} \approx \frac{p}{1-p} \cdot (-\log p),$$

since the infinite series is the Taylor expansion of $-\log p$. \hat{P}_B has expectation

$$E[\hat{P}_B] = E\left[\frac{Y}{10}\right] = \frac{1}{10}E[Y] = \frac{10p}{10} = p$$

The expectation of $\hat{P}_A \neq p$ in general while \hat{P}_B does; \hat{P}_A is said to be biased and \hat{P}_B unbiased.

In the next two questions, estimate the quantity of your interest using the method of your choice: Markov's inequality, Chebyshev's inequality, or the Central Limit Theorem. Justify why the method is applicable and discuss the quality of the estimate.

Summary of the assumption and result of the three methods:

- Markov's inequality: $P(X \ge a) \le E[X]/a$.
 - Applies for any **non-negative** random variable X, and any a > 0 (a > E[X] for a meaningful bound).
 - Requires only E[X], useful when it is small.
 - Is an upper bound to a one-sided (right tail) probability.

- Chebyshev's inequality: $P(|X \mu| \ge t\sigma) \le 1/t^2$, where $\mu = E[X], \sigma = \sqrt{Var[X]}$.
 - Applies for any random variable X (with finite μ, σ), and any t (t > 1 for a meaningful bound).
 - Requires both expectation and variance of X.
 - Is an upper bound to a two-sided probability.
- Central Limit Theorem: $(X \mu_X)/\sigma_X \approx \text{Normal}(0, 1)$, where $X = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ are independent and have the same PDF/PMF, $\mu_X = \mathbb{E}[X] = n \mathbb{E}[X_i], \sigma_X = \sqrt{\text{Var}[X]} = \sqrt{n \text{Var}[X_i]}$.
 - Applies for X being sum of many (usually $n \ge 30$) independent random variables; no restriction on distribution of X_i 's.
 - Requires both $E[X_i]$ and $Var[X_i]$.
 - Approximates the CDF of X. Using the axioms of probability, we can use it to approximate other events of interest (e.g. P(X < -5 or X > 7)).

Roughly speaking, in terms of generality, Markov's inequality > Chebyshev's inequality > CLT; and in terms of tightness, Markov's inequality < Chebyshev's inequality < CLT (if n is large enough).

3. The following exam statistics are posted on the course website:

section	no. students	average grade	std. dev.
А	30	65	5
В	20	70	10

what can you say about the number of students whose exam grade was 30 or below?

Solution: Let X_A and X_B be the grade of a random student in section A and section B, respectively. The table tells us that $\mu_A = E[X_A] = 65$, $\sigma_A = \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}[X_A]} = 5$, $\mu_B = E[X_B] = 70$, $\sigma_B = \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}[X_B]} = 10$. By Chebyshev's inequality, for a random student in section A,

$$P(X_A \le 30) = P(X_A \le \mu_A - 7 \cdot \sigma_A) \le P(|X_A - \mu_A| \ge 7\sigma_A) \le 1/49 \approx 0.0204.$$

Although we are only interested in the probability that X_A is 7 standard deviations smaller than its mean, Chebyshev's inequality only tells us the probability of the possibly larger event that X_A is either 7 standard deviations smaller or 7 standard deviations larger than its mean. This is already a tremendously small probability – about 2%.

Similarly, for a random student in section B,

$$P(X_B \le 30) = P(X_B \le \mu_B - 4 \cdot \sigma_B) \le P(|X_B - \mu_B| \ge 4\sigma_B) \le 1/16 \approx 0.00625.$$

Since there are 30 students in section A, at most $1/49 \cdot 30$ students must have received 30 or below, so nobody got that kind of grade. In section B, at most $1/16 \cdot 20$ students got 30 or below, so at most one student in the whole class could have received 30 or below on the exam.

Alternative Solution: Alternatively, we can first calculate the statistics for a random student X in the whole course and then apply Chebyshev's inequality to X. Let X be a random student and Y their section (using 1 and 2 for sections A and B). Then E[X|Y] takes value 65 with probability 3/5 and 70 with probability 2/5.

By total expectation theorem,

$$\mu = \mathbf{E}[X] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[X|Y]] = 65 \cdot 3/5 + 70 \cdot 2/5 = 67.$$

By total variance theorem $\operatorname{Var}[X] = \operatorname{Var}[\operatorname{E}[X|Y]] + \operatorname{E}[\operatorname{Var}[X|Y]]$, where

Var[E[X|Y]] =
$$(65 - 67)^2 \cdot 3/5 + (70 - 67)^2 \cdot 2/5 = 6$$

E[Var[X|Y]] = $5^2 \cdot 3/5 + 10^2 \cdot 2/5 = 55$,

hence standard deviation of X is $\sigma = \sqrt{61} \approx 7.8103$. Chebyshev's inequality says

$$P(X \le 30) = P(X \le \mu - (37/\sqrt{61}) \cdot \sigma) \le P(|X - \mu| \ge (37/\sqrt{61}) \cdot \sigma) \le 61/37^2 \approx 0.0445,$$

so the number of students who got 30 or below is at most $0.0445 \cdot 50 = 2.2225$, so at most 2.

4. You are collecting donations for a charity. Each donor gives you \$10 with probability half and \$20 with probability half. Assuming donors are independent, estimate the probability that you have collected at least \$1200 after taking in 100 donations.

Solution: Let X be the total amount of money collected. We want to estimate $P(X \ge 1200)$. X is the sum of 100 random variables with the same PMF so we can use the Central Limit Theorem. We have

$$\mu = \mathbf{E}[X] = 100 \cdot (10 \cdot 1/2 + 20 \cdot 1/2) = 1500$$

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\operatorname{Var} X} = \sqrt{100 \cdot ((10 - 15)^2 \cdot 1/2 + (20 - 15)^2 \cdot 1/2)} = \sqrt{100 \cdot 25} = 50.$$

Therefore,

$$P(X \ge 1200) \approx P(X \ge \mu - 6\sigma) \approx P(N \ge -6) \approx 1 - 9.86 \cdot 10^{-10}$$

where N is a Normal(0, 1) random variable.

5. You randomly divide 48 boys and 48 girls into teams of equal size. Show that if you divide them into 12 teams of 8 then there are no same-sex teams with probability at least 90%.

Solution: For $12 \ge i \ge 1$, let X_i be the indicator variable that the *i*-th team consists of all boys or all girls, then $X = \sum_{i=1}^{12} X_i$. The X_i 's are not independent, so the Central Limit Theorem doesn't apply.

The probability that any given team is all-boys is

$$p = \frac{48}{96} \cdot \frac{47}{95} \cdots \frac{41}{89}$$

using the formula for conditional probabilities (the first member is a boy, the second member is a boy given the first one is etc.). As boys and girls are symmetric, the probability the team is same-sex is 2p. By linearity of expectation,

$$E[X] = E[X_1] + \dots + E[X_{12}] = 12 \cdot (2p) \approx 0.068.$$

At this point we can proceed in two ways. We can use Markov's inequality to conclude that $P(X \ge 1) \le E[X]/1 \approx 0.068$, so the probability of having no same-sex teams is $P(X = 0) \approx 1 - 0.068 = 0.922$. This meets the requirement and we are done.

Alternatively, we can calculate Var[X] and apply Chebyshev's inequality, which could result in a better bound. This is feasible but a bit difficult since X_1, \ldots, X_{12} are not independent so we need their covariances.