Alex Psomas: Lecture 19.

- 1. Distributions
- 2. Tail bounds

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$



Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X=i]$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times Pr[X=i]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i (Pr[X \ge i] - Pr[X \ge i+1])$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X = i]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \left(\Pr[X \ge i] - \Pr[X \ge i+1] \right)$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(i \times \Pr[X \ge i] - i \times \Pr[X \ge i+1] \right)$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X = i]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i(\Pr[X \ge i] - \Pr[X \ge i + 1])$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (i \times \Pr[X \ge i] - i \times \Pr[X \ge i + 1])$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X \ge i] - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X \ge i + 1]$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times Pr[X = i]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i(Pr[X \ge i] - Pr[X \ge i+1])$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (i \times Pr[X \ge i] - i \times Pr[X \ge i+1])$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times Pr[X \ge i] - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times Pr[X \ge i+1]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times Pr[X \ge i] - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (i-1) \times Pr[X \ge i]$$

Theorem: For a r.v. X that takes values in $\{0, 1, 2, ...\}$, one has

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X = i]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i(\Pr[X \ge i] - \Pr[X \ge i + 1])$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (i \times \Pr[X \ge i] - i \times \Pr[X \ge i + 1])$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X \ge i] - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X \ge i + 1]$$

=
$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \times \Pr[X \ge i] - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (i - 1) \times \Pr[X \ge i] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \Pr[X \ge i].$$

Let X be Geom(p). **Theorem**

$$Pr[X > n + m | X > n] = Pr[X > m], m, n \ge 0.$$

I flip a coin (probability of H is p) until I get H.

I flip a coin (probability of *H* is *p*) until I get *H*. What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times?

I flip a coin (probability of *H* is *p*) until I get *H*. What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times? $(1 - p)^{99}p$

I flip a coin (probability of H is p) until I get H.

What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times? $(1-p)^{99}p$

What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times if (given that) the first 20 were T?

I flip a coin (probability of H is p) until I get H.

What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times? $(1-p)^{99}p$

What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times if (given that) the first 20 were T?

Same as flipping it exactly 80 times!

I flip a coin (probability of H is p) until I get H.

What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times? $(1-p)^{99}p$

What's the probability that I flip it exactly 100 times if (given that) the first 20 were T?

Same as flipping it exactly 80 times!

 $(1-p)^{79}p$.

X is a geometrically distributed RV with parameter p.

$$E[X^2] = (2-p)/p^2$$

$$E[X^2] = (2-p)/p^2$$
 (tricks)

X is a geometrically distributed RV with parameter p. Thus, $Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p$ for $n \ge 1$. Recall E[X] = 1/p.

$$E[X^2] = (2-p)/p^2$$
 (tricks)

 $var[X] = E[X^2] - E[X]^2$

$$E[X^2] = (2-p)/p^2$$
 (tricks)

$$var[X] = E[X^2] - E[X]^2 = \frac{2-p}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p^2}$$

$$E[X^2] = (2-p)/p^2$$
 (tricks)

$$var[X] = E[X^2] - E[X]^2 = \frac{2-p}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p^2} = \frac{1-p}{p^2}.$$

$$\sigma(X) = \frac{\sqrt{1-p}}{p}$$

$$E[X^2] = (2-p)/p^2$$
 (tricks)

$$var[X] = E[X^2] - E[X]^2 = \frac{2-p}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p^2} = \frac{1-p}{p^2}.$$

 $\sigma(X) = \frac{\sqrt{1-p}}{p} \approx E[X]$ when p is small(ish).

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads.

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$.

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$.

Poisson Distribution is distribution of X "for large *n*."

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$. **Poisson Distribution** is distribution of *X* "for large *n*."



Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$. **Poisson Distribution** is distribution of *X* "for large *n*."

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$. **Poisson Distribution** is distribution of *X* "for large *n*." We expect $X \ll n$.

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$. **Poisson Distribution** is distribution of *X* "for large *n*." We expect $X \ll n$. For $m \ll n$ one has

Experiment: flip a coin *n* times. The coin is such that $Pr[H] = \lambda/n$. Random Variable: *X* - number of heads. Thus, $X = B(n, \lambda/n)$. **Poisson Distribution** is distribution of *X* "for large *n*." We expect $X \ll n$. For $m \ll n$ one has

$$Pr[X=m]=rac{\lambda^m}{m!}e^{-\lambda}.$$

Poisson Distribution: Definition and Mean

Definition Poisson Distribution with parameter $\lambda > 0$

$$X = P(\lambda) \Leftrightarrow Pr[X = m] = \frac{\lambda^m}{m!} e^{-\lambda}, m \ge 0.$$

Poisson Distribution: Definition and Mean

Definition Poisson Distribution with parameter $\lambda > 0$

$$X=P(\lambda)\Leftrightarrow Pr[X=m]=rac{\lambda^m}{m!}e^{-\lambda},m\geq 0.$$
Fact: $E[X]=$
Poisson Distribution: Definition and Mean

Definition Poisson Distribution with parameter $\lambda > 0$

$$X = P(\lambda) \Leftrightarrow Pr[X = m] = rac{\lambda^m}{m!} e^{-\lambda}, m \ge 0.$$

Fact: $E[X] = \lambda$.

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval?

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)".

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals.

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?



Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals. Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval!

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?



Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals. Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval!

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?



Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals. Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval! Maybe more...

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

┝┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼

Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals. Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval! Maybe more... and more.

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

┝┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼

Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals. Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval! Maybe more... and more.

As n goes to infinity...analyze ...

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

┠┽┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼

Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals.

Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval! Maybe more...

and more.

As n goes to infinity...analyze ...

.... $Pr[X = i] = {n \choose i} p^i (1-p)^{n-i}$. derive simple expression.

Poisson: Distribution of how many events in an interval? Average: λ .

What is the maximum number of customers you might see?

┠┽┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼

Idea: Cut into intervals so that "sum of Bernoulli (indicators)". n = 10 sub-intervals.

Binomial distribution, if only one event/interval! Maybe more...

and more.

As n goes to infinity...analyze ...

.... $Pr[X = i] = {n \choose i} p^i (1 - p)^{n-i}$. derive simple expression.

...And we get the Poisson distribution!

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval, and the average number of events per interval is λ

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval, and the average number of events per interval is λ and events are independent

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,

and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$

and events are independent

and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,

- If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,
- and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$
- and events are independent
- and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,
- then it might be appropriate to use Poisson distribution.

- If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,
- and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$
- and events are independent
- and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,
- then it might be appropriate to use Poisson distribution.

$$Pr[k \text{ events in interval}] = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$$

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,

and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$

and events are independent

and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,

then it might be appropriate to use Poisson distribution.

$$\Pr[k \text{ events in interval}] = rac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$$

Examples:

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,

and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$

and events are independent

and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,

then it might be appropriate to use Poisson distribution.

$$\Pr[k \text{ events in interval}] = rac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$$

Examples: photons arriving at a telescope,

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,

and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$

and events are independent

and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,

then it might be appropriate to use Poisson distribution.

$$Pr[k \text{ events in interval}] = rac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$$

Examples: photons arriving at a telescope, telephone calls arriving in a system,

If an event can occur 0,1,2,... times in an interval,

and the average number of events per interval is $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$

and events are independent

and the probability of an event in an interval is proportional to the interval's length,

then it might be appropriate to use Poisson distribution.

$$Pr[k \text{ events in interval}] = rac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$$

Examples: photons arriving at a telescope, telephone calls arriving in a system, the number of mutations on a strand of DNA per unit length...

Simeon Poisson

The Poisson distribution is named after:

Simeon Poisson

The Poisson distribution is named after:



"Life is good for only two things: doing mathematics and teaching it."

►
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m}p^m(1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0, ..., n;$$

•
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m}p^m(1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0, ..., n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$

▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);

►
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

•
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);

•
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m}p^m(1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0, ..., n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

•
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$

▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);

•
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m}p^m(1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0, ..., n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

▶ Geom(p) : Pr[X = n] =

▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);

•
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = {n \choose m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0, ..., n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

• Geom(p): $Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p, n = 1, 2, ...;$

- ▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);
- $B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = {n \choose m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0, ..., n;$ E[X] = np;Var[X] = np(1-p);

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

• Geom(p): $Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p, n = 1, 2, ...;$ $E[X] = \frac{1}{p};$
▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1 - p);

►
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

• $Geom(p): Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p, n = 1, 2, ...;$ $E[X] = \frac{1}{p};$ $Var[X] = \frac{1-p}{p^2};$

• $P(\lambda)$:

▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);

►
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

• $Geom(p): Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p, n = 1, 2, ...;$ $E[X] = \frac{1}{p};$ $Var[X] = \frac{1-p}{p^2};$

•
$$P(\lambda)$$
: $Pr[X = n] =$

▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);

►
$$B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = np;$
 $Var[X] = np(1-p);$

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

• $Geom(p): Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p, n = 1, 2, ...;$ $E[X] = \frac{1}{p};$ $Var[X] = \frac{1-p}{p^2};$

•
$$P(\lambda): Pr[X=n] = \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{-\lambda}, n \ge 0;$$

- ▶ Bern(p): Pr[X = 1] = p; E[X] = p; Var[X] = p(1-p);
- ► $B(n,p): Pr[X = m] = \binom{n}{m} p^m (1-p)^{n-m}, m = 0,...,n;$ E[X] = np;Var[X] = np(1-p);

►
$$U[1,...,n]: Pr[X = m] = \frac{1}{n}, m = 1,...,n;$$

 $E[X] = \frac{n+1}{2};$
 $Var[X] = \frac{n^2-1}{12};$

• $Geom(p): Pr[X = n] = (1 - p)^{n-1}p, n = 1, 2, ...;$ $E[X] = \frac{1}{p};$ $Var[X] = \frac{1-p}{p^2};$

•
$$P(\lambda): Pr[X = n] = \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} e^{-\lambda}, n \ge 0;$$

 $E[X] = \lambda;$
 $Var[X] = \lambda.$

Inequalities: An Overview



Andrey (Andrei) Andreyevich Markov



Andrey (Andrei) Andreyevich Markov



Andrey Markov is best known for his work on stochastic processes. A primary subject of his research later became known as Markov chains and Markov processes.

Andrey (Andrei) Andreyevich Markov



Andrey Markov is best known for his work on stochastic processes. A primary subject of his research later became known as Markov chains and Markov processes.

Pafnuty Chebyshev was one of his teachers.

Andrey (Andrei) Andreyevich Markov



Andrey Markov is best known for his work on stochastic processes. A primary subject of his research later became known as Markov chains and Markov processes.

Pafnuty Chebyshev was one of his teachers.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version) Assume $f : \mathfrak{R} \to [0, \infty)$ is nondecreasing.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version)

Assume $f:\mathfrak{R}\to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative random variable X

 $Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$, for all *a* such that f(a) > 0.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version)

Assume $f:\mathfrak{R}\to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative random variable X

 $Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$, for all *a* such that f(a) > 0.

Proof:

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version) Assume $f: \mathfrak{R} \to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative

random variable X

$$\Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$$
, for all *a* such that $f(a) > 0$.

Proof:

Observe that

$$1\{X \ge a\} \le \frac{f(X)}{f(a)}.$$

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version)

Assume $f:\mathfrak{R}\to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative random variable X

 $Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$, for all *a* such that f(a) > 0.

Proof:

Observe that

$$1\{X\geq a\}\leq \frac{f(X)}{f(a)}.$$

Indeed, if X < a, the inequality reads $0 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot) \ge 0$.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version)

Assume $f:\mathfrak{R}\to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative random variable X

$$\Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$$
, for all *a* such that $f(a) > 0$.

Proof:

Observe that

$$1\{X\geq a\}\leq \frac{f(X)}{f(a)}.$$

Indeed, if X < a, the inequality reads $0 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot) \ge 0$. Also, if $X \ge a$, it reads $1 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot)$ is nondecreasing.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version)

Assume $f:\mathfrak{R}\to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative random variable X

 $Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$, for all *a* such that f(a) > 0.

Proof:

Observe that

$$1\{X\geq a\}\leq \frac{f(X)}{f(a)}.$$

Indeed, if X < a, the inequality reads $0 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot) \ge 0$. Also, if $X \ge a$, it reads $1 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot)$ is nondecreasing. Expectation is monotone: if $X(\omega) \le Y(\omega)$ for all ω , then $E[X] \le E[Y]$.

The inequality is named after Andrey Markov, although it appeared earlier in the work of Pafnuty Chebyshev. It should be (and is sometimes) called Chebyshev's first inequality.

Theorem Markov's Inequality (the fancy version)

Assume $f:\mathfrak{R}\to [0,\infty)$ is nondecreasing. Then, for a non-negative random variable X

$$\Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$$
, for all *a* such that $f(a) > 0$

Proof:

Observe that

$$1\{X\geq a\}\leq \frac{f(X)}{f(a)}.$$

Indeed, if X < a, the inequality reads $0 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot) \ge 0$. Also, if $X \ge a$, it reads $1 \le f(X)/f(a)$, which holds since $f(\cdot)$ is nondecreasing. Expectation is monotone: if $X(\omega) \le Y(\omega)$ for all ω , then $E[X] \le E[Y]$. Therefore,

$$E[1\{X \ge a\}] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}.$$

A picture



$$f(a)1\{X \ge a\} \le f(x) \Rightarrow 1\{X \ge a\} \le \frac{f(X)}{f(a)}$$
$$\Rightarrow \Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(X)]}{f(a)}$$

Markov Inequality Note

A more common version of Markov is for f(x) = x:

Markov Inequality Note

A more common version of Markov is for f(x) = x:

Theorem For a non-negative random variable *X*, and any a > 0,

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}.$$

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$.

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that E[X] =

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] =$

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] = \frac{2-p}{p^2}$.

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] = \frac{2-p}{p^2}$.

Choosing f(x) = x, we get

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] = \frac{2-p}{p^2}$.

Choosing f(x) = x, we get

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a} = \frac{1}{ap}$$

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] = \frac{2-p}{p^2}$.

Choosing f(x) = x, we get

$$\Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a} = \frac{1}{ap}.$$

Choosing $f(x) = x^2$, we get

Let $X \sim Geom(p)$. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] = \frac{2-p}{p^2}$.

Choosing f(x) = x, we get

$$\Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a} = \frac{1}{ap}.$$

Choosing $f(x) = x^2$, we get

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X^2]}{a^2} = \frac{2-p}{p^2a^2}.$$

Let
$$X \sim Geom(p)$$
. Recall that $E[X] = \frac{1}{p}$ and $E[X^2] = \frac{2-p}{p^2}$.



Markov's inequality example

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}.$$

Markov's inequality example

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}.$$

What is a bound on the probability that a random X takes value \geq than twice its' expectation?

Markov's inequality example

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}.$$

What is a bound on the probability that a random *X* takes value \geq than twice its' expectation?

 $\frac{1}{2}$.
$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}$$

What is a bound on the probability that a random X takes value \geq than twice its' expectation?

 $\frac{1}{2}$. It can't be that more than half of the people are twice above the average!

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}$$

What is a bound on the probability that a random X takes value \geq than twice its' expectation?

 $\frac{1}{2}$. It can't be that more than half of the people are twice above the average!

What is a bound on the probability that a random X takes value \geq than k times its' expectation?

$$Pr[X \ge a] \le \frac{E[X]}{a}$$

What is a bound on the probability that a random X takes value \geq than twice its' expectation?

 $\frac{1}{2}$. It can't be that more than half of the people are twice above the average!

What is a bound on the probability that a random X takes value \geq than k times its' expectation?

 $\frac{1}{k}$.

Flip a coin n times. Probability of H is p.

Flip a coin n times. Probability of H is p. X counts the number of heads.

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads. *X* follows the

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$.

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] =

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np.

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

Markov says that $\textit{Pr}[\textit{X} \geq 600] \leq \frac{1000*0.5}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{1000 * 0.5}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Actual probability: < 0.000001

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$.

E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

Markov says that $\textit{Pr}[\textit{X} \geq 600] \leq \frac{1000*0.5}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Actual probability: < 0.000001

Notice:

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n, p)$.

E[X] = np. Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500.

Markov says that $\textit{Pr}[\textit{X} \geq 600] \leq \frac{1000*0.5}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Actual probability: < 0.000001

Notice: Same bound for 10 coins and $Pr[X \ge 6]$

This is Pafnuty's inequality:

This is Pafnuty's inequality: **Theorem:**

$$Pr[|X - E[X]| \ge a] \le \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$
, for all $a > 0$.

This is Pafnuty's inequality: **Theorem:**

$$Pr[|X - E[X]| \ge a] \le \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$
, for all $a > 0$.

Proof: Let Y = |X - E[X]| and $f(y) = y^2$.

This is Pafnuty's inequality: **Theorem:**

$$Pr[|X - E[X]| \ge a] \le \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$
, for all $a > 0$.

Proof: Let Y = |X - E[X]| and $f(y) = y^2$. Then,

$$Pr[Y \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(Y)]}{f(a)}$$

This is Pafnuty's inequality: **Theorem:**

$$Pr[|X - E[X]| \ge a] \le \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$
, for all $a > 0$.

Proof: Let Y = |X - E[X]| and $f(y) = y^2$. Then,

$$Pr[Y \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(Y)]}{f(a)} = \frac{E[|X - E[X]|^2]}{a^2}$$

This is Pafnuty's inequality: **Theorem:**

$$Pr[|X - E[X]| \ge a] \le \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$
, for all $a > 0$.

Proof: Let Y = |X - E[X]| and $f(y) = y^2$. Then,

$$Pr[Y \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(Y)]}{f(a)} = \frac{E[|X - E[X]|^2]}{a^2} = \frac{var[X]}{a^2}.$$

This is Pafnuty's inequality: **Theorem:**

$$Pr[|X - E[X]| \ge a] \le \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$
, for all $a > 0$.

Proof: Let Y = |X - E[X]| and $f(y) = y^2$. Then,

$$Pr[Y \ge a] \le \frac{E[f(Y)]}{f(a)} = \frac{E[|X - E[X]|^2]}{a^2} = \frac{var[X]}{a^2}$$

This result confirms that the variance measures the "deviations from the mean."

Chebyshev and Poisson

Chebyshev and Poisson Let $X = P(\lambda)$. Then, $E[X] = \lambda$ and var[X] =

Chebyshev and Poisson Let $X = P(\lambda)$. Then, $E[X] = \lambda$ and $var[X] = \lambda$.

Chebyshev and Poisson Let $X = P(\lambda)$. Then, $E[X] = \lambda$ and $var[X] = \lambda$. Thus,

$$Pr[|X-\lambda| \ge n] \le \frac{var[X]}{n^2} = \frac{\lambda}{n^2}.$$

Chebyshev and Poisson Let $X = P(\lambda)$. Then, $E[X] = \lambda$ and $var[X] = \lambda$. Thus,

$$Pr[|X-\lambda| \ge n] \le \frac{var[X]}{n^2} = \frac{\lambda}{n^2}$$



Flip a coin n times. Probability of H is p. X counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np.

Flip a coin n times. Probability of H is p. X counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$.

E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p).

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n, p)$.

E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p).Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250.

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250.

Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600]$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$ Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600] = Pr[X - 500 > 100]$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$ Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600] = Pr[X - 500 \ge 100] \le Pr[|X - 500| \ge 100]$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$ Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600] = Pr[X - 500 \ge 100] \le Pr[|X - 500| \ge 100] \le \frac{250}{10000} = 0.025$

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$ Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600] = Pr[X - 500 \ge 100] \le Pr[|X - 500| \ge 100] \le \frac{250}{10000} = 0.025$

Actual probability: < 0.000001
Chebyshev's inequality example

Flip a coin *n* times. Probability of *H* is *p*. *X* counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$ Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600] = Pr[X - 500 \ge 100] \le Pr[|X - 500| \ge 100] \le \frac{250}{10000} = 0.025$ Actual probability: < 0.000001

Notice:

Chebyshev's inequality example

Flip a coin n times. Probability of H is p. X counts the number of heads.

X follows the Binomial distribution with parameters *n* and *p*. $X \sim B(n,p)$. E[X] = np. Var[X] = np(1-p). Say n = 1000 and p = 0.5. E[X] = 500. Var[X] = 250. Markov says that $Pr[X \ge 600] \le \frac{500}{600} = \frac{5}{6} \approx 0.83$

Chebyshev says that $Pr[X \ge 600] = Pr[X - 500 \ge 100] \le Pr[|X - 500| \ge 100] \le \frac{250}{10000} = 0.025$

Actual probability: < 0.000001

Notice: If we had 100 coins, the bound for $Pr[X \ge 60]$ would be different.

What if we had more coins?

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of *H* instead of their number.

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

Let X_i be the indicator random variable for the *i*-th coin. Define

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

 $E[Y_n] =$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\sum X_i] =$$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\Sigma X_i] = \frac{1}{n}np = p = 0.5$$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\sum X_i] = \frac{1}{n}np = p = 0.5$$
$$Var[Y_n] =$$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\Sigma X_i] = \frac{1}{n}np = p = 0.5$$
$$Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n^2}Var[\Sigma X_i] =$$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\sum X_i] = \frac{1}{n}np = p = 0.5$$

Var[Y_n] = $\frac{1}{n^2}$ Var[$\sum X_i$] = $\frac{1}{n^2}np(1-p) = \frac{p(1-p)}{n} = \frac{1}{4n}$

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

Let X_i be the indicator random variable for the *i*-th coin. Define

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\sum X_i] = \frac{1}{n}np = p = 0.5$$

$$Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n^2}Var[\sum X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}np(1-p) = \frac{p(1-p)}{n} = \frac{1}{4n}$$
If et's try to bound how likely it is that the fraction of b

Let's try to bound how likely it is that the fraction of H's differs from 50%.

What if we had more coins?

Also, let's count the fraction of H instead of their number. p is still 0.5

Let X_i be the indicator random variable for the *i*-th coin. Define

$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}, \text{ for } n \ge 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = \frac{1}{n}E[\sum X_i] = \frac{1}{n}np = p = 0.5$$

Var[Y_n] = $\frac{1}{n^2}$ Var[$\sum X_i$] = $\frac{1}{n^2}np(1-p) = \frac{p(1-p)}{n} = \frac{1}{4n}$
Let's try to bound how likely it is that the fraction of *H*'s differs

from 50%.

$$Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \geq \varepsilon]?$$

 $E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \geq \varepsilon]$$

 $E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{\operatorname{Var}[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{\operatorname{Var}[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For $\varepsilon = 0.01$: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le rac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = rac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$
For $n = 250,000$ this is 1%.

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$
For $n = 250,000$ this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$

For *n* = 250,000 this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

In fact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$
For $n = 250,000$ this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

In fact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, as $n \to \infty$,

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$

For *n* = 250,000 this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

In fact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, as $n \to \infty$, the probability that the fraction of *H*s is within $\varepsilon > 0$ of 50% approaches 1:

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$

For *n* = 250,000 this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

In fact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, as $n \to \infty$, the probability that the fraction of *H*s is within $\varepsilon > 0$ of 50% approaches 1:

$$Pr[|Y_n-0.5|\leq \varepsilon] \rightarrow 1.$$

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$

For *n* = 250,000 this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

In fact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, as $n \to \infty$, the probability that the fraction of *H*s is within $\varepsilon > 0$ of 50% approaches 1:

$$Pr[|Y_n-0.5|\leq \varepsilon] \rightarrow 1.$$

This is an example of the Law of Large Numbers.

$$E[Y_n] = 0.5, Var[Y_n] = \frac{1}{4n}.$$

$$\Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge \varepsilon] \le rac{Var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = rac{1}{4n\varepsilon^2}$$

For
$$\varepsilon = 0.01$$
: $Pr[|Y_n - 0.5| \ge 0.01] \le \frac{2500}{n}$

For *n* = 250,000 this is 1%.

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, this probability goes to zero.

In fact, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, as $n \to \infty$, the probability that the fraction of *H*s is within $\varepsilon > 0$ of 50% approaches 1:

$$Pr[|Y_n-0.5|\leq \varepsilon] \rightarrow 1.$$

This is an example of the Law of Large Numbers. We look at a general case next.

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

Let $X_1, X_2, ...$ be pairwise independent with the same distribution and mean μ .

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

$${\sf Pr}[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

$$\Pr[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof:
Let
$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$$
. Then

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

$$\Pr[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof:
Let
$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$$
. Then
 $Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2}$

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

$$\Pr[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof:
Let
$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$$
. Then
 $Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1 + \dots + X_n]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

$${\sf Pr}[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof:
Let
$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$$
. Then
 $Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1 + \dots + X_n]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$
$$= \frac{nvar[X_1]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$$

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

Let $X_1, X_2,...$ be pairwise independent with the same distribution and mean μ . Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$${\sf Pr}[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof: Let $Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$. Then

$$Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1 + \dots + X_n]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$$
$$= \frac{nvar[X_1]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1]}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

Let $X_1, X_2, ...$ be pairwise independent with the same distribution and mean μ . Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\Pr[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof: Let $Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$. Then

$$Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1 + \dots + X_n]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$$
$$= \frac{nvar[X_1]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1]}{n \varepsilon^2} \to 0, \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$
Weak Law of Large Numbers

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

Let $X_1, X_2, ...$ be pairwise independent with the same distribution and mean μ . Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$${\it Pr}[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof:
Let
$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$$
. Then
 $Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1 + \dots + X_n]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$
 $= \frac{nvar[X_1]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1]}{n \varepsilon^2} \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

(I used that variance is finite for this proof.

Weak Law of Large Numbers

Theorem Weak Law of Large Numbers

Let $X_1, X_2, ...$ be pairwise independent with the same distribution and mean μ . Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$${\it Pr}[|rac{X_1+\dots+X_n}{n}-\mu|\geq arepsilon]
ightarrow 0, ext{ as } n
ightarrow \infty.$$

Proof:
Let
$$Y_n = \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{n}$$
. Then
 $Pr[|Y_n - \mu| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{var[Y_n]}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1 + \dots + X_n]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2}$
 $= \frac{nvar[X_1]}{n^2 \varepsilon^2} = \frac{var[X_1]}{n\varepsilon^2} \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$.

(I used that variance is finite for this proof. More complicated proof without this assumption.)

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown. If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

You many coins do you have to flip to make sure that your estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true p, with probability at least 95%?

 $E[\hat{p}] =$

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

You many coins do you have to flip to make sure that your estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true p, with probability at least 95%?

 $E[\hat{p}] = E[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i]$

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

$$E[\hat{p}] = E[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = p$$

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

$$E[\hat{p}] = E[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = p$$
$$Var[\hat{p}] =$$

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

$$E[\hat{p}] = E[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = p$$

$$Var[\hat{p}] = Var[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}Var[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = \frac{p(1-p)}{n}$$

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

$$E[\hat{p}] = E[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = p$$
$$Var[\hat{p}] = Var[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}Var[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i] = \frac{p(1-p)}{n}$$
$$Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[\hat{p}]}{\varepsilon^2}$$

Say *p* in the previous example was unknown.

If you flip *n* coins, your estimate for *p* is $\hat{p} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$.

$$E[\hat{p}] = E[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}] = p$$
$$Var[\hat{p}] = Var[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}] = \frac{1}{n^{2}}Var[\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}] = \frac{p(1-p)}{n}$$
$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \ge \varepsilon] \le \frac{Var[\hat{p}]}{\varepsilon^{2}} = \frac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^{2}}$$

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq rac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq \frac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95.

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq \frac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95.

Same as $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge 0.01]$ at most 0.05.

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq \frac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95.

Same as $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge 0.01]$ at most 0.05.

It's sufficient to have $\frac{p(1-p)}{n\epsilon^2} \leq 0.05$

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq \frac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95. Same as $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge 0.01]$ at most 0.05.

It's sufficient to have $\frac{p(1-p)}{n\epsilon^2} \le 0.05$ or $n \ge \frac{20p(1-p)}{\epsilon^2}$.

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq rac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95. Same as $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge 0.01]$ at most 0.05. It's sufficient to have $\frac{p(1-p)}{n\epsilon^2} \le 0.05$ or $n \ge \frac{20p(1-p)}{\epsilon^2}$. p(1-p) is maximized for p = 0.5.

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq rac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95.

Same as $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge 0.01]$ at most 0.05.

It's sufficient to have $\frac{p(1-p)}{n\epsilon^2} \le 0.05$ or $n \ge \frac{20p(1-p)}{\epsilon^2}$. p(1-p) is maximized for p = 0.5. Therefore it's sufficient to have $n \ge \frac{5}{\epsilon^2}$.

Estimation \hat{p} is within 0.01 of the true *p*, with probability at least 95%.

$$Pr[|\hat{p}-p| \geq \varepsilon] \leq rac{p(1-p)}{n\varepsilon^2}$$

We want to make $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \le 0.01]$ at least 0.95.

Same as $Pr[|\hat{p} - p| \ge 0.01]$ at most 0.05.

It's sufficient to have $\frac{p(1-p)}{n\epsilon^2} \le 0.05$ or $n \ge \frac{20p(1-p)}{\epsilon^2}$. p(1-p) is maximized for p = 0.5. Therefore it's sufficient to have $n \ge \frac{5}{\epsilon^2}$.

For $\varepsilon = 0.01$ we get that $n \ge 50000$ coins are sufficient.

Today's gig: ?

Today's gig: ?

Gigs so far:

- 1. How to tell random from human.
- 2. Monty Hall.
- 3. Birthday Paradox.
- 4. St. Petersburg paradox.
- 5. Simpson's paradox.
- 6. Two envelopes problem.

Today:

Today's gig: ?

Gigs so far:

- 1. How to tell random from human.
- 2. Monty Hall.
- 3. Birthday Paradox.
- 4. St. Petersburg paradox.
- 5. Simpson's paradox.
- 6. Two envelopes problem.

Today: A magic trick.

Summary

- Variance of Geometric.
- Markov's Inequality
- Chebyshev's Inequality.