EXAMPLES 1, Q3,4

Typical "combinatorial" argument for an identity involving binomial coefficients:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} {n \choose k} = 2^n \text{ [to be proved] } \text{ (R)}$$

Could proceed purely algebraically [using BINOMIAL THEOREM], but the aim is to understand the result!

$$\binom{n}{k}$$
 = # of ways of selecting k people [a committee?] from group of n.

So 
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} {n \choose k} = \#$$
 of ways of selecting a including  $k=0 \equiv m_0$  committee !]

Note that we could choose a committee by considering each of the 11 people in turn and deciding whether or not each is in it:

2 possibilities for each person [independent of any other person]

These are just different ways of calculating the same thing, so (B) is proved.

STATISTICAL INDEPENDENCE

Expresses the idea that two events may have no influence on one another.

Prototype: Physically unconnected events

EXAMPLE: A die is rolled and a coin is flipped. What is the chance of getting (6, H)?

The die and coin are unconnected sin different rooms? ], so in N trials we expect about N/6 to give a SIX, with H in about half of these N/6 cases:

$$\Rightarrow P(6,H) = P(6nH) = \frac{1}{12} = P(6)P(H)$$

[Alternative, a priori, argument: (6,H) is just one of  $6\times2=12$  possible outcomes. Assuming equal probability for each  $\Rightarrow P(6nH) = 1/12.$ 

GENERALLY: Events A and B are said to be statistically independent if [and only if]

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

PHYS 10471: LECTURE 3

[STATISTICAL INDEPENDENCE, CONTINUED]

NOTE: Although our "prototype" system consists of physically unconnected parts, statistical independence doesn't REQUIRE this!

EXAMPLE: Roll a die. What is the probability that result is ODD [O = {1,3,5}] and divisible by three? [T = {3,6}]

A priori argument: only 1 of the six, equally likely outcomes is favourable, i.e. OnT = {3}, so P(OnT) = 1/6.

But P(0) = 3/6 = 1/2 and P(T) = 2/6 = 1/3, So P(OnT) = P(0)P(T) here: the events 0 and T are STATISTICALLY INDEPENDENT, yet only ONE die is involved.

TERMINOLOGY: Statistically independent events are also said to be uncorrelated.

## CONDITIONAL PROBABILITY

Useful when 'events' may depend upon one another: E.g., whether or not an electrical component is likely to be faulty may depend on which manufactures it came from...

## DEFINITION:

$$P(A \text{ given B}) \equiv P(A|B) = P(A \land B)/P(B)$$

EXAMPLE [AND MOTIVATION]: A box contains
N components, of which N(B) are from
Birmingham [and N(W) = N-N(B) from
Warnington]. A subset A of the components
is faulty, so AAB are the faulty ones
from B'ham.

The probability of a Bham component being faulty is

$$\frac{N(A \cap B)}{N(B)} = \frac{N(A \cap B)/N}{N(B)/N} = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}.$$

So if we pick a component at random from the box and discover that it's from B'ham, its chance of being faulty is

$$P(+|B) = P(A \cap B)/P(B)$$
.

[CONDITIONAL PROB., CONTO]

Alternative form:

 $P(A \cap B) = P(A \mid B) P(B)$   $= P(B \mid A) P(A) [since A \cap B = B \cap A]$ 

Rearranging the last equation gives

P(B/A) = P(A/B) P(B) /P(A) BAYES' THEOREM.

BAYES' THEOREM reverses the rôles of A and B: it's crucial in assessing likelihood of a hypothesis being true, given some data. E.g., if

A = 'testing positive for a disease'
B = 'having the disease'

P(A/B) = probability of positive test
result from person with the disease

result from person with the disc \$\neq 1\$, as tests sometimes give

But an individual who has tested positive would be more interested in P(B/A): the probability that they actually have the disease, given their test result.

Wrong Msulfs !

SBAYES THEOREM, (ONT)

EXAMPLE: Faulty components again.

Box contains:  $\frac{2}{3}$  Birmingham components, = P(B)1/3 Warvington " . = P(W)

 $P(A|B) \rightarrow 10\%$  of B'ham components are faulty  $P(A) \rightarrow 12\%$  of all components in box are faulty [faulty="Awful"]

What is the probability that a faulty component is from B'ham?

Answer:  $P(B|A) = P(A|B) P(B) / P(A) \approx 56\%$ 

What's the chance that a faulty one came from Warrington?

Answer: P(W|A) = 1 - P(B|A) = 0.44 = 44%

What proportion of the Warrington components are faulty?

Answer:  $P(A|W) = P(W|A) \frac{P(A)}{P(W)} = 0.44 \times \frac{0.12}{(1/3)} = 16\%$ 

[Note the "law of total probability" is often useful here:  $P(x) = P(x \cap Y) + P(x \cap \overline{Y})$ 

= P(XIY) P(Y) + P(XIF) P(F).]

[See Examples 1.6 to 1.8]