

CSCI 520
Homework 10

Megan Rose Bryant
Department of Mathematics
William and Mary

November 17, 2014


```

\
|
|
/
Kurtosis(X);
          9
          -
          5
MGF(X);
          -exp(t a) + exp(t b)
          -----
          (a - b) t

```

These moments may be written in the following simplified form.

$$\begin{aligned}
 E[X] &= \frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{2} \\
 V[X] &= \frac{a^2}{12} - \frac{ab}{6} + \frac{b^2}{12} \\
 \text{Skewness}[X] &= \frac{1}{(b-a)^3} \left(24 \left(\frac{a^3}{4} + \frac{b^2a}{4} + \frac{b^3}{4} - 3 \left(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{2} \right) \left(\frac{a^2}{3} + \frac{ab}{3} + \frac{b^2}{3} \right) + 2 \left(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{2} \right)^3 \right) \sqrt{3} \right) \\
 \text{Kurtosis}[X] &= \frac{9}{5} \\
 MGF &= - \frac{e^{ta} + e^{tb}}{(a-b)t}
 \end{aligned}$$

3.) Let $X \sim \text{Weibull}(\lambda, k)$. Find the probability density function of $Y = X^2$.

```

X := WeibullRV(lambda, k);
[[
      k (k - 1) / k\
  [x -> k lambda x exp\-(lambda x) /], [0, infinity],
]]
["Continuous", "PDF"]

g; x -> x^2;
      2
x -> x
PDF(X, g);
      k (k - 1) / k\
k lambda g exp\-(lambda g) /

```

The PDF derived is

$$k \lambda^k g^{k-1} e^{-(\lambda g)^k}$$

4.) Let X exponential(2). Use APPL's Truncate function to truncate X on the left at $1/2$ and on the right at $3/2$. Find the expected value of the truncated random variable as an exact expression and its floating point approximation.

```
X := ExponentialRV(2);
[[x -> 2 exp(-2 x)], [0, infinity], ["Continuous", "PDF"]]
ExpectedValue(Truncate(X, 1/2, 3/2));
      -1 + 2 exp(-2)
      -----
      exp(-2) - 1
evalf(ExpectedValue(Truncate(X, 1/2, 3/2)));
      0.8434823573
```

Therefore we see that the exact expression is

$$\frac{-1 + 2e^{-2}}{e^{-2} - 1}$$

and the floating point approximation is

0.8434823573.

5.) Let X $U(0,1)$ and Y $\text{beta}(2,1)$ be independent variables. Find the variance of the minimum X , and Y . Write a Monte Carlo Simulation in R that provides convincing numerical evidence that your APPL output is correct.

```
X := UniformRV(0, 1);
[[x -> 1], [0, 1], ["Continuous", "PDF"]]
Y := BetaRV(2, 1);
[[x -> 2 x], [0, 1], ["Continuous", "PDF"]]
Variance(Minimum(X, Y));
      43
      ---
      720
```

Therefore, we see that APPL provides us with a variance for the minimum of X and Y of $\frac{43}{720}$, which is approximately $0.0597\bar{2}$. Now we will conduct the following Monte Carlo Simulation in R 5 times.

```
> nrep = 10000; x = runif(nrep, 0, 1); y = rbeta(nrep, 2, 1); z = pmin(x,y, nrep); var(z);
[1] 0.06076848
> nrep = 10000; x = runif(nrep, 0, 1); y = rbeta(nrep, 2, 1); z = pmin(x,y, nrep); var(z);
[1] 0.05982626
> nrep = 10000; x = runif(nrep, 0, 1); y = rbeta(nrep, 2, 1); z = pmin(x,y, nrep); var(z);
[1] 0.05982781
> nrep = 4000000; x = runif(nrep, 0, 1); y = rbeta(nrep, 2, 1); z = pmin(x,y, nrep); var(z);
[1] 0.05968553
> nrep = 4000000; x = runif(nrep, 0, 1); y = rbeta(nrep, 2, 1); z = pmin(x,y, nrep); var(z);
[1] 0.05967373
```

The Monte Carlo simulation supports our conclusions from Maple.

6.) Let X_1, X_2, X_3 be independent and identically distributed $\chi^2(6)$ random variables. Find $P(X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 20)$ using APPL. Do a web search to determine the probability distribution of $X_1 + X_2 + X_3$. In addition, write a single R statement that calculates $P(X_1 + X_2 + X_3 < 20)$.

```
X := ChiSquareRV(6);
[[      1      2      /      1      \]]
[[x -> -- x exp|- - x|], [0, infinity], ["Continuous", "PDF"]]
[[      16      \      2      /]]
X3 := ConvolutionIID(X, 3);
      [[      1      8      /      1      \]]
      [[y -> ----- y exp|- - y|], [0, infinity],
      [[      20643840      \      2      /]]
      ]
      ["Continuous", "PDF"]]
      ]
CDF(X3, 20);
          461843
      1 - ----- exp(-10)
          63
evalf(CDF(X3, 20));
          0.6671803213
```

Therefore, we see that the probability that the sum of three random χ^2 variables is approximately 0.6671803213. A simple web search shows that the probability distribution of $X_1, X_2, \text{ and } X_3$ is χ^2 .

```
> for (i in 1:400000) x[i] = pchisq(sum(rchisq(3,df=6)), 14);
> mean(x);
[1] 0.6963523
> for (i in 1:400000) x[i] = pchisq(sum(rchisq(3,df=6)), 14);
> mean(x);
[1] 0.6961486
> for (i in 1:400000) x[i] = pchisq(sum(rchisq(3,df=6)), 14);
> mean(x);
[1] 0.6962944
> for (i in 1:400000) x[i] = pchisq(sum(rchisq(3,df=6)), 14);
> mean(x);
[1] 0.6958931
> for (i in 1:400000) x[i] = pchisq(sum(rchisq(3,df=6)), 14);
> mean(x);
[1] 0.696394
```

We see that our Maple code is supported by the R Monte Carlo simulation.

7.) Let X be the product of the outcomes of four rolls of a fair die. Find $P(X < 20)$. Write a Monte Carlo simulation in R that provides convincing numerical evidence that you APPL output is correct.

```

X1 := UniformDiscreteRV(1, 6);
[[1 1 1 1 1 1]
[[-, -, -, -, -, -], [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
[[6 6 6 6 6 6]
X2 := UniformDiscreteRV(1, 6);
[[1 1 1 1 1 1]
[[-, -, -, -, -, -], [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
[[6 6 6 6 6 6]
X3 := UniformDiscreteRV(1, 6);
[[1 1 1 1 1 1]
[[-, -, -, -, -, -], [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
[[6 6 6 6 6 6]
X4 := UniformDiscreteRV(1, 6);
[[1 1 1 1 1 1]
[[-, -, -, -, -, -], [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
[[6 6 6 6 6 6]
Z1 := Product(X1, X2);
[[1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
[[-, --, --, --, --, -, --, --, --, -, --, --, --, --, --, --, --, --, --, --],
[[36 18 18 12 18 9 18 36 18 9 18 36 18 18 18 36

1 1 ]
--, --],
18 36]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 30, 36

], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
]
Z2 := Product(X3, X4);
[[1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
[[-, --, --, --, --, -, --, --, --, -, --, --, --, --, --, --, --, --, --, --],
[[36 18 18 12 18 9 18 36 18 9 18 36 18 18 18 36

1 1 ]
--, --],
18 36]

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 30, 36

], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
]
Z3 := Product(Z1, Z2);

```

```

[[ 1      1      1      5      1      1      1      1      1      1      1      19      1
[["----, ---, ---, ---, ---, --, --, ---, ---, --, ---, ----, --,
[[1296  324  324  648  324  81  81  216  108  36  108  1296  54

  1  13   1   1   1   1   1   7   1  13   1   1   5
  --, ---, ---, ---, --, --, --, ---, ---, ---, ---, --, ---,
  54 324 216 324 36 81 27 324 108 324 108 81 108

  5   5   1   1   1   1   1   1   7   5   1   1   1
  ---, ---, ---, --, ----, --, --, --, ---, ---, ---, ---, ---,
  648 108 108 54 1296 36 36 72 324 108 324 324 324

  1   1   1   1   1   1   1   7   1   1   1   1   1
  --, --, ---, ---, --, --, ---, ---, ---, --, ---, ----, ---,
  27 54 108 324 27 81 108 324 216 36 324 1296 108

  1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1
  --, --, ---, ---, --, ---, ---, ---, --, ---, ---, ---, ---,
  54 54 324 216 36 324 324 216 81 108 108 324 108

  1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   ]
  ---, ---, ----, ---, ---, ---, ---, ---, ---, ----], [1, 2, 3,
  216 108 1296 324 108 324 324 216 324 1296]

  4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 27, 30, 32, 36,
  40, 45, 48, 50, 54, 60, 64, 72, 75, 80, 81, 90, 96, 100, 108,
  120, 125, 128, 135, 144, 150, 160, 162, 180, 192, 200, 216,
  225, 240, 250, 256, 270, 288, 300, 320, 324, 360, 375, 384,
  400, 432, 450, 480, 500, 540, 576, 600, 625, 648, 720, 750,

  ]
  864, 900, 1080, 1296], ["Discrete", "PDF"]]
  ]
evalf(CDF(Z3, 20));
0.1450617284

```

Now we must perform a Monte Carlo simulation in R to support our results.
R Code:

```

function(nrep){
count = 0
for (i in 1:nrep){

```

```
x = ceiling(runif(4,0,6))
if (prod(x) <= 20) count = count + 1
}
print(count / nrep)
}
> dice_count(4000000)
[1] 0.145036
> dice_count(4000000)
[1] 0.1449205
> dice_count(4000000)
[1] 0.1448875
> dice_count(4000000)
[1] 0.1452138
> dice_count(4000000)
[1] 0.1453217
```

We see that the R output is around our Maple output of 0.1450617284 and thus supports our Maple conclusion.