



I'm not robot



Continue

## Probability and stochastic processes yates 3rd edition pdf

5 coment-rios 0 gostaram Estatísticas Notas Seja a primeira pessoa a gostar disto 1. Probability and stochastic processes A friendly introduction for electrical and computer engineers Third Edition INSTRUCTOR'S SOLUTION MANUAL Roy D. Yates, David J. Goodman, David Famolari September 8, 2014 Comments on this solution manual • This solution manual is largely complete. Please send bug reports, suggestions and comments to ryates@winlab.rutgers.edu. • To create solution sets for your class, use the solution set constructor at the www.winlab.rutgers.edu/probsolns site. • Send an email to ryates@winlab.rutgers.edu to access the instructors' web site. • Matlab functions written as a solution to homework problems can be found in the matsoln3e.zip archive (available for instructors). For more Matlab features used in text or these homework solutions, see the matcode3e.zip archive. The .m files in matcode3e are available for download on the Wiley website. Two other documents of interest are also available for download: - A probmatlab3e manual.pdf describes the matcode3e .m features - The Quizzesolutions manual quizzsol.pdf. • This guide uses a page size that fits the screen of an iPad tablet. If you print on paper and have good vision, you can print two pages per sheet in landscape mode. On the other hand, a Fit to Paper print option produces the Large Print output. 1 Probability and stochastic processes A friendly introduction for Electric and Com Full Download: This is just example, download all chapters at: AlibabaDownload.com 2. Problem Solving – Chapter 1 Problem 1.1.1 Solution Based on the Venn diagram on the right is the complete Gerlandas Pizza Menu • Regularly without toppings • Regular with mushrooms • Regular with onions • Regular with mushrooms and onions • Tuscan without toppings • Tuscan with mushrooms M O T Problem 1.1.2 Solution Based on the Venn diagram on the right, the answers are mostly simple. The only trickiness is that a pizza is either Tuscan (T) or Neapolitan (N) so, T, T is a partition, but they are not represented as a partition. In particular, event N is the area of the Venn diagram outside the square block of event T. If this is clear, the questions are simple. M O T (a) Since  $N = T^c$ ,  $N \cap M = \emptyset$ . N and M are therefore not mutually exclusive. b) Each pizza is either Neapolitan (N) or Tuscan (T). Therefore,  $N \cup T = S$ , so that N and T are collectively exhaustive. So it is also (trivially) true that  $N \cup T \cup M = S$ . The R, T and M are also collectively exhaustive. c) From the Venn diagram, T and O are mutually exclusive. In words, this means that Tuscan pizzas never have onions or pizzas with onions, never Tuscan. By the way, by the way, is a fake pizza name; one should not conclude that the people of Tuscany don't really like onions. d) From the Venn diagram,  $M \cap T$  and O are mutually exclusive. So Ger-landa's does not make a Tuscan pizza with mushrooms and onions. e) Yes. In the Venn diagram, these pizzas are in the set  $(T \cup M \cup O)^c$ . 2 3. Problem 1.1.3 Solution With Ricardo, the pizza crust is either Roman (R) or Neapolitan (N). To draw the Venn diagram on the right, let's make the following observations: R N M OW • The set R, N is a partition so that we can draw the Venn diagram with that partition. • Only Roman pizzas can be white. Therefore  $W \subset R$ . • Only a Neapolitan pizza can have onions. Therefore,  $O \subset N$ . • Both Neapolitan and Roman pizzas can have mushrooms, so that event M spans the partition R, N. • Neapolitan pizza can have both mushrooms and onions, so  $M \cap O$  can't be empty. • The problem statement does not exclude the possibility of placing mushrooms on a white Roman pizza. Therefore, the junction  $W \cap M$  should not be empty. Issue 1.2.1 Solution (a) A result indicates whether the connection speed is high (h), medium (m) or low (l) speed, and whether the signal is a mouse click (c) or a tweet (t). The sample space is  $S = s, hc, mt, mc, lt, lc$ . (1) b) The event that the Wi-Fi connection is medium rpm is  $A_1 = 'mt, mc'$ . (c) The event that a signal is a mouse click is  $A_2 = 'hc, mc, lc$ . (d) The event that a connection is either high or at low speed is  $A_3 = ht, hc, lt, lc$ . 3 4. (e) Since  $A_1$  is  $\cap A_2 = mc$  and is not empty,  $A_1, A_2$ , and  $A_3$  are not mutually exclusive. (f) Since  $A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3 = ht, hc, mt, mc, lt, lc = S$ . (2) The collection  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  is collectively exhaustive. Problem 1.2.2 Solution (a) The sample space of the experiment is  $S = aaa, aaf, afa, faa, ffa, faf, aff, fff$ . (1) b) The event that the circuit of Z fails is  $Z^c = aaf, aff, faf, fff$ . (2) The event that the circuit of X is acceptable is  $XA = aaa, aaf, afa, aff$ . (3) (c) Since  $Z^c \cap XA = aaf, aff = \emptyset$ ,  $Z^c$  and  $XA$  are not mutually exclusive. (d) Since  $Z^c \cup XA = aaa, aaf, afa, aff, fff = S$ ,  $Z^c$  and  $XA$  are not collectively exhaustive. e) The event that more than one circuit is acceptable is  $C = aaa, aaf, afa, faa$ . (4) The event that at least two circuits fail is  $D = sffa, faf, aff, fff$ . (5) (f) The test shows that  $C \cap D = \emptyset$  so c and D are mutually exclusive. (g) Since  $C \cup D = S$ , C and D are collectively exhaustive. 4 5. Problem 1.2.3 Solution The sample room is  $S = \{ \dots, K\spadesuit, A\spadesuit, \dots, K\heartsuit, A\heartsuit, \dots, K\clubsuit, A\clubsuit, \dots, K\spadesuit, A\spadesuit, \dots \}$ . (1) Event H that the first card is a heart is the set  $H = A\spadesuit, \dots, A\heartsuit, \dots, A\clubsuit, \dots$ . (2) Event H 13 results, which corresponds to the 13 hearts in one deck. Problem 1.2.4 Solution The sample room is  $S = \{ \dots, 1/1, \dots, 1/31, 2/1, \dots, 2/29, 3/1, \dots, 3/31, 4/1, \dots, 4/30, 5/1, 5/1, \dots, 5/31, 6/1, \dots, 6/30, 7/1, \dots, 7/31, 8/1, \dots, 8/31, 9/1, \dots, 9/31, 10/1, \dots, 10/31, 11/1, \dots, 11/30, 12/1, \dots, 12/31 \}$ . (1) Event H, which is defined by the event of a July birthday, is given by the following set with 31 sample results:  $H = 7.1, 7.2, \dots$  (2) Problem 1.2.5 Solution Of course there are many answers to this problem. Here are four partitions. 1. We can divide students into engineers or non-engineers. Let  $A_1$  match the set of engineering students and  $A_2$  to non-engineers. The pair  $A_1, A_2$  is a partition. 2. To separate students by GPA. Let  $B_i$  designate the subset of students with GPAs G satisfying  $1 \leq G \leq i$ . For Rutgers, partition  $B_5$  is a partition. Note that  $B_5$  is the set of all students with perfect 4.0 GPAs. Of course, other schools use different standards for GPA. 3. We can also divide students by age. Let  $C_i$  designate the subset of students in the age of  $i$  in years. At most universities,  $C_{10}, C_{11}, \dots, C_{100}$  an event room. Since a university can have miracle children under 10 or over 100, we find that  $C_0, C_1, \dots$  is always a partition. 5 6. 4. Finally, we can categorize students by presence. Let  $D_0$  indicate the number of students who missed zero lectures, and let  $D_1$  designate all other students. Although it is likely that  $D_0$  is an empty set, it is a well-defined partition. Problem 1.2.6 Solution Let  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  denote the measured resistors. The pair  $(R_1, R_2)$  is a result of the experiment. Some partitions contain 1. If we need to check if neither of the two resistors is too high, a partition is  $A_1 = R_1 \leq 100, R_2 \leq 100, A_2 = R_1 \geq 100 \cup R_2 \geq 100$ . (1) 2. If we need to check whether the first resistor exceeds the second resistor, a partition is  $B_1 = R_1 \geq R_2$ ;  $R_2 \leq R_1$ . (2) 3. If we need to check whether each resistor does not fall below a minimum value (in this case 50 ohms for  $R_1$  and 100 ohms for  $R_2$ ), a partition is  $C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4$  where  $C_1 = R_1 \geq 50, R_2 \geq 100$ ;  $C_2 = R_1 \geq 50, R_2 \geq 100$ ;  $C_3 = R_1 \geq 50, R_2 \geq 100$ ;  $C_4 = R_1 \geq 50, R_2 \geq 100$ . (4) 4. If we want to check whether the resistors are in parallel in an acceptable range of 90 to 110 ohms, a partition is  $D_1 = (1/R_1 + 1/R_2) \leq 1/90$ ; (5)  $D_2 = 90 \leq (1/R_1 + 1/R_2) \leq 1/10$ . (6)  $D_2 = 1/10 \leq (1/R_1 + 1/R_2) \leq 1/90$ . (7) 6 7. Problem 1.3.1 Solution (a) A and B, which are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive, imply  $P[A] + P[B] = 1$ . Since  $P[A] = 3 P[B]$  we have  $P[B] = 1/4$ . (b) Since  $P[A \text{ is } \cup B] = P[A]$ , we see that  $B \subset A$ . This implies  $P[A \cap B] = P[B]$ . Since  $P[A \cap B] = 0$ , then  $P[B] = 0$ . (c) Since it is always true that  $P[A \cup B] = P[A] + P[B] - P[A \cap B]$ , we have this  $P[A] + P[B] - P[A \cap B] = P[A] - P[B]$ . (1) This implies  $2 P[B] = P[A \cap B]$ . However, since  $A \subset B$ , we can conclude that  $2 P[B] = P[A \cap B] \leq P[B]$ . This implies  $P[B] = 0$ . Problem 1.3.2 Solution The roll of red and white cubes assumed to be independent. For each die, all reels in  $1, 2, \dots, 6$  probably have  $1/6$ . (a) Thus  $P[R_3W_2] = P[R_3] P[W_2] = 1/36$ . (b) In fact, each pair of possible riwj roles has a probability of  $1/36$ . To find  $P[S_5]$ , Let's add up the probabilities of all pairs that add up to 5:  $P[S_5] = P[R_1W_4] + P[R_2W_3] + P[R_3W_2] + P[R_4W_1] = 4/36 = 1/9$ . Problem 1.3.3 Solution A result is a pair  $(i, j)$ , where  $i$  is the value of the first cube and  $j$  is the value of the second cube. The sample space is the set  $S = (1, 1), (1, 2), \dots, (1, 6), \dots, (2, 1), \dots, (2, 6), \dots, (3, 1), \dots, (3, 6), \dots, (4, 1), \dots, (4, 6), \dots, (5, 1), \dots, (5, 6), \dots, (6, 1), \dots, (6, 6)$ . (2) Since there are 6 results in  $D_3$ ,  $P[D_3] = 6/36 = 1/6$ . 7 8. Problem 1.3.4 Solution (a) FALSE. Because  $P[A] = 1 \times P[A^c] = 2 P[A^c]$  implies  $P[A^c] = 1/3$ . b) FALSE. Suppose  $A = B$  and  $P[A] = 1/2$ . In this case  $P[A \cap B] = P[A] = 1/2$  &  $P[A \cup B] = P[A] = 1/2$ . (1) (c) TRUE. Since  $AB \subset A$ ,  $P[AB] \leq P[A]$ , this means  $P[AB] \leq P[A]$  &  $P[B] \leq P[A]$ . (2) (d) FALSE: For a counterexample, leave  $A = \emptyset$  and  $P[B] = 1$ . Problem 1.3.5 Solution The sample space of the experiment is  $S = LF, BF, LW, BW$ . (1) From the problem instruction we know that  $P[LF] = 0.5, P[BF] = 0.2$  and  $P[BW] = 0.2$ . This implies  $P[LW] = 1 \times 0.5 - 0.2 - 0.2 = 0.1$ . The questions can be answered with Theorem 1.5. (a) The probability that a program is slow is  $P[W] = P[LW] + P[BW] = 0.1 + 0.2 = 0.3$ . (2) b) The probability that a program is large is  $P[B] = P[BF] + P[BW] = 0.2 + 0.2 = 0.4$ . (3) (c) The probability that a program is slow or large is  $P[W \cup B] = P[W] + P[B] - P[BW] = 0.3 + 0.4 - 0.2 = 0.5$ . (4) 8 9. Problem 1.3.6 Solution An example result indicates whether the mobile phone is handheld (H) or mobile (M) and whether the speed is fast (F) or slow (W). The sample room is  $S = HF, HW, MF, MW$ . (1) The problem instruction tells us that  $P[HF] = 0.2, P[MW] = 0.1$  and  $P[F] = 0.5$ . We can use these facts to determine the probabilities of the other results. In particular,  $P[F] = P[HF] + P[MF] = 0.5$ . (2) This implies  $P[MF] = P[F] - P[HF] = 0.5 - 0.2 = 0.3$ . (3) Since the probabilities must be summed to 1,  $P[HW] = 1 - P[HF] - P[MF] - P[MW] = 1 - 0.2 - 0.3 - 0.1 = 0.4$  must be summed. (4) Now that we have found the probabilities of the results, it is easy to find a different probability allowance. (a) The probability that a mobile phone is slow is  $P[W] = P[HW] + P[MW] = 0.4 + 0.1 = 0.5$ . (5) b) The probability that a cell phone is mobile and fast is  $P[MF] = 0.3$ . (c) The probability that a cell phone is mobile and fast. mobile phone is held by hand.  $P[H] = P[HF] + P[HW] = 0.2 + 0.4 = 0.6$ . (6) Problem 1.3.7 Solution A reasonable probability model that matches the concept of a mixed deck is that each card in the deck the first card. Let  $H_i$  denote the event that the first drawn card is the  $i$ th heart, where the first heart is the ace, 9, 10, the second heart is the deuce and so on. In this case  $P[H_i] = 1/52$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 13$ . The event H, that the first card is a heart, can be written as the mutually exclusive union  $H = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup \dots \cup H_{13}$ . (1) With Theorem 1.1 we have  $P[H] = 13 \times 1/52 = 1/4$ . (2) This is the answer you would expect, since 13 out of 52 cards are hearts. The point to keep in mind is that this is not just the answer to common sense, but the result of a probability model for a mixed deck and the axioms of probability. Problem 1.3.8 Solution Let  $s_i$  denote the result that the down face has  $i$  points. The sample space is  $S = s_1, \dots, s_6$ . The probability of each sample result is  $P[s_i] = 1/6$ . As of Theorem 1.1, the probability of event E is that the role is straight,  $P[E] = P[s_2] + P[s_4] + P[s_6] = 3/6$ . (1) Problem 1.3.9 Solution Let  $s_i$  match the result of the student quiz. The rehearsal room is then composed of all sorts of notes that it can receive.  $S = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10$ . (1) Since each of the 11 possible results is equally likely, the probability of getting a grade of  $i$  is for each  $i = 0, 1, \dots, 10$   $P[s_i] = 1/11$ . The probability that the student will receive an A is the probability that she will receive a score of 9 or higher. This is  $P[\text{Class of } A] = P[s_9] + P[s_{10}] = 1/11 + 1/11 = 2/11$ . (2) The probability of failure presupposes that the student receives a grade below 4.  $P[\text{Failing}] = P[s_3] + P[s_2] + P[s_1] + P[s_0] = 1/11 + 1/11 + 1/11 + 1/11 = 4/11$ . (3) 10 11. Problem 1.3.10 Solution Each instruction is a sequence of part 4 of Theorem 1.4. a) Since  $A \subset A \cup B$ ,  $P[A] \leq P[A \cup B]$ . (b) Since  $B \subset A \cup B$ ,  $P[B] \leq P[A \cup B]$ . (c) Since  $A \cap B \subset A$ ,  $P[A \cap B] \leq P[A]$ . (d) Since  $A \cap B \subset B$ ,  $P[A \cap B] \leq P[B]$ . Problem 1.3.11 Solution Specifically we use Theorem 1.4(c) stating that for all events A and B,  $P[A \cup B] = P[A] + P[B] - P[A \cap B]$ . (1) In order to prove the union bound by induction, we first prove the proposition in the case of  $n = 2$  events. In this case by theorem 1.4(c),  $P[A_1 \cup A_2] = P[A_1] + P[A_2] - P[A_1 \cap A_2]$ . (2) With the first axiom of probability,  $P[A_1 \cap A_2] \geq 0$ . Thus,  $P[A_1 \cup A_2] \leq P[A_1] + P[A_2]$ . (3) as evidenced by the union bound for case  $n = 2$ . Now we are putting forward our induction hypothesis that the union-linked one applies to each collection of  $n - 1$  subsets. In this case, the given subsets define  $A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}$ . To, we  $a = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_{n-1}$ ,  $B = A_n$ . (4) By our induction hypothesis,  $P[a] = P[A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \dots \cup A_{n-1}] \leq P[A_1] + \dots + P[A_{n-1}]$ . (5) This allows us to write  $P[A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n] = P[a \cup B] \leq P[a] + P[B]$  by the union bound for  $n = 2$   $P[A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n] \leq P[A_1] + P[A_2] + \dots + P[A_n]$  (6), which completes the inductive evidence. 11 12. Problem 1.3.12 Solution It is tempting to use the following proof: since  $S = S \cup \emptyset$ ,  $1 = P[S \cup \emptyset] = P[S] + P[\emptyset]$ . Since  $P[S] = 1$ , we must have  $P[\emptyset] = 0$ . The above evidence used the property, the mutually exclusive sentences  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ ,  $P[A_1 \cup A_2] = P[A_1] + P[A_2]$ . (1) The problem is that this property is a consequence of the three axioms and must therefore be proven. For proof that uses only the three axioms, let  $A_1$  be any set and for  $n = 2, 3, \dots$  let  $T_n = \emptyset$ . Since  $A_1 = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ , we can use Axiom 3 to write  $P[A_1] = P[\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n] = P[A_1] + P[A_2] + \dots + P[A_n] + \dots$ . (2) By subtracting  $P[A_1]$  from both sides allows us to write the fact that  $A_2 = \emptyset$   $P[A_2] = 0$ . (3) By Axiom 1,  $P[A_i] \geq 0$  for all  $i$ . So  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P[A_n] \geq 0$ . This implies  $P[\emptyset] \leq 0$ . Because Axiom requires  $1 P[\emptyset] \geq 0$ , we must have  $P[\emptyset] = 0$ . Problem 1.3.13 Solution After the note, we define the set of events  $A_{ij} = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ,  $A_i = B_i$  and for  $i \neq j$ ,  $A_i = \emptyset$ . By construction  $\sum_{i=1}^m P[A_i] = \sum_{i=1}^m P[B_i] = \sum_{i=1}^m P[A_i]$ . (1) 12 13. For  $i \neq j$ ,  $m$ ,  $P[A_i] = P[\emptyset] = 0$ , which gives the claim  $P[\sum_{i=1}^m A_i] = \sum_{i=1}^m P[A_i] = \sum_{i=1}^m P[B_i]$ . Note that the fact that  $P[\emptyset] = 0$  follows from axioms 1 and 2. This problem is more difficult if you are using axiom 3 only. We start by observing  $P[\sum_{i=1}^m B_i] = \sum_{i=1}^m P[B_i] + \dots + P[A_i]$ . (2) Now we use Axiom 3 again in the countable infinite sequence  $A_m, A_{m+1}, \dots, \infty$   $\sum_{i=1}^m P[A_i] = P[\text{Write on } \cup A_{m+1} \cup \dots] = P[B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \dots \cup B_m] = \sum_{i=1}^m P[B_i]$ . (3) (a) To display  $P[\emptyset] = 0$ , leave  $B_1 = S$  and Leave  $B_2 = \emptyset$ . Thus by sentence 1.3,  $P[S] = P[B_1 \cup B_2] = P[B_1] + P[B_2] = P[S] + P[\emptyset]$ . (4) Thus,  $0 = P[\emptyset]$ . Note that this proof uses only Theorem 1.3, which uses only Axiom 3. b) With Theorem 1.3 with  $B_1 = A$  and  $B_2 = A^c$  we have  $P[S] = P[A \cup A^c] = P[A] + P[A^c]$ . Axiom says  $2 P[S] = 1$ ,  $P[A^c] = 1 - P[A]$ . This proof uses axioms 2 and 3. (c) With Theorem 1.8 we can write both A and B as associations of mutually exclusive events:  $A = (AB) \cup (A\bar{B})$ ,  $B = (AB) \cup (A\bar{B})$ . (6) Now we use Theorem 1.3 to write  $P[A] = P[(AB) \cup (A\bar{B})] = P[AB] + P[A\bar{B}]$ ,  $P[B] = P[(AB) \cup (A\bar{B})] = P[AB] + P[A\bar{B}]$ . (7) We can describe these facts as  $P[AB] = P[A] - P[A\bar{B}]$ ,  $P[A\bar{B}] = P[B] - P[AB]$ . (8) Note that we have only used Axiom 3 so far. Finally, we find that  $A \cup B$  can be written as a union of mutually exclusive events  $A \cup B = (AB) \cup (A\bar{B}) \cup (A\bar{B}B)$ . (9) 14 15. Once again, with Theorem 1.3  $P[A \cup B] = P[AB] + P[A\bar{B}] + P[A\bar{B}B]$  (10) Substituting the results of equation (8) in equation (10) results  $P[A \cup B] = P[AB] + P[A] - P[A\bar{B}] + P[B] - P[AB] = P[A] + P[B] - P[A\bar{B}]$ . (12) From Axiom 1,  $P[A\bar{B}] \geq 0$ , which implies  $P[A] \leq P[B]$ . This proof uses Axiom 1 and 3. Problem 1.4.1 Solution Each question requires a conditional probability. (a) Note that the probability that a call is short is  $P[B] = P[HOB] + P[H1B] + P[H2B] = 0.6$ . (1) The probability that a short call has no donations is  $P[HOB] = P[HOB] P[B] = 0.4 \times 0.6 = 2.3$ . (2) b) The probability of a transfer is  $P[H1B] = P[H1B] + P[H1L] = 0.2$ . The probability that a call with a handoff is long is  $P[LH1B] = P[H1L] P[H1] = 0.1 \times 0.2 = 1.2$ . (3) (c) The probability that a call is long is  $P[L] = 1 - P[B] = 0.4$ . The probability that a long call has one or more handovers is  $P$

