## University of Technology Sydney School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences

Probability and Random Variables (37161) – Class 2 Preparation Work SOLUTIONS

- 1. i) *P*(first three red | first one red) =  $\frac{\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{25}{51} \times \frac{24}{50}}{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{12}{51}$
- ii) P(first three red | first one diamond) =  $\frac{\frac{1}{4} \times \frac{25}{51} \times \frac{24}{50}}{\frac{1}{4}} = \frac{12}{51}$

iii) *P*(fifth and six are aces | one ace in first four)  $=\frac{3}{48} \times \frac{2}{47} = \frac{1}{376}$ 

iv) Of the 12 picture cards which could be drawn first, only four are jacks (the conditional information is irrelevant here.)

*P*(first picture card jack | first four 2, 3 or 4) =  $\frac{1}{3}$ .

2.

i) 
$$P(F|A) = 0.1, P(F|B) = 0.15 \text{ and } P(F|C) = 0.25$$
.

ii)

$$P(C|F^{c}) = \frac{P(C \cap F^{c})}{P(F^{c})} = \frac{P(C \cap F^{c})}{P(A \cap F^{c}) + P(B \cap F^{c}) + P(C \cap F^{c})}$$
$$\frac{0.25 \times 0.75}{(0.5 \times 0.9) + (0.25 \times 0.85) + (0.25 \times 0.75)}$$
$$\approx 0.22$$

- i) Let the proportion of *t* alleles ("non-taster" alleles) in the population be *p*. A person is a "non-taster" if and only if he/she has two *t* alleles. If a proportion *p* of alleles are "non-taster" alleles, then someone is "non-taster" is both his/her maternal allele and paternal allele are both *t*. This occurs with probability  $p \times p = p^2$ . Since 30% of the population are "non-tasters",  $p^2 = 0.3$  hence  $p \approx 0.548$ .
- ii) If both parents "non-tasters" (*tt*) it is certain (i.e. probability of 1) that all children they have will be "non-taster" (*tt*.)
- iii) If the mother is *tt*, all of her children will have at least one *t*. If the father has alleles *Tt*, 50% of his children will inherit a *T* and the other 50% will inherit a *t*. Thus, each child (independently) has a 50% chance of being a "non-taster". The probability that all three children will be "non-tasters" is  $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{8}$ .

3.

4. (See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simpson%27s\_paradox)

a)

i) For Derek Jeter,

P(H) = P(H|Y = 1995)P(Y = 1995) + P(H|Y = 1996)P(Y = 1996) + P(H|Y = 1997)P(Y = 1997)

$$P(H) = 0.250 \left(\frac{48}{1284}\right) + 0.314 \left(\frac{582}{1284}\right) + 0.291 \left(\frac{654}{1284}\right) \approx 0.300.$$

ii) For David Justice,

P(H) = P(H|Y = 1995)P(Y = 1995) + P(H|Y = 1996)P(Y = 1996) + P(H|Y = 1997)P(Y = 1997)

$$P(H) = 0.253 \left(\frac{411}{1046}\right) + 0.321 \left(\frac{140}{1046}\right) + 0.329 \left(\frac{495}{1046}\right) \approx 0.298.$$

b)

- i) Each year, David Justice had the better batting average.
- ii) Averaged over all three years, however, Derek Jeter had the better batting average.
- c) Although Justice had the better year on year average, he did take over 40% of his bats in 1995 when he only batted at 0.253. Compare this with Jeter, whose worst year (1995) consisted of only around 4% of his total times at bat. In other words, Jeter had more bats in his better years, whereas Justice had a much greater proportion in his weakest year.