Fall 2023

Matthew Blackwell

Gov 2002 (Harvard)

Where are we? Where are we going?

• We've defined random variables and their distributions.

Where are we? Where are we going?

- We've defined random variables and their distributions.
- Distributions give full information about the probabilities of an r.v.
- We've defined random variables and their distributions.
- Distributions give full information about the probabilities of an r.v.
- Today: begin to summarize distributions with a few numbers.

• Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."

- Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."
- We'll define two **potential outcomes**:

- Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."
- We'll define two **potential outcomes**:
	- \cdot $Y_i(1)$: whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\sf received$ canvassing.

- Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."
- We'll define two **potential outcomes**:
	- \cdot $Y_i(1)$: whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\sf received$ canvassing.
	- \cdot $\left. Y_i(0) \right.$ whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\mathop{\mathsf{d}}\nolimits$ d**idn't receive** the canvassing.

- Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."
- We'll define two **potential outcomes**:
	- \cdot $Y_i(1)$: whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\sf received$ canvassing.
	- \cdot $\left. Y_i(0) \right.$ whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\mathop{\mathsf{d}}\nolimits$ d**idn't receive** the canvassing.
- The individual causal effect of canvassing then is

$$
\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)
$$

- Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."
- We'll define two **potential outcomes**:
	- \cdot $Y_i(1)$: whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\sf received$ canvassing.
	- \cdot $\left. Y_i(0) \right.$ whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\mathop{\mathsf{d}}\nolimits$ d**idn't receive** the canvassing.
- The individual causal effect of canvassing then is

$$
\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)
$$

• We can think of $Y_i(1)$ and $Y_i(0)$ as rvs and so τ_i is a rv as well.

- Consider a hypothetical intervention such as "door-to-door get out the vote."
- We'll define two **potential outcomes**:
	- \cdot $Y_i(1)$: whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\sf received$ canvassing.
	- \cdot $\left. Y_i(0) \right.$ whether person i would vote (1) or not (0) if they $\mathop{\mathsf{d}}\nolimits$ d**idn't receive** the canvassing.
- The individual causal effect of canvassing then is

$$
\tau_i = Y_i(1) - Y_i(0)
$$

- We can think of $Y_i(1)$ and $Y_i(0)$ as rvs and so τ_i is a rv as well.
- How should we summarize the distribution of causal effects?

1/ Definition of Expectation

• Probability distributions describe the uncertainty about r.v.s.

- Probability distributions describe the uncertainty about r.v.s.
- Can we summarize probability distributions?

- Probability distributions describe the uncertainty about r.v.s.
- Can we summarize probability distributions?
- **Question**: What is the difference between these two p.m.f.s? How might we summarize this difference?

- Probability distributions describe the uncertainty about r.v.s.
- Can we summarize probability distributions?
- **Question**: What is the difference between these two p.m.f.s? How might we summarize this difference?

1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.

- 1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.
	- We'll focus on the mean/expectation.
- 1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.
	- We'll focus on the mean/expectation.
- 2. **Spread**: how spread out the distribution is around the center.
- 1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.
	- We'll focus on the mean/expectation.
- 2. **Spread**: how spread out the distribution is around the center.
	- We'll focus on the variance/standard deviation.
- 1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.
	- We'll focus on the mean/expectation.
- 2. **Spread**: how spread out the distribution is around the center.
	- We'll focus on the variance/standard deviation.
	- These are **population parameters** so we don't get to observe them.
- 1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.
	- We'll focus on the mean/expectation.
- 2. **Spread**: how spread out the distribution is around the center.
	- We'll focus on the variance/standard deviation.
	- These are **population parameters** so we don't get to observe them.
		- We won't get to observe them…
- 1. **Central tendency**: where the center of the distribution is.
	- We'll focus on the mean/expectation.
- 2. **Spread**: how spread out the distribution is around the center.
	- We'll focus on the variance/standard deviation.
- These are **population parameters** so we don't get to observe them.
	- We won't get to observe them…
	- but we'll use our sample to learn about them

• Calculate the average of: $\{1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5\}$

• Calculate the average of: $\{1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5\}$

$$
\frac{1+1+1+3+4+4+5+5}{8} = 3
$$

• Calculate the average of: $\{1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5\}$

$$
\frac{1+1+1+3+4+4+5+5}{8} = 3
$$

• Alternative way to calculate average based on **frequency weights**:

• Calculate the average of: $\{1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5\}$

$$
\frac{1+1+1+3+4+4+5+5}{8} = 3
$$

• Alternative way to calculate average based on **frequency weights**:

$$
1 \times \frac{3}{8} + 3 \times \frac{1}{8} + 4 \times \frac{2}{8} + 5 \times \frac{2}{8} = 3
$$

• Calculate the average of: $\{1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5\}$

$$
\frac{1+1+1+3+4+4+5+5}{8} = 3
$$

• Alternative way to calculate average based on **frequency weights**:

$$
1 \times \frac{3}{8} + 3 \times \frac{1}{8} + 4 \times \frac{2}{8} + 5 \times \frac{2}{8} = 3
$$

• Each value times how often that value occurs in the data.

• Calculate the average of: $\{1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5\}$

$$
\frac{1+1+1+3+4+4+5+5}{8} = 3
$$

• Alternative way to calculate average based on **frequency weights**:

$$
1 \times \frac{3}{8} + 3 \times \frac{1}{8} + 4 \times \frac{2}{8} + 5 \times \frac{2}{8} = 3
$$

- Each value times how often that value occurs in the data.
- We'll use this intuition to create an average/mean for r.v.s.

Definition

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

Definition

The **expected value** (or **expectation** or **mean**) of a discrete r.v. with possible values, $x_1, x_2, ...$ is

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Weighted average of the values of the r.v. weighted by the probability of each value occurring.

Definition

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

- Weighted average of the values of the r.v. weighted by the probability of each value occurring.
	- $E[X]$ is a constant!

Definition

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

- Weighted average of the values of the r.v. weighted by the probability of each value occurring.
	- $E[X]$ is a constant!
- Example: $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] =$

Definition

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

- Weighted average of the values of the r.v. weighted by the probability of each value occurring.
	- $E[X]$ is a constant!
- Example: $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] = 1p + 0(1-p) = p$.

Definition

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

- Weighted average of the values of the r.v. weighted by the probability of each value occurring.
	- $E[X]$ is a constant!
- Example: $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] = 1p + 0(1-p) = p$.
- If X and Y have the same distribution, then $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$.

Definition

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

- Weighted average of the values of the r.v. weighted by the probability of each value occurring.
	- $E[X]$ is a constant!
- Example: $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] = 1p + 0(1-p) = p$.
- If X and Y have the same distribution, then $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$.
	- Converse isn't true!
• Randomized experiment with 3 units. X is number of treated units.

• Randomized experiment with 3 units. X is number of treated units.

• Randomized experiment with 3 units. X is number of treated units.

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Randomized experiment with 3 units. X is number of treated units.

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

= 0 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 0) + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 1) + 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 2) + 3 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 3)

• Randomized experiment with 3 units. X is number of treated units.

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

= 0 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 0) + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 1) + 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 2) + 3 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 3)
= 0 \cdot \frac{1}{8} + 1 \cdot \frac{3}{8} + 2 \cdot \frac{3}{8} + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{8}

• Randomized experiment with 3 units. X is number of treated units.

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} x_j \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

= 0 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 0) + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 1) + 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 2) + 3 \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = 3)
= 0 \cdot \frac{1}{8} + 1 \cdot \frac{3}{8} + 2 \cdot \frac{3}{8} + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{8} = \frac{12}{8} = 1.5

Expectation as balancing point

2/ Linearity of Expectations

• Often want to derive expectation of **transformations** of other r.v.s

- Often want to derive expectation of **transformations** of other r.v.s
- Possible for **linear** functions because expectation is **linear**:

 $\mathbb{E}[X + Y] = \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]$ $\mathbb{E}[aX] = a\mathbb{E}[X]$ if a is a constant

- Often want to derive expectation of **transformations** of other r.v.s
- Possible for **linear** functions because expectation is **linear**:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X + Y] = \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}[aX] = a\mathbb{E}[X] \qquad \text{if } a \text{ is a constant}
$$

• True even if X and Y are dependent!

- Often want to derive expectation of **transformations** of other r.v.s
- Possible for **linear** functions because expectation is **linear**:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X + Y] = \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}[aX] = a\mathbb{E}[X] \qquad \text{if } a \text{ is a constant}
$$

- True even if X and Y are dependent!
- But this isn't always true for nonlinear functions:

- Often want to derive expectation of **transformations** of other r.v.s
- Possible for **linear** functions because expectation is **linear**:

 $\mathbb{E}[X + Y] = \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]$ $\mathbb{E}[aX] = a\mathbb{E}[X]$ if a is a constant

- True even if X and Y are dependent!
- But this isn't always true for nonlinear functions:
	- $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \neq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ unless $g(\cdot)$ is a linear function.
- Often want to derive expectation of **transformations** of other r.v.s
- Possible for **linear** functions because expectation is **linear**:

 $\mathbb{E}[X + Y] = \mathbb{E}[X] + \mathbb{E}[Y]$ $\mathbb{E}[aX] = a\mathbb{E}[X]$ if a is a constant

- True even if X and Y are dependent!
- But this isn't always true for nonlinear functions:
	- $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \neq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ unless $g(\cdot)$ is a linear function.
	- $E[XY] \neq E[X]E[Y]$ unless X and Y are independent.

Expectation of a binomial

• Let $X \sim Bin(n, p)$, what's $E[X]$? Could just plug in formula:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{k=0}^{n} k \binom{n}{k} p^{k} (1-p)^{n-k} = ??
$$

Expectation of a binomial

• Let $X \sim Bin(n, p)$, what's $E[X]$? Could just plug in formula:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X]=\sum_{k=0}^n k\binom{n}{k}p^k(1-p)^{n-k}=??
$$

• Use the story of the binomial as a sum of *n* Bernoulli $X_i \sim \text{Bern}(p)$

$$
X = X_1 + \cdots + X_n
$$

Expectation of a binomial

• Let $X \sim Bin(n, p)$, what's $E[X]$? Could just plug in formula:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X]=\sum_{k=0}^n k\binom{n}{k}p^k(1-p)^{n-k}=??
$$

• Use the story of the binomial as a sum of *n* Bernoulli $X_i \sim \text{Bern}(p)$

$$
X = X_1 + \dots + X_n
$$

• Use linearity:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X_1 + \dots + X_n] = \mathbb{E}[X_1] + \dots + \mathbb{E}[X_n] = np
$$

• Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$.

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$.
- Define the **sample mean** to be $\overline{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.

Expectation of the sample mean

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$.
- Define the **sample mean** to be $\overline{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.
	- $\cdot \overline{X}$ is a r.v.!

Expectation of the sample mean

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$.
- Define the **sample mean** to be $\overline{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.
	- $\cdot \overline{X}$ is a ry!
- We can find the expectation of the sample mean using linearity:

$$
\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n}n\mu = \mu
$$

Expectation of the sample mean

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be identically distributed with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$.
- Define the **sample mean** to be $\overline{X}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.
	- $\cdot \overline{X}$ is a ry!
- We can find the expectation of the sample mean using linearity:

$$
\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n}n\mu = \mu
$$

• Intuition: on average, the sample mean is equal to the population mean.

• Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.

- Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.
	- $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ has $E[X] = p$ which isn't 0 or 1.
- Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.
	- $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ has $E[X] = p$ which isn't 0 or 1.
- But it must be between the highest and lowest possible value of an r.v.
- Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.
	- $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ has $E[X] = p$ which isn't 0 or 1.
- But it must be between the highest and lowest possible value of an r.v.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \ge c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \ge c$.
- Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.
	- $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ has $E[X] = p$ which isn't 0 or 1.
- But it must be between the highest and lowest possible value of an r.v.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \ge c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \ge c$.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \le c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \le c$.
- Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.
	- $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ has $E[X] = p$ which isn't 0 or 1.
- But it must be between the highest and lowest possible value of an r.v.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \ge c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \ge c$.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \leq c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq c$.
- Useful application of linearity: expectation is **monotone**.
- Expectations don't have to be in the support of the data.
	- $X \sim \text{Bern}(p)$ has $E[X] = p$ which isn't 0 or 1.
- But it must be between the highest and lowest possible value of an r.v.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \ge c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \ge c$.
	- If $\mathbb{P}(X \leq c) = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq c$.
- Useful application of linearity: expectation is **monotone**.
	- If $X \ge Y$ with probability 1, then $E(X) \ge E(Y)$.

• Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.

- Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.
	- Probability of reaching $X = k$ is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \dots \cap T_{k-1} \cap H_k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1)\mathbb{P}(T_2)\cdots \mathbb{P}(T_{k-1})\mathbb{P}(H_k) = \frac{1}{2^k}
$$

- Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.
	- Probability of reaching $X = k$ is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \dots \cap T_{k-1} \cap H_k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1)\mathbb{P}(T_2)\cdots \mathbb{P}(T_{k-1})\mathbb{P}(H_k) = \frac{1}{2^k}
$$

• How much would you be willing to pay to play the game?

- Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.
	- Probability of reaching $X = k$ is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \dots \cap T_{k-1} \cap H_k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1)\mathbb{P}(T_2)\cdots \mathbb{P}(T_{k-1})\mathbb{P}(H_k) = \frac{1}{2^k}
$$

- How much would you be willing to pay to play the game?
- Let payout be $Y=2^X$, we want $\mathbb{E}[Y]$:

$$
\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^k \frac{1}{2^k} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 1 = \infty
$$

- Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.
	- Probability of reaching $X = k$ is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \dots \cap T_{k-1} \cap H_k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1)\mathbb{P}(T_2)\cdots \mathbb{P}(T_{k-1})\mathbb{P}(H_k) = \frac{1}{2^k}
$$

- How much would you be willing to pay to play the game?
- Let payout be $Y=2^X$, we want $\mathbb{E}[Y]$:

$$
\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^k \frac{1}{2^k} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 1 = \infty
$$

• Two ways to resolve the "paradox":

- Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.
	- Probability of reaching $X = k$ is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \dots \cap T_{k-1} \cap H_k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1)\mathbb{P}(T_2)\cdots \mathbb{P}(T_{k-1})\mathbb{P}(H_k) = \frac{1}{2^k}
$$

- How much would you be willing to pay to play the game?
- Let payout be $Y=2^X$, we want $\mathbb{E}[Y]$:

$$
\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^k \frac{1}{2^k} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 1 = \infty
$$

- Two ways to resolve the "paradox":
	- No infinite money: max payout of 2^{40} (around a trillion) $\rightsquigarrow \mathbb{E}[Y]=41$

- Game of chance: stranger pays you \$2^x where X is the number of flips with a fair coin until the first heads.
	- Probability of reaching $X = k$ is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \dots \cap T_{k-1} \cap H_k) = \mathbb{P}(T_1)\mathbb{P}(T_2)\cdots \mathbb{P}(T_{k-1})\mathbb{P}(H_k) = \frac{1}{2^k}
$$

- How much would you be willing to pay to play the game?
- Let payout be $Y=2^X$, we want $\mathbb{E}[Y]$:

$$
\mathbb{E}[Y] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^k \frac{1}{2^k} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 1 = \infty
$$

- Two ways to resolve the "paradox":
	- No infinite money: max payout of 2^{40} (around a trillion) $\rightsquigarrow \mathbb{E}[Y]=41$
	- Risk avoidance/concave utility $U = Y^{1/2} \rightsquigarrow \mathbb{E}[U(Y)] \approx 2.41$
• We saw $E[X]$ can be infinite, but it can also be undefined.

- We saw $E[X]$ can be infinite, but it can also be undefined.
- Example: X takes 2^k and -2^k each with prob $2^{-k-1}.$

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k 2^{-k-1} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k 2^{-k-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} = \infty - \infty
$$

- We saw $E[X]$ can be infinite, but it can also be undefined.
- Example: X takes 2^k and -2^k each with prob $2^{-k-1}.$

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^k 2^{-k-1} - \sum_{k=1}^\infty 2^k 2^{-k-1} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2} = \infty - \infty
$$

• Often, both of these are assumed away by assuming $\mathbb{E}(|X|] < \infty$ which implies $E[X]$ exists and is finite.

3/ Indicator Variables

• The probability of an event is equal to the expectation of its indicator:

 $\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(A)]$

• The probability of an event is equal to the expectation of its indicator:

 $\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(A)]$

• **Fundamental bridge** between probability and expectation

• The probability of an event is equal to the expectation of its indicator:

 $\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(A)]$

- **Fundamental bridge** between probability and expectation
- Makes it easy to prove probability results like **Bonferroni's inequality**

 $\mathbb{P}(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n) \leq \mathbb{P}(A_1) + \dots + \mathbb{P}(A_n)$

• The probability of an event is equal to the expectation of its indicator:

$$
\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(A)]
$$

- **Fundamental bridge** between probability and expectation
- Makes it easy to prove probability results like **Bonferroni's inequality**

$$
\mathbb{P}(A_1\cup \dots \cup A_n)\leq \mathbb{P}(A_1)+\dots +\mathbb{P}(A_n)
$$

• Use the fact that $\mathbb{I}(A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n) \leq \mathbb{I}(A_1) + \dots + \mathbb{I}(A_n)$ and then take expectations.

Using indicators to find expectations

• Suppose we are assigning n units to k treatments and all possibilities equally likely. What is the expected number of treatment conditions without any units?

Using indicators to find expectations

- Suppose we are assigning n units to k treatments and all possibilities equally likely. What is the expected number of treatment conditions without any units?
- Use indicators! $I_j=1$ if j th condition is empty. So $I_1+\cdots+I_k$ is the number of empty conditions.

 $\mathbb{E}[I_j] = \mathbb{P}(\mathsf{cond}\, j\; \mathsf{empty})$ $= \mathbb{P}(\{\text{unit 1 not in cond } j\} \cap \cdots \cap \{\text{unit } n \text{ not in cond } j\})$ $= \mathbb{P}(\{\text{unit 1 not in cond }i\}) \cdots \mathbb{P}(\{\text{unit } n \text{ not in cond }i\})$ $=\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)$ \sqrt{n}

Using indicators to find expectations

- Suppose we are assigning n units to k treatments and all possibilities equally likely. What is the expected number of treatment conditions without any units?
- Use indicators! $I_j=1$ if j th condition is empty. So $I_1+\cdots+I_k$ is the number of empty conditions.

 $\mathbb{E}[I_j] = \mathbb{P}(\mathsf{cond}\, j\; \mathsf{empty})$ $= \mathbb{P}(\{\text{unit 1 not in cond } j\} \cap \cdots \cap \{\text{unit } n \text{ not in cond } j\})$ $= \mathbb{P}(\{\text{unit 1 not in cond }i\}) \cdots \mathbb{P}(\{\text{unit } n \text{ not in cond }i\})$ $=\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)$ \sqrt{n}

• Thus, we have $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_j l_j\right] = k(1-1/k)^n.$

4/ Variance

• The **variance** measures the spread of the distribution:

• The **variance** measures the spread of the distribution:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^2]
$$

• Could also use $\mathbb{E}[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]|]$ but more clunky as a function.

• The **variance** measures the spread of the distribution:

- Could also use $\mathbb{E}[|X \mathbb{E}[X]|]$ but more clunky as a function.
- Weighted average of the squared distances from the mean.

• The **variance** measures the spread of the distribution:

- Could also use $\mathbb{E} [|X \mathbb{E}[X]|]$ but more clunky as a function.
- Weighted average of the squared distances from the mean.
	- Larger deviations (+ or $-$) \rightsquigarrow higher variance

• The **variance** measures the spread of the distribution:

- Could also use $\mathbb{E} [|X \mathbb{E}[X]|]$ but more clunky as a function.
- Weighted average of the squared distances from the mean.
	- Larger deviations (+ or $-$) \rightsquigarrow higher variance
- The **standard deviation** is the (positive) square root of the variance:

$$
SD(X) = \sqrt{\mathbb{V}[X]}
$$

• The **variance** measures the spread of the distribution:

 $\mathbb{V}[X] = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^2]$

- Could also use $\mathbb{E} [|X \mathbb{E}[X]|]$ but more clunky as a function.
- Weighted average of the squared distances from the mean.
	- Larger deviations (+ or $-$) \rightsquigarrow higher variance
- The **standard deviation** is the (positive) square root of the variance:

$$
SD(X) = \sqrt{\mathbb{V}[X]}
$$

• Useful equivalent representation of the variance:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X]=\mathbb{E}[X^2]-(\mathbb{E}[X])^2
$$

LOTUS

• How do we calculate $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$ since it's nonlinear?

LOTUS

• How do we calculate $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$ since it's nonlinear?

Defintion

The Law of the Unconscious Statistician, or LOTUS, states that if $g(X)$ is a function of a discrete random variable, then

$$
\mathbb{E}[g(X)] = \sum_{x} g(x) \mathbb{P}(X = x)
$$

LOTUS

• How do we calculate $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$ since it's nonlinear?

Defintion

The **Law of the Unconscious Statistician**, or LOTUS, states that if $g(X)$ is a function of a discrete random variable, then

$$
\mathbb{E}[g(X)] = \sum_{x} g(x) \mathbb{P}(X = x)
$$

• Example: $\mathbb{E}[X^2]$ where $X \sim Bin(n, p)$.

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{k=0}^{n} k \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}
$$

$$
\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \sum_{k=0}^{n} k^2 \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}
$$

• Use LOTUS to calculate the variance for a discrete r.v.:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Use LOTUS to calculate the variance for a discrete r.v.:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

x	$p_X(x)$
0	1/8
1	3/8
2	3/8
3	1/8

• Let's go back to the number of treated units to figure out the variance of the number of treated units:

• Use LOTUS to calculate the variance for a discrete r.v.:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Let's go back to the number of treated units to figure out the variance of the number of treated units:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 p_X(x_j)
$$

• Use LOTUS to calculate the variance for a discrete r.v.:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Let's go back to the number of treated units to figure out the variance of the number of treated units:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 p_X(x_j)
$$

= $(-1.5)^2 \times \frac{1}{8} + (-0.5)^2 \times \frac{3}{8} + 0.5^2 \times \frac{3}{8} + 1.5^2 \times \frac{1}{8}$

• Use LOTUS to calculate the variance for a discrete r.v.:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Let's go back to the number of treated units to figure out the variance of the number of treated units:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 p_X(x_j)
$$

= $(-1.5)^2 \times \frac{1}{8} + (-0.5)^2 \times \frac{3}{8} + 0.5^2 \times \frac{3}{8} + 1.5^2 \times \frac{1}{8}$
= $2.25 \times \frac{1}{8} + 0.25 \times \frac{3}{8} + 0.25 \times \frac{3}{8} + 2.25 \times \frac{1}{8}$

20 / 28

• Use LOTUS to calculate the variance for a discrete r.v.:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^k (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 \mathbb{P}(X = x_j)
$$

• Let's go back to the number of treated units to figure out the variance of the number of treated units:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \sum_{j=1}^{k} (x_j - \mathbb{E}[X])^2 p_X(x_j)
$$

= (-1.5)² × $\frac{1}{8}$ + (-0.5)² × $\frac{3}{8}$ + 0.5² × $\frac{3}{8}$ + 1.5² × $\frac{1}{8}$
= 2.25 × $\frac{1}{8}$ + 0.25 × $\frac{3}{8}$ + 0.25 × $\frac{3}{8}$ + 2.25 × $\frac{1}{8}$ = 0.75

20 / 28

1. $\mathbb{V}[X + c] = \mathbb{V}[X]$ for any constant c.

- 1. $\mathbb{V}[X + c] = \mathbb{V}[X]$ for any constant c.
- 2. If a is a constant, $\mathbb{V}[aX] = a^2 \mathbb{V}[X].$
- 1. $\mathbb{V}[X + c] = \mathbb{V}[X]$ for any constant c.
- 2. If a is a constant, $\mathbb{V}[aX] = a^2 \mathbb{V}[X].$
- 3. If X and Y are **independent**, then $V[X + Y] = V[X] + V[Y]$.
- 1. $\mathbb{V}[X + c] = \mathbb{V}[X]$ for any constant c.
- 2. If a is a constant, $\mathbb{V}[aX] = a^2 \mathbb{V}[X]$.
- 3. If X and Y are **independent**, then $V[X + Y] = V[X] + V[Y]$.
	- But this doesn't hold for dependent r.v.s
- 1. $\mathbb{V}[X + c] = \mathbb{V}[X]$ for any constant c.
- 2. If a is a constant, $\mathbb{V}[aX] = a^2 \mathbb{V}[X].$
- 3. If X and Y are **independent**, then $V[X + Y] = V[X] + V[Y]$.
	- But this doesn't hold for dependent r.v.s
- 4. $\mathbb{V}[X] \geq 0$ with equality holding only if X is a constant, $\mathbb{P}(X = b) = 1$.

• Clunky to use LOTUS to calculate variances. Other ways?

- Clunky to use LOTUS to calculate variances. Other ways?
	- Use stories and indicator variables!

- Clunky to use LOTUS to calculate variances. Other ways?
	- Use stories and indicator variables!
- $X \sim Bin(n, p)$ is equivalent to $X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ where $X_i \sim Bern(p)$

- Clunky to use LOTUS to calculate variances. Other ways?
	- Use stories and indicator variables!
- $X \sim Bin(n, p)$ is equivalent to $X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ where $X_i \sim Bern(p)$
- Variance of a Bernoulli:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X_i]=\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]-(\mathbb{E}[X_i])^2=p-p^2=p(1-p)
$$
Binomial variance

- Clunky to use LOTUS to calculate variances. Other ways?
	- Use stories and indicator variables!
- $X \sim Bin(n, p)$ is equivalent to $X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ where $X_i \sim Bern(p)$
- Variance of a Bernoulli:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X_i]=\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]-(\mathbb{E}[X_i])^2=p-p^2=p(1-p)
$$

• (Used
$$
X_i^2 = X_i
$$
 for indicator variables)

Binomial variance

- Clunky to use LOTUS to calculate variances. Other ways?
	- Use stories and indicator variables!
- $X \sim Bin(n, p)$ is equivalent to $X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ where $X_i \sim Bern(p)$
- Variance of a Bernoulli:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X_i]=\mathbb{E}[X_i^2]-(\mathbb{E}[X_i])^2=p-p^2=p(1-p)
$$

- (Used $X_i^2 = X_i$ for indicator variables)
- Binomials are the sum of **independent** Bernoulli r.v.s so:

$$
\mathbb{V}[X] = \mathbb{V}[X_1+\cdots+X_n] = \mathbb{V}[X_1] + \cdots + \mathbb{V}[X_n] = np(1-p)
$$

• Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$
	- Earlier we saw that $\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n]=\mu$, what about $\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n]$?

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$
	- Earlier we saw that $\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n]=\mu$, what about $\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n]$?
- We can apply the rules of variances:

$$
\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{V}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}
$$

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$
	- Earlier we saw that $\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n]=\mu$, what about $\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n]$?
- We can apply the rules of variances:

$$
\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{V}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}
$$

• Note: we needed independence and identically distributed for this.

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$
	- Earlier we saw that $\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n]=\mu$, what about $\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n]$?
- We can apply the rules of variances:

$$
\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{V}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}
$$

- Note: we needed independence and identically distributed for this.
- $SD(\overline{X}_n) = \sigma/\sqrt{n}$

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$
	- Earlier we saw that $\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n]=\mu$, what about $\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n]$?
- We can apply the rules of variances:

$$
\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{V}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}
$$

- Note: we needed independence and identically distributed for this.
- $SD(\overline{X}_n) = \sigma/\sqrt{n}$
- Under i.i.d. sampling we know the expectation and variance of \overline{X}_n without any other assumptions about the distribution of the $X_{\!\scriptscriptstyle f}!$

- Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu$ and $\mathbb{V}[X_i] = \sigma^2$
	- Earlier we saw that $\mathbb{E}[\overline{X}_n]=\mu$, what about $\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n]$?
- We can apply the rules of variances:

$$
\mathbb{V}[\overline{X}_n] = \mathbb{V}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}[X_i] = \frac{1}{n^2}n\sigma^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{n}
$$

- Note: we needed independence and identically distributed for this.
- $SD(\overline{X}_n) = \sigma/\sqrt{n}$
- Under i.i.d. sampling we know the expectation and variance of \overline{X}_n without any other assumptions about the distribution of the $X_{\!\scriptscriptstyle f}!$
	- We don't know what distribution it takes though!

5/ Inequalities

• Bounds are very important establishing unknown probabilities.

- Bounds are very important establishing unknown probabilities.
	- Also very helpful in establishing limit results later on.
- Bounds are very important establishing unknown probabilities.
	- Also very helpful in establishing limit results later on.
- Remember that $\mathbb{E}[a + bX] = a + b\mathbb{E}[X]$ is linear, but $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \neq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ for nonlinear functions.
- Bounds are very important establishing unknown probabilities.
	- Also very helpful in establishing limit results later on.
- Remember that $\mathbb{E}[a + bX] = a + b\mathbb{E}[X]$ is linear, but $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \neq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ for nonlinear functions.
- Can we relate those? Yes for **convex** and **concave** functions.

Concave and convex

Jensen's inequality

Let X be a r.v. Then, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is convex $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \leq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is concave

with equality only holding if g is linear.

• Makes proving variance positive simple.

Jensen's inequality

Let X be a r.v. Then, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is convex $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \leq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is concave

- Makes proving variance positive simple.
	- $g(x) = x^2$ is convex, so $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \geq (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$.

Jensen's inequality

Let X be a r.v. Then, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is convex $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \leq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is concave

- Makes proving variance positive simple.
	- $g(x) = x^2$ is convex, so $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \geq (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$.
- Allows us to easily reason about complicated functions:

Jensen's inequality

Let X be a r.v. Then, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is convex $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \leq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is concave

- Makes proving variance positive simple.
	- $g(x) = x^2$ is convex, so $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \geq (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$.
- Allows us to easily reason about complicated functions:
	- $E[|X|] \geq |E[X]|$

Jensen's inequality

Let X be a r.v. Then, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is convex $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \leq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is concave

- Makes proving variance positive simple.
	- $g(x) = x^2$ is convex, so $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \geq (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$.
- Allows us to easily reason about complicated functions:
	- $E[|X|] \geq |E[X]|$
	- $\mathbb{E}[1/X] \geq 1/\mathbb{E}[X]$

Jensen's inequality

Let X be a r.v. Then, we have

 $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \geq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is convex $\mathbb{E}[g(X)] \leq g(\mathbb{E}[X])$ if g is concave

- Makes proving variance positive simple.
	- $g(x) = x^2$ is convex, so $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \geq (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$.
- Allows us to easily reason about complicated functions:
	- $E[|X|] \geq |E[X]|$
	- $\mathbb{E}[1/X] \geq 1/\mathbb{E}[X]$
	- $\mathbb{E}[\log(X)] \leq \log(\mathbb{E}[X])$

6/ Poisson Distribution

Definition

An r.v. X has the **Poisson distribution** with parameter $\lambda > 0$, written $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ if the p.m.f. of X is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X=k) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k}{k!}, \qquad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots
$$

• One more discrete distribution is very popular, especially for counts.

Definition

An r.v. X has the **Poisson distribution** with parameter $\lambda > 0$, written $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ if the p.m.f. of X is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X=k) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k}{k!}, \qquad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots
$$

- One more discrete distribution is very popular, especially for counts.
	- Number of contributions a candidate for office receives in a day.

Definition

An r.v. X has the **Poisson distribution** with parameter $\lambda > 0$, written $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ if the p.m.f. of X is:

$$
\mathbb{P}(X=k) = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k}{k!}, \qquad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots
$$

- One more discrete distribution is very popular, especially for counts.
	- Number of contributions a candidate for office receives in a day.
- Key calculus fact that makes this a valid p.m.f.: $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k/k! = e^{\lambda}$.

• A Poisson r.v. $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ has an unusual property:

$$
\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{V}[X] = \lambda
$$

• A Poisson r.v. $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ has an unusual property:

 $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{V}[X] = \lambda$

• The sum of independent Poisson r.v.s is Poisson:

$$
X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_1) \quad Y \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_2) \quad \implies \quad X + Y \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)
$$

• A Poisson r.v. $X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ has an unusual property:

 $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{V}[X] = \lambda$

• The sum of independent Poisson r.v.s is Poisson:

$$
X \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_1) \quad Y \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_2) \quad \implies \quad X + Y \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)
$$

• If $X \sim Bin(n, p)$ with *n* large and *p* small, then X is approx Pois(*np*).