

Chapter 11

11.1 If Y is a discrete random variable taking values in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ let X_i be a random variable with distribution function $F_i(x)$ which is independent of Y . Then $X_Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \mathbf{1}(Y = i)$ has density function

$$\mathbb{P}(X_Y \leq x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_Y \leq x | Y = i) \mathbb{P}(Y = i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x) \mathbb{P}(Y = i) = \sum_{i=1}^n F_i(x) \mathbb{P}(Y = i).$$

Setting $P_i = \mathbb{P}(Y = i)$ brings us to the answer of the first part of the question: We simulate first Y , e.g. by simulating a uniform on $(0, 1)$, say U and setting

$$Y = \min\{y \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{i=1}^y P_i \geq U\}$$

and then simulating from F_Y .

We can apply this to $P_1 = 1/3$, $P_2 = 2/3$, $F_1(x) = 1 - e^{-2x}$ for $x \in (0, \infty)$ and $F_2(x) = x$ for $x \in (0, 1)$.

11.5 Let X_i be a random variable with distribution function $F_i(x)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and assume that the X_i 's are independent. Then,

$$\prod_{i=1}^n F_i(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x) = \mathbb{P}(\text{all } X_i \text{ are at most } x) = \mathbb{P}(\max X_i \leq x).$$

So, you can simulate from $\prod_{i=1}^n F_i(x)$ by simulating from the F_i 's separately and take the maximum of the simulated values. Similarly,

$$1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - F_i(x)) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i > x) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\min X_i > x) = \mathbb{P}(\min X_i \leq x).$$

So, you can simulate from $\prod_{i=1}^n F_i(x)$ by simulating from the F_i 's separately and take the minimum of the simulated values.

If $F(x) = x^n$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ one can use part a) and simulate n independent random variables with distribution function $x \in (0, 1)$ (that is n independent uniforms) or one can use the inverse distribution method and simulate a single uniform U and compute $U^{1/n}$.

11.7 We are going to use a rejection algorithm. we note that

$$\frac{d}{dx} f(x) = 30(2x - 6x^2 + 4x^3) = 60x(1 - 2x)(1 - x).$$

So, $f(x)$ takes its extrima in $x = 0$, $x = 1/2$ and $x = 1$, where $f(0) = 0$, $f(1/2) = 30/16$ and $f(1) = 0$. So $f(1/2)$ is the maximum of $f(x)$ in $(0, 1)$ and we can use Section 11.2.2 with $g(y) = 1$ on $(0, 1)$ and $c = 30/16$. Then simulate two independent uniforms Y and U on $(0, 1)$ and if $U \leq f(Y)/c$ then set $X = Y$ otherwise simulate new Y and U and repeat the procedure.

11.8 a) We use the rejection method for $f(x) = \frac{\lambda^n x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\lambda x}$ and $g(x) = (\lambda/n)e^{-(\lambda/n)x}$. We first compute c which is taken to be the maximum of $f(x)/g(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} &= \frac{d}{dx} \frac{n(\lambda x)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\lambda \frac{n-1}{n} x} = \left(\frac{n\lambda^{n-1} x^{n-2}}{(n-2)!} - \frac{\lambda^n x^{n-1}}{(n-2)!} \right) e^{-\lambda \frac{n-1}{n} x} \\ &= (n - \lambda x) \frac{n\lambda^{n-1} x^{n-2}}{(n-2)!} e^{-\lambda \frac{n-1}{n} x}. \end{aligned}$$

This derivative is positive for $x \in (0, n/\lambda)$ and negative for $x \in (n/\lambda, \infty)$ and therefore $f(x)/g(x)$ takes its maximum if $x = n/\lambda$ and the maximum is $f(n/\lambda)/g(n/\lambda) = \frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} e^{-(n-1)}$. So, we can set $c = \frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} e^{-(n-1)}$ and from the theory we know this is also the expected number of trials before we accept a proposed realisation of the random variable.

b) Stirling's formula is $n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi n} n^n e^{-n}$. Filling that in, in part a) gives

$$c \approx \frac{n^n e^{-(n-1)}}{(n-1)^{n-1} \sqrt{2\pi(n-1)} e^{-(n-1)}} = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{2\pi}} \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right)^{-n} = \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{2\pi}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right)^{-n}.$$

Since $(1 - \frac{1}{n})^n \rightarrow e^{-1}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\frac{c}{\sqrt{n-1}} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

c) To apply the rejection method we can generate independently an exponential Y_2 with mean 1 and a Uniform U and set $Y = nY_2/\lambda$. Note that for a constant K , K times an exponentially distributed random variable with parameter μ is an exponentially distributed random variable with parameter μ/K . Then applying the rejection method gives. if

$$U \leq \frac{n(\lambda Y)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} e^{-\lambda \frac{n-1}{n} Y} / \frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} e^{-(n-1)},$$

that is if

$$U \leq \left(\frac{\lambda Y}{n} \right)^{n-1} e^{-(n-1)(\frac{\lambda Y}{n} - 1)} = (Y_2)^{n-1} e^{-(n-1)(Y_2 - 1)}$$

or

$$-\log U \geq (n-1)[- \log(Y_2) + Y_2 - 1],$$

then set $X = Y = nY_2/\lambda$. Otherwise repeat. Note that $-\log U$ is distributed as an exponential with mean 1 and instead of simulating U and computing $-\log U$ we could have immediately simulated Y_1 and the acceptance inequality would be:

$$Y_1 \geq (n-1)[- \log(Y_2) + Y_2 - 1].$$

d) An independent exponential can be obtained by observing that conditioned on

$$Y_1 \geq (n-1)[- \log(Y_2) + Y_2 - 1]$$

then $Y_1 - (n-1)[- \log(Y_2) + Y_2 - 1]$ is independent of $(n-1)[- \log(Y_2) + Y_2 - 1]$ and exponentially distributed with mean 1, by the memoryless property of the exponential distribution.

11.13 Let U_k be the U random variable generated in the k -th round and Y_k the Y random variable generated in the k -th round. Let A_k be the event that you accept in the k -th round. Assume that we repeat the procedure infinitely many times independently, and we only take X from the first accepted round. So we want to compute $\mathbb{P}(Y_k = i|A_k)$ and show that this is equal to $\mathbb{P}(X = i)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(Y_k = i|A_k) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_k = i \cap A_k)}{\mathbb{P}(A_k)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_k = i \cap U_k < \frac{P_i}{CQ_i})}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{P}(Y_k = j \cap U_k < \frac{P_j}{CQ_j})} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y_k = i)\mathbb{P}(U_k < \frac{P_i}{CQ_i})}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{P}(Y_k = j)\mathbb{P}(U_k < \frac{P_j}{CQ_j})} = \frac{Q_i \frac{P_i}{CQ_i}}{\sum_{j=1}^n Q_j \frac{P_j}{CQ_j}} = \frac{P_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n P_j} = P_i.\end{aligned}$$

To jump from the first to the second line we have used that the U_k 's are independent of the Y_k 's.

11.30 In this exercise $f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$ and $f_t(x) = \frac{e^{tx}f(x)}{M(t)}$, where $M(t)$ can be seen as a normalizing constant.

$$e^{tx}f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2 - 2tx\sigma^2}{2\sigma^2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}e^{-\frac{(x-\mu-t\sigma^2)^2 - t^2\sigma^4 - 2\mu\sigma^2t}{2\sigma^2}} = e^{t^2\sigma^2/2 + \mu t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}e^{-\frac{(x-\mu-t\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2}}.$$

Now note that the part from the fraction on is the density of a Normal distribution with mean $\mu + t\sigma^2$ and variance σ^2 . The factor $e^{t^2\sigma^2/2 + \mu t}$ is a constant as a function of x . Therefore, $f_t(x)$ is a constant (as function of x) times $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}e^{-\frac{(x-\mu-t\sigma^2)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$, and because $f_t(x)$ should integrate to 1, the constant should be equal to 1.

11.31 We want to use variance reduction by conditioning. In order to use the method of part *b* we need that $\mathbb{E}[D_n|W_n] = W_n - \mu$. However

$$\mathbb{E}[D_n|W_n] = \mathbb{E}[W_n - S_n|W_n] = W_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n|W_n].$$

So, we need $\mathbb{E}[S_n|W_n] = \mu$. This is however not the case. It is even possible that we have a queue with infinitely many servers, so $\mathbb{P}(D_n = 0) = 1$, while if $W_n = S_n$ has non-zero variance, $W_n - \mu$ is with positive probability not 0.

If we want to use D_n to simulate W_n , we can use conditioning for variance reduction, since

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n|D_n] = \mathbb{E}[D_n + S_n|D_n] = D_n + \mathbb{E}[S_n|D_n] = D_n + \mu.$$

Because the service time of a customer is independent of how long he or she has been in the queue.

11.32 We use that X and Y are identically distributed and thus that $Var(X) = Var(Y)$ and $Corr(X, Y) = Cov(X, Y)/Var(X)$.

$$Var\left(\frac{X+Y}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{4}Var(X+Y) = \frac{1}{4}(VarX+VarY+2Cov(X, Y)) = \frac{Var(X)}{4}(2+2Corr(X, Y)),$$

which is in the interval $Var(X) \times [0, 1]$ because the correlation takes values in $[-1, 1]$.

11.33 Note that $a\mathbb{E}[X] - \mathbb{E}[X^2] = \mathbb{E}[X(a - X)] \geq 0$, because both factors in the product are in the interval $[0, a]$ and part (a) follows. Using this we obtain that

$$\text{Var}(X) = \mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 \leq a\mathbb{E}[X] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 = \mathbb{E}[X](a - \mathbb{E}[X]).$$

The final part follows by observing that because $\mathbb{P}(0 \leq X \leq a) = 1$ and (by finding that $x(a - x)$ takes its maximum in $a/2$) that $\max_{x \in [0, a]} x(a - x) = a^2/4$.

11.23 (a) Let $m(t) = \int_0^t \lambda(s)ds$ and assume that $\lambda(s) > 0$ for $s > \infty$ $\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x) = e^{-m(x)}$, but also

$$e^{-m(x)} = \mathbb{P}(X_1 > x) = \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{X_1} \lambda(t)dt > \int_0^x \lambda(t)dt\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\int_0^{X_1} \lambda(t)dt > m(x)\right),$$

which gives the desired result.

(b) We know that $\mathbb{P}(X_i - X_{i-1} > t | X_{i-1} = s) = e^{-[m(t+s) - m(s)]}$ therefore

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{X_{i-1}}^{X_i} \lambda(t)dt > x | X_{i-1} = s\right) = \mathbb{P}(m(X_i) - m(X_{i-1}) > x | X_{i-1} = s) = \mathbb{P}(m(X_i) > x + m(s) | X_{i-1} = s)$$

Now the only information obtained from $X_{i-1} = s$ on the event $m(X_i) > x + m(s)$ is that $X_i > s$, thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\int_{X_{i-1}}^{X_i} \lambda(t)dt > x | X_{i-1} = s\right) = \mathbb{P}(X_i > m^{-1}(x + m(s)) | X_i > s) = e^{-x + m(s)} / e^{-m(s)} = e^{-x}.$$

As desired. Note that the probability above is independent of s and therefore we have independence for the different i .

11.24 Simulate two independent Poisson processes one homogeneous with rate b (e.g. by simulating i.i.d. exponentials with rate b and treat those as the interarrival times) and one inhomogeneous with rate $1/(t + a)$ and use example 11.13 to simulate the second process. Then combine the points of the two processes.

11.17 (a) Let $f(x)$ be the density associated with the distribution function F , then $\lambda(t) = f(t)/(1 - F(t))$. We first compute the hazard of $X_{(1)}$. Note that this hazard is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \mathbb{P}(X_{(1)} \leq t + h | X_{(1)} > t) &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{(1)} > t + h | X_{(1)} > t)) \\ &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_i > t + h \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, n)}{\mathbb{P}(X_i > t \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, n)} \right) = \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbb{P}(X_1 > t + h))^n}{(\mathbb{P}(X_1 > t))^n} \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbb{P}(X_1 > t) - f(t)h + o(h))^n}{(1 - F(t))^n} \right) = \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{f(t)h + o(h)}{1 - F(t)} \right)^n \right) \\ &= n \frac{f(t)}{1 - F(t)} = n\lambda(t). \end{aligned}$$

More general assume that the j -th “arrival” is at time t_j and let \mathcal{J} be the index set for which the X_i 's are larger than t_j , i.e. $\mathcal{J} = \{i \in 1, 2, \dots, n; X_i > t_j\}$. Then for $t > t_j$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \mathbb{P}(X_{(j+1)} \leq t + h | X_{(j+1)} > t) &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{(1)} > t + h | X_{(1)} > t)) \\ &= \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_i > t + h \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{J})}{\mathbb{P}(X_i > t \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{J})} \right) = \lim_{h \searrow 0} h^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{(\mathbb{P}(X_1 > t + h))^{n-j}}{(\mathbb{P}(X_1 > t))^{n-j}} \right) \\ &= \dots (\text{as above}) \dots = (n - j) \frac{f(t)}{1 - F(t)} = (n - j)\lambda(t). \end{aligned}$$

So, conditioned on the j -th arrival being at time t_j , the $j + 1$ -st arrival has hazard $(n - j)\lambda(t)$ for $t > t_j$.

(b) Since F is continuous and not decreasing F^{-1} is increasing. Let U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n be independent and identically distributed uniform random variables on $(0, 1)$ and for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ set $Y_i = F^{-1}(U_i)$. Note that Y_i is distributed as X_i and that because F^{-1} is increasing $Y_{(i)} = f^{(-1)}(U_{(i)})$. Which gives the desired result. Now the i -th order statistic of n uniforms is Beta distributed with parameters i and $n + i + 1$.

(c) This is actually the order statistic property for a Poisson process with intensity 1. The numerator is distributed as the i -th point of the Poisson process, while the denominator is distributed as the $n + 1$ -st point. By the order statistic property, conditioned on the $n + 1$ -st point being at time t the positions of the first n points are distributed as n independent identically distributed uniforms on $(0, t)$ and the positions of the first n points divided by t are distributed as n independent identically distributed uniforms on $(0, 1)$ as desired.

(d) Use the order statistic property as in part *c*. We know that $S_n = y(Y_1 + \dots + Y_{n+1})$ and the points S_1, \dots, S_{n-1} are then distributed as $n - 1$ independent uniforms on $(0, S_n) = (0, y)$.

(e) Let V_1, V_2, \dots be independent identically distributed uniforms on $(0, 1)$. Note that $\mathbb{P}(V_{(n)} \leq x) = \prod_{j=1}^n \mathbb{P}(V_j \leq x) = x^n$ for $x \in (0, 1)$, while $\mathbb{P}(U_1^{1/n} \leq x) = \mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq x^n) = x^n$ for $x \in (0, 1)$, which shows the first line of step II. The remaining part is obtained by using part (d) and noting that $U_{(j-1)}/U_{(j)}$ is distributed as the maximum of $j - 1$ i.i.d. uniforms on $(0, 1)$.