

SDS 321: Introduction to Probability and Statistics Lecture 2: Conditional probability

Purnamrita Sarkar Department of Statistics and Data Science The University of Texas at Austin

www.cs.cmu.edu/~psarkar/teaching

Alice and Bob toss two fair coins separately. Denote the event that Alice gets a *H* by E_A and the event that Bob gets a *H* by E_B . We know that $P(E_A) = P(E_B) = 1/2$.

P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.

- P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.
- Whats wrong with this argument?

- P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.
- Whats wrong with this argument? But both could get tails!

- P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.
- Whats wrong with this argument? But both could get tails!
- Are *E_A* and *E_B* disjoint?

- P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.
- Whats wrong with this argument? But both could get tails!
- ► Are *E_A* and *E_B* disjoint? Not quite. The sample space you are considering is: *HT*, *TH*, *TT*, *HH*. So *E_A* = {*HT*, *HH*} and *E_B* = {*TH*, *HH*}.

- P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.
- Whats wrong with this argument? But both could get tails!
- ► Are *E_A* and *E_B* disjoint? Not quite. The sample space you are considering is: *HT*, *TH*, *TT*, *HH*. So *E_A* = {*HT*, *HH*} and *E_B* = {*TH*, *HH*}.
- So the union is really $P(E_A \cup E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) - P(E_A \cap E_B) = 3/4.$

- P(E_A ∪ E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) = 1. So its certain that at least one of them will get a head.
- Whats wrong with this argument? But both could get tails!
- ► Are *E_A* and *E_B* disjoint? Not quite. The sample space you are considering is: *HT*, *TH*, *TT*, *HH*. So *E_A* = {*HT*, *HH*} and *E_B* = {*TH*, *HH*}.
- So the union is really $P(E_A \cup E_B) = P(E_A) + P(E_B) - P(E_A \cap E_B) = 3/4.$
- May be what you are really thinking about is independent and not disjoint events.

Partial information

- So far, we have assumed we know nothing about the outcome of our experiment, except for the information encoded in the probability law.
- Sometimes, however, we have partial information that may affect the likelihood of a given event.
 - The experiment involves rolling a die. You are told that the number is odd.
 - The experiment involves the weather tomorrow. You know that the weather today is rainy.
 - The experiment involves the presence or absence of a disease. A blood test comes back positive.
- In each case, knowing about some event B (e.g. "it is raining today") changes our beliefs about event A ("Will it rain tomorrow?").
- We want to update our probability law to incorporate this new knowledge.

Original problem:

- What is the probability of some event A.
 - e.g. What is the probability that we roll a number less than 4?
- In other words, what is P(A)?
- > This is given by our probability law.

Original problem:

- What is the probability of some event A.
 - e.g. What is the probability that we roll a number less than 4?
- In other words, what is P(A)?
- This is given by our probability law.

New problem:

- Assuming event B (equivalently given event B), what is the probability of event A?
 - e.g. Given that the number rolled is an odd number, what is the probability that it is less than 4?
- We call this the **conditional distribution** of *A* given *B*.
- We write this as P(A|B)
- ▶ Read | as "given" or "conditioned on the fact that".
- Our conditional probability is still describing "the probability of something", so we expect it to behave like a probability distribution.

- Consider rolling a fair 6-sided die (uniform, discrete probability distribution).
- Let A be the event "outcome is equal to 1'.
 - ▶ What is *P*(*A*)?
- Let's now assume that the number rolled is an odd number.
 - What is the set, B, that we are conditioning on?
- ▶ What do you think *P*(*A*|*B*) should be?

▶ You are conditioning on event *B*. So your new sample space is {1,3,5} instead of {1,2,3,4,5,6}.

- ▶ You are conditioning on event *B*. So your new sample space is {1,3,5} instead of {1,2,3,4,5,6}.
- Each of these are equally likely. So P(A|B) = 1/3.

- ▶ You are conditioning on event *B*. So your new sample space is {1,3,5} instead of {1,2,3,4,5,6}.
- Each of these are equally likely. So P(A|B) = 1/3.
 - ► Formally, if all outcomes are equally likely, we have

$$P(A|B) = \frac{\# \text{ elements in } A \cap B}{\# \text{ elements in } B}$$

- ▶ You are conditioning on event *B*. So your new sample space is {1,3,5} instead of {1,2,3,4,5,6}.
- Each of these are equally likely. So P(A|B) = 1/3.
 - Formally, if all outcomes are equally likely, we have

$$P(A|B) = \frac{\# \text{ elements in } A \cap B}{\# \text{ elements in } B}$$

• More generally,
$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$$
.

- You are conditioning on event B. So your new sample space is {1,3,5} instead of {1,2,3,4,5,6}.
- Each of these are equally likely. So P(A|B) = 1/3.
 - Formally, if all outcomes are equally likely, we have

$$P(A|B) = \frac{\# \text{ elements in } A \cap B}{\# \text{ elements in } B}$$

- More generally, $P(A|B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$.
- A conditional probability is only defined if P(B) > 0.

- ► Nonnegativity Check.
- Normalization –
- Additivity –

- ► Nonnegativity Check.
- Normalization Your new universe is now B, and we know that P(B|B) = 1.
- Additivity –

- Nonnegativity Check.
- Normalization Your new universe is now B, and we know that P(B|B) = 1.
- Additivity $P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B)$ for two disjoint sets, A_1 and A_2 .

- ▶ Nonnegativity Check.
- Normalization Your new universe is now B, and we know that P(B|B) = 1.
- Additivity $P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B)$ for two disjoint sets, A_1 and A_2 .



- Nonnegativity Check.
- Normalization Your new universe is now B, and we know that P(B|B) = 1.
- Additivity $P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B)$ for two disjoint sets, A_1 and A_2 .



Using additivity, $P((A_1 \cup A_2) \cap B) = P(A_1 \cap B) + P(A_2 \cap B)$, so

$$P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = rac{P(A_1 \cap B) + P(A_2 \cap B)}{P(B)} = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B)$$

If P(B) > 0,

▶ If A_i for $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ are all pairwise disjoint, then $P(\cup_{i=1}^n A_i | B) = \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i | B).$

If P(B) > 0,

▶ If
$$A_i$$
 for $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ are all pairwise disjoint, then
 $P(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i | B) = \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i | B).$

• If
$$A_1 \subseteq A_2$$
, then $P(A_1|B) \leq P(A_2|B)$.

If P(B) > 0,

▶ If
$$A_i$$
 for $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ are all pairwise disjoint, then
 $P(\cup_{i=1}^n A_i | B) = \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i | B).$

• If
$$A_1 \subseteq A_2$$
, then $P(A_1|B) \leq P(A_2|B)$.

•
$$P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B) - P(A_1 \cap A_2|B)$$

If P(B) > 0,

▶ If A_i for $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ are all pairwise disjoint, then $P(\cup_{i=1}^n A_i | B) = \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i | B).$

• If
$$A_1 \subseteq A_2$$
, then $P(A_1|B) \leq P(A_2|B)$.

•
$$P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B) - P(A_1 \cap A_2|B)$$

• Union bound: $P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) \le P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B)$

If P(B) > 0,

▶ If A_i for $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ are all pairwise disjoint, then $P(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i | B) = \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i | B).$

• If
$$A_1 \subseteq A_2$$
, then $P(A_1|B) \leq P(A_2|B)$.

•
$$P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) = P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B) - P(A_1 \cap A_2|B)$$

• Union bound: $P(A_1 \cup A_2|B) \le P(A_1|B) + P(A_2|B)$

►
$$P(\cup_{i=1}^n A_i|B) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i|B).$$

- Notation: Let A := {Tosses yield alternating tails and heads} and B := {The first toss is a head}.
- We want P(A|B).
- What if you wanted to follow the formula?

- Notation: Let A := {Tosses yield alternating tails and heads} and B := {The first toss is a head}.
- We want P(A|B).
- What if you wanted to follow the formula?
 - ► Sample space for three coin tosses {*HHH*, *HHT*, *HTH*, *HTT*, *THH*, *THT*, *TTH*, *TTT*}.

- Notation: Let A := {Tosses yield alternating tails and heads} and B := {The first toss is a head}.
- We want P(A|B).
- What if you wanted to follow the formula?
 - Sample space for three coin tosses {HHH, HHT, HTH, HTT, THH, THT, TTH, TTT}.
 - $A = \{HTH, THT\}$ and $A \cap B = \{HTH\}$.

- Notation: Let A := {Tosses yield alternating tails and heads} and B := {The first toss is a head}.
- We want P(A|B).
- What if you wanted to follow the formula?
 - Sample space for three coin tosses {HHH, HHT, HTH, HTT, THH, THT, TTH, TTT}.
 - $A = \{HTH, THT\}$ and $A \cap B = \{HTH\}$.
 - We have P(B) = 4/8 and $P(A \cap B) = 1/8$ and so P(A|B) = 1/4.

- Notation: Let A := {Tosses yield alternating tails and heads} and B := {The first toss is a head}.
- We want P(A|B).
- What if you wanted to follow the formula?
 - Sample space for three coin tosses {HHH, HHT, HTH, HTT, THH, THT, TTH, TTT}.
 - $A = \{HTH, THT\}$ and $A \cap B = \{HTH\}$.
 - We have P(B) = 4/8 and $P(A \cap B) = 1/8$ and so P(A|B) = 1/4.
 - Your new world/sample space when you condition is B = {HHT, HTH, HTT, HHH}. Each of these are equally likely. Out of these 1 event satisfies alternating heads and tails.

- Notation: Let A := {Tosses yield alternating tails and heads} and B := {The first toss is a head}.
- We want P(A|B).
- What if you wanted to follow the formula?
 - Sample space for three coin tosses {HHH, HHT, HTH, HTT, THH, THT, TTH, TTT}.
 - $A = \{HTH, THT\}$ and $A \cap B = \{HTH\}$.
 - We have P(B) = 4/8 and $P(A \cap B) = 1/8$ and so P(A|B) = 1/4.
 - Your new world/sample space when you condition is B = {HHT, HTH, HTT, HHH}. Each of these are equally likely. Out of these 1 event satisfies alternating heads and tails.

Homework

- ▶ Read Sections 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of Bertsekas and Tsitsiklis.
- The first homework will be posted online today. It is due next Thursday by 5pm via Canvas.