

## 1. The geometric distribution, continued

**1.1. An example.** A couple has children until their first son is born. Suppose the sexes of their children are independent from one another [unrealistic], and the probability of girl is 0.6 every time [not too bad]. Let  $X$  denote the number of their children to find then that  $X = \text{Geom}(0.4)$ . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{X \leq 3\} &= f(1) + f(2) + f(3) \\ &= p + p(1-p) + p(1-p)^2 \\ &= p [1 + 1-p + (1-p)^2] \\ &= p [3 - 3p + p^2] \\ &= 0.784. \end{aligned}$$

**1.2. The tail of the distribution.** Now you may be wondering why these random variables are called “geometric.” In order to answer this, consider the tail of the distribution of  $X$  (probability of large values). Namely, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{X \geq n\} &= \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} p(1-p)^{j-1} \\ &= p \sum_{k=n-1}^{\infty} (1-p)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Let us recall an elementary fact from calculus.

**Lemma 9.1** (Geometric series). *If  $r \in (0, 1)$ , then for all  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$\sum_{j=n}^{\infty} r^j = \frac{r^n}{1-r}.$$

**Proof.** Let  $s_n = r^n + r^{n+1} + \dots = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} r^j$ . Then, we have two relations between  $s_n$  and  $s_{n+1}$ :

- (1)  $rs_n = \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} r^j = s_{n+1}$ ; and
- (2)  $s_{n+1} = s_n - r^n$ .

Plug (2) into (1) to find that  $rs_n = s_n - r^n$ . Solve to obtain the lemma.  $\square$

Return to our geometric random variable  $X$  to find that

$$P\{X \geq n\} = p \frac{(1-p)^{n-1}}{1-(1-p)} = (1-p)^{n-1}.$$

That is,  $P\{X \geq n\}$  vanishes geometrically fast as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the couples example (§1.1),

$$P\{X \geq n\} = 0.6^{n-1} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

## 2. The negative binomial distribution

Suppose we are tossing a  $p$ -coin, where  $p \in (0, 1)$  is fixed, until we obtain  $r$  heads. Let  $X$  denote the number of tosses needed. Then,  $X$  is a discrete random variable with possible values  $r, r+1, r+2, \dots$ . When  $r=1$ , then  $X$  is  $\text{Geom}(p)$ . In general,

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \binom{x-1}{r-1} p^r (1-p)^{x-r} & \text{if } x = r, r+1, r+2, \dots, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This  $X$  is said to have a *negative binomial distribution with parameters  $r$  and  $p$* . Note that our definition differs slightly from that of your text (p. 117).

## 3. The Poisson distribution

Choose and fix a number  $\lambda > 0$ . A random variable  $X$  is said to have the *Poisson distribution with parameter  $\lambda$*  (written  $\text{Poiss}(\lambda)$ ) if its mass function is

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^x}{x!} & \text{if } x = 0, 1, \dots, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

In order to make sure that this makes sense, it suffices to prove that  $\sum_x f(x) = 1$ , but this is an immediate consequence of the Taylor expansion of  $e^\lambda$ , viz.,

$$e^\lambda = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}.$$

**3.1. Law of rare events.** Is there a physical manner in which  $\text{Poiss}(\lambda)$  arises naturally? The answer is “yes.” Let  $X = \text{Bin}(n, \lambda/n)$ . For instance,  $X$  could denote the total number of sampled people who have a rare disease (population percentage =  $\lambda/n$ ) in a large sample of size  $n$ . Then, for all fixed integers  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ,

$$f_X(k) = \binom{n}{k} \left(\frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^k \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}\right)^{n-k}. \quad (8)$$

Poisson’s “law of rare events” states that if  $n$  is large, then the distribution of  $X$  is approximately  $\text{Poiss}(\lambda)$ . In order to deduce this we need two computational lemmas.

**Lemma 9.2.** *For all  $z \in \mathbf{R}$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right)^n = e^z.$$

**Proof.** Because the natural logarithm is continuous on  $(0, \infty)$ , it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \ln \left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) = z. \quad (9)$$

By Taylor’s expansion,

$$\ln \left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) = \frac{z}{n} + \frac{\theta^2}{2},$$

where  $\theta$  lies between 0 and  $z/n$ . Equivalently,

$$\frac{z}{n} \leq \ln \left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) \leq \frac{z}{n} + \frac{z^2}{2n^2}.$$

Multiply all sides by  $n$  and take limits to find (9), and thence the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 9.3.** *If  $k \geq 0$  is a fixed integer, then*

$$\binom{n}{k} \sim \frac{n^k}{k!} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

where  $a_n \sim b_n$  means that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n/b_n) = 1$ .

**Proof.** If  $n \geq k$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n!}{n^k(n-k)!} &= \frac{n(n-1)\cdots(n-k+1)}{n^k} \\ &= \frac{n}{n} \times \frac{n-1}{n} \times \cdots \times \frac{n-k+1}{n} \\ &\rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows upon writing out  $\binom{n}{k}$  and applying the preceding to that expression.  $\square$

Thanks to Lemmas 9.2 and 9.3, and to (8),

$$f_X(k) \sim \frac{n^k \lambda^k}{k! n^k} e^{-\lambda} = \frac{e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k}{k!}.$$

That is, when  $n$  is large,  $X$  behaves like a  $\text{Pois}(\lambda)$ , and this proves our assertion.