

Re: Exponential RV and Conditional Expectation Problem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-10/4214.html>

From: Randy Poe (poespam-trap_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 10/14/04

Date: 14 Oct 2004 11:31:00 -0700

Stridar@gmail.com (bg) wrote in message news:<216501ce.0410140209.1edcfdb3@posting.google.com>...

> Dear all,

>

> I am working alone through a book (Sheldon Ross's *Probability Models for Computer Science*). While I have enjoyed the exposition and have been able to do most problems, I do not understand the math behind one question. Would anyone be kind enough to show me how to calculate the conditional expectation in the following problem?

>

> Problem 1.23

>

> Let X, Y be ind. exponential r.v.'s with rates λ and μ , and let $c \geq 0$.

>

> a) Find $E(\min(X, Y) | X > c)$

> b) Find $E(\min(X, Y) | X > Y + c)$

>

>

> Thank you,

> BG

>

> P.S.

> For part (a), I have tried breaking the integral into three parts to remove the min function instead of finding a joint probability density. Is this a correct method?

If done correctly. What are your three parts?

I'd do it this way:

Think in terms of a new rv, $Z = \min(X, Y)$. You can easily reason about the cumulative distribution of Z .

$\text{Prob}(Z < z | X > c) = 1 - \text{P}(Z \geq z | X > c)$. I find this latter probability easier to reason about. $Z \geq z$ iff both $X \geq z$ and $Y \geq z$. Thus

sci.math: Re: Exponential RV and Conditional Expectation Problem

$$\begin{aligned} P(Z \geq z | X > c) &= P(Y \geq z \ \& \ X \geq z | X > c) \\ &= P(Y \geq z | X > c) P(X \geq z | X > c) \end{aligned}$$

You know how to evaluate those expressions.

This is in general a useful trick for dealing with the minimum.

> For part (b), I am lost. I thought conditioning on Y would work since
> it seems $\min(X, Y)$ should simply be Y

That seems correct.

> instead of integrating over the
> exponential r.v. with parameter $\mu + \lambda$. However, Ross gives a
> later problem to show
> $E(\min(X, Y) | X > Y + c) = E(\min(X, Y) | X > Y)$

I have to think about this one a little.

> = $\frac{1}{\lambda + \mu}$
>

While it may work out to this, I don't think it's because there is an exponential rv with parameter $\lambda + \mu$.

– Randy