

Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2005-04/msg00470.html>

- *From:* "\"Luis A. Afonso\"" <licas_@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 27 Apr 2005 19:45:46 EDT
-

Bob

Thank you for the reply.

I use M.C. since 83-84. I need not to be persuaded that the method is useful.

Bob wrote:

<Good pseudorandom generators are. virtually indistinguishable from those >

I agree.

There are some questions I would like to ask about testing PRG:

- 1) are there a set of tests that could assure us that the Generator is fair, or the comparison with a similar exact problem is necessary in order to be sure that it is a good one ? (This is my favourite approach, am I wrong?)
- 2) The micro-holes or inadmissible , as you prefer, are sufficient to discard the Generator?
- 3) The Generators are specialised i.e. good for one purpose bad for the others?
- 4) what you think about the randoms independence?

A final note: I did not intend, not at all, to say that the Chi-squared test is completely exempt of flaws. If you think that is my opinion you are wrong.

About the two dimensional $[0,1] \times [0,1]$ I made long ago some experiences in order to evaluate areas of figures. laying inside the square resulting exact .

Regards

licas_@xxxxxxxxxx

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ ***Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator***
 - ◇ *From:* Reef Fish

Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator

- **References:**

- ◆ **[Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator](#)**

- ◇ From: \"Luis A. Afonso\"

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Testing a Pseudo-Random Generator](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**