

TASK

If you break a stick uniformly in two places, you will be left with three segments. Write an algorithm for computing the probability that the three segments form a triangle. This algorithm is supposed to employ Metropolis - Hastings ideas and serve as an independent verification of our theoretical calculations.

SOLUTION

First, we note that the probability can be calculated quite easily on a piece of paper...

Let A and B be the two break points falling on a stick of length L. To distinguish between the break points, we will order them chronologically, A being the older one. Two cases are to be considered:

CASE 1: $0 \leq A \leq B \leq L$;

and

CASE 2: $0 \leq A < B \leq L$.

The three pieces will form a triangle if none is longer than the sum of the others. In terms of A and B, the conditions are the following.

CASE 1:

$A < L - A$	<=====>	$A < L/2$;
$L - B < B$	<=====>	$B > L/2$;
$B - A < A + (L - A)$	<=====>	$B < A + L/2$.

CASE 2: $B < L/2$, $A > L/2$ and $A < B + L/2$.

Now we are capable of plotting the acceptable region on the plane. We see that it consists of two small triangles: one triangle corresponds to case 1 and the other triangle corresponds to case 2. The area of the acceptable region can be calculated as

$$1/2 * (L/2)^2 + 1/2 * (L/2)^2.$$

The space of all elementary possibilities is the square $[0,L] \times [0,L]$. It has the area of L^2 . Since (A,B) are uniformly distributed on $[0,L] \times [0,L]$, the probability of the three segments forming a triangle equals

(the area of the acceptable region) / (the area of the space of all elementary possibilities) =

$$= (1/2 * (L/2)^2 + 1/2 * (L/2)^2) / (L^2) = 1/4.$$

~~~~~

Next, we are going to build an algorithm to verify our theoretical result...

Now let  $LF = \min(A,B)$  be the left break point and  $RT = \max(A,B)$  be the right breakpoint. It is a straightforward exercise to determine conditional and marginal distributions of LF and RT. First we focus on marginal distributions:

$$Fm\_LF(x) = P(LF \leq x) = 1 - P(LF > x) = 1 - P(\min(A,B) > x) = 1 - P(A > x, B > x) =$$

$$= 1 - P(A > x) * P(B > x) = 1 - ((1-x)/L)^2.$$

$$Fm\_RT(y) = P(RT \leq y) = P(\max(A,B) \leq y) = P(A \leq y, B \leq y) = P(A \leq y) * P(B \leq y) = (y/L)^2.$$

And now we are ready to calculate conditional distributions. For any  $x \leq y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Fc\_LF(x | y) &= P(LF \leq x | RT = y) = P(\min(A,B) \leq x | \max(A,B) = y) = \\ &= 1/2 * P(\min(A,B) \leq x | \max(A,B) = y, A < B) + 1/2 * P(\min(A,B) \leq x | \max(A,B) = y, A \leq B) = \\ &= 1/2 * P(A \leq x | A < y) + 1/2 * P(B \leq x | B \leq y) = x/y. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any  $x \leq y$ ,

$$Fc\_RT(y | x) = P(RT \leq y | LF = x) = 1 - P(RT > y | LF = x) = 1 - (1-y)/(1-x).$$

Using functions  $Fc\_LF()$  and  $Fc\_RT()$ , random variables  $LF$  and  $RT$  can be simulated one from the other. Here we employ the rule:

*if  $F(x)$  is a cumulative distribution function (cdf) of a given distribution, then random variable  $F^{-1}(U)$  has this distribution, where  $U$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$ .* (\*\*\*)

NOTE: of course, we did not have to derive conditional distributions of  $TF$  and  $RT$  to simulate the three random segments of the line. We could have easily simulated the marginals of  $A$  and  $B$  and seen if the three segments form a triangle. Focusing on  $LF$  and  $RT$  was necessitated by the requirement to use **Metropolis algorithm**.

~~~~~

The algorithm below employs **Gibbs sampling**, which says: to simulate a joint distribution of (LF, RT) , we can simulate LF given RT and RT given LF long enough.

% INITIALIZATION

Counter = 0

Random.Seed(0)

for(S = 1:Sample_Number)

 % SIMULATING INITIAL VALUES OF Z AND W

 U = Simulated_Uniform(0,1)

 LF = Fm⁻¹_{LF}(U) % Using the marginal cdf of LF and rule (***) to simulate LF.

 U = Simulated_Uniform(0,1)

 RT = Fm⁻¹_{RT}(U) % Using the marginal cdf of RT and rule (***) to simulate RT.

 for(iter = 1:(Burn.In+1))

 % THE MAGIC OF GIBBS SAMPLING.

 % Randomly selecting LF or RT.

 U = Simulated_Uniform(0,1)

 if(U <= 1/2)

 U = Simulated_Uniform(0,1)

 LF = Fc⁻¹_{LF}(U | RT) % Simulating LF using its conditional cdf
 % and the current value of RT.

 else

```

        U = Simulated_Uniform(0,1)
        RT = Fc^{-1}_RT(U | LF) % Simulating RT using its conditional cdf
                               % and the current value of LF.
    end
end

% CHECKING IF ONE CAN MAKE A TRIANGLE
% OUT OF THE SIMULATED SEGMENTS
if(LF < L/2 & RT > L/2 & RT < LF + L/2)
    Counter = Counter + 1
end
end

end

Prob_Of_Triangle = Counter / Sample_Number.

```

~~~~~

The proposed computational algorithm uses Gibbs sampling. So how is our work related to the ideas of Metropolis?... It turns out that the employed version of Gibbs sampling is a particular case of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Let us denote  $W = (LF, RT)$ .

- Gibbs sampling simulates a Markov chain of different realizations of  $W$  in multiple steps (just like in the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm).
- At each step we have a current value of  $W$  and propose a new value  $W'$  [just like in Metropolis].
- We propose the new value  $W'$  with the proposal density  $Q(w' | w)$ , which is based on the following two-stage procedure. First, a single dimension  $i$  of  $W$  is chosen randomly. Second, the proposed value  $W'$  is identical to  $W$ , except for its value along the  $i$ -dimension  $W_i$  (which is either LF or RT).  $W_i$  is sampled from the conditional distribution  $P(W_i | W_{-i})$ , where  $W_{-i}$  is the other dimension (if  $W_i = LF$ , then  $W_{-i} = RT$ , and the other way around). Therefore

$$Q(W' | W) = P(W'_i | W_{-i}).$$

- The new value is accepted with probability

$$(P(W') * Q(W | W')) / (P(W) * Q(W' | W))$$

(just like in the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm). We note that, due to the specific construction of  $Q(w, w')$ , the acceptance probability equals

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (P(W') * Q(W | W')) / (P(W) * Q(W' | W)) = \\
 & = (P(W') * P(W_i | W'_{-i})) / (P(W) * P(W'_i | W_{-i})) = \\
 & = (P(W_{-i}) * P(W'_i | W_{-i}) * P(W_i | W'_{-i})) / \\
 & / (P(W'_{-i}) * P(W_i | W'_{-i}) * P(W'_i | W_{-i})) = \\
 & = P(W_{-i}) / P(W'_{-i}) = 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

So we always accept the new realization  $W'$ .

---

**Statistical & Financial Consulting by Stanford PhD**

**[consulting@stanfordphd.com](mailto:consulting@stanfordphd.com)**