

# The Wonderful World of Binomial Coefficients and Probability

Alan Stein  
University of Connecticut  
Waterbury Campus

February 1, 2006

# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$



# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$

$$(x + y)^1 = 1 \cdot x + 1 \cdot y$$

$$(x + y)^2 = 1 \cdot x^2 + 2xy + 1 \cdot y^2$$

# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$

$$(x + y)^1 = 1 \cdot x + 1 \cdot y$$

$$(x + y)^2 = 1 \cdot x^2 + 2xy + 1 \cdot y^2$$

$$(x + y)^3 = 1 \cdot x^3 + 3x^2y + 3xy^2 + 1 \cdot y^3$$

# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$

$$(x + y)^1 = 1 \cdot x + 1 \cdot y$$

$$(x + y)^2 = 1 \cdot x^2 + 2xy + 1 \cdot y^2$$

$$(x + y)^3 = 1 \cdot x^3 + 3x^2y + 3xy^2 + 1 \cdot y^3$$

$$(x + y)^4 = 1 \cdot x^4 + 4x^3y + 6x^2y^2 + 4xy^3 + 1 \cdot y^4$$

# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$

$$(x + y)^1 = 1 \cdot x + 1 \cdot y$$

$$(x + y)^2 = 1 \cdot x^2 + 2xy + 1 \cdot y^2$$

$$(x + y)^3 = 1 \cdot x^3 + 3x^2y + 3xy^2 + 1 \cdot y^3$$

$$(x + y)^4 = 1 \cdot x^4 + 4x^3y + 6x^2y^2 + 4xy^3 + 1 \cdot y^4$$

$$(x + y)^5 = 1 \cdot x^5 + 5x^4y + 10x^3y^2 + 10x^2y^3 + 5xy^4 + 1 \cdot y^5$$



# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$

$$(x + y)^1 = 1 \cdot x + 1 \cdot y$$

$$(x + y)^2 = 1 \cdot x^2 + 2xy + 1 \cdot y^2$$

$$(x + y)^3 = 1 \cdot x^3 + 3x^2y + 3xy^2 + 1 \cdot y^3$$

$$(x + y)^4 = 1 \cdot x^4 + 4x^3y + 6x^2y^2 + 4xy^3 + 1 \cdot y^4$$

$$(x + y)^5 = 1 \cdot x^5 + 5x^4y + 10x^3y^2 + 10x^2y^3 + 5xy^4 + 1 \cdot y^5$$

If we write down the coefficients in an organized way, we get what's known as *Pascal's Triangle*:

# Binomials and Pascal's Triangle

Consider different powers of binomials:

$$(x + y)^0 = 1$$

$$(x + y)^1 = 1 \cdot x + 1 \cdot y$$

$$(x + y)^2 = 1 \cdot x^2 + 2xy + 1 \cdot y^2$$

$$(x + y)^3 = 1 \cdot x^3 + 3x^2y + 3xy^2 + 1 \cdot y^3$$

$$(x + y)^4 = 1 \cdot x^4 + 4x^3y + 6x^2y^2 + 4xy^3 + 1 \cdot y^4$$

$$(x + y)^5 = 1 \cdot x^5 + 5x^4y + 10x^3y^2 + 10x^2y^3 + 5xy^4 + 1 \cdot y^5$$

If we write down the coefficients in an organized way, we get what's known as *Pascal's Triangle*:

				1					
				1		1			
			1		2		1		
		1		3		3		1	
	1		4		6		4		1

# Pascal's Triangle

			1		
		1		1	
	1		2		1
	1	3		3	1
1	4	6	4	1	

# Pascal's Triangle

			1		
		1		1	
	1		2		1
	1	3		3	1
1	4	6	4	1	

The entries in Pascal's Triangle are called *binomial coefficients* and have tons of interesting properties and also have significant connections to combinatorics (the science of counting) and to probability.

# Pascal's Triangle

			1		
		1		1	
	1		2		1
	1	3		3	1
1	4	6	4	1	

The entries in Pascal's Triangle are called *binomial coefficients* and have tons of interesting properties and also have significant connections to combinatorics (the science of counting) and to probability.

Notation:  $\binom{n}{k}$  is the coefficient of  $x^{n-k}y^k$  in the expansion of  $(x + y)^n$ .

# Pascal's Triangle

			1		
		1		1	
	1		2		1
	1	3		3	1
1	4	6	4	1	

The entries in Pascal's Triangle are called *binomial coefficients* and have tons of interesting properties and also have significant connections to combinatorics (the science of counting) and to probability.

Notation:  $\binom{n}{k}$  is the coefficient of  $x^{n-k}y^k$  in the expansion of  $(x + y)^n$ .

$\binom{n}{k}$  is also the  $k^{\text{th}}$  entry in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row of Pascal's Triangle, where we count both rows and columns starting with 0.

## Definition (Combination)

A combination is a collection of objects chosen from a set.

## Definition (Combination)

A combination is a collection of objects chosen from a set.

Essentially, this means that a combination is a subset.



## Definition (Combination)

A combination is a collection of objects chosen from a set.

Essentially, this means that a combination is a subset.

For example,  $\{b, c\}$  is a combination of two elements chosen from the set consisting of the letters of the alphabet.

## Definition (Combination)

A combination is a collection of objects chosen from a set.

Essentially, this means that a combination is a subset.

For example,  $\{b, c\}$  is a combination of two elements chosen from the set consisting of the letters of the alphabet.

With sets, the order in which we list the elements does not matter, so the same combination may be written  $\{c, b\}$ .

## Definition (Combination)

A combination is a collection of objects chosen from a set.

Essentially, this means that a combination is a subset.

For example,  $\{b, c\}$  is a combination of two elements chosen from the set consisting of the letters of the alphabet.

With sets, the order in which we list the elements does not matter, so the same combination may be written  $\{c, b\}$ .

For convenience, we often omit the braces and sometimes refer to the combination  $b, c$  or even just  $bc$ .

Combinations are sometimes confused with permutations.

Combinations are sometimes confused with permutations.

## Definition (Permutation)

A permutation is an arrangement of objects chosen from a set.

Combinations are sometimes confused with permutations.

## Definition (Permutation)

A permutation is an arrangement of objects chosen from a set.

With permutations, the order in which elements are listed matters; with combinations, the order doesn't matter.

Combinations are sometimes confused with permutations.

## Definition (Permutation)

A permutation is an arrangement of objects chosen from a set.

With permutations, the order in which elements are listed matters; with combinations, the order doesn't matter.

$bc$  and  $cb$  are different permutations, but they come from the same combination.

# Counting Combinations

We often need to count the number of combinations of a certain size chosen from a set of a certain size.

**Notation:**  $C_{n,k}$  is the number of combinations of  $k$  elements chosen from a set of size  $n$ .

There is a formula for  $C_{n,k}$ , which depends on counting permutations and on ...



# The Fundamental Principle of Counting

If a sequences of choices need to be made for which there are:  
 $n_1$  ways of making the first choice,  
 $n_2$  ways of making the second choice,  
 $n_3$  ways of making the third choice, and so on, then

# The Fundamental Principle of Counting

If a sequences of choices need to be made for which there are:  
 $n_1$  ways of making the first choice,  
 $n_2$  ways of making the second choice,  
 $n_3$  ways of making the third choice, and so on, then  
there are  $n_1 \cdot n_2 \cdot n_3 \cdot \dots$  ways of making the sequence of choices.

# A Deck of Cards

As one example of the Fundamental Principle of Counting, we can determine the number of cards in a standard deck. We can observe the number of cards must equal the number of ways we can choose a card. Since we can choose a card by first choosing its face value, which can be done in 13 ways, and then choosing its suit, which can be done in 4 ways, it follows that we can choose a card in  $13 \cdot 4 = 52$  different ways. Thus, a deck of cards must contain 52 cards.

# Counting Permutations

Let us denote the number of permutations containing  $k$  distinct elements chosen from a set of size  $n$  by  $P_{n,k}$ . We can find  $P_{n,k}$  using the Fundamental Principle of Counting by observing:

# Counting Permutations

Let us denote the number of permutations containing  $k$  distinct elements chosen from a set of size  $n$  by  $P_{n,k}$ . We can find  $P_{n,k}$  using the Fundamental Principle of Counting by observing:

There are  $n$  different ways of choosing the first element.

# Counting Permutations

Let us denote the number of permutations containing  $k$  distinct elements chosen from a set of size  $n$  by  $P_{n,k}$ . We can find  $P_{n,k}$  using the Fundamental Principle of Counting by observing:

There are  $n$  different ways of choosing the first element.

There are  $(n - 1)$  different ways of choosing the second element

...

# Counting Permutations

Let us denote the number of permutations containing  $k$  distinct elements chosen from a set of size  $n$  by  $P_{n,k}$ . We can find  $P_{n,k}$  using the Fundamental Principle of Counting by observing:

There are  $n$  different ways of choosing the first element.

There are  $(n - 1)$  different ways of choosing the second element  
... since when we choose the second element we have already eliminated one of the  $n$  elements from consideration.

# Counting Permutations

Let us denote the number of permutations containing  $k$  distinct elements chosen from a set of size  $n$  by  $P_{n,k}$ . We can find  $P_{n,k}$  using the Fundamental Principle of Counting by observing:

There are  $n$  different ways of choosing the first element.

There are  $(n - 1)$  different ways of choosing the second element  
... since when we choose the second element we have already eliminated one of the  $n$  elements from consideration.

There are  $(n - 2)$  different ways of choosing the third element.



# Counting Permutations

Let us denote the number of permutations containing  $k$  distinct elements chosen from a set of size  $n$  by  $P_{n,k}$ . We can find  $P_{n,k}$  using the Fundamental Principle of Counting by observing:

There are  $n$  different ways of choosing the first element.

There are  $(n - 1)$  different ways of choosing the second element . . . since when we choose the second element we have already eliminated one of the  $n$  elements from consideration.

There are  $(n - 2)$  different ways of choosing the third element.

We can continue like this. When we get to the last, or  $k^{\text{th}}$  element, we have already chosen  $k - 1$  elements, so we have  $n - (k - 1) = n - k + 1$  ways of choosing the last element.

Applying the Fundamental Principle of Counting, we have  $n(n-1)(n-2)\dots(n-k+2)(n-k+1)$  ways of choosing the  $k$  elements. Using *factorial notation*, we may write this as  $\frac{n!}{(n-k)!}$ .

Applying the Fundamental Principle of Counting, we have  $n(n-1)(n-2)\dots(n-k+2)(n-k+1)$  ways of choosing the  $k$  elements. Using *factorial notation*, we may write this as  $\frac{n!}{(n-k)!}$ .

We just have the formula  $P_{n,k} = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!}$ . From this, we can fairly easily find  $C_{n,k}$ .

# Counting Combinations

Using either the formula for counting permutations or simply using the Fundamental Principle of Counting, every combination of  $k$  elements can be arranged in  $P_{k,k} = k!$  different ways. Thus, there must be  $k!$  times as many permutations of a given size as combinations. In other words,  $P_{n,k} = k!C_{n,k}$ .

# Counting Combinations

Using either the formula for counting permutations or simply using the Fundamental Principle of Counting, every combination of  $k$  elements can be arranged in  $P_{k,k} = k!$  different ways. Thus, there must be  $k!$  times as many permutations of a given size as combinations. In other words,  $P_{n,k} = k!C_{n,k}$ .

Thus,  $C_{n,k} = \frac{P_{n,k}}{k!} = \frac{n!/(n-k)!}{k!}$ . In other words,

# Counting Combinations

Using either the formula for counting permutations or simply using the Fundamental Principle of Counting, every combination of  $k$  elements can be arranged in  $P_{k,k} = k!$  different ways. Thus, there must be  $k!$  times as many permutations of a given size as combinations. In other words,  $P_{n,k} = k!C_{n,k}$ .

Thus,  $C_{n,k} = \frac{P_{n,k}}{k!} = \frac{n!/(n-k)!}{k!}$ . In other words,

$$C_{n,k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}.$$

# Combinations and Binomial Coefficients

It turns out there's a close relationship between *combinations* and *binomial coefficients*.

# Combinations and Binomial Coefficients

It turns out there's a close relationship between *combinations* and *binomial coefficients*.

## Theorem

$$\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$$



# Combinations and Binomial Coefficients

It turns out there's a close relationship between *combinations* and *binomial coefficients*.

## Theorem

$$\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$$

Why?

Why  $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

T0.88100101.44cmq0n5840.5Bformf48TET1T0.181S8md(k)58m1g11g3

# Why $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

Take a look at how one gets a term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  when one expands  $(x + y)^n$ .

Visualize ...

# Why $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

Take a look at how one gets a term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  when one expands  $(x + y)^n$ .

Visualize  $\dots(x + y)^n =$

# Why $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

Take a look at how one gets a term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  when one expands  $(x + y)^n$ .

Visualize  $\dots (x + y)^n =$   
 $(x + y) \cdot (x + y) \cdot (x + y) \dots (x + y)$ .

# Why $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

Take a look at how one gets a term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  when one expands  $(x + y)^n$ .

Visualize  $\dots(x + y)^n =$   
 $(x + y) \cdot (x + y) \cdot (x + y) \dots (x + y)$ .

Each term of the product comes from taking either  $x$  or  $y$  from each of the  $n$  factors  $x + y$ . Each term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  comes from taking  $x$  from  $n - k$  of those factors and taking  $y$  from  $k$  of those factors.



# Why $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

Take a look at how one gets a term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  when one expands  $(x + y)^n$ .

Visualize  $\dots(x + y)^n =$   
 $(x + y) \cdot (x + y) \cdot (x + y) \dots (x + y)$ .

Each term of the product comes from taking either  $x$  or  $y$  from each of the  $n$  factors  $x + y$ . Each term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  comes from taking  $x$  from  $n - k$  of those factors and taking  $y$  from  $k$  of those factors.

The number of ways this can be done is precisely the number of ways one can choose the  $k$  factors from which one chooses  $y$ .  
By definition, this can be done in  $C_{n,k}$  ways.



# Why $\binom{n}{k} = C_{n,k}$

Take a look at how one gets a term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  when one expands  $(x + y)^n$ .

Visualize  $\dots (x + y)^n =$   
 $(x + y) \cdot (x + y) \cdot (x + y) \dots (x + y)$ .

Each term of the product comes from taking either  $x$  or  $y$  from each of the  $n$  factors  $x + y$ . Each term of the form  $x^{n-k}y^k$  comes from taking  $x$  from  $n - k$  of those factors and taking  $y$  from  $k$  of those factors.

The number of ways this can be done is precisely the number of ways one can choose the  $k$  factors from which one chooses  $y$ .

By definition, this can be done in  $C_{n,k}$  ways.

Thus, the coefficient of  $x^{n-k}y^k$  must be  $C_{n,k}$ , so  $C_{n,k}$  must be equal to  $\binom{n}{k}$ . From now on, we'll use  $\binom{n}{k}$  rather than  $C_{n,k}$ .

# Interesting Properties

If we look at Pascal's Triangle, which contains the Binomial Coefficients, the most obvious fact to most is that each term appears to be the sum of the two terms directly above it, to the left and to the right.

			1					
			1		1			
		1		2		1		
	1		3		3		1	
1		4		6		4		1



$$\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k}$$

We can see why this is true if we visualize  $(x + y)^n$  as  $(x + y)^{n-1}(x + y)$  and observe the  $x^{n-k}y^k$  term of  $(x + y)^n$  comes from the  $x^{n-k}y^{k-1}$  and  $x^{n-k-1}y^k$  terms of  $(x + y)^{n-1}$  when we multiply the former by  $y$  and the latter by  $x$ .

$$\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k}$$

We can see why this is true if we visualize  $(x + y)^n$  as  $(x + y)^{n-1}(x + y)$  and observe the  $x^{n-k}y^k$  term of  $(x + y)^n$  comes from the  $x^{n-k}y^{k-1}$  and  $x^{n-k-1}y^k$  terms of  $(x + y)^{n-1}$  when we multiply the former by  $y$  and the latter by  $x$ .

We thus see the  $x^{n-k}y^k$  term comes from

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1}x^{n-k}y^{k-1} \cdot y + \binom{n-1}{k}x^{n-k-1}y^k \cdot x = \left[ \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k} \right] x^{n-k}y^k.$$

$$\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k}$$

We can see why this is true if we visualize  $(x + y)^n$  as  $(x + y)^{n-1}(x + y)$  and observe the  $x^{n-k}y^k$  term of  $(x + y)^n$  comes from the  $x^{n-k}y^{k-1}$  and  $x^{n-k-1}y^k$  terms of  $(x + y)^{n-1}$  when we multiply the former by  $y$  and the latter by  $x$ .

We thus see the  $x^{n-k}y^k$  term comes from

$$\binom{n-1}{k-1}x^{n-k}y^{k-1} \cdot y + \binom{n-1}{k}x^{n-k-1}y^k \cdot x = \left[ \binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k} \right] x^{n-k}y^k.$$

This shows that  $\binom{n}{k}$ , the coefficient of  $x^{n-k}y^k$ , is  $\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k}$ .

# The Total in Any Row

Another interesting property comes if we add up the terms in each row.











# The Total in Row $n$ is $2^n$

This is easily seen because

$$2^n = (1+1)^n = \binom{n}{0}1^n \cdot 1^0 + \binom{n}{1}1^{n-1} \cdot 1^1 + \binom{n}{2}1^{n-2} \cdot 1^2 + \dots + \binom{n}{n}1^0 \cdot 1^n = \\ \binom{n}{0} + \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{n}$$

The most basic connection to probability is through the *Binomial Probability Distribution*.

The most basic connection to probability is through the *Binomial Probability Distribution*.

Suppose we perform the same experiment  $n$  times and the experiment satisfies the following conditions, where the performance of each experiment is referred to as a *binomial trial*, so that we may think of the complete sequence of trials as a *binomial experiment*.

# Binomial Experiments

1. Each trial has two possible outcomes, which may be denoted by  $S$  and  $F$ .

# Binomial Experiments

1. Each trial has two possible outcomes, which may be denoted by  $S$  and  $F$ .
2. The result of each trial is independent of the results of the other trials.



# Binomial Experiments

1. Each trial has two possible outcomes, which may be denoted by  $S$  and  $F$ .
2. The result of each trial is independent of the results of the other trials.
3. There are numbers  $p$  and  $q$  with  $p \geq 0$ ,  $q \geq 0$  and  $p + q = 1$  such that for each trial, the probability of the outcome  $S$  is  $p$  and the probability of outcome  $F$  is  $q$ . We may write  $\Pr(P) = p$ ,  $\Pr(F) = q$ .

If we let  $X$  be the number of  $S$ 's, it turns out that

$$\Pr(X = k) = \binom{n}{k} p^k q^{n-k}.$$

## Example: Tossing Coins

If we toss a coin a number of times, it may be considered a binomial experiment with  $p = q = \frac{1}{2}$ , where S may correspond to getting a head and F to getting a tail.

## Example: Tossing Coins

If we toss a coin a number of times, it may be considered a binomial experiment with  $p = q = \frac{1}{2}$ , where S may correspond to getting a head and F to getting a tail.

In a simple example, if we toss a coin twice, the probability of getting exactly 1 head is

$$\binom{2}{1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 = \binom{2}{1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{2!}{1!1!} = \frac{2 \cdot 1}{1 \cdot 1} \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

## Example: Tossing Coins

If we toss a coin a number of times, it may be considered a binomial experiment with  $p = q = \frac{1}{2}$ , where S may correspond to getting a head and F to getting a tail.

In a simple example, if we toss a coin twice, the probability of getting exactly 1 head is

$$\binom{2}{1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 = \binom{2}{1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{2!}{1!1!} = \frac{2 \cdot 1}{1 \cdot 1} \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

In other words, the chance of getting exactly one head if we toss a coin twice is  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

## Example: Tossing Coins

If we toss a coin a number of times, it may be considered a binomial experiment with  $p = q = \frac{1}{2}$ , where S may correspond to getting a head and F to getting a tail.

In a simple example, if we toss a coin twice, the probability of getting exactly 1 head is

$$\binom{2}{1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 = \binom{2}{1} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{2!}{1!1!} = \frac{2 \cdot 1}{1 \cdot 1} \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{2}{4} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

In other words, the chance of getting exactly one head if we toss a coin twice is  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

The same analysis implies that if any birth was equally likely to be a boy or a girl, then half the families with two children would have one boy and one girl.

# Where does the connection come from?

If one performs the same trial  $n$  times, there are exactly  $\binom{n}{k}$  ways of  $k$  trials coming out S and  $n - k$  trials coming out F, with each way having a probability  $p^k q^{n-k}$  of happening.

# Other Interesting Properties

Suppose we take any row other than the top row in Pascal's Triangle and alternately add and subtract adjacent terms. We always come up with 0.





# Odd Binomial Coefficients

All integers are characterized as either even or odd—hardly a revelation.

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

All integers are characterized as either even or odd—hardly a revelation.

If we look at the binomial coefficients, and look at the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row, it turns out that the number of odd binomial coefficients in that row is  $2^{\alpha(n)}$ , where  $\alpha(n)$  is the number of  $1^{\text{s}}$  in the binary (base 2) representation of  $n$ . (We need to look at the top row as the 0

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

All integers are characterized as either even or odd—hardly a revelation.

If we look at the binomial coefficients, and look at the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row, it turns out that the number of odd binomial coefficients in that row is  $2^{\alpha(n)}$ , where  $\alpha(n)$  is the number of  $1^{\text{s}}$  in the binary (base 2) representation of  $n$ . (We need to look at the top row as the  $0^{\text{th}}$  row.)

In fact, it turns out that  $\binom{n}{k}$  is odd precisely when all the places where the binary representation of  $k$  have 1's are at places where the binary representation of  $n$  also have 1's.

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

All integers are characterized as either even or odd—hardly a revelation.

If we look at the binomial coefficients, and look at the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row, it turns out that the number of odd binomial coefficients in that row is  $2^{\alpha(n)}$ , where  $\alpha(n)$  is the number of  $1^{\text{s}}$  in the binary (base 2) representation of  $n$ . (We need to look at the top row as the  $0^{\text{th}}$  row.)

In fact, it turns out that  $\binom{n}{k}$  is odd precisely when all the places where the binary representation of  $k$  have 1's are at places where the binary representation of  $n$  also have 1's.

				1			
				1		1	
			1	2		1	
		1	3	3		1	
	1	4	6	4		1	

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

$$0_2 = 0, \quad \binom{0}{0} = 0, \quad 2^{\alpha(0)} = 2^0 = 1$$

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

$$0_2 = 0, \quad \binom{0}{1} = 0, \quad 2^{\alpha(0)} = 2^0 = 1$$

$$1_2 = 1, \quad \binom{1}{1} = 1, \quad 2^{\alpha(1)} = 2^1 = 2$$

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} 0_2 &= 0, & \binom{0}{0} &= 0, & 2^{\alpha(0)} &= 2^0 = 1 \\ 1_2 &= 1, & \binom{1}{1} &= 1, & 2^{\alpha(1)} &= 2^1 = 2 \\ 2_2 &= 10, & \binom{2}{2} &= 1, & 2^{\alpha(2)} &= 2^1 = 2 \end{aligned}$$

# Odd Binomial Coefficients

$$\begin{array}{lll} 0_2 = 0, & \binom{0}{1} = 0, & 2^{\alpha(0)} = 2^0 = 1 \\ 1_2 = 1, & \binom{1}{1} = 1, & 2^{\alpha(1)} = 2^1 = 2 \\ 2_2 = 10, & \binom{2}{1} = 2, & 2^{\alpha(2)} = 2^1 = 2 \\ 3_2 = 11, & \binom{3}{1} = 3, & 2^{\alpha(3)} = 2^2 = 4 \end{array}$$



# Odd Binomial Coefficients

$$\begin{array}{lll} 0_2 = 0, & \binom{0}{1} = 0, & 2^{\alpha(0)} = 2^0 = 1 \\ 1_2 = 1, & \binom{1}{1} = 1, & 2^{\alpha(1)} = 2^1 = 2 \\ 2_2 = 10, & \binom{2}{1} = 2, & 2^{\alpha(2)} = 2^1 = 2 \\ 3_2 = 11, & \binom{3}{1} = 3, & 2^{\alpha(3)} = 2^2 = 4 \\ 4_2 = 100, & \binom{4}{1} = 4, & 2^{\alpha(4)} = 2^1 = 2 \end{array}$$



# The Macro Perspective

In the long run, it turns out that almost all binomial coefficients are even rather than odd.

# The Macro Perspective

In the long run, it turns out that almost all binomial coefficients are even rather than odd.

Perhaps more surprisingly, if one took any finite set of prime numbers and started looking, row by row, at all the binomial coefficients, one would find that almost all the binomial coefficients were divisible by every prime in the set . . .

# The Macro Perspective

In the long run, it turns out that almost all binomial coefficients are even rather than odd.

Perhaps more surprisingly, if one took any finite set of prime numbers and started looking, row by row, at all the binomial coefficients, one would find that almost all the binomial coefficients were divisible by every prime in the set . . . although it might take a few lifetimes to actually check enough rows to see it.

# Binomial Coefficients Modulo 3

The odd binomial coefficients can be viewed as the binomial coefficients that are not divisible by 2. One might similarly look at the binomial coefficients not divisible by 3. We already know almost all binomial coefficients are divisible by 3, but among the ones which aren't, one might categorize those which leave a remainder of 1 when divided by 3 and those which leave a remainder of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

# Binomial Coefficients Modulo 3

The odd binomial coefficients can be viewed as the binomial coefficients that are not divisible by 2. One might similarly look at the binomial coefficients not divisible by 3. We already know almost all binomial coefficients are divisible by 3, but among the ones which aren't, one might categorize those which leave a remainder of 1 when divided by 3 and those which leave a remainder of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

Offhand, one might expect about as many to have a remainder of 1 as of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

# Binomial Coefficients Modulo 3

The odd binomial coefficients can be viewed as the binomial coefficients that are not divisible by 2. One might similarly look at the binomial coefficients not divisible by 3. We already know almost all binomial coefficients are divisible by 3, but among the ones which aren't, one might categorize those which leave a remainder of 1 when divided by 3 and those which leave a remainder of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

Offhand, one might expect about as many to have a remainder of 1 as of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

That's exactly what happens.



# Binomial Coefficients Modulo 3

The odd binomial coefficients can be viewed as the binomial coefficients that are not divisible by 2. One might similarly look at the binomial coefficients not divisible by 3. We already know almost all binomial coefficients are divisible by 3, but among the ones which aren't, one might categorize those which leave a remainder of 1 when divided by 3 and those which leave a remainder of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

Offhand, one might expect about as many to have a remainder of 1 as of  $-1$  when divided by 3.

That's exactly what happens.

But there's more to the story.

# Binomial Coefficients Modulo 3

If we take 2 and raise it to a power equal to the number of 1's in the ternary (base 3) expansion of  $n$ , take 3 and raise it to a power equal to the number of 2's in the ternary expansion of  $n$ , and multiply those two numbers together, we get the number of binomial coefficients in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row which are not divisible by 3.



# Binomial Coefficients Modulo 3

If we take 2 and raise it to a power equal to the number of 1's in the ternary (base 3) expansion of  $n$ , take 3 and raise it to a power equal to the number of 2's in the ternary expansion of  $n$ , and multiply those two numbers together, we get the number of binomial coefficients in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row which are not divisible by 3.

More surprisingly, if we just take the first of those factors, the power of two, that happens to be just what we get if we count the number of binomial coefficients in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  row which leave a remainder of 1 when divided by 3 and subtract the number which leave a remainder of  $-1$ .

Since any power of 2 must be a positive number, this implies the interesting result that every single row contains more binomial coefficients which give a remainder of 1 than which give a remainder of  $-1$ !!!

# The Inevitability of Events of Probability Zero

This doesn't really have too much to do with binomial coefficients, but it does show how, in combinatorics and probability, intuition can't always be trusted.

# The Inevitability of Events of Probability Zero

This doesn't really have too much to do with binomial coefficients, but it does show how, in combinatorics and probability, intuition can't always be trusted.

Consider a light bulb sold with an average life of 1000 hours.

# The Inevitability of Events of Probability Zero

This doesn't really have too much to do with binomial coefficients, but it does show how, in combinatorics and probability, intuition can't always be trusted.

Consider a light bulb sold with an average life of 1000 hours. I will show the probability that it lasts exactly 1000 hours is 0.

# The Inevitability of Events of Probability Zero

This doesn't really have too much to do with binomial coefficients, but it does show how, in combinatorics and probability, intuition can't always be trusted.

Consider a light bulb sold with an average life of 1000 hours.

I will show the probability that it lasts exactly 1000 hours is 0.

A similar argument would clearly hold for every other possible time.



# The Inevitability of Events of Probability Zero

This doesn't really have too much to do with binomial coefficients, but it does show how, in combinatorics and probability, intuition can't always be trusted.

Consider a light bulb sold with an average life of 1000 hours.

I will show the probability that it lasts exactly 1000 hours is 0.

A similar argument would clearly hold for every other possible time.

But the light bulb must burn out at some point, so an event with probability 0 will inevitably occur.

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ .

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ . I think you'll agree the probability of it burning out at any particular time within a minute or so of 1000 hours won't be much different. For example, it will certainly be at least half  $p$ .

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ . I think you'll agree the probability of it burning out at any particular time within a minute or so of 1000 hours won't be much different. For example, it will certainly be at least half  $p$ .

Let  $\Pr(t)$  be the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly  $t$  hours and let  $n$  be any positive integer bigger than  $\frac{2}{p}$ .

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ . I think you'll agree the probability of it burning out at any particular time within a minute or so of 1000 hours won't be much different. For example, it will certainly be at least half  $p$ .

Let  $\Pr(t)$  be the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly  $t$  hours and let  $n$  be any positive integer bigger than  $\frac{2}{p}$ .

I think you'll also agree that the probability the light bulb burns out within a minute of 1000 hours is at least equal to  $\Pr(1000) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{1}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{2}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{3}{60n}) + \dots + \Pr(1000 + \frac{n-1}{60n})$ .

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ . I think you'll agree the probability of it burning out at any particular time within a minute or so of 1000 hours won't be much different. For example, it will certainly be at least half  $p$ .

Let  $\Pr(t)$  be the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly  $t$  hours and let  $n$  be any positive integer bigger than  $\frac{2}{p}$ .

I think you'll also agree that the probability the light bulb burns out within a minute of 1000 hours is at least equal to  $\Pr(1000) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{1}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{2}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{3}{60n}) + \dots + \Pr(1000 + \frac{n-1}{60n})$ .

But that last sum contains  $n$  terms, each at least as large as  $\frac{p}{2}$ , so it must total at least  $n \cdot \frac{p}{2}$ .

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ . I think you'll agree the probability of it burning out at any particular time within a minute or so of 1000 hours won't be much different. For example, it will certainly be at least half  $p$ .

Let  $\Pr(t)$  be the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly  $t$  hours and let  $n$  be any positive integer bigger than  $\frac{2}{p}$ .

I think you'll also agree that the probability the light bulb burns out within a minute of 1000 hours is at least equal to  $\Pr(1000) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{1}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{2}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{3}{60n}) + \dots + \Pr(1000 + \frac{n-1}{60n})$ .

But that last sum contains  $n$  terms, each at least as large as  $\frac{p}{2}$ , so it must total at least  $n \cdot \frac{p}{2}$ . Since  $n > \frac{2}{p}$ , this must be more than 1.

# The Death of a Light Bulb

Suppose the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly 1000 hours is some positive number  $p$ . I think you'll agree the probability of it burning out at any particular time within a minute or so of 1000 hours won't be much different. For example, it will certainly be at least half  $p$ .

Let  $\Pr(t)$  be the probability the light bulb burns out in exactly  $t$  hours and let  $n$  be any positive integer bigger than  $\frac{2}{p}$ .

I think you'll also agree that the probability the light bulb burns out within a minute of 1000 hours is at least equal to  $\Pr(1000) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{1}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{2}{60n}) + \Pr(1000 + \frac{3}{60n}) + \dots + \Pr(1000 + \frac{n-1}{60n})$ .

But that last sum contains  $n$  terms, each at least as large as  $\frac{p}{2}$ , so it must total at least  $n \cdot \frac{p}{2}$ . Since  $n > \frac{2}{p}$ , this must be more than 1. But no probability can be bigger than 1. It follows the assumption  $\Pr(1000) > 0$  must be wrong!



# The Problem of the Three Chests

A solution to this problem is worth extra credit to students in my classes!

# The Problem of the Three Chests

A solution to this problem is worth extra credit to students in my classes!

*Hint 1: This problem is explained in a book authored by the person for whom the building I had my office in when I was in graduate school was named.*

# The Problem of the Three Chests

A solution to this problem is worth extra credit to students in my classes!

*Hint 1: This problem is explained in a book authored by the person for whom the building I had my office in when I was in graduate school was named.*

*Hint 2: At that time, his son was a reporter for the New York Times.*

# The Problem of the Three Chests

Suppose you are standing in front of three chests which look exactly alike, each of the chests containing two drawers. We will call the chests A, B, and C. Each drawer of Chest A contains a gold piece. In Chest B one drawer has a gold piece, one a silver piece. In Chest C each drawer contains a silver piece.

# The Problem of the Three Chests

Suppose you are standing in front of three chests which look exactly alike, each of the chests containing two drawers. We will call the chests A, B, and C. Each drawer of Chest A contains a gold piece. In Chest B one drawer has a gold piece, one a silver piece. In Chest C each drawer contains a silver piece.

You choose a chest at random, choose one of its drawers at random, open the drawer, and find it contains a gold piece.

# The Problem of the Three Chests

Suppose you are standing in front of three chests which look exactly alike, each of the chests containing two drawers. We will call the chests A, B, and C. Each drawer of Chest A contains a gold piece. In Chest B one drawer has a gold piece, one a silver piece. In Chest C each drawer contains a silver piece.

You choose a chest at random, choose one of its drawers at random, open the drawer, and find it contains a gold piece.

What is the probability that, if you open the other drawer in the same chest, it will also contain a gold piece?