

## NOTE ON DEDUCED PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS

R. VON MISES

In this Bulletin, December, 1936, A. H. Copeland\* resumed the study of the problem first suggested by H. Poincaré: How can the fact of uniform probability distribution, which we meet so frequently in different games of chance, be explained? Recently E. Hopf devoted a profound essay† to this question and he has just published a short note‡ dealing with his principal results. I want to contribute a quite simple remark which seems to show how far the results are independent of the particular form of dynamical equations.

We assume that there exists a density function  $f(x)$  for the one-dimensional variable  $x$ , such that  $\int_a^b f(x)dx$  denotes the probability that the value of  $x$  falls in the interval  $(a, b)$  and  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)dx = 1$ . If between  $x$  and  $y$  there is established a one-to-one correspondence

$$(1) \quad y = y(x), \quad x = x(y),$$

the given density function  $f(x)$  leads to a new density function  $g(y)$  defined by

$$(2) \quad g(y) = f(x) \frac{dx}{dy}.$$

The integral  $\int_a^b g(y)dy$  gives, of course, the probability that  $y$  belongs to the interval  $(a, b)$  and  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(y)dy = 1$ .

Now we suppose  $y$  to be an "angular" variable, that is, instead of  $y$  we consider the new variable:

$$(3) \quad \eta = y - [y], \quad 0 \leq \eta < 1,$$

and try to determine the probability distribution  $\phi(\eta)$  of  $\eta$ . Evidently, if  $\nu$  is a positive or negative integer, the probability density of  $\eta$  is given by

$$(4) \quad \phi(\eta) = \sum_{\nu} g(\eta + \nu) = \sum_{\nu} f(x_{\nu}) \left( \frac{dx}{dy} \right)_{x=x_{\nu}}; \quad x_{\nu} = x(\eta + \nu).$$

---

\* Vol. 42, p. 895.

† Journal of Mathematics and Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, vol. 13 (1934).

‡ Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung, vol. 46 (1936), p. 179.

We may suppose the transformation ratio  $dx/dy > 0$ . In this case the consecutive values  $\dots x(-2), x(-1), x(0), x(1), x(2), \dots$  define an infinite set of intervals corresponding to intervals of length 1 on the  $y$ -axis. Let  $\eta'$  and  $\eta''$  be two values of  $\eta$ ; then the corresponding values  $x'_\nu = x(\eta' + \nu)$  and  $x''_\nu = x(\eta'' + \nu)$  fall in the same interval  $(x(\nu), x(\nu+1))$ . Therefore, the difference between the values of the products

$$f(x'_\nu) \left( \frac{dx}{dy} \right)_{x=x'_\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad f(x''_\nu) \left( \frac{dx}{dy} \right)_{x=x''_\nu}$$

is less than or equal to the variation of the product  $f \cdot dx/dy$  through the interval  $(x(\nu), x(\nu+1))$ , and the difference between the two values of the sum (4) for  $\eta'$  and  $\eta''$  does not exceed the value of the total variation of the same product. Hence, our theorem follows:

*The maximum difference between two values of the deduced probability density  $\phi(\eta)$  is less than or equal to the total variation of the product of initial density  $f(x)$  by the transformation ratio  $dx/dy$ .*

If we consider an infinite set of similar problems where the initial distribution  $f(x)$  remains unchanged and the transformation ratio is multiplied by a parameter  $\lambda$ , then the deduced distribution  $\phi(\eta)$  approaches uniformity as the parameter  $\lambda$  approaches 0 and the functions  $f(x)$  and  $dx/dy$  are of finite variation.

The mechanical example mentioned by Copeland and by Hopf consists in a system rotating about a vertical axis and subjected to friction forces which depend on the instantaneous angular velocity  $\omega$ . The dynamical equation is given by

$$(5) \quad \frac{d\omega}{dt} = -r(\omega).$$

Let  $x$  be the initial value  $\omega_0$  of  $\omega$ . Until the system comes to rest, a point at the distance 1 from the axis will travel a distance which may be designed by  $2\pi y$ . Then it follows from (5) that

$$(6) \quad 2\pi y = \int_0^x \omega d\omega = \int_0^x \frac{\omega d\omega}{r(\omega)}, \quad \frac{dx}{dy} = 2\pi \frac{r(x)}{x}.$$

Copeland supposes the friction  $r(x)$  to be proportional to a parameter  $\lambda$ , but the distribution  $f(x)$  to be independent of  $\lambda$ . In this case it is clear that, in consequence of (6),  $f(x) \cdot dx/dy$  approaches zero with  $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ , and our theorem shows that the asymptotic value of  $\phi(\eta)$  is a constant.

On the other hand, Hopf considers the initial distribution to be given in the form  $f(x) = f_1(x - \lambda)$ , where  $f_1$  is a function of one variable and  $\lambda$  a parameter. Moreover, he supposes that

$$(7) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r(x)}{x} = 0.$$

We find  $f(x) \cdot dx/dy = 2\pi f_1(x - \lambda) \cdot r(x)/x = 2\pi f_1(z)r(\lambda + z)/(\lambda + z)$ , which approaches zero, according to (7), as  $\lambda$  increases. If the functions  $f_1$  and  $r/x$  are of finite variation, it follows from our theorem that  $\phi(\eta)$  approaches uniformity.

It is a quite different question to decide whether the foregoing investigation is or is not sufficient to explain the fact of the nearly perfect uniformity of distribution in a particular case of a real game. Let us consider a sort of roulette consisting of a billiard ball which runs in a smooth circular channel subjected to a constant resistance  $r(\omega) = c$ ; the number of revolutions is found to vary from about 8.1 to 12.1. Our equation (6) gives

$$2\pi y = \frac{x^2}{2c}, \quad \frac{dx}{dy} = \frac{2\pi c}{x} = \left(\frac{\pi c}{y}\right)^{1/2}, \quad x = 2(\pi c y)^{1/2}.$$

Therefore  $x$  varies from  $9(0.4 \pi c)^{1/2}$  to  $11(0.4 \pi c)^{1/2}$ , and if we assume  $f(x)$  to be constant in this interval of length  $2(0.4 \pi c)^{1/2}$ , we find

$$g(y) = \frac{1}{2(0.4 \pi c)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\pi c}{y}\right)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2(0.4 y)^{1/2}}, \quad 8.1 \leq y \leq 12.1.$$

The resulting density function  $\phi(\eta)$  is a monotonic decreasing function in the interval from  $\eta = 0.1$  to  $\eta = 1.1$ . If we divide the whole circle in two parts from  $\eta = 0.1$  to  $\eta = 0.6$  and from  $0.6$  to  $1.1$ , it follows that the probability of a rest position in the first of these semi-circles is

$$\int_{8.1}^{8.6} g(y) dy + \int_{9.1}^{9.6} \dots + \int_{10.1}^{10.6} \dots + \int_{11.1}^{11.6} \dots = 0.506.$$

The excess of 1.2% is doubtless too large for a fair game of chance. It seems that in such cases other circumstances increase the tendency towards uniformity.