



On bounding the union probability using partial weighted information[☆]

Jun Yang^a, Fady Alajaji^{b,*}, Glen Takahara^b

^a Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto, Canada

^b Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Queen's University, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 February 2016

Received in revised form 20 April 2016

Accepted 20 April 2016

Available online 26 April 2016

Keywords:

Probability of a finite union of events

Lower and upper bounds

Optimal bounds

Linear programming

ABSTRACT

Lower bounds on the finite union probability are established in terms of the individual event probabilities and a weighted sum of the pairwise event probabilities. The lower bounds have at most pseudo-polynomial computational complexity and generalize recent analytical bounds.

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Lower and upper bounds on the union probability $P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right)$ in terms of the individual event probabilities $P(A_i)$'s and the pairwise event probabilities $P(A_i \cap A_j)$'s have been actively investigated in the recent past. Optimal bounds can be obtained numerically by solving linear programming (LP) problems with 2^N variables (for instance, see Prékopa and Gao, 2005; Veneziani, unpublished). Since the number of variables is exponential in the number of events, N , some suboptimal but numerically efficient bounds have been proposed, such as the algorithmic Bonferroni-type bounds in Kuai et al. (2000b) and Behnamfar et al. (2005).

Among the established analytical bounds is the Kuai–Alajaji–Takahara lower bound (for convenience, hereafter referred to as the KAT bound) (Kuai et al., 2000a) that was shown to be better than the Dawson–Sankoff (DS) (Dawson and Sankoff, 1967) and the D. de Caen (DC) bounds (De Caen, 1997). Noting that the KAT bound is expressed in terms of $\{P(A_i)\}$ and only the sums of the pairwise event probabilities, i.e., $\{\sum_{j:j \neq i} P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$, in order to fully exploit all pairwise event probabilities, it is observed in Behnamfar et al. (2007), Hoppe (2006) and Hoppe (2009) that the analytical bounds can be further improved algorithmically by optimizing over subsets. Furthermore, in Prékopa and Gao (2005), the KAT bound is extended by using additional partial information such as the sums of joint probabilities of three events, i.e., $\{\sum_{j,l} P(A_i \cap A_j \cap A_l), i = 1, \dots, N\}$. Recently, using the same partial information as the KAT bound, i.e., $\{P(A_i)\}$ and $\{\sum_{j:j \neq i} P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$, the optimal lower/upper bound and a new analytical bound which is sharper than the KAT bound were developed by Yang–Alajaji–Takahara in Yang et al. (2014) and Yang et al. (2014) (these two bounds are respectively referred to as the YAT-I and YAT-II bounds).

[☆] This work was supported in part by NSERC of Canada.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: jun@utstat.toronto.edu (J. Yang), fady@mast.queensu.ca (F. Alajaji), takahara@mast.queensu.ca (G. Takahara).

In this work, we extend the existing analytical lower bounds, the KAT and YAT-II bounds, and establish two new classes of lower bounds on $P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right)$ using $\{P(A_i)\}$ and $\{\sum_j c_j P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$ for a given weight or parameter vector $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_N)^T$. These lower bounds are shown to have at most pseudo-polynomial computational complexity and to be sharper in certain cases than the Gallot–Kounias (GK) (Gallot, 1966; Kounias, 1968) and Prékopa–Gao (PG) bounds (Prékopa and Gao, 2005) even though the latter bounds employ more information on the events joint probabilities.

More specifically, we first propose a novel expression for the union probability given a weight vector \mathbf{c} . Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, several existing bounds, such as the bound in Cohen and Merhav (2004), and the DC and GK bounds, can be directly derived from this new expression. Next, we derive two new classes of lower bounds as functions of the weight vector \mathbf{c} by solving linear programming problems. The KAT and YAT-II analytical bounds are shown to be special cases of the new classes of lower bounds. Furthermore, it is noted that the proposed lower bounds can be sharper than the GK bound under some conditions.

We emphasize that our bounds can be applied to any general estimation problem involving the probability of a finite union of events. In particular, they can be applied to effectively estimate and analyze the error performance of communication systems (e.g., see Yang et al., 2014, Kuai et al., 2000b, Behnamfar et al., 2007, Cohen and Merhav, 2004, Seguin, 1998, Mao et al., 2013). Such bounds are also pertinently useful in the analysis of asymptotic problems such as the Borel–Cantelli lemma and its generalization (Erdős and Rényi, 1959; Feng et al., 2009; Frolov, 2012; Feng and Li, 2013). Finally, we note that the proposed bounds provide useful tools for chance-constrained stochastic programs (e.g., see Prékopa, 1995, Shapiro et al., 2014) in operations research. More specifically, using partial information of uncertainty, the proposed bounds on the union probability can be applied to formulate tractable conservative approximations of chance-constrained stochastic problems, which can be solved efficiently and produce feasible solutions for the original problems (see, for instance, Pintér, 1989, Nemirovski and Shapiro, 2006, Ben-Tal et al., 2009). An example of such application is the work in Ahmed and Papageorgiou (2013) on the probabilistic set covering problem with correlations, where the KAT bound is used for the case where only partial information on the correlation is available.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we propose a new expression of the union probability using weight vector \mathbf{c} such that many existing bounds can be directly derived from this expression. In Section 3, we develop two new classes of lower bounds as functions of the weight vector \mathbf{c} and discuss their connection with existing bounds, including the KAT, YAT-II and GK bounds. As by-products of the new lower bounds, two new classes of upper bounds are also obtained. Finally, in Section 4, we compare via numerical examples existing lower bounds with the proposed bounds under different choices of weight vectors.

2. A new expression of the union probability

For simplicity, and without loss of generality, we assume that the events $\{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$ are in a finite probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , where N is a fixed positive integer. Let \mathcal{B} denote the collection of all non-empty subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Given $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we let ω_B denote the atom in $\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i$ such that for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\omega_B \in A_i$ if $i \in B$ and $\omega_B \notin A_i$ if $i \notin B$ (note that some of these “atoms” may be the empty set). For ease of notation, for a singleton $\omega \in \Omega$, we denote $P(\{\omega\})$ by $p(\omega)$ and $P(\omega_B)$ by p_B . Since $\{\omega_B : i \in B\}$ is the collection of all the atoms in A_i , we have $P(A_i) = \sum_{\omega \in A_i} p(\omega) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}: i \in B} p_B$, and

$$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} p_B. \tag{1}$$

Suppose there are N functions $f_i(B)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(B) = 1$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$. If we further assume that $f_i(B) = 0$ if $i \notin B$, we can write

$$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(B)\right) p_B = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}: i \in B} f_i(B) p_B. \tag{2}$$

Note that if we define the degree of a subset $A \subset \Omega$, $\text{deg}(A)$, to be the number of A_i ’s that contain A , then by the definition of ω_B , we have $\text{deg}(\omega_B) = |B|$. Therefore,

$$f_i(B) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|B|} = \frac{1}{\text{deg}(\omega_B)} & \text{if } i \in B \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin B \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(B) = 1$ and (2) becomes

$$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}: i \in B} \frac{p_B}{\text{deg}(\omega_B)} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\omega \in A_i} \frac{p(\omega)}{\text{deg}(\omega)}. \tag{4}$$

Note that many of the existing bounds, such as the DC bound, the KAT bound and the recent bounds in Yang et al. (2014) and Yang et al. (2014), are based on (4).

In the following lemma, we propose a generalized expression of (4).

Lemma 1. Suppose $\{\omega_B, B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ are all the $2^N - 1$ atoms in $\bigcup_i A_i$. If $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_N)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfies

$$\sum_{k \in B} c_k \neq 0, \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{B} \tag{5}$$

then we have

$$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}: i \in B} \frac{c_i p_B}{\sum_{k \in B} c_k} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\omega \in A_i} \frac{c_i p(\omega)}{\sum_{\{k: \omega \in A_k\}} c_k}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. If we define

$$f_i(B) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_i}{\sum_{k \in B} c_k} & \text{if } i \in B \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin B \end{cases}$$

where the parameter vector $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_N)^T$ satisfies $\sum_{k \in B} c_k \neq 0$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$ (therefore $c_i \neq 0, i = 1, \dots, N$), then $\sum_i f_i(\omega) = 1$ holds and we can get (6) from (2). ■

Note that (6) holds for any \mathbf{c} that satisfies (5) and is clearly a generalized expression of (4).

Remark 1. Both the Cohen and Merhav (2004) and Gallot (1966) bounds can be derived from this new expression of the union probability in Lemma 1 using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. We refer to Yang et al. (2016, Sections 1 and 2) for further details.

3. New bounds using $\{P(A_i)\}$ and $\{\sum_j c_j P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$

Due to space limitations, we only present the results when $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Results regarding more general \mathbf{c} are available in the accompanying supplementary material (Yang et al., 2016, Section 3).

3.1. New class of lower bounds when $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ satisfies (5)

Theorem 1. For any given $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ that satisfies (5), a new lower bound on the union probability is given by

$$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right) \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i(\mathbf{c}) =: \ell_{\text{NEW-1}}(\mathbf{c}), \tag{7}$$

where

$$\ell_i(\mathbf{c}) = P(A_i) \left(\frac{c_i}{\sum_{k \in B_1^{(i)}} c_k} + \frac{c_i}{\sum_{k \in B_2^{(i)}} c_k} - \frac{c_i \sum_k c_k P(A_i \cap A_k)}{P(A_i) \left(\sum_{k \in B_1^{(i)}} c_k\right) \left(\sum_{k \in B_2^{(i)}} c_k\right)} \right), \tag{8}$$

where $B_1^{(i)}$ and $B_2^{(i)}$ are subsets of $\{1, \dots, N\}$ that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} B_1^{(i)} &= \arg \max_{\{B: i \in B\}} \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \leq \frac{\sum_k c_k P(A_i \cap A_k)}{c_i P(A_i)}, \\ B_2^{(i)} &= \arg \min_{\{B: i \in B\}} \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \geq \frac{\sum_k c_k P(A_i \cap A_k)}{c_i P(A_i)}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Proof. The proof is given in Yang et al. (2016, Section 3). ■

Remark 2 (The New Bound $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ vs. the GK Bound ℓ_{GK}). For any $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we have these relations between different lower bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c}) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{c_i^2 P(A_i)^2}{c_i \sum_k c_k P(A_i \cap A_k)} \\ &\geq \frac{\left[\sum_i c_i P(A_i) \right]^2}{\sum_i \sum_k c_i c_k P(A_i \cap A_k)} \geq \frac{\left[\sum_i c_i P(A_i) \right]^2}{\sum_i \sum_j c_i^2 P(A_i \cap A_j)}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Therefore, if the optimal weight vector obtained by the GK bound (see Yang et al., 2016, Eq. (21); Feng et al., 2010), denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$, satisfies $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, then $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}) \geq \ell_{\text{GK}}$.

Remark 3 (The New Bound $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ vs. the KAT Bound ℓ_{KAT}). One can easily verify that $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\kappa \mathbf{1}) = \ell_{\text{KAT}}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one vector of size N and κ is any non-zero constant.

Lemma 2. When $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, the lower bound $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ can be computed in pseudo-polynomial time, and can be arbitrarily closely approximated by an algorithm running in polynomial time.

Proof. See Yang et al. (2016, Section 4). ■

Corollary 1 (New Class of Upper Bounds $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$). We can derive an upper bound for any given $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ by

$$P\left(\bigcup_i A_i\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\min_k c_k} + \frac{1}{\sum_k c_k}\right) \sum_i c_i P(A_i) - \frac{1}{(\min_k c_k) \sum_k c_k} \sum_i \sum_k c_i c_k P(A_i \cap A_k) =: \mathfrak{h}_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c}). \tag{11}$$

The proof is given in Yang et al. (2016, Section 5). According to the results from randomly generated \mathbf{c} , it is conjectured the optimal upper bound in this class is achieved at $\mathbf{c} = \kappa \mathbf{1}$ where κ is any non-zero constant.

3.2. New class of lower bounds when $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$

We only consider $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ in this subsection. A new class of lower bounds, $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}$, is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Defining $\mathcal{B}^- = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\tilde{\gamma}_i := \sum_k c_k P(A_i \cap A_k)$, $\tilde{\alpha}_i := P(A_i)$ and

$$\tilde{\delta} := \max_i \left[\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i - \left(\sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k\right) \tilde{\alpha}_i}{\min_k c_k} \right]^+, \tag{12}$$

where $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, another class of lower bounds is given by

$$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right) \geq \tilde{\delta} + \sum_{i=1}^N \ell'_i(\mathbf{c}, \tilde{\delta}) =: \ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c}), \tag{13}$$

where

$$\ell'_i(\mathbf{c}, x) = [P(A_i) - x] \cdot \left(\frac{c_i}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}_1^{(i)}} c_k} + \frac{c_i}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}_2^{(i)}} c_k} - \frac{c_i \sum_k c_k [P(A_i \cap A_k) - x]}{[P(A_i) - x] \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}_1^{(i)}} c_k\right) \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}_2^{(i)}} c_k\right)} \right), \tag{14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_1^{(i)} &= \arg \max_{\{B \in \mathcal{B}^- : i \in B\}} \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \leq \frac{\sum_k c_k [P(A_i \cap A_k) - x]}{c_i [P(A_i) - x]}, \\
 B_2^{(i)} &= \arg \min_{\{B \in \mathcal{B}^- : i \in B\}} \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \geq \frac{\sum_k c_k [P(A_i \cap A_k) - x]}{c_i [P(A_i) - x]}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Proof. Let $x = p_{\{1,2,\dots,N\}}$ and consider $\sum_i \ell'_i(\mathbf{c}, x) + x$ as a new lower bound where $\ell'_i(\mathbf{c}, x)$ equals the objective value of the problem

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\min_{\{p_B : i \in B, B \in \mathcal{B}^-\}} \sum_{B : i \in B, B \in \mathcal{B}^-} \frac{c_i p_B}{\sum_{k \in B} c_k} \\
 &\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{B : i \in B, B \in \mathcal{B}^-} p_B = P(A_i) - x, \\
 &\quad \sum_{B : i \in B, B \in \mathcal{B}^-} \left(\frac{\sum_{k \in B} c_k}{c_i} \right) p_B = \frac{1}{c_i} \sum_k c_k [P(A_i \cap A_k) - x], \\
 &\quad p_B \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{B}^- \text{ such that } i \in B.
 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The solution of (16) exists if and only if

$$\min_k c_k \leq \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i - \left(\sum_k c_k \right) x}{\tilde{\alpha}_i - x} \leq \sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k. \tag{17}$$

Therefore, the new lower bound can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\min_x \left[x + \sum_{i=1}^N \ell'_i(\mathbf{c}, x) \right] \\
 &\text{s.t.} \quad \left[\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i - \left(\sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k \right) \tilde{\alpha}_i}{\min_k c_k} \right]^+ \leq x \leq \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_i - (\min_k c_k) \tilde{\alpha}_i}{\sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k}, \quad \forall i.
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

We can prove that the objective function of (18) is non-decreasing with x . Therefore, defining $\tilde{\delta}$ as in (12), the new lower bound can be written as (13) where $\ell'_i(\mathbf{c}, \tilde{\delta})$ can be obtained by solving (16), which is given in (14). We refer to Yang et al. (2016, Section 6) for more details for the proof. ■

Remark 4 ($\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ vs. $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$). If $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ is the solution of a relaxed problem to the problem for obtaining $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$; thus

$$\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c}) \geq \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c}).$$

Also, since $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, the solution of (15) can be computed in pseudo-polynomial time and has a polynomial-time approximation algorithm.

Remark 5 (The New Bound $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ vs. the YAT-II Bound $\ell_{\text{YAT-II}}$). One can easily verify that $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\kappa \mathbf{1}) = \ell_{\text{YAT-II}}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one vector of size N and κ is any non-zero constant.

Corollary 2 (Improved Class of Upper Bounds $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$). We can improve the upper bound $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ in (11) by

$$\begin{aligned}
 P \left(\bigcup_i A_i \right) &\leq \min_i \left\{ \frac{\sum_k c_k P(A_i \cap A_k) - (\min_k c_k) P(A_i)}{\sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k} \right\} + \left(\frac{1}{\min_k c_k} + \frac{1}{\sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k} \right) \sum_i c_i P(A_i) \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{(\min_k c_k) \left(\sum_k c_k - \min_k c_k \right)} \sum_i \sum_k c_i c_k P(A_i \cap A_k) =: \mathfrak{h}_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Table 1
Comparison of lower bounds.

System	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
N	6	6	6	7	3	4	4	4
$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right)$	0.7890	0.6740	0.7890	0.9687	0.3900	0.3252	0.5346	0.5854
ℓ_{KAT}	0.7247	0.6227	0.7222	0.8909	0.3833	0.2769	0.4434	0.5412
ℓ_{GK}	0.7601	0.6510	0.7508	0.9231	0.3813	0.2972	0.4750	0.5390
ℓ_{PG}	0.7443	0.6434	0.7556	0.9148	0.3900	0.3240	0.5281	0.5726
$\ell_{\text{YAT-II}}$	0.7247	0.6227	0.7222	0.8909	0.3900	0.3205	0.4562	0.5464
$\ell_{\text{YAT-I}}$	0.7487	0.6398	0.7427	0.9044	0.3900	0.3252	0.5090	0.5531
$\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$	0.7638	0.6517	0.7512	0.9231	0.3900	0.2951	0.4905	0.5412
$\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}} + \kappa \mathbf{1})$	0.7577	0.6539	0.7557	0.9235	0.3899	0.2993	0.4949	0.5412
$\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_{\text{Rand}}^+)$	0.7783	0.6633	0.7810	0.9501	0.3900	0.3022	0.4992	0.5666
$\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$	0.7638	0.6517	0.7512	0.9231	0.3900	0.2951	0.4905	0.5412
$\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}_{\text{Rand}}^+)$	0.7783	0.6633	0.7810	0.9501	0.3900	0.3203	0.4992	0.5666

Table 2
Comparison of $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ and $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ with randomly generated $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ (a bold number indicates $\max \ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c}) > \max \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$).

System	V	VI	VII	VIII
N	3	4	4	4
$P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N A_i\right)$	0.3900	0.3252	0.5346	0.5854
$\max \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$	0.3900	0.3022	0.4992	0.5666
$\max \ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$	0.3900	0.3203	0.4992	0.5666
Average $\frac{\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})}{\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})}$	1.0011	1.065	1.0006	1.0000
Percentage $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c}) > \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$	7.82%	69.6%	3.87%	0.54%

Note that the upper bound $h_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ in (19) is always sharper than $h_{\text{NEW-I}}$ in (11). The proof is given in Yang et al. (2016, Section 7). According to numerical examples using randomly generated \mathbf{c} , it is conjectured the optimal upper bound in this class is achieved at $\mathbf{c} = \kappa \mathbf{1}$, where κ is any non-negative constant.

4. Numerical examples

The same eight systems as in Yang et al. (2014) are used in this section. For comparison, we include bounds that utilize $\{P(A_i)\}$ and $\{\sum_j P(A_i \cap A_j), i = 1, \dots, N\}$, such as ℓ_{KAT} , $\ell_{\text{YAT-II}}$ and the optimal lower bound $\ell_{\text{YAT-I}}$ in this class. Furthermore, we included the GK bound ℓ_{GK} which fully exploits $\{P(A_i)\}$ and $\{P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$ and the PG bound (Prékopa and Gao, 2005), denoted as ℓ_{PG} , which extends the KAT bound by using $\{P(A_i)\}$, $\{\sum_j P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$ and $\{\sum_{j,i} P(A_i \cap A_j \cap A_i)\}$.

In the numerical examples, $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}$ is obtained by the GK bound (see Yang et al., 2016, Eq. (21) or Feng et al., 2010); the elements of $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+$ are given by $\{\tilde{c}_i^+ = \max(\tilde{c}_i, \epsilon), i = 1, \dots, N\}$ where $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough so that if $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ then $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+ = \tilde{\mathbf{c}}$.

We present $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$, $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$ and $\max_{\kappa} \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}} + \kappa \mathbf{1})$ in Table 1. In three examples (Systems II, III and VIII), $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$; therefore $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}) = \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$. The lower bound $\max_{\kappa} \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}} + \kappa \mathbf{1})$ is calculated by searching κ from -1 to 1 with a fixed step length 0.005 (so that 401 points are used in total). We also randomly generated 100,000 samples of $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ to compute $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ and $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ and the largest bounds were selected and denoted as $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c}_{\text{Rand}}^+)$ and $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c}_{\text{Rand}}^+)$.

From the results, we note that $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$ is sharper than ℓ_{GK} in most of the examples except for System VI. The line search $\max_{\kappa} \ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}} + \kappa \mathbf{1})$ is sharper than $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$ in most of the examples except for Systems I and V. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+ \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, the class of lower bounds $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$ is at least as good as $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\tilde{\mathbf{c}}^+)$, as observed in Remark 4 (in the examples shown in the table, both bounds give identical results). Furthermore, the PG bound which uses sums of joint probabilities of three events, may be even poorer (e.g., see Systems I and VI) than the numerical bound $\ell_{\text{YAT-I}}$ which utilizes less information but is optimal in the class of lower bounds using $\{P(A_i)\}$ and $\{\sum_j P(A_i \cap A_j)\}$. It is also weaker than the proposed lower bounds in several cases (see Systems I–IV).

In Table 2, we compared $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ and $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ with randomly generated $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. We remark that in System VI, the maximum $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ is 0.3203 which is sharper than the maximum $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ which is 0.3022. Also, the percentage that $\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})$ is strictly larger than $\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})$ and the averages of $\frac{\ell_{\text{NEW-II}}(\mathbf{c})}{\ell_{\text{NEW-I}}(\mathbf{c})}$ are shown in Table 2.

We close by noting that the new general lower and upper bounds established in this work are applicable to the analytical or numerical study of any statistical problem involving the probability of a finite union of events.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.spl.2016.04.017>.

References

- Ahmed, S., Papageorgiou, D.J., 2013. Probabilistic set covering with correlations. *Oper. Res.* 61 (2), 438–452.
- Behnamfar, F., Alajaji, F., Linder, T., 2005. Tight error bounds for space–time orthogonal block codes under slow Rayleigh flat fading. *IEEE Trans. Commun.* 53 (6), 952–956.
- Behnamfar, F., Alajaji, F., Linder, T., 2007. An efficient algorithmic lower bound for the error rate of linear block codes. *IEEE Trans. Commun.* 55 (6), 1093–1098.
- Ben-Tal, A., El Ghaoui, L., Nemirovski, A., 2009. *Robust Optimization*. Princeton University Press.
- Cohen, A., Merhav, N., 2004. Lower bounds on the error probability of block codes based on improvements on de Caen's inequality. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 50 (2), 290–310.
- Dawson, D.A., Sankoff, D., 1967. An inequality for probabilities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 18 (3), 504–507.
- De Caen, D., 1997. A lower bound on the probability of a union. *Discrete Math.* 169 (1), 217–220.
- Erdős, P., Rényi, A., 1959. On Cantor's series with convergent $\sum 1/q_n$. *Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest. Eötvös Sect. Math.* 2, 93–109.
- Feng, C., Li, L., 2013. On the Móri–Székely conjectures for the Borel–Cantelli lemma. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* 50 (2), 280–285.
- Feng, C., Li, L., Shen, J., 2009. On the Borel–Cantelli lemma and its generalization. *C. R. Math. I* (347), 1313–1316.
- Feng, C., Li, L., Shen, J., 2010. Some inequalities in functional analysis, combinatorics, and probability theory. *Electron. J. Combin.* 17 (R58), 1.
- Frolov, A.N., 2012. Bounds for probabilities of unions of events and the Borel–Cantelli lemma. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 82 (12), 2189–2197.
- Gallot, S., 1966. A bound for the maximum of a number of random variables. *J. Appl. Probab.* 3 (2), 556–558.
- Hoppe, F.M., 2006. Improving probability bounds by optimization over subsets. *Discrete Math.* 306 (5), 526–530.
- Hoppe, F.M., 2009. The effect of redundancy on probability bounds. *Discrete Math.* 309 (1), 123–127.
- Kounias, E.G., 1968. Bounds for the probability of a union, with applications. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 39 (6), 2154–2158.
- Kuai, H., Alajaji, F., Takahara, G., 2000a. A lower bound on the probability of a finite union of events. *Discrete Math.* 215 (1–3), 147–158.
- Kuai, H., Alajaji, F., Takahara, G., 2000b. Tight error bounds for nonuniform signaling over AWGN channels. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 46 (7), 2712–2718.
- Mao, Z., Cheng, J., Shen, J., 2013. A new lower bound on error probability for nonuniform signals over AWGN channels. In: *Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, pp. 3005–3009.
- Nemirovski, A., Shapiro, A., 2006. Convex approximations of chance constrained programs. *SIAM J. Optim.* 17 (4), 969–996.
- Pintér, J., 1989. Deterministic approximations of probability inequalities. *Z. Oper. Res.* 33 (4), 219–239.
- Prékopa, A., 1995. *Stochastic Programming*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht.
- Prékopa, A., Gao, L., 2005. Bounding the probability of the union of events by aggregation and disaggregation in linear programs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 145 (3), 444–454.
- Seguin, G., 1998. A lower bound on the error probability for signals in white Gaussian noise. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 44 (7), 3168–3175.
- Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., Ruszczyński, A., 2014. *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*, vol. 16. SIAM.
- Veneziani, P., 2007. Lower bounds of degree 2 for the probability of the union of N events via linear programming, unpublished. June.
- Yang, J., Alajaji, F., Takahara, G., 2014. Lower bounds on the probability of a finite union of events. *ArXiv e-prints*. [arXiv:1401.5543](https://arxiv.org/abs/1401.5543).
- Yang, J., Alajaji, F., Takahara, G., 2014. New bounds on the probability of a finite union of events. In: *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory. ISIT*, pp. 1271–1275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2014.6875037>.
- Yang, J., Alajaji, F., Takahara, G., 2016. On bounding the union probability using partial weighted information—supplementary material. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*