

Math 218a Lecture Notes, Fall 2020

Probability Theory

Professor: Shirshendu Ganguly

Vishal Raman

Contents

1	August 27th, 2020	5
1.1	Introduction	5
1.2	Nonmeasurable Sets	5
1.3	Measure Theory Beginnings	6
2	September 1st, 2020	7
2.1	Measures	7
2.2	Sigma algebras	8
2.3	Uniform Measure on the Borel Sets	8
3	September 3rd, 2020	10
3.1	Uniform Measure on the Borel Sets	10
4	September 8th, 2020	13
4.1	The Outer Measure	13
4.2	Functions Between Measure Spaces	13
5	September 10th, 2020	15
5.1	Integration	15
5.2	Simple Functions	15
5.3	Bounded Functions	16
5.4	General Functions	16
5.5	Arbitrary Measurable Functions	17
6	September 15th, 2020	18
6.1	Properties of Integrals with Limits	18
6.2	Expected Value	20
6.3	Change of measure for Integrals	20
6.4	Product Measures	21
7	September 17th, 2020	22
7.1	Product Measures, Continued	22
7.2	Independence	23
8	September 22nd, 2020	26
8.1	Law of Large Numbers	26
9	September 24th, 2020	30
9.1	Law of Large Numbers, continued	30
9.2	Almost Sure Convergence	31
10	September 29th, 2020	33
10.1	General Law of Large Numbers	33
10.2	Second Proof of SLLN	35
11	October 1st, 2020	36
11.1	Another Proof of SLLN, continued	36
12	October 6th, 2020	40
12.1	Convergence of Distributions	40

13 October 8th, 2020	43
13.1 Weak Convergence	43
13.2 Portmanteau's Lemma	43
13.3 Helly's Selection Theorem	44
13.4 Fourier Transforms	44
14 October 13, 2020	46
14.1 Fourier Transforms, Continued	46
14.2 Differentiability of Characters	46
14.3 Fourier Inversion Formula	47
15 October 15th, 2020	49
15.1 Characteristic Functions	49
15.2 Weak Convergence	50
16 October 20th, 2020	52
16.1 Basic Central Limit Theorem	52
16.2 Lindeberg-Feller CLT	53
16.3 Kolmogorov Three-Series Theorem	54
17 October 22nd, 2020	56
17.1 CLT with Unbounded Variance	56
17.2 General Theory of Distributions	56
17.3 Convergence in \mathbb{R}^d	57
18 October 27th, 2020	58
18.1 Fourier Inversion in \mathbb{R}^d	58
18.2 Convergence of Characters	58
18.3 Multivariate Central Limit Theorem	59
18.4 Poisson Processes	59
18.5 Signed Measures	60
19 October 29th, 2020	61
19.1 Decomposition Theorems	61
19.2 Conditional Expectation	62
20 November 3rd, 2020	64
20.1 Properties of Conditional Expectations	64
20.2 Regular Conditional Probabilities	65
20.3 Martingales	65
21 November 5th, 2020	67
21.1 Martingales, Continued	67
21.2 Predictable Sequences	67
21.3 Stopping Times	67
21.4 Expectation for Stopped Martingales	68
21.5 Convex Functions and Martingales	68
22 November 10th, 2020	70
22.1 Convergence of Martingales	70
22.2 Martingales with Bounded Increments	71
22.3 L_p inequalities	71

23 November 12th, 2020	73
23.1 L^p Inequalities, continued	73
23.2 L^p Convergence	73
23.3 L^1 Convergence, Uniform Integrability	74
23.4 Optimal Stopping Theorems	75
24 November 17th, 2020	76
24.1 More Optimal Stopping Conditions	76
24.2 Reverse Martingales	76
24.3 Applications of Reverse Martingales	77
25 November 19th, 2020	79
25.1 de Finetti's Theorem	79
25.2 Symmetric and Asymmetric Random Walks	79
26 November 24th, 2020	81
26.1 Random Walks, Continued	81
26.2 Combinatorics of SRW	82

§1 August 27th, 2020

§1.1 Introduction

Consider a **random experiment** - this involves a state space Ω and some "probability" on it. The outcome of an experiment would be $\omega \in \Omega$.

Example 1.1 (Fair Coin Toss)

$\Omega = \{0, 1\}$, $P(0) = 1/2$, $P(1) = 1/2$ models a fair coin toss. The outcomes are $\omega \in \Omega$, $\omega = 0$ or $\omega = 1$.

Example 1.2 (Continuous State Space)

$\Omega = [0, 1]$, X is the outcome of a random experiment. Suppose X is uniformly distributed random variable. $P(X \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]) = 1/2$. Take $A = \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$. $P(x \in A) = 0$, since A has no "volume". Similarly, taking $A_1 = \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$, then $P(x \in A_1) = 1 - P(x \in A) = 1$. Finally, take $E \subset [0, 1]$. $P(x \in E)$ = "volume" of E .

The issue: we need to define some notion of volume. Some properties we would like are the following:

- Translation Invariance
- Countable Additivity: A_1, A_2, \dots disjoint with $A = \bigcup A_i$, then $P(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P(A_i)$.

§1.2 Nonmeasurable Sets

Take $I = [-1, 2]$, and define $x \sim y$ iff $x - y \in \mathbb{Q}$. [Exercise: check that \sim is an equivalence relation.] This decomposes I into equivalence classes I/\sim . Note that the equivalence classes are countable, since any class is $x + A$, $A \subset \mathbb{Q}$.

For each equivalence class B , pick $x_B \in B \cap [0, 1]$. Define $E = \{x_B\}$ over all the equivalence classes. Note that x_B is a representative of B in E , so $B = \{x_b + q : x_b + q \in I, q \in \mathbb{Q}\}$.

Now, consider the set $[0, 1] \subset \bigcup_{q \in [-1, 1]} E + q \subset [-1, 2]$. Equality doesn't hold, because there can be B s. t. x_b is close to 0. Then $E + (\mathbb{Q} \cap [-1, 1])$ will only recover elements of B near 1 and will not go up to 2.

Proposition 1.3

We claim that $E + q$ are disjoint for different values of q .

Proof. Suppose $E + q_1 \cap E + q_2 \neq \emptyset$ for some q_1, q_2 . Then, there exists $x, y \in E$ such that $x + q_1 = y + q_2$. This implies that $x - y = q_2 - q_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$, so $x \sim y$, but by definition, there is exactly one member of each equivalence class in E . \square

The big question: What is $P(E)$? Suppose $P(E) > 0$. Then $\bigcup_{q \in [-1, 1]} E + Q \subset [-1, 2]$ and $P(E + q_1) = P(E + q_2) = P(E)$ for all q_1, q_2 . Furthermore, by countable additivity,

$$1 \geq P\left(\bigcup_{q \in [-1, 1]} E + q\right) = \sum_{q \in [-1, 1]} P(E + q) = \infty \cdot P(E).$$

This would imply that $P(E) = 0$. However,

$$[0, 1] \subseteq \bigcup_{q \in [-1, 1]} E + q \Rightarrow P([0, 1]) = 1/3 \leq \sum_{q \in [-1, 1]} P(E + q) = 0.$$

Hence, $P(E)$ cannot be defined.

The issue is the step where we pick x_B , since we need to pick x_B from uncountably many points, which assumes the axiom of choice. It was proved by Robert M. Solovay that all models of set theory excluding the axiom of choice have the property that all sets are Lebesgue measurable.

Our goal is thus to come up with a general framework where things can be consistently defined for a large class of sets.

§1.3 Measure Theory Beginnings

For the definitions, we take Ω to be the state space.

Definition 1.4 (Sigma-Algebra). Suppose Σ follows the following properties:

1. $\emptyset \in \Sigma$
2. $A \in \Sigma \Rightarrow A^c \in \Sigma$
3. $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \Sigma$, then $\bigcup A_i \in \Sigma$

Note that 2 and 3 imply 1 since $(A \cup A^c)^c = \emptyset$. Then Σ is a sigma-algebra.

Note that we also have countable intersections (this is an easy exercise).

§2 September 1st, 2020

Last time:

- We discussed the notation of a Σ -algebra, a reasonable class of sets on which we will define measures.
- Properties: $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$, $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$, $\bigcup A_i \in \mathcal{A}$.

§2.1 Measures

We are working in a space (Ω, Σ) .

Definition 2.1 (Measure). A measure is a function $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with the following properties:

- $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$
- "Countable Additivity": $\mu(\bigcup A_i) = \sum \mu(A_i)$ for disjoint $A_i \in \Sigma$.

Example 2.2

If Ω is finite, $1, 2, \dots, n$, $\Sigma = 2^\Omega$, then all possible measures on (Ω, Σ) are given by fixing $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in [0, \infty]$ and $\mu(A) = \sum_{i \in A} a_i$.

Properties of measures:

- Monotonicity: $A \subset B$, then $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$.

Proof. $B = A \cup (B \setminus A)$ and $B \setminus A \in \Sigma$, so

$$\mu(B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B \setminus A) \geq \mu(A).$$

□

- Countable Subadditivity: $A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$, then $\mu(A) \leq \sum \mu(B_i)$.

Proof. We disjointify the B_i : Define $C_1 = B_1$, $C_i = B_i \setminus B_{i-1}$. Then

$$\mu(A) \leq \mu\left(\bigcup C_i\right) = \sum \mu(C_i) \leq \sum \mu(B_i).$$

□

- Continuity from below: If $A_i \uparrow A$, then $\mu(A_i) \uparrow \mu(A)$.

Proof. $A = A_1 \cup (A_2 \setminus A_1) \cup (A_3 \setminus A_2) \dots$, so by countable additivity

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(C_i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(C_i) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n).$$

□

- Continuity from above, if $A_i \downarrow A$, and $\mu(A_1) < \infty$, then $\mu(A_i) \rightarrow \mu(A)$

Proof. We need the condition $\mu(A_i) < \infty$. Take $A_i = [i, \infty)$ as a counterexample if we don't have that condition.

Define $A_1 \setminus A_i = B_i$, so $B_i \uparrow A_1 \setminus A$. Then, use the continuity from below. □

§2.2 Sigma algebras

Fact 2.3. For any $A \subset 2^\Omega$, define

$$\Sigma(A) = \bigcap_{A \in \Sigma} \Sigma.$$

Then, $\Sigma(A)$ is a sigma-algebra.

Note that $\Sigma(A)$ is the smallest sigma-algebra containing A . For this reason, we call it the sigma-algebra **generated** by A .

Example 2.4

Take $X, Y \subset 2^\Omega$. We want to prove $\Sigma(X) = \Sigma(Y)$. It suffices to show $X \subseteq \Sigma(Y)$ and $Y \subseteq \Sigma(X)$.

Definition 2.5 (Borel Sigma-Algebra). (Ω, \mathcal{U}) , a topological space with a family of open sets. The **Borel Sigma-Algebra** is $\mathcal{B} = \Sigma(\mathcal{U})$.

Example 2.6

For $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$, \mathcal{B} is the sigma algebra generated by open sets in \mathbb{R} . We also have \mathcal{B} is the sigma-algebra generated by open intervals in \mathbb{R} , which follows from the fact that any open set can be written as a countable union of open intervals. Furthermore,

$$\Sigma((a, b) : a, b \in \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}) = \Sigma([a, b] : a, b \in \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}),$$

since $[a, b] = \bigcap (a - 1/n, b + 1/n)$ and $(a, b) = \bigcup [a + 1/n, b - 1/n]$.

§2.3 Uniform Measure on the Borel Sets

We will attempt to define the uniform measure on Borel sets of \mathbb{R} . Broadly, we do it as follows:

1. Define it on a semi-algebra containing the intervals.
2. Extend the definition to an algebra.
3. Extend it to a sigma-algebra.

Definition 2.7 (Semi-algebra). $\Sigma \subset 2^\Omega$ is a semi-algebra if

- $A_1, A_2 \in \Sigma$ implies $A_1 \cap A_2 \in \Sigma$
- $A_1 \in \Sigma$ implies that $A_1^c = \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_i$ for $B_i \in \Sigma$.

Note: The set of intervals $\{(a, b) : a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is not a semi-algebra. If $(a, b)^c = [b, \infty)$ which is not finitely coverable by disjoint open sets. Similarly, $\{[a, b] : a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is not a semi-algebra.

Claim: $\Sigma = \{(a, b) : a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a semi-algebra. [This is left as an exercise].

Now, $\mu((a, b)) = b - a$. The proof that μ is countable additive on Σ . If $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$, B_i disjoint, $A, B_i \in \Sigma$, then $\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i)$.

Proof. We first show that $\mu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i)$. This is an easy exercise, show $\mu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(B_i)$, and we pass to the limit.

It suffices to show $\mu(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i)$. We do this by exploiting compactness.

Let $A = (a, b] \supset [a + 1/n, b] = A'$, take $B_i = (c_i, d] \subset c_i, d + \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} = B'_i$. Note that

$$A' \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B'_i,$$

so there exists a finite subcover $A' \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^k B'_{i_j}$. It is easy to show that $b - (a + 1/n) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k (d'_{i_j} - c'_{i_j})$. But note that

$$\sum_{j=1}^k (d'_{i_j} - c'_{i_j}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k d_{i_j} - c_{i_j} + \epsilon,$$

which implies that

$$\mu(A) - 1/n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i) + \epsilon \Rightarrow \mu(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i).$$

□

Definition 2.8. \mathcal{A} is an algebra if

- $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$
- $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$
- $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \in \mathcal{A}$.

The algebra generated by a semi-algebra is given by taking all possible disjoint finite unions.

Claim: $\Sigma_a = \{\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i\}$ for disjoint A_i semi-algebras is an algebra.

Proof. We show $A, B \in \Sigma_a \Rightarrow A \cup B \in \Sigma_a$ and $A^c \in \Sigma_a$. Note that $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n C_i, B = \bigcup_{j=1}^k D_j$, so

$$A \cap B = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \bigcup_{j=1}^k C_i \cap D_j,$$

and $C_i \cap D_j$ are disjoint. Then $C_i, D_j \in \Sigma$ implies $C_i \cap D_j \in \Sigma$.

Then, if $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i$, then $A^c = \bigcap_{i=1}^k C_i^c$, and $C_i^c = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} E_j \in \Sigma_a$. □

We extend μ to an algebra by $\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu(C_i)$, where $A = \bigcup C_i$ in the semi-algebra.

§3 September 3rd, 2020

Recall that we are aiming to define the uniform measure on $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$.

Last time:

1. We defined a **premeasure** on a semi-algebra, which $\Sigma_{semi} = \{(a, b] : -\infty \leq a \leq b \leq \infty\}$, $\mu((a, b]) = b - a$ was countably additive.
2. Extend μ to an algebra $\Sigma_a =$ disjoint union of elements of Σ_{semi} .
3. For $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i \in \Sigma_a$,

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu(C_i).$$

§3.1 Uniform Measure on the Borel Sets

We first need show show μ is well defined. Suppose $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^l C_i, \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} B_j$ for $C_i, B_i \in \Sigma_{semi}$. We want

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu(C_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mu(B_j).$$

Note that $C_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\ell} (C_i \cap B_j)$, which are all disjoint. Similarly, $B_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^k (B_j \cap C_i)$, disjoint. Thus, from the finite additivity of Σ_{semi} , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \mu(C_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mu(C_i \cap B_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \mu(B_j),$$

as desired.

We will next show that μ is finitely additive. First, if we have $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in \Sigma_a$ disjoint, we show $\mu(\bigcup A_i) = \sum \mu(A_i)$.

Note that each $A_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_i} C_j^i$, which are disjoint, so

$$\mu\left(\bigcup A_i\right) = \mu\left(\bigcup_i \bigcup_j C_j^i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mu(C_j^i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(A_i).$$

Next, we show μ is monotonic. For $A, B \in \Sigma_a, A \subseteq B, B = A \cup (B \setminus A)$, so

$$\mu(B) = \mu(A) + \mu(B \setminus A) \geq \mu(A).$$

We show countably additivity: Let $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$. We need to show $\mu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$.

We first show $\mu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$. It suffices to show $\mu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(A_i)$. Since $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \subseteq A$, monotonicity gives $\mu(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i) \leq \mu(A)$.

Next, we show $\mu(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$. First $A = \bigcup_{j=1}^k C_j$ for $C_j \in \Sigma_{semi}, A_i = \bigcup_{\ell}^{m_i} C_{\ell}^i$ for $C_{\ell}^j \in \Sigma_{semi}$.

Thus,

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mu(C_j).$$

Hence, it suffices to show $\mu(C_j) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(C_j \cap A_i)$, since

$$\mu(A) = \sum \mu(C_j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(C_j \cap A_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^k \mu(C_j \cap A_i).$$

Note that $C_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\ell}^{m_i} C_j \cap C_{\ell}^i$, and we finish by using countable additivity for Σ_{semi} .

It suffices extend to $\Sigma(\Sigma_a)$ which is the sigma-algebra generated by Σ_a .

Theorem 1 (Caratheodory's Extension Theorem)

We have the following:

- Given a countably additive measure μ on an algebra Σ_a , it can be extended to a measure on $\Sigma(\Sigma_a)$.
- If μ is σ -finite on Σ_a , the extension is unique.

A measure μ is σ -finite on Σ_a if there exists $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots \in \Sigma_a$ so that $\bigcup A_i = \Omega$, $\mu(A_i) \leq \infty$ for all i .

Proof. For example, consider $\Sigma_{semi} = \{(a, b] \cap \mathbb{Q}\}$. Then $\Sigma = 2^{\mathbb{Q}}$. The cardinality of every element in Σ_{semi} is either ∞ or 0. Define $\mu(A) = \infty$ if $|A| = \infty$, else 0. One can check μ is a measure on Σ_{semi} . We can also take the counting measure ν . This agrees on Σ_{semi} , but not on Σ . We can check that ν is not sigma-finite.

We now show uniqueness, given σ -finiteness. For simplicity, assume $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$. If we have two measures μ_1, μ_2 on Σ with $\mu_1(A) = \mu_2(A)$ for all $A \in \Sigma_a$, then we show $\mu_1(B) = \mu_2(B)$ for all $B \in \Sigma$.

A general strategy to show some property is true for a sigma-algebra is to show that the sets satisfying those properties must be closed under some natural operations and that any such family of sets must contain a sigma-algebra.

Theorem 2 (π - λ)

A class of sets P is said to be a π -system if $A, B \in P$ implies $A \cap B \in P$. A class of sets G is said to be a λ -system if $\Omega \in G$, $A \subset B, A, B \in G$, then $B \setminus A \in G$, and $A_i \in G, A_i \uparrow A \rightarrow A \in G$. If P is a π system contained in G , a λ -system, then $\Sigma(P) \subset G$.

Note that a semi-algebra is a π system. It suffices to consider the set $\mathcal{C} = \{A : \mu_1(A) = \mu_2(A)\}$. We know that $\Sigma_{semi} \subset \mathcal{C}$. To show $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{C}$, it suffices to show that \mathcal{C} is a λ -system.

Note that a sigma-algebra is a λ -system, so given any π -system P , $\Sigma(P)$ is the smallest λ -system containing P .

We have already verified $\Sigma_a \subset \mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ because Ω is an algebra. Finally, suppose we have $A \subset B, A, B \in \mathcal{C}$. We need $B \setminus A \in \mathcal{C}$. $\mu_1(A) = \mu_2(A), \mu_1(B) = \mu_2(B)$ and $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$. Since $\mu_1(\Omega) = \mu(\Omega) = \mu_2(\Omega) < \infty$,

$$\mu_1(B \setminus A) = \mu_1(B) - \mu_1(A) = \mu_2(B) - \mu_2(A) = \mu_2(B \setminus A).$$

For $A_i \uparrow A$, by continuity from below, $\mu_1(A_i) \rightarrow \mu_1(A), \mu_2(A_i) \rightarrow \mu_2(A)$, so $A \in \mathcal{C}$. \square

An easy exercise is to modify the above proof to include the sigma-finite case. The proof of the $\pi - \lambda$ theorem involves some set theory.

We'll sketch the existence proof. Suppose we have μ on Σ_a . For example, take $B \subset \mathbb{R}$. How do we define $\mu(B)$? We could try to approximate B by the union of intervals.

Define the outer measure, $\mu_*(B) = \inf \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i)$ defined over covers of B . Some properties are $\mu_*(B_1) \leq \mu_*(B_2)$ if $B_1 \subseteq B_2$, $\mu_*(\emptyset) = 0$, and $\mu_*(\bigcup C_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_*(C_i)$.

Define $\mathcal{A} = \{A : \mu_*(E) = \mu_*(E \cap A) + \mu_*(E \cap A^C) \forall E\}$. \mathcal{A} is a sigma algebra containing Σ_a and μ_* is a measure when restricted to \mathcal{A} .

§4 September 8th, 2020

Last time, we completed the construction of the uniform measure on the Borel sets.

§4.1 The Outer Measure

On an algebra Σ_a , let Σ_a^σ be the elements formed by taking countable unions of elements of Σ_a . Let $\Sigma_a^{\sigma\delta}$ contain countable intersections of elements of Σ_a^σ . Notice that from the definition of an outer measure, for any set B , there exists a set $B' \in \Sigma_a^{\sigma\delta}$ such that

$$B \subset B', \mu_*(B) = \mu_*(B').$$

This implies that $\mu_*(B' \setminus B) = 0$ and for every N such that $\mu_*(N) = 0$, we can check that N belongs to \mathcal{A} . Remark: The construction defines the measure μ_* on sets of the form $A \cup B$, where A is a Borel set and $\mu_*(B) = 0$. It is easy to check that $\mu_*(B) = 0$ implies that there exists a Borel set C such that $\mu_*(C) = 0$ and $B \subseteq C$. Thus, we call it the completion of Borel sets. This is a strictly larger sigma-algebra than the Borel sets, which follows from comparing cardinalities. Namely, the cardinality of the Borel sets is 2^{\aleph_0} . Observe the Lebesgue sigma algebra contains $2^{\text{Cantor Set}} = 2^C$.

Measures on the real line are characterized by distribution functions, which are non-decreasing right continuous functions F . One can adopt the same strategy to define a measure on the real line by defining $\mu((a, b]) = F(b) - F(a)$. Similarly, given μ on $(\mathbb{R}, B(\mathbb{R}))$, we can check that $F(b) = \mu((-\infty, b])$ is a distribution function.

We can also consider $(\mathbb{R}^d, B(\mathbb{R}^d))$, the Borel sets on \mathbb{R}^d . We claim that this is

$$\Sigma((a_1, b_1) \times (a_2, b_2) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d)) = \Sigma(B_1, B_2, \dots, B_d : B_i \in B(\mathbb{R})).$$

For distribution functions on \mathbb{R}^d , consider the lexicographical partial order. We would like them to satisfy,

- $F(x)$ is non-decreasing
- $F(x)$ is right continuous: If $x_i \downarrow x$, then $F(x_i) \rightarrow F(x)$.
- $F(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \downarrow -\infty$, $F(x) \rightarrow 1$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

The properties above are not actually enough to define a measure. (Consider the semibox in \mathbb{R}^2).

However, for any F such that $F(A) \geq 0$ for any $A \in \Sigma_{\text{semi}}$, the strategy to build a measure on $B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ from $\Sigma_{\text{semi}} \rightarrow \Sigma_a \rightarrow B(\mathbb{R}^d)$ works.

§4.2 Functions Between Measure Spaces

Suppose we have two measure spaces $(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1), (\Omega_2, \Sigma_2)$ and a function $f : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$.

Definition 4.1 (Measurable Function). f is said to be **measurable** if $f^{-1}(A_2) \in \Sigma_1$ for all $A \in \Sigma_2$. If $(\Omega_2, \Sigma_2) = (\mathbb{R}, B(\mathbb{R}))$, then f will be called a **random variable**.

Proposition 4.2

If $\Sigma_2 = \Sigma(\mathcal{A})$, then to check f is measurable, it suffices to check $f^{-1}(B) \in \Sigma_1$ for all $B \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof.

$$\Sigma' = \{B : f^{-1}(B) \in \Sigma_1\}$$

is a sigma-algebra: If $B \in \Sigma'$, then $B^c \in \Sigma'$, since $f^{-1}(B^c) = (f^{-1}(B))^c$. $\Omega \in \Sigma'$ since $f^{-1}(\Omega_2) = \Omega_1$. It is easy to check countable unions. Σ' is a sigma algebra containing \mathcal{A} , so Σ' contains $\Sigma(\mathcal{A})$. \square

Fact 4.3. If we have $f : (\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1) \rightarrow (\Omega_2, \Sigma_2)$, f induces a measure μ_2 on (Ω_2, Σ_2) where $\mu_2(B) = \mu_1(f^{-1}(B))$ for all $B \in \Sigma_2$.

Some properties:

- If we have $f : (\Omega_1, \Sigma_1) \rightarrow (\Omega_2, \Sigma_2), g : (\Omega_2, \Sigma_2) \rightarrow (\Omega_3, \Sigma_3)$, then $h = g \circ f$ is measurable.
- If X_1, X_2 are two random variables, then (X_1, X_2) is a measurable function into $(\mathbb{R}^2, B(\mathbb{R}^2))$.

We know that $B(\mathbb{R}^2) = \Sigma(I_1 \times I_2)$ for intervals. Finally,

$$(X_1, X_2)^{-1}(I_1 \times I_2) = X_1^{-1}(I_1) \cap X_2^{-1}(I_2)$$

, so $(X_1, X_2)^{-1}(I_1 \times I_2)$ is measurable.

- Suppose F is a continuous function from $(\Omega_1, B(\Omega_1)) \rightarrow (\Omega_2, B(\Omega_2))$. Then F is measurable, since the preimage of open sets is open.
- if X_1, X_2, \dots, X_d is a random variable, then $X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_d$ is a random variable.
- If f_n are random variables and $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise. Then, f is measurable.

Proof. Consider the set $\{f > x\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=n}^{\infty} \{f_m > x\}$ is measurable. Then $(x, \infty)_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a generating set. \square

- $X : (\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1) \rightarrow (R, B(R))$ induces a measure μ on $(R, B(R))$, where $\mu(B) = \mu_1(X^{-1}(B))$ for all $B \in B(R)$. It also induces a distribution function F , which is nondecreasing, right continuous, and $F(x) \uparrow 1$ and $x \rightarrow \infty, F(x) \downarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow -\infty$.

Given a distribution function, is there a random variable? Given a distribution function, we can construct a measure on \mathbb{R} by the Caratheodory Extension Theorem. Let $I : (R, B(R), \mu) \rightarrow (R, B(R))$. We could also take $X : ([0, 1], B([0, 1], \mu) \rightarrow (R, B(R))$, where μ is uniform. Suppose F is continuous and strictly monotone. We want X to induce the distribution F , so it suffices to show $X^{-1}(\infty, y) = [0, F(y)]$. If we define $X(F(y)) = y$, we get the above, but that's not always well defined. For general distributions, one can come up with various definitions of an "inverse" which induces the desired properties. One particular choice is

$$w \in (0, 1), X(w) = \sup\{y : F(y) < w\}.$$

It is an exercise to check that $\{\omega : X(\omega) < x\} = \{\omega : \omega \leq F(x)\}$, which implies that X is measurable.

§5 September 10th, 2020

§5.1 Integration

We work in (Ω, Σ, μ) a sigma-finite measure space. Often, we take it to be a probability measure. The goal is to define a notion of integration for measurable functions and the behavior of integration with limits. Consider a function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ measurable with the Borel Sigma-algebra.

Our strategy is as follows:

1. Consider simple functions.
2. Extend to bounded functions.
3. Extend to general functions.

§5.2 Simple Functions

Definition 5.1 (Simple Function). Consider $f = 1_E$, where $\mu(E) < \infty$, an indicator function. A **simple function** is a linear combination of indicator functions,

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i 1_{A_i}, \mu(A_i) < \infty,$$

where A_i are disjoint.

We'll define the integral of a simple function as

$$\int f d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i \mu(A_i).$$

First, note that any $f = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i 1_{B_i}$ can be represented as $\sum_{i=1}^k c_i 1_{A_i}$, where they are disjoint. We verify that our definition is well defined. Suppose

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i 1_{A_i} = \sum_{j=1}^m e_j 1_{F_j}.$$

Then, observe that for i, j such that $A_i \cap F_j \neq \emptyset$, then $c_i = e_j$. So, we have $f = \sum_{i,j} d_{i,j} 1_{A_i \cap F_j}$, and we can check that $d_{i,j} = c_i = e_j$. Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k c_i \mu(A_i) = \sum_{i,j} d_{i,j} \mu(A_i \cap F_j) = \sum_{j=1}^m e_j \mu(F_j).$$

Some properties:

- If $f \geq 0$ then $\int f \geq 0$.
- $\int af = a \int f$.
- $\int(f + g) = \int f + \int g$.
- If $g \leq f$ then $\int g \leq \int f$.
- if $g = f$, $\int g = \int f$.
- $|\int f| \leq \int |f|$.

§5.3 Bounded Functions

Suppose $|f| \leq M$ and f vanishes outside E and $\mu(E) < \infty$.

We can approximate from above or below:

$$\sup \int_{g \leq f} g \leq \inf \int_{h \geq f} h$$

To prove equality, it suffices to show that there exists g, h such that $\int h - \int g \leq \epsilon$. It suffices to construct h such that $h - f < \epsilon$ and $f - g < \epsilon$. Then $\int h - \int g \leq 2\epsilon\mu(E)$.

Note that the range of f is $[-M, M]$, so we can discretize the interval into smaller intervals I_1, \dots, I_k of size ϵ .

Then, define $A_1 = f^{-1}(I_1) \cap E$, and $f^{-1}(I_j) \cap E = A_j$. Then.

$$h = \sum ((j+1)\epsilon - M)1_{A_j}, g = \sum (j\epsilon - M)1_{A_j}.$$

Thus, $\int f = \sup \int g = \inf \int h$.

Observe that the new definition agrees with the old definition when f is simple.

As an exercise, we'll verify $\int f + g = \int f + \int g$. Take Suppose $\int h_1 \geq \int f \geq \int g_1$ with $\int h_1 - g_1 < \epsilon$, and $\int h_2 \geq \int g \geq \int g_2$ with $\int h_2 - g_2 < \epsilon$.

Then

$$h_1 + h_2 \geq f + g \geq g_1 + g_2,$$

and

$$\int h_1 + \int h_2 < \int g_1 + g_2 + 2\epsilon = \int g_1 + \int g_2 + 2\epsilon.$$

§5.4 General Functions

Assume $f \geq 0$. Note that we can no longer approximate from above, so we approximate from below:

$$\int f = \sup \{ \int h, h \leq f, \text{ bounded} \}.$$

Clearly, the definition agrees with the old one for bounded functions with finite support.

As an exercise, we'll prove that $\int f + g = \int f + \int g$. If we have a bounded $h_1 \leq f, h_2 \leq g$, then $h_1 + h_2 \leq f + g$, which implies that $\int h_1 + h_2 = \int h_1 + \int h_2 \leq \int f + g$. and $\sup \int h_1 + \sup \int h_2 = \int f + \int g$, so $\int f + \int g \leq \int f + g$.

Lemma 5.2

Suppose $E_n \uparrow \Omega, \mu(E_n) < \infty$. Now, consider $(f \wedge n)1_{E_n}$, where $f \wedge n$ is the minimum of f, n . Then, the function is bounded and has finite support. Note that $(f \wedge n)1_{E_n}$. We claim that

$$\int (f \wedge n)1_{E_n} \uparrow \int f.$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\lim \int (f \wedge n)1_{E_n} \leq \int f,$$

since $h_n = (f \wedge n)1_{E_n}$ is contained in the set of bounded functions for which the supremum is $\int f$.

It suffices to show that $\lim \int (f \wedge n)1_{E_n} \geq \int f$. Take h bounded such that $\int f < \int h + \epsilon$. There is a set E such that $g \leq M$ on E and g is 0 on E^c .

$g \leq f$, so for any $n \geq M$, $h_n \geq g$ on $E_n \cap E$. We claim that

$$\int h_n \geq \int g - M\mu(E \setminus E_n).$$

Then $E_n \uparrow \Omega$, so $\mu(E \setminus E_n) \rightarrow 0$. □

Now, we conclude the original proof. Note that $\int f + g = \lim \int ((f + g) \wedge n) 1_{E_n}$, so

$$\int ((f + g) \wedge n) 1_{E_n} \leq \int (f \wedge n) 1_{E_n} + \int (g \wedge n) 1_{E_n}.$$

Taking limits gives the desired result.

§5.5 Arbitrary Measurable Functions

Define $\int f$ only when $\int |f| < \infty$. Define

$$f = f^+ - f^-,$$

where $f^+ = f \vee 0$, $f^- = f \wedge 0$.

Then

$$\int f = \int f^+ - \int f^-.$$

Lemma 5.3

If f_1, f_2 nonnegative and $f = f_1 - f_2$, then

$$\int f = \int f_1 - \int f_2.$$

Proof. $f = f^+ - f^- = f_1 - f_2$, so

$$f^+ + f_2 = f_1 + f^-,$$

then

$$\int f^+ + \int f_2 = \int f_1 + \int f^-,$$

so

$$\int f = \int f^+ - \int f^- = \int f_1 - \int f_2.$$

□

§6 September 15th, 2020

§6.1 Properties of Integrals with Limits

We assume for simplicity that our measure space (Ω, Σ, μ) is finite. Last time, we defined integrals for measurable functions starting with indicators, to simple functions, to non-negative functions, and finally to general functions.

Observe that if f is 0 almost surely, then $\int f = 0$. Suppose $\{f_n\}$ is a set of measurable functions and $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise almost everywhere, then $\lim \int f_n$ is measurable. In other words, there exists a set E such that $\mu(E) = 0$ and f_n converges on E^c . Define f to be 0 on E and $\lim f_n$ on E^c . Note that f is measurable. Suppose f_n "converge" to f . When can one expect $\int f_n$ to converge to $\int f$?

Definition 6.1 (Convergence in Measure). We say $f_n \rightarrow f$ in measure if given $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(|f_n - f| > \epsilon) = 0$$

We denote this by $f_n \xrightarrow{\mu} f$.

Exercise 6.2. If $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$, then $f_n \rightarrow f$ almost everywhere implies that $f_n \xrightarrow{\mu} f$.

Example 6.3

Suppose $f_n = 1_{[-n, n]}$ over \mathbb{R} . Then $f_n \rightarrow f = 1_{\mathbb{R}}$, but $\mu(|f_n - f| > \epsilon) = \infty$.

Recall continuity of measure from below: If $A_n \uparrow A$ then $\mu(A_n) \uparrow \mu(A)$, but if $\mu(A) = \infty$, then $\mu(A) - \mu(A_n) = \infty$ for all n . This doesn't happen for $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$.

Example 6.4

If $f_n \xrightarrow{\mu} f$, then does $f_n \rightarrow f$ almost everywhere? No: Take $\Omega = [0, 1]$, $f = 0$ and $f_1 = 1_{[0, 1/n]}$, $f_2 = 1_{[1/n, 2/n]}$, \dots , $f_n = 1_{[(n-1)/n, 1]}$, $f_{n+1} = 1_{[0, 1/(n+1)]}$, \dots

There is always some interval where $f_n = 1$, so it does not converge pointwise to 0.

Example 6.5

If $f_n \xrightarrow{\mu} f$, then does $\int f_n \rightarrow \int f$? No. Take $f_n = \frac{1}{n} 1_{[0, n]}$.

Theorem 3 (Bounded Convergence Theorem)

Suppose μ is finite and f_n are supposed on E such that $\mu(E) < \infty$.

If $|f_n| < M$ and $f_n \xrightarrow{\mu} f$, then $\int f_n \rightarrow \int f$.

Proof. f must be 0 almost everywhere outside E . Define $F = \{|f_n - f| < \epsilon\}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_E f_n - \int_E f \right| &\leq \int_{F \cap E} |f_n - f| + \int_{E \cap F^c} |f_n - f| \\ &\leq \epsilon \mu(E) + 2M \mu(F^c \cap E) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 4 (Fatou's Lemma)

If $f_n \geq 0$ then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu \geq \int \left(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \right) d\mu.$$

Proof. Let $g_n(x) = \inf_{m \geq n} f_m(x)$. Then $g_n(x) \uparrow g = \liminf f_n$.

We know that $f_n \geq g_n$. This implies that $\int f_n \geq \int g_n$. We have that

$$\liminf \int f_n \geq \liminf \int g_n = \lim \int g_n.$$

Hence, It suffices to show that

$$\lim \int g_n \geq \int g.$$

Recall that $g_n \uparrow g$ so $\lim g_n = g$. Consider $g_n \wedge m$, a bounded function. Note that $g_n \wedge m \uparrow g \wedge m$, so by the Bounded Convergence Theorem,

$$\int (g_n \wedge m) \uparrow \int (g \wedge m).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\int g_n \geq \int (g_n \wedge m),$$

so

$$\lim \int g_n \geq \lim \int (g_n \wedge m) \uparrow \int (g \wedge m) \uparrow \int g,$$

where the last inequality comes from approximation by bounded functions of finite support. \square

Theorem 5 (Monotone Convergence Theorem)

If $f_n \geq 0$ and $f_n \uparrow f$, then $\int f_n \uparrow \int f$.

Proof. Note that $\int f \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n$ since $\int f \geq \int f_n$. Then $\int f \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n$ by Fatou's lemma. \square

Theorem 6 (Dominated Convergence Theorem)

If $|f_n| \leq g$ where $\int g \leq \infty$ and $f_n \rightarrow f$ pointwise, then

$$\int f_n \rightarrow \int f.$$

Proof. Note that $f_n + g \geq 0$, and $f_n + g \rightarrow f + g$ so by Fatou's lemma,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n + g \geq \int f + g d\mu,$$

which implies that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n \geq \int f$.

Then, applying the result to $g - f_n$, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -f_n \geq \int -f \Rightarrow \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \leq \int f,$$

which implies that $\lim \int f_n = \int f$, as desired. \square

§6.2 Expected Value

We have been discussing measurable functions, but these can easily be translated into the language of random variables. Namely, if X is a random variable and $\int |X| < \infty$, then $\int X = E(X)$, the expectation of X .

- $X_n \geq 0$, then $X_n \uparrow X \rightarrow E(X_n) \rightarrow E(X)$.
- $|X_n| < Y$, $X_n \rightarrow X$, $E(Y) < \infty$, then $E(X_n) \rightarrow E(X)$.

§6.3 Change of measure for Integrals

We have a random measurable map

$$X : (\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1) \rightarrow (\Omega_2, \Sigma_2) \xrightarrow{f} (\mathbb{R}, B(\mathbb{R})).$$

Then $f \circ X : (\Omega_1, \Sigma_1) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}, B(\mathbb{R}))$, and if $\int |f \circ X| < \infty$, then X induces a measure μ_2 on (Ω_2, Σ_2) with $\mu_2(A) = \mu_1(X^{-1}(A))$. Hence, we can discuss

$$\int_{\Omega_2} f d\mu_2.$$

Theorem 7 (Change of Measure)

$$\int_{\Omega_1} f \circ X d\mu_1 = \int_{\Omega_2} f d\mu_2.$$

Proof. Let $f = 1_E$ for $E \in \Sigma_2$.

$$\int_{\Omega_2} f d\mu_2 = \mu_2(E) = \mu_1(X^{-1}(E)).$$

Then $f \circ X = 1(X^{-1}(E))$, so

$$\int f \circ X = \mu_1(X^{-1}(E)).$$

For simple functions, we can use linearity of integrals for the result. For nonnegative functions, we construct a monotone sequence of functions which increase to f . One possible choice is

$$f_n = \frac{\lfloor 2^n f \rfloor}{2^n} \wedge n.$$

We know that $f_n \uparrow f$ and $\int_{\Omega_1} f_n \circ X = \int_{\Omega_2} f_n$, and $f_n \circ X \uparrow f \circ X$, so by the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\int_{\Omega_1} f_n \circ X \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_1} f \circ X,$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_2} f_n \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_2} f,$$

so it follows that $\int_{\Omega_1} f \circ X = \int_{\Omega_2} f$, as desired. \square

§6.4 Product Measures

We will relate high dimensional integrals with low dimensional ones with the notion of Product Measures.

Let $(\Omega_1, \Sigma_1, \mu_1), (\Omega_2, \Sigma_2, \mu_2)$ be measure spaces. Consider $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \Sigma(\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2))$. Note that $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$ is a semialgebra. From here, we construct the product measure.

Theorem 8

There exists a unique measure on $\Sigma_p = \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$, μ such that

$$\mu(A \times B) = \mu_1(A)\mu_2(B)$$

for all $A \times B \in \Sigma_p$. We will call this the product measure.

Proof. Given a countable additive sigma-finite measure on a semi-algebra, it admits a unique extension to the generated sigma-algebra by Caratheodory's extension theorem. To prove the existence and uniqueness, it suffices to check countable additivity on $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$.

If we have $A \times B = \bigcup A_i \times B_i$, we want

$$\mu(A \times B) = \mu_1(A)\mu_2(B) = \sum \mu_1(A_i)\mu_2(B_i).$$

Our strategy is to product to one dimension less. Fix $x \in A$. Note that $B = \{y : (x, y) \in A \times B\}$. But $A \times B = \bigcup A_i \times B_i$. Consider all A_i 's that contain x . Then, the corresponding B_i 's form a disjoint partition of B . We know that $\mu_2(B) = \sum_{x \in A_i} \mu_2(B_i)$ for all $x \in A$, so in particular

$$1_A \mu_2(B) = \sum 1_A \mu_2(B_i).$$

We claim that the two functions are pointwise same on Ω_1 . Then, we integrate (uses MCT) with respect to μ_1 to get

$$\mu_1(A)\mu_2(B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_1(A_i)\mu_2(B_i).$$

□

§7 September 17th, 2020

§7.1 Product Measures, Continued

We have a semialgebra $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$ and we denote $\Sigma_{1 \times 2} = \Sigma(\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2)$. Let $E \in \Sigma_{1 \times 2}$.

Lemma 7.1

For any $X \in \Omega_1$, the set

$$E_x = \{y \in \Sigma_2 : (x, y) \in E\}$$

is measurable.

Proof. If $E = E_1 \times E_2$, then either $E_x = \emptyset$ or $E_x = E_2$. We show that the set of E with this property forms a sigma-algebra. If $E \in \mathcal{A}$, then $(E^c)_x = (E_x)^c$ so $E^c \in \mathcal{A}$.

If $E_1, E_2, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$, then

$$\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right)_x = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (E_i)_x.$$

Hence, \mathcal{A} is a sigma-algebra containing $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$, so $\mathcal{A} = \Sigma_{1 \times 2}$. \square

Theorem 9

For any $E \in \Sigma_{1 \times 2}$,

$$\mu_1 \times \mu_2(E) = \mu(E) = \int_{\Omega_1} \mu_2(E_x) d\mu_1,$$

and $\mu_2(E_x)$ is a measurable function from $\Omega_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. The result is clear for rectangles. If $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\mu_2(E_x) = \mu_2(E_{1x}) + \mu_2(E_{2x}) - \mu((E_1 \cap E_2)_x)$. We use the $\pi - \lambda$ theorem. It suffices to show that \mathcal{A} is a λ -system and we have that $\mathcal{A} \supset \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$, which is a π -system.

It is clear that $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. We claim that if $E_n \in \mathcal{A}$, then $E_n \uparrow E$ implies $E \in \mathcal{A}$. Note that $(E_n)_x \uparrow E_x$ for all x then $\mu_2(E_{nx}) \uparrow \mu_2(E_x)$ and if we define $\mu_2(E_{nx}) = f_n(x)$, then $f_n(x) \uparrow E_x$ is measurable, as desired. Finally, we show that if $E_1 \supset E_2$ and $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, then $E_1 \setminus E_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. This is clear since $(E_1 \setminus E_2)_x = E_{1x} \setminus E_{2x}$ so $\mu((E_1 \setminus E_2)_x) = \mu_2(E_{1x}) - \mu_2(E_{2x})$ is measurable as the difference of finite measurable functions.

The same argument shows that \mathcal{A} is a λ -system if we define \mathcal{A} to be all E so that both conclusions of the theorem hold. \square

Theorem 10 (Fubini)

Let $f \geq 0$ or $\|f\|_1 < \infty$. Then

1. For all x , $f(x, \cdot)$ is measurable on Σ_2 .
2. $\int f(x, \cdot)$ is measurable on Σ_1 .
3. $\int \int f(x, \cdot) = \int f$.

Proof. We have verified this for $f = 1_E$. Suppose $f \geq 0$. By linearity of integrals and the fact that the sum of measurable functions is measurable, the claim holds for simple functions. For general $f \geq 0$, take a sequence of simple functions $f_n \uparrow f$.

Then,

$$\int \left(\int f_n(x, \cdot) d\mu_2 \right) d\mu_1 = \int f_n d(\mu_1 \times \mu_2),$$

so the result follows from the monotone convergence theorem.

For general $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$, $f = f^+ - f^-$, so we use the above to conclude. \square

Example 7.2 (Not-integrable Function)

Let $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \mathbb{N}$. Suppose μ_1, μ_2 are counting measures. Let $f(m, m) = 1$, $f(m+1, m) = -1$ and $f(m, n) = 0$. Then

$$\sum_m \sum_n f(m, n) = 1, \quad \sum_n \sum_m f(m, n) = 0.$$

The failure is that $f \notin \ell^1$.

Example 7.3 (Not σ -finite)

Let $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = (0, 1)$. Let μ_1 be the uniform measure and μ_2 be the counting measure. Let $E = \{(x, x) : x \in (0, 1)\}$. Then $\int \int \mu_2(E_x) d\mu_1 = 1$, but $\int \int \mu_1(E_y) d\mu_2 = 0$.

§7.2 Independence

Definition 7.4 (Naive Independence). If X_1, X_2 are random variables, then X_1 and X_2 are independent if

$$P(X_1 \in E, X_2 \in F) = P(X_1 \in E)P(X_2 \in F).$$

We will generalize this notion.

Definition 7.5 (Independence). For a (Ω, Σ, μ) , if $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k \subset \Sigma$ are said to be **mutually independent** if for any subset $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_\ell\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ and sets $A_{i_1}, A_{i_2}, \dots, A_{i_\ell}$, $A_{i_j} \in \Sigma_{i_j}$

$$\mu(A_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap A_{i_\ell}) = \prod \mu(A_{i_j}).$$

This is the same as the condition

$$\mu(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_k) = \prod_{i=1}^k \mu(A_i),$$

since we take some of the $A_i = \Omega$.

Definition 7.6 (Independent Random Variables). X_1, \dots, X_k are mutually independent if $\{\Sigma(X_i)\}$ are mutually independent.

Theorem 11

Suppose $A_1, A_2, \dots \subset \Sigma$ are mutually independent π -systems. Then $\Sigma(A_i)$ are also mutually independent.

Proof. Wlog, we can assume $\Omega \in A_i$ for all i . Fix $B_2 \in A_2, \dots, B_\ell \in A_\ell$. For $B_1 \in \Sigma(A_1)$, define the two measures μ', μ'' as

$$\begin{aligned}\mu'(B_1) &= \mu(B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \dots \cap B_\ell), \\ \mu''(B_1) &= \mu(B_1) \prod_{i=2}^{\ell} \mu(B_i).\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $\mu' = \mu''$. Observe that μ' and μ'' agree on A_1 by hypothesis, so the claim holds by the uniqueness part of the Caratheodory Extension theorem on $\Sigma(A_1)$.

$\Sigma(A_1), A_2, \dots, A_\ell$ are mutually independent π systems. We iterate to get that $\Sigma(A_i)$ are mutually independent. \square

Example 7.7 (Pairwise Independent \neq Mutually Independent)

Take $X_1, X_2, X_3 \in \{0, 1\}$, Pick (X_1, X_2, X_3) uniformly from all triples (x_1, x_2, x_3) such that $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0 \pmod{2}$. Note that $P(X_i = 1) = P(X_i = 0) = 1/2$. It is clear that (X_i, X_j) are independent, but (X_1, X_2, X_3) are not independent since $P((X_1, X_2, X_3) = (1, 1, 1)) = 0 \neq (1/2)^3$.

Theorem 12 (Kolmogorov's 0-1 Law)

Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots are independent random variables. Consider

$$T_n = \sigma(X_n, X_{n+1}, \dots),$$

and let

$$T = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} T_n$$

(this is known as a tail-sigma algebra). Then T is a μ -trivial sigma algebra: for all $E \in T$, $\mu(E) = 0$ or 1 .

Proof. The idea is E is independent of X_1, \dots, X_{n-1} , so E is independent of $\sigma(X_1), \sigma(X_2), \dots, \sigma(X_{n-1})$. Hence E is independent of $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n-1} \sigma(X_i)$, so E is independent of $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \sigma(X_i)$, so E is independent of $\Sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots)$. But $E \in T \subset \Sigma(X_1, \dots)$, so $P(E \cap E) = P(E)P(E) = P(E)$, so $P(E) = 0$ or 1 .

Claim: If A_{ij} for $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ such that A_{ij} are all π -systems containing Ω are mutually independent, then $\Sigma(A_{i1}, A_{i2}, \dots, A_{im_i})$ are also mutually independent. To prove this, let $A_i = \{B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \dots \cap B_{m_i} : B_j \in A_{ij}\}$.

We know that $\Sigma(X_1), \dots$ are independent π systems, so $\Sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $\Sigma(X_{n+1}, \dots)$ are independent. Hence E is independent of $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \Sigma(X_i)$, so E is independent of T , which gives the result. \square

Theorem 13 (Kolmogorov Extension)

Take $(\mathbb{R}^n, B(\mathbb{R}^n), \mu_n)$ a consistent family of measures on \mathbb{R}^n : for $A \in B(\mathbb{R}^n)$

$$\mu_{n+1}(A \times \mathbb{R}) = \mu_n(A).$$

Then there exists a measure μ on $(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}, B(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}))$ such that μ agrees with μ_n on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \dots$

§8 September 22nd, 2020

Last time, we discussed product measures, independent random variables/sigma algebras, and how to construct infinitely many independent random variables. We also proved the $0 - 1$ law for tail-sigma algebras.

If we have $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ and random variables $X_1, X_2, \dots, T_n = \Sigma(X_n, X_{n+1}, \dots)$ and $T_\infty = \bigcap T_n$ is a sigma algebra that is \mathbb{P} -trivial.

Any event that does not depend on any finite set of X_i 's is in the tail-sigma algebra. For example, let $Y = \limsup X_i$ and $E = \{Y < t\}$. Note that Y does not depend on finitely many X_i 's. Another example is $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ and we define $Y = \limsup \frac{S_n}{n}$.

When does $\frac{S_n}{n}$ have a limit?

§8.1 Law of Large Numbers

We have X_1, X_2, \dots independent random variables. What is the asymptotic behavior of $\frac{S_n}{n}$?

Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots have $E(X_i^2) < C$, $E(X_i X_j) = 0$ and $E(X_i) = 0$. Then,

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. We first note Markov's Inequality: Suppose X is a nonnegative random variable. For any positive c ,

$$P(X > c) \leq \frac{E(X)}{c}.$$

Furthermore, note that

$$\left\{\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right\} = \left\{\left(\frac{S_n}{n}\right)^2 > \epsilon^2\right\}.$$

By Markov's Inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left(\frac{S_n}{n}\right)^2 > \epsilon^2\right) \leq \frac{1}{n^2 \epsilon^2} E(S_n^2),$$

and finally,

$$E(S_n^2) = E((X_1 + \dots + X_n)^2) = \sum E X_i^2 + \sum E(X_i X_j) \leq nC$$

so

$$\frac{1}{n^2 \epsilon^2} E(S_n^2) \leq \frac{nC}{n^2 \epsilon^2} = \frac{C}{n \epsilon^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

□

Corollary 8.1

If X_1, X_2, \dots are independent with the same distribution and $E(X_i) = \mu$, $E(X_i^2) = \sigma^2$, then

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \mu.$$

Proof. Note that $E(\overline{X_i X_j}) = E(\overline{X_i})E(\overline{X_j}) = 0$ by Fubini's theorem. Hence we apply the previous theorem to $\overline{X_i} = X_i - \mu$. □

Fact 8.2. Chebyshev's Inequality: For any RV X ,

$$P(|X| > t) \leq \frac{E(X^2)}{t^2}.$$

Example 8.3 (Polynomial Approximation)

Task: Given $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous, and $\epsilon > 0$, find a polynomial $f_n(x)$ such that

$$|f_n(x) - f(x)| < \epsilon$$

for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

Let

$$f_n(x) = \sum_{m=0}^n \binom{n}{m} x^m (1-x)^{n-m} f\left(\frac{m}{n}\right).$$

We expect $f_n(x) \approx f(x)$ by the Binomial Theorem. Precisely,

$$f_n(x) = E\left(f\left(\frac{S_n}{n}\right)\right)$$

where $S_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, x)$ with $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ for $X_i \sim \text{Ber}(x)$. It suffices to show that $\frac{S_n}{n} \approx x$.

By the Law of Large Numbers,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n} - x\right| > \epsilon\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Since f is continuous on $[0, 1]$, it is uniformly continuous, so that given δ , there exists ϵ such that for all x, y with $|x - y| < \epsilon$, $|f(x) - f(y)| < \delta$. If we let the event above be A^c , then,

$$\begin{aligned} E(f(S_n/n)) &= E(f(S_n/n)1_A) + E(f(S_n/n)1_{A^c}) \\ &= f(x)P(A) + E(f(S_n/n) - f(x))1_A + E(f(S_n/n))1_{A^c} \\ &\leq f(x)P(A) + \delta P(A) + \sup_{x \in [0,1]} f(x)P(A^c) \rightarrow f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$P(A^c) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(S_n)}{n^2\epsilon^2} \leq \frac{1}{n\epsilon^2}$$

since $\text{Var}(X_i) \leq 1$ for $X_i \in [0, 1]$.

Hence, for any $x \in [0, 1]$, $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ uniformly as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now, our goal is to prove the law of Large Numbers without the second moment assumption. Namely, for X_1, X_2, \dots iid with $E|X_i| < \infty$, $EX_i = 0$,

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Our strategy is truncation.

Definition 8.4. For any random variable X , we will consider the random variable from $X_M = X1_{|X| < M}$. Note that we have $E(X_M^2) < \infty$ for all M even if $E(X^2) = \infty$.

Theorem 14

Suppose that for each n there exists a constant b_n such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n P(|X_{n_i}| > b_n) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{E(\overline{X_{n_i}})^2}{b_n^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_{n_i} - E(\overline{X_{n_i}})}{b_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. We first prove that

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\overline{X_{n_i}} - E(\overline{X_{n_i}})}{b_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

This follows from Chebyshev, since $E(Y) = 0$ and

$$\text{Var}(Y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{E(\overline{X_{n_i}}^2)}{b_n^2}.$$

Then $\sum_{i=1}^n P(|X_{n_i}| > bn) \rightarrow 0$ so if $X_{n_i} < b_n$, $X_{n_i} = \overline{X_{n_i}}$.
Let $B = \{X_{n_i} \neq \overline{X_{n_i}} : i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$. Then

$$P(B) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n P(|X_{n_i}| > b_n) \rightarrow 0,$$

so it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_{n_i} - E(\overline{X_{n_i}})}{b_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

□

Lemma 8.5

Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots are iid. Suppose that

$$KP(|X_1| > K) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i - nE(X_1 1_{\{|X_1| < n\}})}{n} \rightarrow 0$$

in measure.

Proof. Note that this does not imply $E(X_1) < \infty$. Form a triangular sequence from the X_i 's and let $b_n = n$. We show that $\sum_{i=1}^n P(|X_i| > n) \rightarrow 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n E(\overline{X_i}^2) \rightarrow 0$.

For 2, it suffices to show

$$E(\overline{X_i}^2)/n \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $|\overline{X}_i| = |X_i|1_{\{|X_i| < n\}}$. Suppose X is a non-negative random variable. Note that

$$E(X) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(X > n).$$

Similarly,

$$E(X^2) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nP(X > n).$$

Then

$$E(\overline{X}_i^2) \approx \sum_{K=1}^n KP(X_1 > K).$$

It suffices to show that

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^n kP(|X_1| > k)}{n} \rightarrow 0,$$

which follows from the fact that $kP(|X_1| > k) \rightarrow 0$. \square

Theorem 15 (Law of Large Numbers)

If X_1, X_2, \dots iid and $E(|X_1|) < \infty$ and $E(X_1) = 0$, then $S_n/n \rightarrow 0$ in measure.

Proof. Note that $kP(|X_1| > k) \leq E(|X_1|1_{\{|X_1| > k\}}) \rightarrow 0$, by the dominated convergence theorem. By the lemma,

$$\frac{S_n}{n} - E(\overline{X}_1) \rightarrow 0,$$

and note that $E(\overline{X}_1) \rightarrow E(X_1) = 0$ by the dominated convergence theorem. \square

§9 September 24th, 2020

§9.1 Law of Large Numbers, continued

Last time, we began discussing the Law of large numbers. Recall:

- Markov's Inequality:

$$P(|X| > c) \leq \frac{E(|X|)}{c}.$$

- With X_1, X_2, \dots iid, $E(X_i) = 0$. When $E(X_1^2) < \infty$,

$$S_n/n \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

- Under 1st Moment condition, we used truncation to make things bounded and have second moments. We discussed triangular arrays and saw a theorem which proves a LLN type of statement for truncated variables.
- We showed that the truncation has no limiting effect. Then, we considered

$$\sum X_i 1_{|X_i| < n} / n \rightarrow 0,$$

which implied the law of large numbers.

Example 9.1

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be iid with $X_i \geq 0$. Suppose $E(X_1) = \infty$. Then

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} \underset{?}{\rightarrow} ?$$

Let $Y_i \sim X_i 1_{|X_i| < M}$. Then $S'_n/n \xrightarrow{P} E(Y_i)$ by the weak law of large numbers. But by nonnegativity, $S_n/n > S'_n/n \rightarrow E(Y_i)$, but $E(Y_i)$ can be made arbitrarily large by choosing M very large.

For any c ,

$$P\left(\frac{S_n}{n} > c\right) \rightarrow 1,$$

so $S_n/n \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 9.2

Let $X = 2^i$ with probability $1/2^i$ for $i \geq 1$. Note $E(X) = \infty$.

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be iid X . What is the growth rate of S_n ? One expects to see some X_i 's take value comparable to n since $P(X_1 = n) = \frac{1}{n}$.

We will control the growth with truncation. Let $\alpha_n = \log n + k(n)$, $b_n = 2^{\alpha_n}$. We need to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n P(X_i > b_n) \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E(X_i^2 1_{X_i < b_n})}{b_n^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that

$$P(X_i > b_n) \approx \frac{1}{b_n} = \frac{1}{n2^{k(n)}},$$

so

$$\sum P(X_i > b_n) = \frac{1}{2^{k(n)}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then,

$$E(X_i^2 1_{X_i < b_n}) \approx \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha(n)} 2^{2i} / 2^i = \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha(n)} 2^i \approx 2^{\alpha(n)} = b_n.$$

Then,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E(X_i^2 1_{X_i < b_n})}{b_n^2} \approx \frac{nb_n}{b_n^2} = \frac{1}{2^{k(n)}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{S_n - nE(\overline{X_i})}{b_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $E(\overline{X_i}) = \alpha(n)$, so

$$\frac{S_n - n(\log n + k(n))}{n2^{k(n)}}$$

If we choose $\log \log n$, then

$$\frac{S_n - n(\log n + \log \log n)}{n \log n} \rightarrow 0,$$

so

$$\frac{S_n}{n \log n} \rightarrow 1 \implies S_n = \Theta(n \log n).$$

§9.2 Almost Sure Convergence

Let X_1, X_2, \dots iid, $E(X_i) = 0$, $E(X_i^2) < C$.

We know that

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

but do we have

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \rightarrow 0,$$

almost surely?

Lemma 9.3 (Borel-Cantelli)

If events E_i satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P(E_i) < \infty$, then $P(E_i \text{ infinitely often}) = 0$.

Example 9.4

Let $\epsilon > 0$. We want

$$P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon, i.o.\right) = 0.$$

In order to apply BC, we have to show

$$\sum P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right) < \infty,$$

but

$$\sum P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right) \approx \frac{1}{\epsilon^2 n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

We try to get around this by assuming a higher moment. Suppose $E(X^4) < \infty$. Then,

$$\frac{E(S_n^4)}{n^4} = \frac{E((\sum_{i=1}^n X_i)^4)}{n^4} = \frac{nE(X_1^4) + n^2E(X_1^2 X_2^2)}{n^4} \approx \frac{1}{n^2}.$$

So

$$P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^4} E((S_n/n)^4) \approx \frac{1}{\epsilon^4 n^2},$$

which gives that

$$\sum P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right) < \infty.$$

Can one use naive Markov to show a subsequence converges?

If we let $K(n) = n^2$,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{S_{k(n)}}{k(n)}\right| > \epsilon\right) \approx \frac{1}{n^2}$$

so we can take the infinite sum and it approaches 0.

Define

$$D(n) = \sup_{k(n) \leq i \leq k(n+1)} |S_i - S_{k(n)}|.$$

It suffices to show that

$$\frac{D(n)}{k(n)} \rightarrow 0.$$

We know that

$$P(|D_n/k(n)| > \epsilon) \leq \sum_{i=k(n)}^{k(n+1)} P\left(\frac{|S_i - S_{k(n)}|}{k(n)} > \epsilon\right),$$

by subadditivity. By Chebyshev,

$$\sum_{i=k(n)}^{k(n+1)} P\left(\frac{|S_i - S_{k(n)}|}{k(n)} > \epsilon\right) \leq \sum \frac{i - k(n)}{k(n)^2 \epsilon^2} \leq \frac{(k(n+1) - k(n))^2}{2k(n)^2} \approx \frac{1}{n^2},$$

so $\frac{D_n}{k(n)} \rightarrow 0$ almost surely by BC.

§10 September 29th, 2020

Recall from last time:

- Weak law of Large Numbers, using triangular arrays and truncation,
- The Borel-Cantelli Lemma,
- The Strong Law of Large Numbers, assuming 4th moments with Markov, and assuming 2nd moments, we proved convergence along a subsequence and controlled oscillations.

Fact 10.1. $X_n \rightarrow X$ in probability if and only if for any sequence of X_n , there exists a subsequence which converges almost surely.

Today, we will prove the most general version of SLLN, under the first moment assumption.

§10.1 General Law of Large Numbers

Let E_1, E_2, \dots be pairwise independent events, where $p_i = P(E_i)$. Assume that $\sum P_i \rightarrow \infty$. We have $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{E_i}$, and we would like to consider $\frac{S_n}{E(S_n)}$. We claim that

$$S_n/E(S_n) \rightarrow 1,$$

almost surely.

Proof. Let $a_n = \{|S_n - E(S_n)| > \epsilon E(S_n)\}$. We want to bound $P(a_n)$. It suffices to prove that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $\sum a_n < \infty$, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma.

Note that

$$P(|S_n - E(S_n)| > \epsilon E(S_n)) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(S_n)}{\epsilon^2 (E(S_n))^2},$$

and

$$\text{Var}(S_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(1_{E_i}) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(1 - p_i) \leq 1.$$

Hence, $\text{Var}(S_n) \leq E(S_n)$ and

$$a_n \leq \frac{E(S_n)}{\epsilon^2 (E(S_n))^2} = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \frac{1}{E(S_n)}.$$

Denote $E(S_n) = g_n$. Let $k(n)$ be the least element such that $g_{k(n)} \geq n^2$.

We have that

$$S_{k(n)}/g_{k(n)} \rightarrow 1,$$

almost surely, by applying Borel-Cantelli. It suffices to control the error between the subsequence.

Let $k(n) \leq m \leq k(n+1)$. We would like to show that

$$S_m/g_m \rightarrow 1.$$

But notice that $S_{k(m)} \leq S_m \leq S_{k(m+1)}$ since indicator functions are nonnegative. So,

$$S_{k(n)}/g_{k(n+1)} \leq S_m/g_m \leq S_{k(n+1)}/g_{k(n)} = \frac{S_{k(n+1)}}{g_{k(n+1)}} \frac{g_{k(n+1)}}{g_{k(n)}} \approx \frac{S_{k(n+1)}}{g_{k(n+1)}} \frac{(n+1)^2}{n^2} \rightarrow 1.$$

We can have a similarly bound for the bottom term, and the result follows from the squeeze theorem. \square

Theorem 16 (Strong Law of Large Numbers)

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be iid and $E|X_i| < \infty$, $E(X_i) = 0$. Then

$$S_n/n \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely.

Proof. We will prove convergence of S_n^+/n and S_n^-/n , where $S_n^+ = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^+$ and similarly for the negative. Hence, we can assume without loss of generality that $X_i \geq 0$. We start by applying truncation: $\bar{X}_i = X_i 1_{|X_i| \leq i}$.

It suffices to prove $\bar{S}_n/n \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. This follows from the fact that $\bar{X}_i = X_i$ for large enough i almost surely, since $\sum P(\bar{X}_i \neq X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P(X_i > i) = E(X_i) < \infty$.

By Markov,

$$P\left(\left|\frac{\bar{S}_n - E(\bar{S}_n)}{n}\right| > \epsilon\right) \approx \frac{\text{Var}(\bar{S}_n - E(\bar{S}_n))}{\epsilon^2 n^2}.$$

This will not necessarily be summable over all n , so we choose a subsequence. We will choose $k(n) = \alpha^n$ for a fixed $\alpha > 1$.

We need to show that $\sum \text{Var}(\bar{S}_{k(n)})/k(n)^2 < \infty$. Note that

$$\text{Var}(\bar{S}_{k(n)})/k(n)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k(n)} E\bar{X}_i^2/k(n)^2$$

and

$$E\bar{X}_i^2 \approx \sum_{j=1}^i jP(X > j).$$

We can hence rewrite our expression as

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k(n)} \sum_{j=1}^i jP(X > j)}{k(n)^2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{jP(X > j)}{k(n)} 1_{(k(n) \geq j)} \approx \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} jP(X > j) \cdot \frac{1}{j} \approx E(X),$$

and we have that $E(X) < \infty$.

Hence

$$\frac{\bar{S}_{k(n)} - E(\bar{S}_{k(n)})}{k(n)} \rightarrow 0,$$

almost surely.

Then, $E(\bar{S}_{k(n)})/k(n) \rightarrow E(X)$ since $E(\bar{X}_i) \rightarrow E(X)$ by DCT, so $\bar{S}_{k(n)}/k(n) \rightarrow E(X)$ almost surely. Since $\bar{X}_i > 0$, we have

$$\bar{S}_{k(n)} \leq \bar{S}_m \leq \bar{S}_{k(n+1)},$$

and we can apply the squeezing argument from before but within bounds of $1/\alpha, \alpha$. It suffices to choose any $\alpha > 1$, so choosing α arbitrarily close to 1 gives that \limsup and \liminf are both equal to $E(X)$.

Hence, $\bar{S}_m/m \rightarrow E(X)$ almost surely, and by BC we have that

$$\frac{S_m}{m} \rightarrow E(X),$$

when $X \geq 0$ almost surely. The full theorem comes from splitting $S_m = S_m^+ - S_m^-$. \square

Corollary 10.2

If X_i iid with $E(X_i) = \infty$ then $S_n/n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Take $X_i^m = X_i 1(X_i < m)$. $E(X_i^m) < \infty$ and $\frac{S_n^m}{n} \rightarrow E(X_i^m)$ and $S_n/n \geq S_n^m/n$ for all n, m so choosing large enough m gives the result. \square

§10.2 Second Proof of SLLN

We will use the following:

Theorem 17 (Kolmogorov's Maximal Inequality)

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be independent with $E(X_i^2) < \infty$, $E(X_i) = 0$.

$$P(\max_{k \leq n} |S_k| > \epsilon) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(S_n)}{\epsilon^2}.$$

Proof. Let $A_n = \{\max_{k \leq n} |S_k| > \epsilon\}$. Suppose T_k is the event that k is the smallest index such that $|S_k| > \epsilon$. Then,

$$A_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^n T_k.$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(S_n^2) &\geq E(S_n^2 1_{A_n}) = E(S_n^2 \sum_{k=1}^n 1_{T_k}) \\ &= E((S_k + (S_n - S_k))^2 1_{T_k}) \\ &= E(S_k^2 1_{T_k}) + E((S_n - S_k)^2 1_{T_k}) + E(S_k(S_n - S_k) 1_{T_k}). \end{aligned}$$

The last term is 0 since S_k and 1_{T_k} are measurable functions with respect to $\{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$, but $S_n - S_k = \sum_{j=k+1}^n X_j$ is measurable with respect to $\{X_{k+1}, \dots, X_n\}$.

Hence,

$$E(S_n^2 1_{T_k}) \geq E(S_k^2 1_{T_k}) \geq \epsilon^2 P(T_k),$$

since $|S_k| > \epsilon$ on T_k , which gives

$$P(A_n) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(S_n)}{\epsilon^2}$$

by the union bound. \square

Theorem 18

Suppose X_1, \dots are independent mean 0 random variables. If $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(X_i) < \infty$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ converges almost surely.

§11 October 1st, 2020

Last time:

- We covered the SLLN using an exponentially growing convergent subsequence.
- Kolmogorov's Maximal Inequality: Let X_1, X_2, \dots be independent with $E(X_i^2) < \infty$, $E(X_i) = 0$.

$$P(\max_{k \leq n} |S_k| > \epsilon) \leq \frac{\text{Var}(S_n)}{\epsilon^2}.$$

§11.1 Another Proof of SLLN, continued

Theorem 19

Suppose X_1, \dots are independent mean 0 random variables. If $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(X_i) < \infty$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ converges almost surely.

Proof. We would like to show that S_1, S_2, \dots converges. It suffices to show that (S_i) is almost surely Cauchy. Given any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists n_0 such that for all $n_1, n_2 > n_0$ $|S_{n_1} - S_{n_2}| < \epsilon$.

Then,

$$P\left(\sup_{n \leq k \leq m} |S_k - S_n| > \epsilon\right) = \epsilon^{-2} \sum_{k=n}^m \text{Var}(X_k).$$

Hence,

$$P\left(\sup_{n \leq k} |S_k - S_n| > \epsilon\right) = \epsilon^{-2} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \text{Var}(X_k),$$

where we take the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$ and use continuity from below. Denote $A_n = \{\sup_{n \leq k} |S_k - S_n| > \epsilon\}$. If we let $B_n = \{\sup_{k_1, k_2 \geq n} |S_{k_1} - S_{k_2}| < 2\epsilon\}$, then $P(B_n) \geq 1 - P(A_n)$. Note that B_n increases and $P(\bigcup B_n) \geq 1 - \lim P(A_n) = 1$, and since ϵ is arbitrary, taking the intersection over $\epsilon = 1/m$ implies that S_k is Cauchy almost surely. \square

Theorem 20

Suppose X_i are iid with $E|X_i| < \infty$, $E(X_i) = 0$. Then $\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{X_k}{k}$ converges almost surely.

Proof. Let $\bar{X}_k = X_k 1_{|X_k| \leq k}$. We first show that $\sum \bar{X}_k/k$ converges almost surely, and X_k and \bar{X}_k at finitely many points (by BC), which gives the desired result.

It suffices to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(\bar{X}_k)/k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E(\bar{X}_k^2)/k^2 < \infty.$$

Then

$$E(\bar{X}_k^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} iP(|\bar{X}_k| > i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k iP(|X_1| > i).$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E(\overline{X}_k^2)/k^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} iP(|X_1| > i) \sum_{k=i}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \approx \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} iP(|X_1| > i) \frac{1}{i} \approx E|X_1| < \infty.$$

□

Lemma 11.1 (Kronecker's Lemma)

Suppose $a_n \uparrow \infty$ and y_k are real numbers such that $\sum_{k=1}^n y_k/a_k$ converges. Then $\sum_{k=1}^n y_k/a_n \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Note that $\sum_{k=1}^n y_k/a_k = b_n$ with $b_n \rightarrow b$. Then, $y_k = (b_k - b_{k-1})a_k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n y_k &= a_n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n (b_k - b_{k-1})a_k \\ &= a_n^{-1} \left(a_n b_n + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k (a_k - a_{k-1}) \right) \\ &= b_n - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k \left(\frac{a_k - a_{k-1}}{a_n} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_k \left(\frac{a_k - a_{k-1}}{a_n} \right) \rightarrow b$ and $b_n \rightarrow b$, so the difference converges to 0. □

This implies SLLN, since $\sum X_k/k$ converges almost surely. We claimed that this was quantitative.

Example 11.2 (Tighter Bound)

Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots are iid and $E(X_i) = 0$, $E(X_1^2) < c$. We have already proved that $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i/n \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. We can also show that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{\sqrt{n} \log n^{1/2+\epsilon}} \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely, for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. Let $a_k = \sqrt{k} \log k^{1/2+\epsilon}$. It suffices to show the convergence of

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{X_k}{a_k}.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(X_k/a_k) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{C}{k(\log k)^{1+2\epsilon}} < \infty.$$

□

Example 11.3

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be iid with $EX_i = 0$. Assume that $E|X_1|^p < \infty$ for some $p \in (1, 2)$. Then $S_n/n^{1/p} \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Let $Y_k = X_k 1_{|X_k| < k^{1/p}}$. Note that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(Y_k \neq X_k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(|X_k|^p > k) \leq E|X_1|^p < \infty.$$

We then show the convergence of

$$\sum \frac{Y_k - EY_k}{k^{1/p}}.$$

It suffices to show that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(Y_k)/k^{2/p} < \infty$. Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(Y_k)/k^{2/p} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} EY_k^2/k^{2/p},$$

where $m = k_0^{1/p}$. Then, $EY_k^2 = \sum_{m=1}^{k^{1/p}} m^2 P(x \in [m, m+1])$, so this is approximately

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^2 P(x \in [m, m+1]) \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{2/p}} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^2 P(x \in [m, m+1]) \frac{1}{k_0^{2/p-1}},$$

and $k_0^{2/p-1} = m^{2-p}$, so this simplifies to

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^p P(x \in [m, m+1]) \approx E|X|^p < \infty.$$

Finally $E(Y_k) = -E(X 1_{|X_k| > k^{1/p}})$ and

$$E(X 1_{|X_k| > k^{1/p}}) = k^{1/p} E((X/k^{1/p}) 1_{|X| > k^{1/p}}) \leq k^{1/p} E(|X/k^{1/p}|^p 1_{|X| > k^{1/p}}).$$

This can be written as

$$k^{1/p-1} E(|X|^p 1_{|X| > k^{1/p}}) \rightarrow 0,$$

so

$$\left| \sum EY_k \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^n k^{1/p-1} b_k \approx_{k=1}^n n^{1/p} b_k \rightarrow 0.$$

□

Lemma 11.4 (Glivenko-Cantelli)

Consider a X_1, X_2, \dots iid for some distribution F . Define

$$F_n(y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{X_i \leq y}.$$

Then, almost surely,

$$\sup_y |F_n(y) - F(y)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Proof. The uniformity follows because F and F_n are monotone. □

§12 October 6th, 2020

§12.1 Convergence of Distributions

Lemma 12.1 (Glivenko-Cantelli)

Consider a X_1, X_2, \dots iid for some distribution F . Define

$$F_n(y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{X_i \leq y}.$$

Then, almost surely,

$$\sup_y |F_n(y) - F(y)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Proof. Note that F_n is monotonically increasing from 0 to 1. We divide the real line into intervals depending on F as follows: Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Say $Z_0 = -\infty$, $Z_1 = \inf\{y : F(y) \geq \epsilon\}$, and $Z_n = \inf\{y : F(y) \geq n\epsilon\}$. We eventually have a sequence of random variables $\{Z_n\}$. We also define $Z_{1/\epsilon} = \infty$.

For any i , $\sup |F_n(x) - F(x)|$ is small for all $x \in [Z_i, Z_{i+1})$. Note that $F(Z_{i+1}) - F(Z_i) \leq \epsilon$. Then, we apply SLLN: We let $w_j = 1(X_j \leq Z_i)$ and $w'_j = 1(X_j < Z_{i+1})$. Then $E(w_j) = F(Z_i)$ and $E(w'_j) = F(Z_{i+1})$. Then we use SLLN to show that the end points are uniformly close and we sandwich the limit inside $[Z_i, Z_{i+1})$. \square

Definition 12.2. Let F_n, F be distribution functions. We say $F_n \rightarrow F$ in the sense of distributions in $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ such that F is continuous at x .

Example 12.3

Let F_n be the distribution induced by the point mass at $1/n$. We see that $F_n(0) = 0$, which does not converge to $F(0)$, which is 1.

Example 12.4

Suppose X_i are iid $Ber(\pm 1)$. Let $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and consider $\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow$ Standard Gaussian.

Take any random variable with distribution F . Let $X_n = X + \frac{1}{n}$, then $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution. For any continuity point z of F , $F_n(z) \rightarrow F(z)$ and $F_n(z) = F(z - \frac{1}{n})$, so for all $X_n \leq z, X \leq z - \frac{1}{n}$ which implies that

$$P(X_n \leq z) = P(X \leq z - 1/n) = F(z - 1/n).$$

We investigate the relationship between notions of convergence. If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in probability, does $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution? Yes.

If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in probability, $P(|X_n - X| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$. Note that

$$P(X_n \leq z) \leq P(X \leq z + \epsilon) + P(|X_n - X| > \epsilon),$$

so $\limsup P(X_n \leq z) \leq P(X \leq z + \epsilon) \leq P(X \leq z)$.

Then

$$P(X_n \leq z) \geq P(X \leq z - \epsilon) - P(|X_n - X| > \epsilon),$$

so $\liminf P(X_n \leq z) \geq P(X \leq z - \epsilon) \geq P(X \leq z)$, so $P(X_n \leq z) = P(X \leq z)$.

The converse does not make sense. One example that fails where $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution but $X_n \not\rightarrow X$ where $X = \text{Ber}(\pm 1)$ and X_1, X_2, \dots are all $-X$. Then $X_i \sim X$, but $X_i - X = -2X$.

Theorem 21 (Skorokhod Representation)

If $F_n \rightarrow F$ in distribution, then there exists a probability space (Ω, Σ, P) and random variables X_n, X defined on Ω such that $X_n \sim F_n$ and $X_n \rightarrow X$ almost surely.

Proof. We did some similar when given a distribution F , we constructed a random variable with distribution F . We work in the uniform space $([0, 1], B, P)$. Then $X_n = F_n^{-1}(\omega) = \sup\{y : F_n(y) < \omega\}$ and $X(\omega) = F^{-1}(\omega) = \sup\{y : F(y) < \omega\}$. It suffices to show that $F_n^{-1}(\omega) \rightarrow F^{-1}(\omega)$.

Define $F_n'^{-1}(\omega) = \inf\{z : F_n(z) > \omega\}$ and similarly $F_n'^{-1}$. Let $A = \{\omega : F^{-1}(\omega) < F_n'^{-1}(\omega)\}$. We showed in homework that A is countable. We now prove that $X_n \rightarrow X$ in A^c . Suppose that $F_n^{-1}(\omega) \rightarrow z$. Let $u < z < v$ where u, v are continuity points and $F(u) < \omega - \epsilon$, $F(v) > \omega + \epsilon$. These can be chosen because the set of discontinuities of a function is countable. For all large n , $F_n(u) < \omega - \epsilon/2$ and $F_n(v) > \omega + \epsilon/2$ because $F_n \rightarrow F$ at all continuity points. Then $F_n^{-1}(\omega) \geq u$ and $F_n^{-1}(\omega) \leq v$, hence

$$\limsup_n |F_n^{-1}(\omega) - z| \leq u - v.$$

But u, v were arbitrary continuity points, so

$$\limsup_n |F_n^{-1}(\omega) - z| = 0.$$

□

Fact 12.5. $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution if and only if for any bounded continuous function g , $E(g(X_n)) \rightarrow E(g(X))$.

Proof. If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution, then we have $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ with $Y_n \sim X_n$, $Y \sim X$ so $g(Y_n)$ has the same distribution as $g(X_n)$. Thus $E(g(Y_n)) = E(g(X_n))$. Then, g is continuous so $g(Y_n) \rightarrow g(Y)$ almost surely since $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ almost surely, and g is bounded so $E(g(X_n)) = E(g(Y_n)) \rightarrow E(g(Y)) = E(g(X))$.

For the other direction, if $E(g(X_n)) \rightarrow E(g(x))$ for all bounded continuous functions g , we choose a mollified indicator function. Then $E(g(X_n)) \geq P(X_n \leq z)$ and $E(g(X_n)) \rightarrow E(g(X)) \leq P(x \leq z + \epsilon)$. Hence,

$$\limsup P(X_n \leq z) \leq P(x \leq z + \epsilon).$$

Similarly,

$$\liminf P(X_n \leq z) \geq P(X \leq z - \epsilon),$$

which gives that $P(X_n \leq z) \rightarrow P(X \leq z)$ by using the fact that z is a continuity point. □

This gives an alternate definition of convergence in distribution.

For any topological space and a sequence of measures μ_n and μ on Ω , we can say $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ in distribution if for all bounded continuous $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $E_{\mu_n} g \rightarrow E_{\mu} g$.

Theorem 22 (Continuous Mapping Theorem)

Suppose $X_n \rightarrow X$ and $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that C_g is a set of continuity points of g such that $P(X \in C_g) = 1$, then $g(X_n) \rightarrow g(X)$ in distribution.

Proof. Note that the set of continuity points for a measurable function g , C_g is measurable. \square

§13 October 8th, 2020

Last time,

- We defined distributional convergence.
- We proved the Skorokhod Representation Theorem.
- We showed an equivalent notion of distributional convergence, namely for bounded continuous functions g , $E(g(x_n)) \rightarrow E(g(x))$ implies $x_n \rightarrow x$ in distribution.

§13.1 Weak Convergence

Theorem 23 (Continuous Mapping Theorem)

Suppose $X_n \rightarrow X$ and $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that C_g is a set of continuity points of g such that $P(X \in C_g) = 1$, then $g(X_n) \rightarrow g(X)$ in distribution.

Proof. We claimed that C_g , the set of continuity points is measurable. We know that $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution, so there exists $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ almost surely with $X_n \sim Y_n$, $X \sim Y$. Then $g(X_n) \sim g(Y_n)$ and $g(X) \sim g(Y)$. Then $Y \in C_g$ almost surely because $X \sim Y$. Therefore, $g(Y_n) \rightarrow g(Y)$ almost surely, which implies distributional convergence. \square

§13.2 Portmanteau's Lemma

We show many equivalent conditions for distributional convergence.

1. $F_n \xrightarrow{d} F$
2. For any open U , $\liminf P_n(U) \geq P(U)$.
3. For any closed V , $\limsup P_n(V) \leq P(V)$.
4. For any A such that $P(\partial A) = 0$ ($\partial A = \bar{A} \setminus A^\circ$), we have $P_n(A) \rightarrow P(A)$.

Proof. We first show 1 implies 2. Let $Y_n \sim F_n$, $Y \sim F$ with $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ almost surely. Let $f_n = 1(Y_n \in U)$, $f = 1(Y \in U)$. Then $P(Y_n \in U) = P_n(U)$. Finally,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n \geq f.$$

This is because $f(\omega) = 1$ if $Y(\omega) \in U$ and 0 otherwise. Pick ω such that $f(\omega) = 1$. Then $Y(\omega) \in U$ and $Y_n(\omega) \rightarrow Y(\omega)$ and U is open, we know that for large n , $Y_n(\omega) \in U$. Hence, $f_n(\omega) = 1$ for large n , so $\liminf f_n = 1$.

Finally, by Fatou's Lemma,

$$\liminf P_n(U) \geq \int \liminf f_n \geq \int f = P(U).$$

2 implies 3 is easy. We take V^c , then $P_n(V) = 1 - P_n(V^c)$ and $\limsup P_n(V) = 1 - \liminf P_n(V^c)$.

We show 3 implies 4. Note that $\bar{A} = A \cup \partial A$ and $P(\bar{A}) = P(A)$. Then $A^\circ = A \setminus \partial A$ and $P(A^\circ) = P(A)$. By 2, $\liminf P_n(A^\circ) \geq P(A)$ and $\limsup P_n(\bar{A}) \leq P(A)$ and $P_n(A^\circ) \leq P_n(A) \leq P_n(\bar{A})$. Therefore, $P_n(A) \rightarrow P(A)$.

Finally 4 implies 1. If $P_n(A) \rightarrow P(A)$ for $P(\partial A) = 0$, then choose $A = (-\infty, x]$ for a continuity point x . Then $P(\{x\}) = 0$, so we get $F_n(x) = P_n(A) \rightarrow P(A) = F(x)$. \square

§13.3 Helly's Selection Theorem

Theorem 24

Given a sequence of distributions F_1, F_2, \dots , there exists a subsequence n_1, n_2, \dots and a right continuous non-decreasing function F so that $F_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ for all continuity points.

Note that F may not be a distribution since $F(\infty) - F(-\infty) \neq 1$. For example, take $F_n(x) = 1_{x \geq n}$. Then $F_n(x) = 0$ for $n \geq x$ so $F_n \rightarrow 0$, which is not a distribution.

Proof. We want $F_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow F(x)$. If we fix x , $0 \leq F_n(x) \leq 1$ so we can pick a subsequence so that $F_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow a$ from the compactness of $[0, 1]$. We first ensure convergence for the rationals. Let $\{q_n\}$ be an enumeration of the rationals. Iteratively choose subsequences n_k^i such that $\{n_k^i\}$ is a subsequence of $\{n_k^{i-1}\}$ and $F_{n_k^i}(q_i)$ converges.

Hence, $F_{n_k^k}(q)$ converges for all $q \in \mathbb{Q}$. We will call this $\{n^k\}$ for convenience. Let the limit be $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{n^k} = G(q)$.

Then, define $F(x) = \inf_{q > x} G(q)$. We show $F_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ for all x with F continuous at x . Pick $q_1, q_2, q_3 \in \mathbb{Q}$ so that $q_1 > x > q_2 > q_3$. Then $F_{n_k}(x) \leq F_{n_k}(q_1)$ so $\limsup F_{n_k}(x) \leq G(q_1)$ so $\limsup F_{n_k}(x) \leq F(x)$.

Since x is a continuity point, there exists q_3 close to x so that $F(q_3) \geq F(x) - \epsilon$, but $F(q_3) = \inf_{q > q_3} G(q)$, so there exists q_2 with $q_3 < q_2 < x$ so that $G(q_2) \geq F(q_3) + \epsilon$ so $G(q_2) \geq F(x) - 2\epsilon$. But $F_{n_k}(x) \geq F_{n_k}(q_2)$ so $\liminf F_{n_k}(x) \geq G(q_2) \geq F(x) - 2\epsilon$ so $\liminf F_{n_k}(x) \geq F(x)$. \square

When does the limit preserve mass?

Definition 13.1. Given $\epsilon > 0$, $\{F_n\}$ is tight if there exists M_ϵ so that F_n in the sequence

$$F_n(M_\epsilon) - F_n(-M_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Tightness is a necessary and sufficient condition for preserving mass.

Proof. We have $F_{n_k} \rightarrow F$ for continuity points. We show F has mass 1. We can assume $M_\epsilon, -M_\epsilon$ are continuity points. Then

$$F_{n_k}(M_\epsilon) - F_{n_k}(-M_\epsilon) \rightarrow F(M_\epsilon) - F(-M_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

\square

If a sequence is not tight, then there exists subsequential limits with mass less than 1.

§13.4 Fourier Transforms

Let X be a random variable with distribution F . For any t , define $\phi(t) = E(e^{itx})$.

We have some properties:

- $\phi(0) = 1$.
- $\overline{\phi(t)} = \phi(-t)$.
- $|\phi(t)| \leq 1$.

Proof. We use Jensen's Inequality: For a convex function $\phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ with $E|\phi| < \infty$, $E|X_i| < \infty$ for all i , then $E(\phi) \geq \phi(EX_1, EX_2, \dots)$.

Take $(x, y) \mapsto (x^2 + y^2)^{1/2}$. Then

$$|\phi(t)| \leq E|e^{itx}| = 1.$$

□

- ϕ is uniformly continuous.

$$|\phi(t+h) - \phi(t)| \leq |E(e^{i(t+h)x} - e^{itx})| \leq E|e^{itx}(e^{ihx} - 1)| = E|e^{ihx} - 1| \rightarrow 0,$$

by the Bounded Convergence Theorem.

§14 October 13, 2020

§14.1 Fourier Transforms, Continued

Recall $\phi(t) = E(e^{itx})$. The broad goal is to study distributional convergence using the characteristic functions.

§14.2 Differentiability of Characters

When is $\phi(t)$ differentiable? If ϕ is differentiable at t , then $\phi'(t) = E(ixe^{itx})$, so $\phi'(0) = E(ix)$. For this to make sense, we might need $E|X| < \infty$.

Theorem 25

If $E|X| < \infty$, then ϕ is continuously differentiable.

Proof.

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{\phi(t+h) - \phi(t)}{h} = E\left(\frac{e^{i(t+h)X} - e^{itX}}{h}\right)$$

It suffices to show that

$$E\left(\frac{e^{i(t+h)X} - e^{itX}}{h} - ix e^{itX}\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\frac{e^{i(t+h)X} - e^{itX}}{h} - ix e^{itX}\right) &= E\left(ix e^{itX} \left(\frac{e^{ihX} - 1}{ihX} - 1\right)\right) \\ &= E\left(ix e^{itX} \left(\frac{\int_0^h e^{iuX} - 1}{h} - 1\right)\right) \\ &\leq E(|ix e^{itX}| \sup_{u \leq h} |e^{iuX} - 1|) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

by DCT, since the argument is at most $2|X|$.

Then, ϕ' is continuous since

$$\phi'(t+h) - \phi'(t) = E(ixe^{i(t+h)x} - ix e^{itx}) = E(ixe^{itx}[e^{ihx} - 1]) \rightarrow 0$$

by DCT. □

Similarly if $E|X|^k < \infty$, then $\phi(t) \in C^k$. The proof follows straightforwardly by induction on the moment.

Lemma 14.1

If ϕ is twice-differentiable, then $E(X^2) < \infty$.

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{2\phi(0) - \phi(h) - \phi(-h)}{h^2} \xrightarrow{h \rightarrow 0} -\phi''(0).$$

But this quantity is exactly

$$\frac{2 - 2E(\cos(hx))}{h^2} \rightarrow -\phi''(0)$$

since $\phi(h) = E(\cos(hx) + i \sin(hx))$ and $\phi(-h) = E(\cos(hx) - i \sin(hx))$.

Finally, $\cos(x) = 1 - \frac{x^2}{2}$, so we $f_h(X) \rightarrow X^2$, $f_h(X) \geq 0$ and $E(f_h(X)) \rightarrow \phi''(0)$ (where $f_h(X)$ is the term inside the expectation). It follows that $E(X^2) \leq \lim E(f_h(X)) = -\phi''(0)$. Furthermore, $\phi''(0) = E(-X^2)$. \square

§14.3 Fourier Inversion Formula

Let $X \sim \mu$ and $\phi(t) = E(e^{itx})$. Let F be the distribution induced by μ . We would like to approximate $F(b) - F(a)$.

We consider

$$\int_{-T}^T \int_a^b e^{-iut} \phi(t) du dt = \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-iat} - e^{-bt}}{it} \phi(t) dt.$$

Then

$$\int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-iat} - e^{-bt}}{it} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itx} d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{it(x-a)} - e^{it(x-b)}}{it} = 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^T \frac{\sin(t(x-a)) - \sin(t(x-b))}{t} dt.$$

Hence, we have

$$2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\mu \int_0^T \frac{\sin(t(x-a)) - \sin(t(x-b))}{t} dt.$$

Then, for any x ,

$$\int_0^T \frac{\sin(\theta x)}{x}$$

is bounded as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and converges to $\frac{\pi}{2} \operatorname{sgn}(\theta)$. It follows that the integral converges to $\pi\mu(\{a\}) + \pi\mu(\{b\}) + 2\pi\mu(a, b)$. Dividing by 2π throughout, gives

$$\mu(a, b) + \frac{\mu(\{a\} \cup \{b\})}{2}.$$

Lemma 14.2

If F_1, F_2 are two distributions with $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t)$, where ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are the characteristics functions, then $F_1 = F_2$.

Proof. Consider the set $A = \{x : \mu_1(x), \mu_2(x) > 0\}$, which is countable. For all $a, b \in A^c$, $\mu_1([a, b]) = \mu_2([a, b])$. Then, send $a \rightarrow -\infty$ to show $F_1(b) = F_2(b)$ for all $b \in A^c$, but A^c is dense so $F_1 = F_2$ everywhere by right-continuity. \square

Theorem 26

If $\phi(t)$ is integrable, then F has a density: $F[a, b] = \int_a^b f dx$ for all a, b .

Namely,

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-ixt} \phi(t) dx.$$

Proof. We first show there are no atoms, $\mu(x) = 0$ for all x . Then for $a < x < b$

$$\mu(x) \leq \int |\phi(t)| |b - a| \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally,

$$\int_a^b \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-iut} \phi(t) dt = \mu(a, b) = \mu[a, b].$$

It is easy to show that f is real valued.

$$\bar{f}(u) = \int e^{iut} \bar{\phi}(t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{iut} \phi(-t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-iut} \phi(t) dt = f(u).$$

□

§15 October 15th, 2020

Recall

- Moments of a Random Variable implies smoothness of the characteristic functions
In particular, the existence of the k -th moment implies that $\phi^{(k)}$ exists and is continuous.
- The Inversion Formula:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \int_a^b e^{-itu} \phi(t) dt \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{a, b\}) + \mu(a, b).$$

- If $\phi(t)$ is integrable, then a density exists - namely

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-itx} \phi(t) dt.$$

This implies that $\int_a^b f = \mu[a, b]$. We can also show that f is continuous since $|f(t+h) - f(h)| \rightarrow 0$ uniformly by the dominated convergence theorem.

§15.1 Characteristic Functions

Proposition 15.1

If X, Y are independent random variables, $\phi_{X+Y}(t) = \phi_X(t)\phi_Y(t)$.

Proof.

$$E(e^{it(X+Y)}) = E(e^{itX} e^{itY}) = E(e^{itX})E(e^{itY}).$$

□

Proposition 15.2

$$\phi(t) = E \left(\sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(itX)^m}{m!} \right) + o(t^n).$$

Proof. Note that

$$\left| \phi(t) - E \left(\sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(itx)^m}{m!} \right) \right| \leq E \min(2|x|^n/n!, |x|^{n+1}/(n+1)!).$$

This follows from the fact that

$$\int_0^x e^{is} (x-s)^n ds = \frac{x^{n+1}}{n+1} + \frac{i}{n+1} \int e^{is} (x-s)^{n+1} ds.$$

Putting $n = 0$ gives

$$e^{ix} = 1 + ix + i^2 \int e^{is} (x-s) ds.$$

It follows by induction that

$$e^{ix} - \sum_{m=0}^n \frac{(ix)^m}{m!} = \frac{i^{n+1}}{n!} \int_0^x e^{is}(x-s)^n dx.$$

Finally,

$$\left| \frac{i^{n+1}}{n!} \int_0^x e^{is}(x-s)^n dx \right| \leq \int_0^x (x-s)^n / n! = \frac{x^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n!} \int_0^x e^{is}(x-s)^n &= \frac{1}{n!} (e^{is}/i)(x-s)^n \Big|_0^x + \int_0^x n e^{is}/i (x-s)^{n-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} (ix^n - in \int_0^x e^{is}(x-s)^{n-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \int_0^x (x-s)^{n-1} (1 - e^{is}) \\ &\leq 2x^n/n!. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $|\phi(t) - \sum E(itX)^m/m!| \leq E \min(2(tX)^n/n!, (tx)^{n+1}/(n+1)!)$ \square

§15.2 Weak Convergence

Theorem 27

For F_n distributions with $\phi_n(t)$, F_n converge in distribution if and only if $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$ (where ϕ is continuous at 0).

Remark: Consider $N(0, 1)$. Then $\phi(t) = e^{-t^2}/2$. It's easy to prove that $\phi'(t) = E(ixe^{itx}) = -t\phi(t)$, using integration by parts to simplify the right side with $\phi(0) = 1$. If $X \sim N(0, 1)$ $\sigma X \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ so $\phi(t) = e^{-\sigma^2 X^2/2}$. Then $\phi_n \rightarrow \delta_0$. But $F_n(x) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ for all x . We will see that continuity at 0 gives the tightness condition.

Proof. We prove the forward direction. $F_n \rightarrow F$ in distribution implies that $E(g(X_n)) \rightarrow E(g(X))$ for bounded continuous functions. The result follows since e^{itx} is a bounded continuous function.

We prove the converse. We first show that $\{F_n\}$ is a tight sequence. Note that

$$\int_{-u}^u (1 - e^{itx}) = 2u - \int_{-u}^u (\cos tx + i \sin tx) dt = 2u - \frac{2 \sin ux}{x}.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{2u} \int_{-u}^u (1 - e^{itx}) = 1 - \frac{\sin ux}{ux}.$$

Then $|\sin x| \leq |x|$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2u} \int_{-u}^u (1 - \phi_n(t)) &= \int 1 - \frac{\sin ux}{ux} d\mu_n \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \mu_n(|x| \geq 2/u). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\phi_n(0) \rightarrow \phi(0) = 1$, so

$$\mu_n(|x| > 2/u) \leq u^{-1} \int_{-u}^u (1 - \phi_n(t)) dt \rightarrow u^{-1} \int_{-u}^u (1 - \phi(t)) dt \leq 2\epsilon,$$

for some choice of u from the continuity of ϕ at 0.

Since ϵ is arbitrary, it follows that μ_n is tight. Now we show that F_n converges to F in distribution. Note that any subsequence has a convergent subsequence which converges to a distribution. Then the subsequences converge to $\phi_{n_i} \rightarrow \phi_F$, and $\phi_n \rightarrow \phi$ so $\phi_F = \phi$. Hence, every subsequence has a convergence converges to the same F by the uniqueness of characteristic functions. Then $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ for all continuity points x of F and it follows that for $F_n(x)$, and subsequence admits a further subsequence converging to $F(x)$. Hence $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$, since otherwise one can extract a subsequence such that $|F_{n_i}(x) - F(x)| > \delta$ for all i . \square

§16 October 20th, 2020

§16.1 Basic Central Limit Theorem

Under natural conditions, we will prove that

$$\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2).$$

Example 16.1

Let $X_i = \pm 1$ with probability $1/2$. We can analyze binomial coefficients to prove a central limit theorem.

Theorem 28

Let X_i be iid $E(X_i) = 0$, $E(X^2) = 1$. Then

$$\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1).$$

Proof. Recall that $\phi_z(t)e^{-t^2/2}$. Hence, we show that $\phi_{S_n/\sqrt{n}}(t) \rightarrow e^{-t^2/2}$.

Then

$$\phi_{S_n/\sqrt{n}}(t) = \phi_{S_n}(t/\sqrt{n}).$$

Then $S_n = \sum X_i$ iid, so

$$\phi_{S_n}(t/\sqrt{n}) = (\phi_{X_1}(t/\sqrt{n}))^n.$$

Then

$$|\phi_{X_1}(t/\sqrt{n}) - E \sum_{m=0}^2 (itx/\sqrt{n})^m / m!| \leq E(\min\{(itx/\sqrt{n})^2, (itx/\sqrt{n})^3\}).$$

Then, the expectation simplifies to $1 - t^2/2n$ since $E(X_1) = 0$, $E(X_1^2) = 1$.

Then,

$$E = E(\min\{(itx/\sqrt{n})^2, (itx/\sqrt{n})^3\}) = o(t^2/n),$$

or $\frac{E}{t^2/n} \rightarrow 0$ as $t^2/n \rightarrow 0$. This is because

$$E = \frac{t^2}{n} E(\min(X^2, t/\sqrt{n}X^3)) \xrightarrow{t^2/n \rightarrow 0} 0,$$

by DCT.

Hence,

$$\phi_{X_1}(t/\sqrt{n})^n = (1 - t^2/2n + o(t^2/n))^n.$$

We show that

$$(1 - t^2/2n + o(t^2/n))^n \rightarrow e^{-t^2/2}.$$

More generally, we show that if $c_n \rightarrow c$, then $(1 + c_n/n)^n \rightarrow e^c$.

Lemma 16.2

Suppose we have complex numbers $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$ with $|z_i| |w_i| \leq \theta$. Then

$$\left| \prod_{i=1}^n z_i - \prod_{i=1}^n w_i \right| \leq \theta^{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i - w_i|.$$

Proof. We use telescoping.

$$\prod z_i - \prod w_i = \prod_{i=1}^n z_i - \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} z_i w_n + \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} z_i w_n - \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} z_i w_{n-1} w_n + \dots - \prod_{i=1}^n w_i.$$

Then, using the triangle inequality and summing the bound gives that

$$\left| \prod z_i - \prod w_i \right| \leq \theta^{n-1} \sum |z_i - w_i|.$$

□

We first bound

$$|(1 + c_n/n)^n - e^{c_n}|.$$

The whole thing is the same as $|(1 + c_n/n)^n - (e^{c_n/n})^n|$. Note that $e^x \geq 1 + x$ for real x and $|e^x - (1 + x)| \leq |x|^2$ for complex x .

Note that $1 + |c_n/n| \leq e^{|c_n/n|} = \theta$, so the error is bounded by

$$n e^{|c_n/n|(n-1)} |e^{c_n/n} - (1 + c_n/n)| \leq e^{|c_n/n|(n-1)} |c_n|^2/n,$$

and it follows that $(1 + c_n/n)^n \rightarrow e^c$. □

§16.2 Lindeberg-Feller CLT**Theorem 29** (Lindeberg-Feller)

We prove CLT for a triangular array of random variables. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{11} \\ &X_{21}, X_{22} \\ &\dots \\ &X_{n1}, X_{n2}, \dots, X_{nn} \end{aligned}$$

independent. We suppose that $EX_{ni} = 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n EX_{ni}^2 \rightarrow 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n E(X_{ni}^2, 1(|X_{ni}| > \epsilon)) \rightarrow 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ni}$. We show that $S_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Example 16.3

For the previous example, we had X_1, X_2, \dots and $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. We take $X_{ni} = X_i/\sqrt{n}$. We know that $EX_{ni} = 0$ and $E(X_{ni}^2) = \frac{1}{n}$, so $\sum EX_{ni}^2 = 1$.

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E(X_{ni}^2, 1(|X_{ni}| > \epsilon)) = nE(X_{n1}^2, 1(|X_{n1}| > \epsilon)) = E(X_1^2, 1(|X_1| > \epsilon\sqrt{n})) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Note that $\phi_{S_n}(t) = \prod \phi_{X_{ni}}(t)$. Let $EX_{ni}^2 = \sigma_{ni}^2$. We have that $\sum \sigma_{ni}^2 = 1$. We want to show that $\phi_{S_n}(t) \rightarrow e^{-t^2/2}$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{X_{ni}}(t) - (1 - \sigma_{ni}^2 t^2/2)| &\leq E(\min(t^2 X_{ni}^2, t^3 X_{ni}^3)) \\ &\leq E(t^2 X_{ni}^2 1_{|X_{ni}| > \epsilon}) + E(t^3 X_{ni}^3 1_{|X_{ni}| < \epsilon}) \\ &\leq E(t^2 X_{ni}^2 1_{|X_{ni}| > \epsilon}) + \epsilon t^3 E(X_{ni}^2 1_{|X_{ni}| < \epsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

If we sum the left and take limits, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E_{ni} \leq 0 + \epsilon t^3 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty, \epsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Now, from the previous lemma, note that $|\phi_{ni}(t)| \leq 1$. We also have $|1 - \sigma_{ni}^2 t^2/2| \leq 1$, since $\sup \sigma_{ni}^2 \rightarrow 0$. This is because

$$\sigma_{ni}^2 = EX_{ni}^2 = E(X_{ni}^2 | |X_{ni}| < \epsilon) + E(X_{ni}^2 | |X_{ni}| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence,

$$\left| \prod \phi_{ni}(t) - \prod (1 - \sigma_{ni}^2 t^2/2) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Finally,

$$\log \left(\prod (1 - \sigma_{ni}^2 t^2/2) \right) = \sum \log(1 - \sigma_{ni}^2 t^2/2) \approx - \sum \sigma_{ni}^2 t^2/2 \rightarrow -t^2/2,$$

so

$$\phi_{S_n}(t) \rightarrow e^{-t^2/2}.$$

□

§16.3 Kolmogorov Three-Series Theorem

Theorem 30 (Kolmogorov Three-Series)

Let X_1, \dots, X_i, \dots be independent and $\sum_{i=1}^n$ converges almost surely. The above and the following are equivalent. For $A > 0$,

1. $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P(|X_i| > A) < \infty$.
2. Where $\bar{X}_i = X_i 1_{(|X_i| < A)}$, $\sum_{i=1}^n E\bar{X}_i$ converges.
3. $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Var}(\bar{X}_i) < \infty$.

Proof. We first prove the converse. It suffices to show that $\sum \bar{X}_i$ converges almost surely, since $\sum \bar{X}_i$ converges is equivalent to $\sum X_i$ converging by BC.

By the Kolmogorov Maximal Inequality, $\sum \text{Var} < \infty$ implies converges of centered independent random variables, so $\sum \bar{X}_i - E(\bar{X}_i)$ converges and $\sum E(\bar{X}_i)$ converges by assumption, so $\sum \bar{X}_i$ converges.

Now, we prove the forward direction. The first condition is easy since by BC, $|X_i| < A$ eventually, so $\sum P(|X_i| > A) < \infty$. We now prove $\sum \text{Var}(\bar{X}_i) < \infty$. Suppose not: let $c_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\bar{X}_i)$. Then $c_n \rightarrow \infty$. Define $\bar{X}_{ni} = \frac{\bar{X}_i - E\bar{X}_i}{\sqrt{c_n}}$. Note that $E\bar{X}_{ni} = 0$, $\sum_{i=1}^n E\bar{X}_{ni}^2 = 1$. Finally, for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sum E(\bar{X}_{ni}^2, 1_{(|X_{ni}| > \epsilon)}) \rightarrow 0,$$

since $\overline{X_{ni}} > \epsilon$ implies that $\overline{X_i} - E\overline{X_i} > \epsilon\sqrt{c_n}$. By Lin-Fell CLT,

$$\sum \frac{\overline{X_i} - E\overline{X_i}}{\sqrt{c_n}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

But by hypothesis, $\sum \overline{X_i}$ converges almost surely, so

$$\sum \overline{X_i}/\sqrt{c_n} \rightarrow 0,$$

which is a contradiction.

Hence, $\sum \text{Var}(\overline{X_i}) < \infty$. By KMI, $\sum \overline{X_i} - E\overline{X_i}$ converges, so $\sum E\overline{X_i}$ converges, giving 2. \square

§17 October 22nd, 2020

§17.1 CLT with Unbounded Variance

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be iid symmetric random variables, and $P(|X_i| > x) = \frac{1}{x^2}$ for all $x > 1$. Then

$$E(X^2) = \int 2xP(|X| > x) = \int 2/x = \infty.$$

We will handle this by using truncation, applying BC, and using CLT for truncated variables. We want to truncate at the smallest possible level so that BC can still be applied.

Define $X_i^n = X_i 1(|X_i| \leq \sqrt{n} \log \log n)$ for $i \leq n$. Then,

$$P(X_1 + \dots + X_n \neq X_1^n + X_2^n + \dots + X_n^n) \leq \frac{n}{(\sqrt{n} \log \log n)^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

By symmetry, $EX_i^n = 0$. Then

$$E((X_i^n)^2) \leq \int_1^{\sqrt{n} \log \log n} 2xP(|X| > x) = \int_1^{\sqrt{n} \log \log n} \frac{2}{x} = \log(n(\log \log n)^2) = \log n + 2 \log \log \log n.$$

We can also lower bound it by approximately $\log n$, so $E((X_1^n)^2) = \log n + o(\log n)$. Using LF CLT, take

$$\frac{X_1^n}{\sqrt{n \log n}}, \frac{X_2^n}{\sqrt{n \log n}}, \dots, \frac{X_n^n}{\sqrt{n \log n}}.$$

We show the sum of variances to a limit, and contributions from large variances add up asymptotically to 0.

Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(\overline{X_{n,i}}) = n \frac{\log n + o(\log n)}{n \log n} \rightarrow 1.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E(\overline{X_{n,i}}^2, |\overline{X_{n,i}}| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0,$$

since

$$\frac{X_i 1(|X_i| \leq \sqrt{n} \log \log n)}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \leq \frac{\log \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}} < \epsilon$$

for large n .

By LF, $\frac{\overline{S_n}}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$, and by BC it follows that $\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$.

§17.2 General Theory of Distributions

We have a separable metric space (S, d) and we define distributions convergence in this context.

Definition 17.1. $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ if $Ef(X_n) \rightarrow Ef(X)$ for any bounded continuous function f .

Theorem 31 (Equivalent Conditions for Convergence)

The following are equivalent.

1. $Ef(X_n) \rightarrow Ef(X)$ for all bounded continuous f .
2. For closed K , $\limsup P(X_n \in K) \leq P(X \in K)$.
3. For open U , $\liminf P(X_n \in U) \geq P(X \in U)$.
4. For A with $P(\partial A) = 0$, $P(X_n \in A) \rightarrow P(A)$.
5. If f is a bounded measurable function and D_f denotes the discontinuity points of f , if $P(X \in D_f) = 0$, then $Ef(X_n) \rightarrow Ef(X)$.

Remark: We have not stated a Skorokhod Representation Theorem.

Proof. We only show 4 implies 5, the rest are trivial. Suppose $|f(x)| \leq K$. Divide $[-K, K]$ into intervals of size ϵ , and call them I_i . Let $A_i = f^{-1}(I_i)$. It suffices to show that $P(X_n \in A_i) \rightarrow P(X \in A_i)$. Note that $\partial A_i \subset D_f \cap f^{-1}(i\epsilon) \cup f^{-1}((i+1)\epsilon)$. Then, we choose the partition so that the boundary points have 0 mass (which is possible since the set of boundary points with positive mass is countable). Hence, the boundary probability is 0 and the result follows. \square

§17.3 Convergence in \mathbb{R}^d

We can talk about distribution functions $F(X) \uparrow 1$ as $X \uparrow \infty$ and $F(X) \downarrow 0$ with $X \downarrow -\infty$ that are right continuous and monotone. We also require that all rectangles have positive mass.

Then, we define weak convergence as $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ for all continuity points of X . In $d = 1$, there were at most countably many discontinuity points. In $d > 1$, this is false. For example, take $Y = U[0, 1]$, $X = 0$ and $(0, Y)$. The distribution function is given by

$$F(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \geq 0, y \geq 1 \\ y, & x \geq 0, 0 \leq y \leq 1, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

which is discontinuous at each $(0, y)$.

Exercise 17.2. For each coordinate, the discontinuity points for each coordinate D_i is countable.

Theorem 32

$F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ at continuity points is equivalent to $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution.

Proof. If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution, then $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ and x is a continuity point, since if x is a continuity point, the hyperplane passing through x has mass 0 so $P(X \in \partial A) = 0$ so $P(X_n \in A) \rightarrow P(X \in A)$, and by definition, this is $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$.

If $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ for all continuity points, then given $A = (a_1 \times b_1] \times \cdots \times (a_d \times b_d]$, then $P(X_n \in A) \rightarrow P(X \in A)$. Observing that any open set can be approximated from the inside by a disjoint union of such rectangles, we find that $\liminf P(X_n \in U) \geq \lim P(X_n \in B) = P(X \in B) \approx P(X \in U)$. \square

§18 October 27th, 2020

§18.1 Fourier Inversion in \mathbb{R}^d

For a distribution F on \mathbb{R}^d with $X \sim F$,

$$\phi_X(t) = E(e^{i\langle t, x \rangle}),$$

where

$$\langle t, x \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d t_i x_i.$$

We can show the inversion theorem generalizes: take $A = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \times \cdots \times [a_d, b_d]$. Suppose $P(\partial A) = 0$.

In 1D, recall that we had

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} \mu(a, b) + \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{a, b\}).$$

Let $t = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_d)$. Then

$$(2\pi)^{-d} \int_{-T, T}^d \prod_{i=1}^d \psi(t_i, a_i, b_i) \phi(t_i) \rightarrow \mu(A),$$

where $\psi(t, a, b) = \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it}$. The result follows from applying Fubini's theorem to get

$$\int \prod_{i=1}^d \int_{-T}^T \psi(t_i, a_i, b_i) e^{it_i x_i},$$

and $\int_{-T}^T \psi(t_i, a_i, b_i) e^{it_i x_i} \rightarrow 1(X_i \in (a_i, b_i)) + 1/2 1(X_i \in \{a_i, b_i\})$.

It follows that

$$\int \prod_{i=1}^d \int_{-T}^T \psi(t_i, a_i, b_i) e^{it_i x_i} \rightarrow \mu(A^\circ) = \mu(A).$$

§18.2 Convergence of Characters

Theorem 33

$X_n \Rightarrow X_\infty$ if and only if $\phi_{X_n} \rightarrow \phi_{X_\infty}$.

Proof. The forward direction follows from the definition of bounded continuous functions converging. For the converse, we show that $\phi_{X_n} \rightarrow \phi_{X_\infty}$ implies tightness, which implies existence of subsequential limits, which implies that every subsequential limit has characteristic function ϕ_{X_∞} , which by inversion implies that the limit is unique. We already have continuity at 0. Note that $X_n = (X_n^1, \dots, X_n^d)$, $X_\infty = (X_\infty^1, \dots, X_\infty^d)$. We have that $\phi_{X_n^i}(t) \rightarrow \phi_{X_\infty^i}(t)$. It follows that each of $\{X_n^i\}_n$ are tight sequences.

By tightness, there exists $P(X_n^i \in [-M_i, M_i]^c) < \frac{\epsilon}{d}$. Then,

$$P(X_n \in (\times [-M_i, M_i]^c)^c) \leq \epsilon,$$

so X_n is tight, as desired. \square

Proposition 18.1

$X_n \Rightarrow X_\infty$ if and only if $\langle \theta, X_n \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \theta, X_\infty \rangle$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. We could use the continuous mapping theorem or characteristic functions. We could also use characteristic functions. We know that $\phi_{X_n}(t\theta) \rightarrow \phi_{X_\infty}(t\theta)$, but note that $\phi_{X_n}(t\theta) = \phi_{\theta \cdot X_n}(t) \rightarrow \phi_{\theta \cdot X_\infty}(t)$. The other direction is clear taking $\phi_{\theta \cdot X_n}(1) = \phi_{X_n}(\theta) \rightarrow \phi_{X_\infty}(\theta)$. \square

§18.3 Multivariate Central Limit Theorem

Definition 18.2. X is said to have multivariate Gaussian distribution with covariance Σ and mean 0 if

$$\phi_X(\theta) = e^{\theta^T \Sigma \theta / 2}.$$

Theorem 34 (Multivariate CLT)

If X_1, \dots are iid random vectors with mean 0 covariance Σ , then

$$\frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma).$$

Proof. The proof follows from using 1D CLT and using the lemma above. \square

§18.4 Poisson Processes**Theorem 35**

Suppose we had a triangular array $\{X_n^i\}$ with $X_{i,n} \sim \text{Ber}(P_{n,i})$ where $\sum_{i=1}^n P_{n,i} \rightarrow \lambda$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} P_{n,i} \rightarrow 0$. Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n X_n^i \xrightarrow{d} \text{Poi}(\lambda)$$

where $P(X = k) = e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k / k!$.

Proof. The characteristic function for a Poisson variable is

$$\phi_X(t) = \sum e^{itx} e^{-\lambda} \lambda^k / k! = e^{-\lambda} \sum (e^{it} \lambda)^k / k! = e^{-\lambda} e^{e^{it} \lambda} = e^{\lambda(e^{it} - 1)}.$$

The characteristic function of $\text{Ber}(P_{ni})$ is

$$\phi(t) = 1 - P_{ni} + P_{ni} e^{it} = 1 + P_{ni}(e^{it} - 1).$$

Then,

$$\phi_{X_1^n + \dots + X_n^n}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + P_{ni}(e^{it} - 1)) = A.$$

If we compute $e^{\sum P_{ni}(e^{it} - 1)} = B$.

We find that

$$|A - B| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n P_{ni} |e^{it} - 1|^2 \leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^n P_{ni}^2 \leq 4 \max P_{ni} \sum P_{ni} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then $e^{\sum P_{ni}(e^{it} - 1)} \rightarrow e^{\lambda(e^{it} - 1)} = \phi_{\text{Poi}(\lambda)}(t)$. \square

§18.5 Signed Measures

Definition 18.3. In a space (Ω, Σ) , we have $\mu : \Sigma \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ so that $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ and if $A = \bigcup E_i$ disjoint, then either $\mu(A) = \infty$ or $\mu(A) < \infty$. In the first case $\sum \mu(E_i)_- < \infty$ and $\sum \mu(E_i)_+ = \infty$. In the second case, we need $\sum |\mu(E_i)| < \infty$, which implies that $\sum \mu(E_i) = \mu(A)$ is well-defined.

Example 18.4

If μ_1, μ_2 are finite measures, then $\mu_1 - \mu_2$ is a signed measure.

Example 18.5

In (Ω, Σ, μ) f is a measurable function with $\int f_- < \infty$ and $\int f_+ = \infty$, then $\nu(A) = \int_A f$ is a signed measure.

Definition 18.6. A set $A \in \Sigma$ is positive if for all $B \subset A$ $\mu(B) \geq 0$.

Lemma 18.7

If A_1, A_2, \dots are positive then so is $\bigcup A_i$.

Theorem 36 (Hahn Decomposition Theorem)

Given signed measures, there exists A, B so that A is negative, B is positive, A, B disjoint and

$$\mu(E) = \mu(E \cap A) + \mu(E \cap B).$$

Lemma 18.8

Suppose C is such that $\mu(C) < 0$. Then there exists $D \subset C$ with $\mu(D) < 0$.

§19 October 29th, 2020

§19.1 Decomposition Theorems

Definition 19.1. A set S is a null set if all its measurable subsets have 0 measure.

Lemma 19.2

Suppose C is such that $\mu(C) < 0$. Then there exists $D \subset C$ with $\mu(D) < 0$.

Proof. We iteratively throw out sets with positive mass. If S is negative, we are done. Otherwise, there are sets of positive mass. Let n_1 be the smallest integer such that there exists E_1 with $\mu(E_1) \geq \frac{1}{n_1}$. Then, consider $S \setminus E_1$ and repeat.

If the process stops in finite steps, we are done, since $S \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2 \cup \dots \cup E_k)$ is a negative set for some k . If not, let $S' = S \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$. Because μ is a signed measure,

$$\mu(S) = \mu(S') + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i).$$

Note that $\mu(S) < 0$ and $\mu(S') < 0$, so we must have $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i) < \infty$. Then S' must be negative. If not, there exists $F \subset S'$ with $\mu(F) > 1/N$ for some N . But after some i_0 , $\mu(E_i) < \frac{1}{n}$, so we would have thrown away F instead of the E_i , a contradiction. \square

Now we prove the Hahn Decomposition Theorem:

Proof. If there does not exist any set S with negative measure, we are done. If not, there exist negative sets. Let $\alpha = \inf\{\mu(C) : C \text{ negative}\}$. Let C_1, C_2, \dots be increasing negative sets with $\mu(C_i) \downarrow \alpha$. We have shown that $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} C_i$ is negative. Then $\mu(B) \geq \alpha$ since α is the infimum. However, $\mu(B) \leq \mu(C_i)$ for all i , so $\mu(B) \leq \alpha$, which implies that $\mu(B) = \alpha$.

We claim that B^c is positive. If not, it contains a set with $\mu(D) < 0$, which implies there exists $E \subset D$ with $\mu(E) < 0$ and E is a negative set. Hence $B \cup E$ is a negative set with $\mu(B \cup E) < \alpha$, a contradiction.

The composition is then $\Omega = B \cup B^c$. Suppose there is a set $C \cup C^c$ with C negative and C^c positive. Then $C \cap B^c$ is both negative and positive so it is a null set. Similarly, $C^c \cap B$ is a null set. \square

Definition 19.3. Measures μ, ν are mutually singular if there is a set A with $\mu(A) = 0$ and $\nu(A^c) = 0$.

Theorem 37 (Jordan Decomposition)

For α a signed measure, there exists mutually singular measures α^+ and α^- such that $\alpha = \alpha^+ - \alpha^-$.

Proof. We take $\alpha^+ = \alpha|_{B^c}$ and $\alpha^- = -\alpha|_B$ where $\Omega = B \cup B^c$ is the Hahn Decomposition. In this case α^+ and α^- are unique, since null sets are measure 0 and don't change the value of the measures. \square

Theorem 38 (Lebesgue Decomposition Theorem)

If μ_1, μ_2 are finite measures, then $\mu_2 = \mu_2^a + \mu_2^s$ such that there exists $g \geq 0$ with $\mu_2^a(E) = \int_E g d\mu_1$ and μ_2^s is singular with respect to μ_1 .

Proof. We extract μ_2^a from μ_2 . Then, consider $\mathcal{H} = \{h : h \geq 0, \int h d\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(E), E \in \Sigma\}$. We want g is to be the maximal element of h . Note that if $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ then $h_1 \vee h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. If we take $A : \{h_1 > h_2\}$, then

$$\int_E h_1 \vee h_2 d\mu_1 = \int_{E \cap A} h_1 d\mu_1 + \int_{E \cap A^c} h_2 d\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(E \cap A) + \mu_2(E \cap A^c) = \mu_2(E).$$

Let $\alpha = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \int h d\mu_1$. Let $\{h_i\}$ be so that $\int h_i d\mu_1 \uparrow \alpha$. Then $g = \lim h_i$ is well defined since h_i are increasing and

$$\int_E g d\mu_1 = \lim \int_E h_i d\mu_1 \leq \mu_2(E).$$

Hence, $g \in \mathcal{H}$ and by MCT, $\int g = \alpha$.

Define $\mu_2^a(E) = \int_E g d\mu_1$. It suffices to show that $\mu_2' = \mu_2 - \mu_2^a$ is singular with respect to μ_1 .

Consider the signed measure $\mu_2' - \epsilon\mu_1$ and consider the positive and negative part A_ϵ, B_ϵ . If $\mu_1(A_\epsilon) > 0$ then $g + \epsilon 1_{A_\epsilon} \in \mathcal{H}$ since

$$\int g + \epsilon 1_{A_\epsilon} d\mu_1 = \mu_2^a(E) + \epsilon\mu_1(A_\epsilon) \leq \mu_2^a(E) + \mu_2'(E) = \mu_2(E).$$

However,

$$\int g + \epsilon 1_{A_\epsilon} d\mu_1 = \alpha + \epsilon\mu_1(A_\epsilon) > \alpha,$$

a contradiction.

For any ϵ , the positive part of $\mu_2' - \epsilon\mu_1$, A_ϵ has 0 μ_1 -mass. Where B_ϵ is the negative part, take $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_{1/n}$ and $B = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} B_{1/n}$. We claim that $\mu_2'(B) = 0$. If $\mu_2'(B) > 0$, then $\mu_2'(B) - \epsilon\mu_1(B) > 0$ for some small ϵ , but B is contained in the negative set B_ϵ .

The uniqueness is easy to show. \square

Definition 19.4. μ_2 is said to be absolutely continuous with respect to μ_1 (denoted $\mu_2 \ll \mu_1$) if for any A with $\mu_1(A) = 0$, $\mu_2(A) = 0$.

Theorem 39 (Radon-Nikodym Theorem)

Suppose μ, ν are σ -finite measures and ν is absolutely continuous with respect to μ , then there is a $h \geq 0$, so that $\nu(E) = \int_E h d\mu$.

Proof. By the Lebesgue decomposition, $\mu_2 = \mu_2^a + \mu_2^s$, but $\mu_2 \ll \mu_1$, $\mu_2^s = 0$. It's easy to check the uniqueness of h almost surely. \square

§19.2 Conditional Expectation

Definition 19.5. Suppose we have (Ω, Σ, P) and a random measurable variable X with $E|X| < \infty$. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \Sigma$, another σ -algebra. We define $E(X|\mathcal{F})$ as an \mathcal{F} measurable function with the property that for all $S \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\int_S E(X|\mathcal{F}) d\mu = \int_S X d\mu.$$

Lemma 19.6

$|E(X|\mathcal{F})|$ is in L^1 .

Proof. Let $A = \{E(X|F) > 0\} \in F$. Then

$$\int |E(X|F)| = \int_A E(X|F) - \int_{A^c} E(X|F) = \int_A X - \int_{A^c} X \leq \int |X|.$$

□

We first address **existence**. Assume $X \geq 0$. Define a measure μ' on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) where $\mu'(E) = \int_E X d\mu_1$. We have that μ' is a measure on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . It is easy to check that $\mu' \ll \mu_1$. By RN, there exists g measurable with $\mu'(E) = \int_E g d\mu_1$. The theorem also shows uniqueness almost surely, so we define $E(X|F) = g$.

Now we handle uniqueness. Suppose h_1, h_2 are two versions of $E(X|F)$. Then

$$\int_E h_1 = \int_E h_2 = \int_E X$$

and $\int h_1 - h_2 = 0$, so $h_1 = h_2$ almost surely.

Some facts about conditional expectations:

- Suppose $B \in F$ and $X_1 = X_2$ on B . Then $E(X_1|F) = E(X_2|F)$ almost surely on B .
- Linearity: $X, Y \in \Sigma$, then $E(aY + bY|F) = aE(X|F) + bE(Y|F)$ almost surely.
- Monotonicity: $X \leq Y$ implies that $E(X|F) \leq E(Y|F)$ almost surely.
- $X_n \geq 0$ and $X_n \uparrow X$, $E(X) < \infty$ then $E(X_n|F) \uparrow E(X|F)$. Then, we adapt the proof of MCT to prove this.

§20 November 3rd, 2020

§20.1 Properties of Conditional Expectations

We have a mapping $(\Omega, \Sigma, P) \xrightarrow{X} (\mathbb{R}, B(\mathbb{R}))$, and a subsigma algebra \mathcal{F} so that $E(X|\mathcal{F})$ is the \mathcal{F} -measurable function such that

$$\int E(X|\mathcal{F}) = \int_A X$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

Remark 20.1. In a sense, this corresponds to the maximum information of X given the subsigma algebra \mathcal{F} .

Exercise 20.2. State and prove versions of Fatou's Lemma, MCT, and DCT for conditional expectation.

Theorem 40 (Jensen's Inequality)

Let ϕ be a convex function and X a random variable so that $E|X|, E|\phi(X)| < \infty$. Then

$$\phi(E(X|\mathcal{F})) \geq \phi(E(X|\mathcal{G})) \text{ almost surely.}$$

Theorem 41 (Tower Property)

Given $\mathcal{G}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_2 \subset \Sigma$,

$$E(E(X|\mathcal{G}_2)|\mathcal{G}_1) = E(X|\mathcal{G}_1) \text{ almost surely.}$$

Proof. For $A \in \mathcal{G}_1$,

$$\int_A E(E(X|\mathcal{G}_2)|\mathcal{G}_1) = \int_A E(X|\mathcal{G}_2) = \int_A X = \int_A E(X|\mathcal{G}_1).$$

□

Theorem 42

For $\mathcal{G} \subset \Sigma$, X is a random variable that is independent of \mathcal{G} , which means that \mathcal{G} and $\Sigma(X)$ are independent as subsigma algebras of Σ . Then

$$E(X|\mathcal{G}) = E(X), \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. For two random variables Y, S independent, $E(YZ) = E(Y)E(Z)$. Then

$$\int_A E(X|\mathcal{G}) = \int_A X = \int X 1_A = E(X)P(A) = \int_A E(X).$$

□

Theorem 43

Suppose X, Y are random variables with Y \mathcal{G} -measurable with $E|X| < \infty$ and $E|XY| < \infty$. Then $E(XY|G) = YE(X|G)$.

Proof. Take $Y = 1_B$ with $B \in \mathcal{G}$. Then $E(X1_B|G) = 1_BE(X|G)$. Then

$$\int_A E(X1_B|G) = \int_A X1_B = \int_{A \cap B} X = \int_A E(X|G)1_B.$$

□

Theorem 44

Suppose $X \in L^2$. If we take $\mathcal{G} \subset \Sigma$ and Y to be a G measurable function in L^2 . Then $E((X - Y)^2) \geq E((X - E(X|G))^2)$.

Remark 20.3. The geometric interpretation of this result is that $E(X|G)$ is the projection of X onto $L^2(\mathcal{G})$.

§20.2 Regular Conditional Probabilities

We will call $P(A|\mathcal{G}) = E(1_A|\mathcal{G})$. For any A_1, A_2, \dots disjoint,

$$P\left(\bigcup A_i|\mathcal{G}\right) = \sum P(A_i|\mathcal{G}), a.s.$$

by applying *MCT* for conditionals to the function $\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{A_i}$. However, one can face issues to ensure the almost surely condition holds simultaneously for all such families of sets. This is because the nullsets can depend on the set system $\{A_i\}$, which means for no $\omega \in \Omega$, we can expect $P(\bigcup A_i|\mathcal{G}) = \sum_{i=1}^n P(A_i|\mathcal{G})$ for all sets A_i .

Definition 20.4 (Regular Conditional Probability). . If we have $f : \Omega \times B(\mathbb{R})$, for all $A \in B(\mathbb{R})$,

$$f(\cdot, A) : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

is a version of $P(A|\mathcal{G})$ and almost surely, $f(\omega, \cdot)$ is a probability measure.

Remark 20.5. These only exist in the case of "nice spaces", namely Polish spaces. The key thing that make the construction possible is the separability.

§20.3 Martingales

We have a stochastic process $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n, \dots$ measurable random variables with $E|X_n| < \infty$ for all n .

Definition 20.6. A filtration is a sequence of Σ -algebras,

$$F_0 \subseteq F_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \Sigma.$$

We assume X_n is F_n -measurable. Since X_n is in L^1 , we discuss $E(X_n|F_m)$ for $m < n$. If $m \geq n$ then $E(X_n|F_m) = X_n$ almost surely.

Definition 20.7. A process H_1, H_2, \dots is predictable if H_n is F_{n-1} measurable.

Definition 20.8. Suppose $\{X_n\}$ is F_n adapted. Then X_n is a martingale if for all n , $E(X_n|F_{n-1}) = X_{n-1}$ almost surely.

Example 20.9 (Linear Martingale)

Suppose Z_i are all iid $Ber(\pm 1)$. Then $X_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$, $F_n = \sigma(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$.

$$E(X_n|F_{n-1}) = E(Z_n + X_{n-1}|F_{n-1}) = X_{n-1} + E(Z_n|F_{n-1}) = X_{n-1}.$$

Definition 20.10. A submartingale is when $E(X_n|F_{n-1}) \geq X_{n-1}$ almost surely, and a supermartingale is when $E(X_n|F_{n-1}) \leq X_{n-1}$ almost surely.

Example 20.11 (Exponential Martingale)

If X_n are iid, $E(X_n) = 1$. $M_n = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$ is a martingale.

Theorem 45

Given a martingale X_n , we can generate a new martingale using predictable processes. Suppose H_i predictable X_n is a martingale. Then

$$Y_n = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(X_n - X_{n-1})$$

is a martingale.

Proof. Note that Y_n is F_n -adapted since X_n, H_n are F_n -adapted. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y_n|F_{n-1}) &= E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} H_i(X_i - X_{i-1}) + H_n(X_n - X_{n-1})|F_{n-1}\right) \\ &= Y_{n-1} + E(H_n(X_n - X_{n-1})|F_{n-1}) \\ &= Y_{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

§21 November 5th, 2020

§21.1 Martingales, Continued

Recall the setting: we have a filtration $\mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$ and X_n adapted to (\mathcal{F}_n) in L^1 if $E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = X_{n-1}$ almost surely. We can extend this to $E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_m) = X_m$ for $m \leq n$ by iteratively using the tower property.

Example 21.1

A simple random walk $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where X_i are iid $Ber(\pm 1)$, is a martingale. If we change $X_i \sim Ber(p)$, then it becomes a submartingale because the mean of each entry is strictly positive.

§21.2 Predictable Sequences

Definition 21.2. A sequence $H_n \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ is called predictable.

Given a martingale sequence X_n and a predictable process H_n , we showed that the process $M_n = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(X_i - X_{i-1})$ was a martingale, where $M_0 = 0$.

Proposition 21.3

Suppose X_n is a submartingale. Define $M_n = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(X_i - X_{i-1})$. If $H_n \geq 0$ and is predictable, then M_n is a submartingale.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} E(M_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) &= M_{n-1} + E(H_n(X_n - X_{n-1}) | \mathcal{F}_n) \\ &= M_{n-1} + H_n E(X_n - X_{n-1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \\ &\geq M_{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

§21.3 Stopping Times

Definition 21.4. A stopping time τ is a random variable from $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$ such that the event $\{\tau \leq n\}$ is \mathcal{F}_n measurable.

Remark 21.5. Given the filtration, then we should be able to consider the information up to time n to determine whether $\{\tau \leq n\}$ is measurable.

Example 21.6

Consider the symmetric random walk $S_n = \sum X_i$ which are iid $Ber(\pm 1)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$. We can pick the stopping time τ_0 as the minimum time so that $S_n = 0$.

In general, if we look at the last hitting time: $\hat{\tau}$, the max n so that $S_n = 0$ is not a stopping time since we would need to consider all the noise in the future as well.

Theorem 46

Suppose X_n is a martingale and τ is a stopping time. The process $Z_n = X_{n \wedge \tau}$ is a martingale.

Proof. The strategy is to show that Z_n is a transform of X_n . To do this, we have to construct a predictable process H_n such that $(H \cdot X) = Z$. Define $H_n = 1_{\{\tau \geq n\}}$.

Then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n H_i(X_i - X_{i-1}) = X_{n \wedge \tau} - X_0.$$

H_i is predictable since τ is a stopping time, and $H_i = 1_{Z \geq i} = 1 - 1_{\{Z \leq i-1\}}$, which is \mathcal{F}_{i-1} measurable. Hence X_n is a martingale so $X_{n \wedge \tau} - M_0$ is a martingale, so $X_{n \wedge \tau}$ is a martingale. \square

Remark 21.7. Observe that the same holds for submartingales and supermartingales.

§21.4 Expectation for Stopped Martingales**Lemma 21.8**

If $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$ almost surely for two stopping times, then $E(X_{n \wedge \tau_1}) \leq E(X_{n \wedge \tau_2})$ for a submartingale X_n .

Proof. It suffices to show that $E(X_{n \wedge \tau_1}) \leq E(X_n)$. If $\tau_1 \geq n$, the result is clear.

We saw that H is a predictable sequence and $M_n = X_{n \wedge \tau} - X_0 = (H \cdot X)$. Call $Z_n = (1 - H) \cdot X$, which is also a submartingale.

Then $Z_n + M_n = X_n - X_0$ is a submartingale, so $E(Z_n) \geq 0$ for all n . Finally,

$$E(Z_n) + E(M_n) = E(X_n) - E(X_0) \implies E(M_n) \leq E(X_n) - E(X_0)$$

but $E(M_n) = E(X_{n \wedge \tau}) - E(X_0)$, so it follows that $E(X_{n \wedge \tau}) \leq E(X_n)$.

Define $Z_n = X_{n \wedge \tau_2}$. We know that Z_n is a submartingale. Then $E(Z_{n \wedge \tau_1}) \leq E(Z_n) = E(X_{n \wedge \tau_2})$. \square

Remark 21.9. The same argument shows that if X_n is a martingale, then $E(X_{n \wedge \tau}) = E(X_n) = E(X_0)$ for all n and stopping times τ . However, it does not follow generally that $E(X_\tau) = E(X_0)$.

Example 21.10

Let $S_0 = 1$, $S_i = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^i X_j$, for $X_i \sim \text{Ber}(\pm 1)$. Take $\tau = \min\{n : S_n = 0\}$. One can show that $\tau < \infty$ almost surely. However, $S_0 = 1$, $ES_\tau = 0$.

§21.5 Convex Functions and Martingales

The following theorem will prove to be useful.

Theorem 47

Suppose ϕ is a convex function and X_n is a martingale. Then $\phi(X_n)$ is a submartingale.

Proof. This follows from the conditional Jensen's inequality.

$$E(\phi(X_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}) \geq \phi(E(X_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1})) = \phi(X_{n-1}).$$

The above also works in X_n is a submartingale and ϕ is increasing as well. \square

We often choose $\phi(X) = X^+$ or $\phi(X) = (X - a)^+$.

Theorem 48 (Doob's Maximal Inequality)

Suppose X_n is a submartingale, Then for any $a > 0$,

$$P(\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} X_k \geq a) \leq \frac{E(X_n^+)}{a}.$$

Proof. Define τ to be the stopping time, $\{\inf_{0 \leq k \leq n} X_k \geq a\}$. We know that $X_{k \wedge \tau}$ is a submartingale so $E(X_{n \wedge \tau}) \leq E(X_n)$. The LHS can be decomposed in $E(X_{n \wedge \tau} 1_{\tau \leq n}) + E(X_{n \wedge \tau} 1_{\tau > n})$, and

$$E(X_{n \wedge \tau} 1_{\tau > n}) = E(X_n 1_{\tau > n}),$$

so it follows that

$$E(X_{n \wedge \tau} 1_{\tau \leq n}) \leq E(X_n) - E(X_n 1_{\tau > n}) = E(X_n 1_{\tau \leq n}) \leq E(X_n^+).$$

On the other hand,

$$E(X_{n \wedge \tau} 1_{\tau \leq n}) = E(X_\tau 1_{\tau \leq n}) \geq aP(\tau \leq n),$$

so it follows that

$$aP(\tau \leq n) \leq E(X_n^+),$$

which gives the result. \square

Remark 21.11. Recall the Kolmogorov Maximal Inequality, X_i are iid mean 0, $EX_i^2 < \infty$, $S_k = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i$. Then

$$P(\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} |S_k| \geq x) \leq \text{Var}(S_n)/x^2.$$

This is a corollary of Doob's by considering the submartingale $M_n = S_n^2$.

§22 November 10th, 2020

§22.1 Convergence of Martingales

Recall Doob's inequality: If X_n is a sub-martingale, then

$$P(\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} X_k > x) \leq E(X_n^+)/x.$$

We begin by proving the upcrossing inequality:

Theorem 49 (Upcrossing Inequality)

Suppose X_n is a sub-martingale. Pick $a \leq b$. Define $\tau_0 : \inf t : X_t \leq a$, $\tau_1 : \inf t \geq \tau_0, X_t \geq b, \dots$. Each of $\tau_0 \rightarrow \tau_1, \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3, \dots$ is an upcrossing. Let $N(a, b, n)$ be the number of crossings up to time n .

$$E(N(a, b, n)) \leq \frac{E((X_n - a)^+) - E((X_0 - a)^+)}{b - a}.$$

Proof. Consider the sub-martingale $M_n = (X_n - a)^+ + a$, since $f(x) = (x - a)^+ + a$ is convex and increasing.

Define the predictable process

$$H_k = 1_{\tau_0 < k \leq \tau_1} + 1_{\tau_2 < k \leq \tau_3} + \dots$$

We know that $H \cdot M$ is a sub-martingale. $M_n - M_0 = H \cdot M + (1 - H) \cdot M$ is a submartingale so

$$E(M_n - M_0) \geq E(H \cdot M).$$

We know that

$$E((X_n - a)^+ - E(X_0 - a)^+) \geq H \cdot M \geq (b - a)N(a, b, n) + \text{some correction.}$$

□

Theorem 50 (Martingale Convergence Theorem)

If X_n is a submartingale with $\sup E X_n^+ < \infty$, then as $n \rightarrow \infty$, X_n converges almost surely to a limit X with $E|X| < \infty$.

Proof. Fix $a < b$. Then

$$E(N(a, b, n)) \leq \frac{E((X_n - a)^+)}{b - a} \leq \frac{E(X_n^+ + |a|)}{b - a}.$$

Then $E(N(a, b, \infty)) < \infty$ since $E(X^+) < \infty$ uniformly in n . Now, choosing $a < b \in \mathbb{Q}$, one can ensure almost surely that

$$N(q_1, q_2, \infty) < \infty$$

for all $q_1 < q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$. It follows that

$$\bigcap_{a, b \in \mathbb{Q}} \{N(a, b, \infty) < \infty\}$$

is probability 1, so it implies that X_n has a limit. We show that $\limsup X_n = \liminf X_n$. If not, one can find

$$\liminf X_1 < q_1 < q_2 < \limsup X_n.$$

This implies that we have infinitely many crossing between $\liminf X_n$ and $\limsup X_n$ and hence between q_1, q_2 , which is a contradiction.

Finally, we show $E|X| < \infty$. $EX^+ < \infty$ and $X_n \rightarrow X$ so $X_n^+ \rightarrow X^+$. By Fatou's Lemma, $EX^+ \leq \liminf E(X_n^+) < \infty$. Then,

$$\sup E(X_n^-) = \sup E(X_n^+) - E(X_n) \leq \sup E(X_n^+) - E(X_0) < \infty.$$

Using Fatou's lemma again shows that $EX_n^- < \infty$, so we have $E|X| < \infty$. \square

Corollary 22.1

If $X_n \geq 0$ is a supermartingale, then $X_n \rightarrow X$ almost surely so that $E|X| < \infty$.

Proof. $Y_n = -X_n$ is a sub-martingale and $Y_n^+ = 0$ so $EY_n^+ = 0$. Hence $\sup E(Y_n^+) < \infty$. The previous result shows that $Y_n \rightarrow Z \in L^1$ almost surely so $X_n \rightarrow -Z$. \square

§22.2 Martingales with Bounded Increments

Theorem 51

Suppose X_n is a martingale sequence satisfying $|X_n - X_{n-1}| < K$ almost surely for all n . Then, define

$$A = \{X_n \text{ converges}\}, B = \{\limsup X_n = \infty, \liminf X_n = -\infty\}.$$

Then $P(A \cup B) = 1$.

Proof. Let $\tau = \inf\{t : X_t \geq M\}$. WLOG take $X_0 = 0$, since $X_n - X_0$ is a martingale. Define $Y_n = X_{\tau \wedge n}$, which is a martingale. Then $Y_n^+ \leq M + K$ so $EY_n^+ \leq M + K$ for all n . By the Martingale Convergence Theorem, Y_n converges almost surely implies that X_n converges on the event $\tau = \infty$. Sending M to infinity,

$$\bigcap_{M=1}^{\infty} \{Y_n \text{ converges}\}.$$

It follows that X_n converges on the event $\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \{\tau_m = \infty\}$. Equivalently, $\limsup X_n < \infty$. On the event $\limsup X_n < \infty$, X_n converges. Because X_n is a martingale, we can work with $-X_n$ to conclude X_n converges on the event $\{\liminf X_n > -\infty\}$. So either X_n converges, or $\limsup X_n = \infty$ and $\liminf X_n = -\infty$. \square

§22.3 Lp inequalities

Theorem 52

If we have submartingale sequence X_n and $E|X_n|^p < \infty$ for $1 < p < \infty$ for all n then

$$E\left(\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} X_k^+\right)^p \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^p E((X_n^+)^p).$$

Remark 22.2. The statement is **false** for $p = 1$.

Proof. Let $Y_n = \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} X_k^+$. By Doob's Maximal inequality, $P(Y_n > \lambda) \leq E(X_n^+ 1_{Y_n > \lambda})/\lambda$, so it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y_n^p) &= \int p\lambda^{p-1}P(Y_n > \lambda)d\lambda \\ &\leq \int p\lambda^{p-2}E(X_n^+ 1_{Y_n > \lambda}) \\ &= \int p\lambda^{p-2} \int X_n^+ 1_{Y_n > \lambda} \\ &= p \int X_n^+ \int_0^{Y_n} \lambda^{p-2} \\ &= \frac{p}{p-1} \int X_n^+ (Y_n)^{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Holder's inequality,

$$E(Y_n^p) \leq \frac{p}{p-1} E(X_n^+ Y_n^{p-1}) \leq \frac{p}{p-1} E((X_n^+)^p)^{1/p} E(Y_n^p)^{(p-1)/p}.$$

Dividing by both sides,

$$E(Y_n^p) \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^p E((X_n^+)^p).$$

However, $E(Y_n^p)$ could be infinite. To fix this, one can show by truncation the same inequality holds for the truncated version,

$$E(|Y_n \wedge M|^p) \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^p E(X_n^+)^p.$$

Taking $M \rightarrow \infty$ and applying the monotone convergence theorem gives the result. \square

§23 November 12th, 2020

§23.1 Lp Inequalities, continued

Last time, we used Doob's Maximal Inequality to show that

$$E(|\max_{i \leq n} X_i^+|^p) \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^p E|X_n|^p.$$

Example 23.1 (Counterexample for $p = 1$)

Take a simple random walk with $S_0 = 1, S_1 = X_1, S_2 = X_1 + X_2$ where $X_i \sim \text{Ber}(\pm 1)$, iid. Let $\tau = \inf\{t : S_t = 0\}$. $S_{n \wedge \tau}$ is a non-negative martingale.

Then, $E(S_{n \wedge \tau}) = ES_0 = 1$. We will show that

$$P(\max_{i \leq n} S_{n \wedge \tau} > M) = \frac{1}{M},$$

so it follows that

$$E(\max_{i \leq n} S_{n \wedge \tau}) \approx \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \rightarrow \infty.$$

§23.2 L^p Convergence

Theorem 53

Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots is a martingale sequence with $\sup E(|X_n|^p) < \infty$. Then, there exists a random variable X so that $E|X_n - X|^p \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. $X_n \in L^p$ implies that $X_n \in L^1$ and $E(|X_n|)^p \leq E(|X_n|^p)$. So $\sup E|X_n| < \infty$ and By Fatou's lemma, $E|X|^p \leq \liminf E(|X_n|^p) < \infty$, so $X_n \rightarrow X$ almost surely by martingale convergence.

Using the L^p maximal inequality, $|X_k|$ is a submartingale so

$$E(\max_{k \leq n} |X_k|^p) \leq (p/(p-1))^p E(|X_n|^p).$$

Sending $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using MCT, it follows that

$$E(\sup |X_n|^p) < \infty.$$

Finally, $X_n \rightarrow X$ so $|X_n - X| \leq 2 \sup |X_n|$. It follows that $|X_n - X|^p \leq (2 \sup |X_n|)^p$ and using the dominated convergence theorem, it follows that $E|X_n - X|^p \rightarrow 0$. \square

Example 23.2

From our simple random walk from earlier, $S_{n \wedge \tau} \geq 0$ is a martingale so it converges. We can show that $S_{n \wedge \tau} \rightarrow 0$, since $S_{n \wedge \tau} \rightarrow X$ and $|S_{n+1 \wedge \tau} - S_{n \wedge \tau}| = 1$ unless $S_{n \wedge \tau} = 0$. But $ES_{n \wedge \tau} = 1$, so $S_{n \wedge \tau} \not\rightarrow 0$ in L^1 since that implies that $ES_{n \wedge \tau} \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 54 (Doob's Decomposition)

Suppose X_n is an \mathcal{F}_n adapted submartingale. Then, there exists a unique predictable non-negative process A_n with $A_0 = 0$ such that $X_n = M_n + A_n$ where M_n is an \mathcal{F}_n adapted martingale.

Example 23.3

Take $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$ where $Z_i \sim \text{Ber}(p)$. Note that $E(Z_i) = p$ so it is a submartingale. We know that $M_n = \sum Z_i - np$ is a martingale since $E(Z_i - p) = 0$. Then $S_n = M_n + np$. In this case $A_n = np$.

Proof. We have $X_n = M_n + A_n$, then $E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = M_{n-1} + A_n = X_{n-1} - A_{n-1} + A_n$. Hence,

$$E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) - X_{n-1} = E(X_n - X_{n-1} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = A_n - A_{n-1} \geq 0,$$

since X_n is a submartingale. Then, we have $A_0 = 0$ and

$$A_n = \sum_{m=1}^n E(X_m - X_{m-1} | \mathcal{F}_{m-1}).$$

A_n is predictable since it is \mathcal{F}_{n-1} measurable. Then, $M_n = X_n - A_n$. This is a martingale since

$$E(M_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) - A_n = X_{n-1} - A_{n-1} = M_{n-1}.$$

□

§23.3 L^1 Convergence, Uniform Integrability

Definition 23.4. X_n is said to be uniformly integrable if given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists M so that

$$E(|X_n| 1_{|X_n| > M}) < \epsilon.$$

Theorem 55

If X_n is a martingale, then the following are equivalent:

- X_n is UI.
- $X_n \rightarrow X$ almost surely and in L^1 for some X .
- $X_n = E(X | \mathcal{F}_n)$.

Proof. Uniform integrability implies that $\sup E|X_n| < \infty$. By the martingale convergence theorem, we have X so that $X_n \rightarrow X$ almost surely and $X \in L^1$. Convergence in L^1 was a homework problem(9.5b).

For 2 implies 3, we want to show that $X_n \rightarrow X$ as, L1 implies that $X_n = E(X | \mathcal{F}_n)$. It suffices to show that

$$\int_a AX_n = \int_A X$$

for $A \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Notice that $\int_A X_n = \int_A X_m$ for $m \geq n$ by the martingale property ($E(X_m | \mathcal{F}_n) = X_n$). It follows that

$$|E(X; A) - E(X_m; A)| \leq E(|X - X_m|; A) \leq E|X - X_m| \rightarrow 0.$$

For 3 implies 1, $X_n = E(X | \mathcal{F}_n)$ implies that X_n is a martingale since

$$E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = E(E(X | \mathcal{F}_n) | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = E(X | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = X_{n-1}.$$

This was a homework problem. □

Corollary 23.5

X is a random variable, then $X_n = E(X | \mathcal{F}_n)$ is a martingale. We know that $X_n \rightarrow Y$ almost surely and in L^1 . Let $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n)$. Then, $Y = E(X | \mathcal{F}_\infty)$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $E(X; A) = E(Y; A)$ for $A \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$. Instead, we show that $E(X; B) = E(Y; B)$ for all $B \in \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n$, and use the $\pi - \lambda$ theorem.

Take $B \in \mathcal{F}_n$. We know that $E(X; B) = E(X_n; B)$ since $X_n = E(X | \mathcal{F}_n)$ and $E(X_n; B) = E(X_m; B) \rightarrow E(Y; B)$ since $X_m \rightarrow Y$ in L^1 . □

§23.4 Optimal Stopping Theorems

We know that $E(X_0) = E(X_{n \wedge \tau})$ since it is a martingale. We want to find conditions so that $E(X_0) = E(X_\tau)$.

Lemma 23.6

If X_n is UI and τ is a stopping time, then $\overline{X_n} = X_{n \wedge \tau}$ is UI.

Proof. We start with

$$E(|\overline{X_n}| 1_{|\overline{X_n}| > M}) = E(|X_n| 1_{|X_n| > M} 1_{\tau > n}) + E(|X_\tau| 1_{|\overline{X_n}| > M}).$$

Observe that $|\overline{X_n}|$ is a submartingale so $E|\overline{X_n}| \leq E|X_n|$ since X_n is UI. Then

$$\sup E(|\overline{X_n}|) \leq \sup E(|X_n|) < \infty,$$

so it follows that $|\overline{X_n}| \rightarrow |X|$. It follows that both sets in above are sets of small probability. □

From the UI, we can show that $E(X_{n \wedge \tau}) \rightarrow E(X_\tau)$ and $E(X_{n \wedge \tau}) = E(X_0)$, so $E(X_\tau) = E(X_0)$, as desired.

Other conditions where OST holds:

- X_n is a martingale sequence and $X_n - X_{n-1}$ have the property that $|X_n - X_{n-1}| \leq B$ almost surely, and $E(\tau) < \infty$.

§24 November 17th, 2020

§24.1 More Optimal Stopping Conditions

Other conditions where OST holds:

- X_n is a martingale sequence and $X_n - X_{n-1}$ have the property that $|X_n - X_{n-1}| \leq B$ almost surely, and $E(\tau) < \infty$.
- X_n is a martingale sequence and $X_n - X_{n-1}$ have the property that $E(|X_n - X_{n-1}| | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) \leq B$ almost surely, and $E(\tau) < \infty$.

Proof. Suppose $X_0 = 0$. We note that $X_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - X_{i-1}$, so

$$X_{n \wedge \tau} = \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} X_i = X + i - 1 = \sum (X_i - X_{i-1}) 1_{(\tau > i-1)}.$$

Finally, $|X_{n \wedge \tau}| \leq \sum |X_i - X_{i-1}| 1_{\tau > i-1} = A$ and it follows that

$$\sum E(|X_i - X_{i-1}| 1_{\tau > i-1}) = \sum E(E(|X_i - X_{i-1}| 1_{\tau > i-1} | F_{i-1})) \leq \sum E(1_{\tau > i-1} B) = BE\tau,$$

□

Remark 24.1. The amount of information is somehow "encoded" in the moment of the martingale you take.

Corollary 24.2

Let $\tau = \tau_0$ and consider $S^* = \max_{i < \tau} S_i$. Then $ES^* = \infty$.

Proof. We can compute

$$P(S^* \geq n) = P_1(\tau_x < \tau_0) = \frac{1}{x-1+1} = \frac{1}{x}.$$

□

§24.2 Reverse Martingales

For standard X_0, X_1, \dots and a filtration \mathcal{F}_n so that $E(X_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = X_{n-1}$ almost surely.

Definition 24.3. We have $F_0 \supset F_1 \supset F_2 \dots$ and

$$E(X_i | F_{i+1}) = X_{i+1}$$

almost surely. We could also write it this as $E(X_0 | F_i)$ for a decreasing sequence of Σ algebras $F_0 \supset F_1 \supset \dots$

Lemma 24.4

If X_i is a reverse martingale, then there exists X with $X_i \rightarrow X$ almost surely, $X_i \rightarrow X$ in L^1 and $X = E(X_0 | F_\infty)$ where $F_\infty = \bigcap F_i$.

Proof. The proof in the forward direction used the upcrossing lemma: for any $q_1 < q_2$ rational, $\lim E(N(q_1, q_2, n)) < \infty$ if $\sup EX_n^+ < \infty$.

Fixing some n and going from $n \rightarrow 0$ gives a forward martingale. Then if $N'(q_1, q_2, n)$ is the crossing number,

$$E(N'(q_1, q_2, n)) \leq \frac{E(|X_0| + q_1)}{q_2 - q_1}.$$

Hence, $\lim E(N'(q_1, q_2, n)) < \infty$ almost surely for all $q_1 < q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$. It follows that X_i has a limit almost surely, which we will call X . For L^1 convergence, it suffices to show UI. Each $X_i = E(X_0 | F_i)$, so it follows that this is uniformly integrable.

Finally, $X = \lim X_i$ and hence $\cap F_i$ measurable. Take $B \in \mathcal{F}_\infty$. It suffices to show that

$$\int_B X = \int_B X_0,$$

which follows from the fact that $B \in \mathcal{F}_\infty \subset F_i$ for all i and $E(X_i; B) \rightarrow E(X; B)$. \square

§24.3 Applications of Reverse Martingales

Definition 24.5. Let $\mathcal{E}_n = \Sigma(A : A \text{ is invariant under permutation of the first } n \text{ coordinates})$. This means that for $\omega \in A$, we have $\sigma\omega \in A$ for $\sigma \in S_n$. Then $\mathcal{E} = \bigcap \mathcal{E}_n$.

Theorem 56 (Hewitt-Savage 0-1 Law)

If X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots iid and $A \in \mathcal{E}$ then $P(A) \in \{0, 1\}$.

Proof. We want to show that \mathcal{E} is independent of itself. Fix some K and some bounded function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We show this is independent of \mathcal{E} . This would imply that \mathcal{E} is independent of \mathcal{E} since we can take ϕ as indicators so that $\Sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k)$ is independent of \mathcal{E} . Then $\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty \Sigma(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ is independent of \mathcal{E} , which is a π -system, so it follows that $\Sigma(X_1, X_2, \dots)$ is independent of \mathcal{E} . But \mathcal{E} is a subsigma algebra of the former.

The first step is to symmetrize $\phi(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$: define

$$A_n(\phi) = \frac{1}{(n)_k} \sum_i \phi(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots, X_{i_k}).$$

Note that $A_n(\phi)$ is S_n invariant. Furthermore, $A_n(\phi)$ is \mathcal{E}_n measurable and

$$A_n\phi = E(A_n\phi | \mathcal{E}_n) = \frac{1}{(n)_k} \sum E(\phi(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}) | \mathcal{E}_n).$$

Since \mathcal{E}_n is S_n invariant, it follows that

$$E(\phi(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}, \dots, X_{i_k}) | \mathcal{E}_n) = E(\phi(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k) | \mathcal{E}_n).$$

Hence, we have that

$$A_n\phi = E(\phi(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k) | \mathcal{E}_n).$$

This is a reverse martingale since $\mathcal{E}_n \downarrow \mathcal{E}$. Hence

$$A_n\phi \rightarrow E(\phi(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k) | \mathcal{E}).$$

It suffices to show that $E(\phi(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k) | \mathcal{E}) = E(\phi(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k))$.

Lemma 24.6

If $EX^2 < \infty$, $E(X|\mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{F}$ with X independent of \mathcal{F} , then $E(X|\mathcal{G}) = E(X)$.

Proof.

$$E(E(X|\mathcal{G})X) = E(E(X|\mathcal{G})^2) = E(X^2).$$

It follows that

$$E(E(X|\mathcal{G})^2) = E(X^2),$$

so Jensen's inequality is sharp for the convex function $x \mapsto x^2$. □

We know that $A_n\phi \rightarrow E(\phi(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k)|\mathcal{E})$. We prove that $A_n\phi$ is independent of X_1 . All the terms in $A_n\phi$ not containing X_1 is independent of X_1 and is measurable with respect to $\Sigma(X_2, \dots)$. Then $A_n(\phi) = o(1/n) + A'_n(\phi)$ independent of X_1 , and the error goes to 0. Repeating this for the other k terms gives the result. □

§25 November 19th, 2020

§25.1 de Finetti's Theorem

Definition 25.1. A sequence X_1, X_2, \dots is exchangeable if for each n and $\pi \in S_n$

$$(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) = (X_{\pi(1)}, X_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(n)})$$

in distribution.

Example 25.2

IID sequences are obviously exchangeable. Another example: fix a random $\theta \in [0, 1]$ uniform and consider $Ber(\theta)$, iid. Each $X_i \sim Ber(1/2)$. But $E(X_1, X_2) = E_\theta(E(X_1, X_2|\theta)) = E(\theta^2) = \frac{1}{3}$.

Theorem 25.3

This is the only example of exchangeable sequences. That is, given X_1, X_2, \dots and the exchangeable sigma algebra \mathcal{E} , the distribution of (X_1, X_2, \dots) given \mathcal{E} is iid.

Proof. That the distribution of X_i, X_j given \mathcal{E} are the same follows that $E(\phi(X_i)|\mathcal{E}) = E(\phi(X_j)|\mathcal{E})$ for all i, j (by the change of measure formula). It suffices to show that for any f, g ,

$$E(f(X_i)g(X_j)|\mathcal{E}) = E(f(X_i)|\mathcal{E})E(g(X_j)|\mathcal{E})$$

It will be enough to show for any $f: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$E(f(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k)g(X_{k+1})|\mathcal{E}) = E(f(X_1, \dots, X_k)|\mathcal{E})E(g(X_{k+1})|\mathcal{E})$$

□

§25.2 Symmetric and Asymmetric Random Walks

Let ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots be iid and let $S_n = S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$. Taking $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$, we have some martingales $X_n = S_n - nE\xi_i$ the linear martingale. For $E\xi = 0$, we have $X_n = S_n^2 - nEX_i^2$, the quadratic martingale.

Consider the Symmetric simple random walk with $P(\xi_i = 1) = P(\xi_i = -1) = 1/2$. We compute the moment generating function $E(s^{\tau_1})$ for $s < 1$. We have that $E(\tau_1) = \infty$. We compute this using exponential martingales.

For θ , let $\phi(\theta) = E(e^{\theta X_1})$ where $X_i \sim Ber(\pm 1)$. This is $\phi(\theta) = \frac{e^\theta + e^{-\theta}}{2} \geq 1$. $M_n = \frac{e^{\theta S_n}}{\phi(\theta)^n}$ is a martingale since

$$E(M_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \frac{e^{\theta S_{n-1}}}{\phi(\theta)^{n-1}} \frac{e^{\theta X_n}}{\phi(\theta)},$$

so

$$M_n = M_{n-1} \frac{e^{\theta X_n}}{\phi(\theta)}.$$

Consider $\overline{M}_n = M_{n \wedge \tau}$ for $\tau = \tau_1$. Note that $0 \leq \overline{M}_n \leq e^\theta$. We know that $E1 = (\overline{M}_0) = E(\overline{M}_n)$ and by BCT, $E(\overline{M}_n) = E(M_\tau)$. Therefore,

$$E(M_\tau) = 1 = E^\theta E(\phi(\theta)^{-\tau}).$$

Now, we set $s = \phi(\theta)^{-1}$. Letting $x = e^{\theta}$ and doing some algebra, we find that $x^2 + 1 - 2/sx = 0$, so it follows that

$$x = \frac{2 \pm \sqrt{4 - 4s^2}}{2s} = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1 - s^2}}{s}.$$

It follows that

$$E(s^\tau) = \frac{1}{x} = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - s^2}}{s}.$$

§26 November 24th, 2020

§26.1 Random Walks, Continued

For the simple random walk, we found the associated hitting time between a, b using the martingale $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$.

In the asymmetric case, the closest martingale is $S_n - (2p-1)n$. The idea is to consider exponential martingales: Let $M_n = \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{S_n}$. It is easy to check that M_n is a martingale. Consider the stopping time for $\tau = \tau_{\{-a, b\}}$. The optional stopping theorem (if applicable) is $E(M_\tau) = E(M_0)$. Notably, we can find similar expressions such as

$$P(\tau_{-a} < \tau_b).$$

If we let $\phi(y) = [(1-p)/p]^y$, then $\phi(0) = \phi(b)(1-p) + \phi(-a)p$, so it follows that

$$q = P(\tau_{-a} < \tau_b) = \frac{\phi(b) - \phi(0)}{\phi(b) - \phi(-a)}.$$

Finally, note that the optimal stopping theorem is applicable since $\tau \wedge n$ is a bounded stopping time and $EM_\tau \leq EM_{\tau \wedge n}$, we can apply BCT.

Proposition 26.1

$$P(\tau_b < \infty) = 1, P(\tau_{-a} < \infty) < 1.$$

Proof. Note that

$$1 - q = \frac{\phi(0) - \phi(-a)}{\phi(b) - \phi(-a)} = \frac{1 - ((1-p)/p)^{-a}}{((1-p)/p)^b - ((1-p)/p)^{-a}}.$$

Then

$$P(\tau_b < \infty) = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} P(\tau_b < \tau_{-a}) = 1.$$

For the other conclusion, we send $b \rightarrow \infty$, and $\phi(b) \rightarrow 0$, so

$$P(\tau_{-a} < \infty) = 1 - \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{-a}.$$

To find $E(\tau_b)$, note that $S_n - (2p-1)n$ is a martingale. By OST, $0 = E(S_{\tau \wedge n}) - (2p-1)E(\tau \wedge n)$, so it follows that

$$E(\tau \wedge n) = \frac{1}{2p-1} E(S_{\tau \wedge n}) \leq \frac{b}{2p-1}.$$

By MCT, $\tau \wedge n \uparrow \tau$, so it follows that $E(\tau \wedge n) \uparrow E(\tau) \leq \frac{b}{2p-1}$, if we apply OST.

We can apply DCT since

$$|S^{\tau \wedge n}| \leq b + |\inf S_n|$$

and $P(\inf S_n \leq -a) = P(\tau_{-a} < \infty) = \frac{(1-p)^a}{p^a}$. Hence,

$$E(|\inf S_n|) \leq \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} P(\tau_{-a} < \infty) = \sum_{a=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^a = \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^a}.$$

□

§26.2 Combinatorics of SRW

We consider simple random walks.

Theorem 57 (Reflection Principle)

Let $x, y > 0$. The number of paths from $(0, x)$ to (n, y) that are 0 at some time is equal to the number of paths from $(0, -x)$ to (n, y) .

For any path as above, reflecting the path about the x -axis until the first hitting time of 0 creates a bijection to the set of paths from $(0, -x) \rightarrow (n, y)$. The inverse map is exactly reflecting back.

Theorem 58 (Ballot Theorem)

Suppose A and B get α, β votes each with $\alpha > \beta$. The probability that throughout the vote counting process A is ahead of B is $\frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha + \beta}$.

Proof. Let $V_t(A)$ be the number of votes A has got after the first t votes. Similarly for B . Note that $V_t(A) + V_t(B) = t$. We want to consider $V_t(A) - V_t(B)$, specifically the paths that never hit the x -axis.

Let $n = \alpha + \beta$, $x = \alpha - \beta$. Let $N_{k,r}$ be the number of paths from 0 to r in k steps.

We claim that the number of desired paths is

$$N_{n-1, x-1} - N_{n-1, x+1} = \frac{\alpha - \beta}{\alpha + \beta}$$

Exercise 26.2. Prove this result using the reflection principle. □

Lemma 26.3

$P(S_1 \neq 0, S_2 \neq 0, \dots, S_{2n} \neq 0) = P(S_{2n} = 0)$.

Proof.

$$P(S_1 > 0, \dots, S_{2n} > 0) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} P(S_1 > 0, \dots, S_{2n-1} > 0, S_{2n} = 2r).$$

The probability is exactly

$$\frac{N_{2n-1, 2r-1} - N_{2n-1, 2r+1}}{2n-1}.$$

If we let $p_{n,x} = P(S_n = x)$, then

$$\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} P(S_1 > 0, \dots, S_{2n-1} > 0, S_{2n} = 2r) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} (p_{2n-1, 2r-1} - p_{2n-1, 2r+1}) = \frac{1}{2} p_{2n-1, 1} = \frac{1}{2} P(S_{2n} = 0).$$

By symmetry, the probability each are less than 0 is $\frac{1}{2} P(S_{2n} = 0)$, so it follows that the probability is $P(S_{2n} = 0)$, as desired.

Then,

$$P(S_{2n} = 0) = \binom{2n}{n} \frac{1}{2^{2n}}$$

and using the Stirling Approximation it follows that

$$P(S_{2n} = 0) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

□

Lemma 26.4

$P(\tau = 2n) = P(\tau > 2n - 2) - P(\tau > 2n) = P(S_{2n-2}) - P(S_{2n} = 0) \sim n^{-3/2}$,
plugging in the result from above.

Theorem 26.5 (Arcsin law)

Let π_{2n} be the number of edges that are above the x -axis. Let $u_m = P(S_m = 0)$.
Then $P(\pi_{2n} = 2k) = u_{2k}u_{2n-2k}$.

§27 December 1st, 2020

§27.1 Combinatorics of Simple Random Walks