

Stats 310A Midterm Solutions

October 25, 2017

Problem 1

(a) Let $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\cup_{i \in I_k} J_i \mid \forall I_k \in \mathcal{F}\}$, the sets contains one element($\{k\}$) is not in \mathcal{G}_0 . It can be shown that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$:

(1) \mathcal{G}_0 is a σ -algebra: (a) $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} J_i \in \mathcal{G}_0$. (b) For all $B = \cup_{i \in I_k} J_i \in \mathcal{G}_0$, $B^c = \cup_{i \in I_k^c} J_i \in \mathcal{G}_0$. (c) If $B_k = \cup_{i \in I_k} J_i \in \mathcal{G}_0$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ then $\cup_k B_k = \cup_{i \in \cup_k I_k} J_i \in \mathcal{G}_0$.

(2) $J_k \in \mathcal{G}_0$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

As a result, the sets contains one element($\{k\}$) is not in \mathcal{G} , however, it is in $\mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \mathcal{G} \neq \mathcal{F}$.

(b) See (a), all sets contain only one element is not measurable on \mathcal{G} .

(c) For any function f we consider, let $f_N(\omega) = \sum_{n=0}^N f(n)I_{\{n\}}(\omega)$, by definition:

$$\mu(f_N) = \sum_{n=1}^N f(n)\mu_n, \forall N < \infty \tag{1}$$

As for all $N, f_N \leq f$, and $f_N \uparrow f$, by Monotone convergence theorem, we have

$$\mu(f) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu(f_N) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mu_n f(n) \tag{2}$$

Problem 2 It is obvious that $\mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{Q}}$, and we just need to show the other way around. Because \mathbb{Q} is countable, and for all $S \in \mathbb{Q}$, we can write it as a countable collection of singleton: $S = \cup_i \{q_i\}$, and $\{q_i\} \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ as it is closed. As a result, we have that, for all $S \in \mathbb{Q}$, $S \in \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Q}} \Rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. This ends the proof.

Problem 3

(a) For any $A \in \mathcal{B}$, by Komogorov extension theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_i \in A) &= P(X \in \mathbb{R} \times \dots \times A \dots \times \mathbb{R}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \dots \times A \dots \times \mathbb{R}} f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n) \lambda_n(dx_1, \dots, dx_n) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R} \times A} f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_n) \lambda_n(dx_1, \dots, dx_{i-1}, dx_{i+1}, \dots, dx_n, dx_i) \\ &= \int_A \left(\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}} f(x_1, \dots, x, \dots, x_n) \lambda_{n-1}(dx_1, \dots, dx_{i-1}, dx_{i+1}, \dots, dx_n) \right) \lambda_1(dx) \end{aligned}$$

by consistency of Lesbegue measure.

By the given definition of density, we conclude that

$$f_i(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f(x_1, \dots, x, \dots, x_n) \lambda_{n-1}(dx_1, \dots, dx_{i-1}, dx_{i+1}, \dots, dx_n).$$

- (b) By theorem in the book, we only need to show the equality on any generating set in \mathbb{R}^n . We proved that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \sigma(A_1 \times \dots \times A_n)$ for $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence, for any measurable set A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n , since X_1, \dots, X_n are mutually independent, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(X \in A_1 \times \dots \times A_n) &= P(X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i \in A_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \int_{A_i} f_i(x_i) \lambda_1(dx_i) \\ &= \int_{A_1} \dots \int_{A_n} f_1(x_1) \dots f_n(x_n) \lambda_1(dx_1) \dots \lambda_1(dx_n) \\ &= \int_A f_1(x_1) \dots f_n(x_n) \lambda_n(dx_1, \dots, dx_n) \text{ by property of Lebesgue measure.} \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for any $A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$, and by the definition of density we can conclude that the density of (X_1, \dots, X_n) exists and $f(X_1, \dots, X_n) = f_1(X_1) \dots f_n(X_n)$.

- (c) Counter example: $X_1 \sim U(0, 1), X_2 \sim U(0, 1)$ and $X_1 \stackrel{a.e.}{=} X_2$. Clearly P_{X_1}, P_{X_2} both have density $f(x) = \mathbf{1}(x \in [0, 1])$. However, the support of (X_1, X_2) is $A = \{\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2) : \omega_1 = \omega_2, 0 \leq \omega_1, \omega_2 \leq 1\}$. Thus, A is a line, and has Lebesgue measure 0 in dimension 2. If (X_1, X_2) has a density in dimension 2, then $P(\Omega) = P(A) = \int_A f(X_1, X_2) \lambda_2(dx_1, dx_2) = 0$ for some density f . However, $P(\Omega)$ should be 1. Thus, we get a contradiction, which implies (X_1, X_2) has no density in dimension 2.

Problem 4

- (a) Define $X_n(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^n \omega_k \lambda^{k-1}$. As $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$ follows the uniform distribution in $\{\pm 1\}^n$, the coordinates $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ are mutually independent, giving that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi X_n(\omega)}] = \prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi \omega_k \lambda^{k-1}}] = \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \left(e^{i\xi \lambda^{k-1}} + e^{-i\xi \lambda^{k-1}} \right) = \prod_{k=1}^n \cos(\lambda^{k-1} \xi).$$

As $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, we have for all $\omega \in \Omega$ that

$$|X_n(\omega) - X(\omega)| = \left| \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \omega_k \lambda^{k-1} \right| \leq \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \lambda^{k-1} = \frac{\lambda^n}{1-\lambda} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

So X_n converges pointwise (and hence almost surely) to X . Consequently, $\exp(i\xi X_n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \exp(i\xi X)$. As $|\exp(i\xi X_n)| \leq 1$, applying the dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi X}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{i\xi X_n}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=1}^n \cos(\lambda^{k-1} \xi) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \cos(\lambda^{k-1} \xi),$$

where the last limit exists automatically. To analytically justify the limit exists, use the inequality $|\cos(x) - 1| \leq x^2$ for small x .

- (b) We show that the shifted r.v. $\tilde{\omega} = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \dots)$ has the same distribution as ω . Indeed, marginalizing over ω_1 , the distribution over cylindrical sets is exactly the same as ω , hence by the Kolmogorov extension theorem, such an extension must be unique, and so $\tilde{\omega} \stackrel{d}{=} \omega$. Further, as ω_1 is independent of any finite subcollection of $\{\omega_k\}_{k \geq 2}$, ω_1 is independent of $\tilde{\omega}$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_X(x) &= \mathbb{P}(X \leq x) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\omega_1 = 1) \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \omega_n \lambda^{n-1} \leq x - 1\right) + \mathbb{P}(\omega_1 = -1) \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \omega_n \lambda^{n-1} \leq x - 1\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\omega}_n \lambda^{n-1} \leq \frac{x-1}{\lambda}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\omega}_n \lambda^{n-1} \leq \frac{x+1}{\lambda}\right) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(F_X\left(\frac{x-1}{\lambda}\right) + F_X\left(\frac{x+1}{\lambda}\right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

- (c) This amounts to showing that the Cantor distribution does not have a density. First, note that X is supported on $A_0 = [-1/2, 1/2]$. We define closed sets A_1, A_2, \dots as $A_1 = A_0 \setminus (-1/6, 1/6)$ and sequentially

$$A_{n+1} = \{A_n \text{ with the middle one third taken out from each sub-interval}\}.$$

We show that $X \in A_n$ almost surely for all A_n . Indeed, we have

$$|X| \geq |\omega_1/3| - \left| \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \omega_n (1/3)^n \right| \geq \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1/9}{1 - 1/3} = \frac{1}{6},$$

which shows that $X \notin (-1/6, 1/6)$ and hence $X \in A_1$. To show the result for A_n , we condition on the value of $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$ (2^n possibilities) and use the same argument to show that it cannot belong to the middle one third of any sub-interval left.

Now, we have $\lambda(A_{n+1}) = 2/3\lambda(A_n)$ and hence $\lambda(A_n) = (2/3)^n \rightarrow 0$. Let $A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \bigcap_n A_n$, then $\lambda(A) = 0$. However, as $\mathbb{P}(X \in A_n) = 1$, taking the limit gives $\mathbb{P}(X \in A) = 1$. If X has density f w.r.t. λ , we then have

$$1 = \mathbb{P}(X \in A) = \int_A f(x) d\lambda(x) = 0,$$

a contradiction. So X does not have a density.