

Stats 310A Midterm Solutions

October 28, 2019

Problem 1 Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be right-continuous. Define a sequence of functions f_n by

$$f_n(x) = f\left(\frac{\lceil nx \rceil}{n}\right) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \mathbb{I}_{((k-1)/n, k/n]}(x). \quad (1)$$

Each f_n is a countable sum of indicators and so is measurable. Moreover, for any x , we have that $\lceil nx \rceil / n \downarrow x$. By right-continuity of f , this implies that $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ and so that f is measurable.

Problem 2

(a) Notice that the evaluation operators $\text{ev}_t(\omega) = \omega(t)$ satisfy, for any $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega$,

$$|\text{ev}_t(\omega_1) - \text{ev}_t(\omega_2)| = |\omega_1(t) - \omega_2(t)| \leq d(\omega_1, \omega_2). \quad (2)$$

In particular, each ω_t is Lipschitz and so continuous with respect to the sup norm. We therefore have that each

$$\{\omega : X_t(\omega) < b\} = \{\omega : \omega(t) < b\} = \text{ev}_t^{-1}((-\infty, b)) \quad (3)$$

is an open set and so in \mathcal{B} . Since such sets generate \mathcal{F} , we conclude that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$.

(b) We first show that $C([0, 1])$ with the sup norm has a countable dense subset. To construct this set, define

$$\mathcal{C}_n = \left\{ \phi \in C([0, 1]) : \phi \text{ is a linear interpolation between } \{(k/n, q) : k = 0, \dots, n; q \in \mathbb{Q}\} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

Each such set is countable, so their union $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_n$ is also countable.

To see that \mathcal{D} is dense, let $f \in C([0, 1])$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. Since f is continuous on a compact set, it is uniformly continuous. Hence, let n be such that $|f(x) - f(y)| < \epsilon/2$ whenever $|x - y| \leq 1/n$. By the density of \mathbb{Q} in \mathbb{R} , we can choose $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_n$ such that $|\phi(k/n) - f(k/n)| < \epsilon/2$ for any k .

Now, let $x \in [0, 1]$. Then x falls between $x_k = k/n$ and $x_{k+1} = (k+1)/n$ for some k . Hence, there exists a $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ such that $x = \lambda x_k + (1 - \lambda)x_{k+1}$. By linearity of ϕ on $[x_k, x_{k+1}]$ and convexity of the absolute value, we have that

$$|\phi(x) - f(x)| = |\lambda(\phi(x_k) - f(x)) + (1 - \lambda)(\phi(x_{k+1}) - f(x))| \quad (5)$$

$$\leq \lambda|\phi(x_k) - f(x)| + (1 - \lambda)|\phi(x_{k+1}) - f(x)|. \quad (6)$$

But notice that since $|x_k - x| \leq 1/n$, uniform continuity of f yields that

$$|\phi(x_k) - f(x)| \leq |\phi(x_k) - f(x_k)| + |f(x_k) - f(x)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon. \quad (7)$$

Reasoning similarly for x_{k+1} , eq. 6 becomes

$$|\phi(x) - f(x)| \leq \lambda\epsilon + (1 - \lambda)\epsilon = \epsilon \quad (8)$$

This inequality holds uniformly in x , so $d(\phi, f) \leq \epsilon$, and so we conclude that \mathcal{D} is dense in $C([0, 1])$. Therefore, any set that is open in $C([0, 1])$ is a countable union of open balls, and so in turn we conclude that the open balls generate \mathcal{B} .

But now, for any open ball $B_\epsilon(\omega')$, we have that

$$B_\epsilon(\omega') = \left\{ \omega : \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\omega(t) - \omega'(t)| < \epsilon \right\} \quad (9)$$

$$= \left\{ \omega : \sup_{q \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}} |\omega(q) - \omega'(q)| < \epsilon \right\} \quad (10)$$

$$= \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{q \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q}} \{ \omega : |X_q(\omega) - \omega'(q)| \leq \epsilon - 1/n \}. \quad (11)$$

But this is a countable union of \mathcal{F} -measurable sets and so it itself \mathcal{F} -measurable. Hence, $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Problem 3

(a) We have that

$$\{X_{N_k} \leq b\} = \bigcup_{n \in \bar{\mathbb{N}}} \{X_{N_k} \leq b, N_k = n\} = \bigcup_{n \in \bar{\mathbb{N}}} (\{X_n \leq b\} \cap \{N_k = n\}) \quad (12)$$

This is a countable union of measurable sets. Hence, each $\{Z_k \leq b\}$ is measurable and so each Z_k is a random variable.

(b) By almost sure convergence of the sequences, let A and B be probability-1 events such that on A , $X_n \rightarrow X_\infty$ and on B , $N_k \rightarrow \infty$. Then $A \cap B$ is an intersection of probability-1 events, and so itself has probability 1.

Moreover, on this event, $X_{a_k} \rightarrow X_\infty$ along any sequence a_k diverging to infinity. But on this event, N_k is such a sequence, so we have that $X_{N_k} \rightarrow X_\infty$ on a probability-1 event. That is, X_{N_k} converges almost surely to X_∞ .

(c) Consider the sequence of random variables X_n on $[0, 1)$ with the uniform measure defined by

$$X_{2^k + \ell} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}_{[\ell 2^{-k}, (\ell+1)2^{-k})} & \text{if } \ell = 0, \dots, 2^k - 1. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

We have that $\mathbf{P}(|X_{2^k + \ell}| > \epsilon) = 2^{-k}$ so that $X_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} X_\infty := 0$. However, notice that for any k ,

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{2^k - 1} X_{2^k + \ell} = \mathbb{I}_{[0, 1)}. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, with probability 1, for any n , exactly one of $\{X_{2^k}, \dots, X_{2^{k+1}-1}\}$ is equal to 1, while the rest are 0. In particular, if we define (taking $\min \emptyset = \infty$)

$$N_k = \min\{n \in \{2^k, \dots, 2^{k+1} - 1\} : X_n = 1\}, \quad (15)$$

then surely, $N_k \geq 2^k$ so that $N_k \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely, and so in probability, while also $X_{N_k} = 1$ almost surely and so $X_{N_k} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 1$.

- (d) We use the same counter-example as in the previous question, noting that $\mathbb{E}|X_{2^k+\ell}| = 2^{-k} \rightarrow 0$ and $N_k \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \infty$ but that $\mathbb{E}|X_{N_k} - 1| = 0$ so that $X_{N_k} \xrightarrow{L_1} 1$.

Problem 4

- (a) For $\Omega_M = [-M, M]^d$, define the family of sets

$$\mathcal{G}_M = \left\{ A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^d} : \int f_{\Omega_M}(x) \mathbb{I}_A(x) dx = 0 \right\}. \quad (16)$$

To see that this is a λ -system, first notice that $\Omega_M = [-M, M]^d \in \mathcal{R}$ and so $\mathbb{R}^d \in \mathcal{G}_M$ let $A, B \in \mathcal{G}_M$ such that $A \subseteq B$. We then have that

$$\int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_{B \setminus A} dx = \int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_B dx - \int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_A dx = 0, \quad (17)$$

so that $B \setminus A \in \mathcal{G}$.

Next, let $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots$ be a sequence in \mathcal{G}_M increasing to A . Since $f_{\Omega_M} \in L_1$ and $|f_{\Omega_M}| \mathbb{I}_{A_n} \leq |f_{\Omega_M}| \mathbb{I}_A$, the dominated convergence theorem thus yields that

$$\int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_A dx = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_{A_n} dx = 0. \quad (18)$$

Hence, \mathcal{G}_M is closed under increasing limits and so is a λ -system. Since $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_M$ is a π -system, Dynkin's π - λ theorem then yields that

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^d} = \sigma(\mathcal{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{G}_M. \quad (19)$$

In particular, $\{x : f_{\Omega_M}(x) > 0\}, \{x : f_{\Omega_M}(x) < 0\} \in \mathcal{G}_M$ so that

$$\int |f_{\Omega_M}| dx = \int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_{\{f_{\Omega_M} > 0\}} dx - \int f_{\Omega_M} \mathbb{I}_{\{f_{\Omega_M} < 0\}} dx = 0 \quad (20)$$

Therefore, $f_{\Omega_M} = 0$ almost everywhere for any M . But notice that $\{f_{\Omega_M} \neq 0\}$ is a sequence of sets increasing to $\{f \neq 0\}$, so continuity of measure yields that $f = 0$ almost everywhere.

- (b) For any $R = (a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times (a_n, b_n)$, define the functions $\eta_\epsilon^R \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$\eta_\epsilon^R(t_1, \dots, t_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \eta_\epsilon \left(\frac{2(t_i - a_i)}{b_i - a_i} - 1 \right). \quad (21)$$

In particular, we have that that $\eta_\epsilon^R \rightarrow \mathbb{I}_R$ pointwise (though there is no guarantee that this convergence is monotone). Moreover, $|f\eta_\epsilon^R| = |f|\eta_\epsilon^R \leq |f|\mathbb{I}_{\bar{R}} = f_{\bar{R}}$, where the latter function is integrable since $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and \bar{R} is compact. Hence, the dominated convergence yields that

$$\int f\mathbb{I}_R dx = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int f\eta_\epsilon^R dx = 0. \quad (22)$$

Since this holds for any rectangle R , we have from part (a) that $f = 0$ almost everywhere.

Problem 5

(a) We first prove the result for functions of the form

$$\psi = \sum_{k=1}^n c_k \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]}, \quad (23)$$

which we will call interval-simple functions.

In particular, we have that, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\|\mathbb{T}_\epsilon \psi - \psi\|_p = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n c_i (T_\epsilon \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]} - \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]}) \right\|_p \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \|\mathbb{I}_{[a_i + \epsilon, b_i + \epsilon]} - \mathbb{I}_{[a_i, b_i]}\|_p \quad (25)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i [(a_i + \epsilon - a_i) + (b_i + \epsilon - b_i)]^{1/p} \quad (26)$$

$$= (2\epsilon)^{1/p} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \quad (27)$$

$$\rightarrow 0. \quad (28)$$

To complete the proof, we will show that such functions are dense in L_p .

Let $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{I}_{B_i}$ be a simple function supported inside the set $[-M, M]$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. Since \mathcal{A} , the set of finite unions of fingernail sets, is an algebra that generates \mathcal{B} , we can apply Exercise 1.2.15 (a) of Dembo's notes. In particular, for each B_i , there exists a $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for $\mu = \mathcal{L}|_{[-M, M]}/2M$, the probability measure formed by restricting the Lebesgue measure to $[-M, M]$,

$$\mathcal{L}(A_i \Delta B_i) = 2M\mu(A_i \Delta B_i) < \left(\frac{\epsilon}{nc_i}\right)^p. \quad (29)$$

But then we have that, for $\psi = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbb{I}_{A_i}$, which is an interval-simple function since each A_i is a finite union of fingernail sets,

$$\|\phi - \psi\|_p \leq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \|\mathbb{I}_{B_i} - \mathbb{I}_{A_i}\|_p \quad (30)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathcal{L}(A_i \Delta B_i)^{1/p} \quad (31)$$

$$< \epsilon. \quad (32)$$

Now, let $f \in L_p$ and let $\epsilon > 0$. By the dominated convergence theorem, $f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]} \xrightarrow{L_p} f$, so let M be such that $\|f - f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]}\|_p < \epsilon/3$. Next, since simple functions are dense in L_p , let ϕ be a simple function supported on $[-M, M]$ such that $\|f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]} - \phi\|_p < \epsilon/3$. Finally, by the result that we just proved, let ψ be an interval-simple function such that $\|\phi - \psi\|_p < \epsilon/3$. Therefore, we have that

$$\|f - \psi\|_p \leq \|f - f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]}\|_p + \|f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]} - \phi\|_p + \|\phi - \psi\|_p < \epsilon. \quad (33)$$

Notice that for any $f \in L_p$ and interval-simple function ψ , we have that

$$\|\mathbb{T}_\epsilon f - f\|_p \leq \|\mathbb{T}_\epsilon f - \mathbb{T}_\epsilon \psi\|_p + \|\mathbb{T}_\epsilon \psi - \psi\|_p + \|\psi - f\|_p \quad (34)$$

$$= 2\|f - \psi\|_p + \|\mathbb{T}_\epsilon \psi - \psi\|_p \quad (35)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 2\|f - \psi\|_p. \quad (36)$$

But since interval-simple functions are dense in L_p , taking the infimum over all such functions yields that $\limsup_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbb{T}_\epsilon f - f\|_p = 0$.

(b) For each x , let $\mathbb{F}_x f$ be the function defined by $\mathbb{F}_x f(y) = f(x - y)$. Notice that $\|\mathbb{F}_x f\|_p = \|f\|_p$

We have by Hölder's inequality that

$$|f \star g(x)| \leq \int |f(x - y)g(y)| \, dy \quad (37)$$

$$= \|\mathbb{F}_x f \cdot g\|_1 \quad (38)$$

$$\leq \|\mathbb{F}_x f\|_p \|g\|_q \quad (39)$$

$$= \|f\|_p \|g\|_q. \quad (40)$$

Since the above holds uniformly in x and since $f \in L_p, g \in L_q$, we conclude that

$$\sup_x |f \star g(x)| \leq \|f\|_p \|g\|_q < \infty. \quad (41)$$

(c) Let $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$. We again use Hölder's inequality to compute

$$|f \star g(x) - f \star g(x')| \leq \int |f(x - y) - f(x' - y)| |g(y)| \, dy \quad (42)$$

$$\leq \left[\int |f(x - y) - f(x' - y)|^p \, dy \right]^{1/p} \|g\|_q. \quad (43)$$

Making the substitution $z = x - y$, this becomes

$$\left[\int |f(z) - f(z - (x - x'))|^p \, dz \right]^{1/p} \|g\|_q = \|f - \mathbb{T}_{x-x'} f\|_p \|g\|_q. \quad (44)$$

By the result of part (a), this converges to 0 as $x - x' \rightarrow 0$ at a rate depending on x and x' only through their difference. Therefore, $f \star g$ is uniformly continuous.

(d) Notice that \star is bilinear. In particular, if we define $f_M = f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]}$ and $g_M = f\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]}$, then we have from part (b) that

$$|f \star g(x)| \leq |f_M \star g_M(x)| + |(f - f_M) \star g(x)| + |f_M \star (g - g_M)(x)| \quad (45)$$

$$\leq |f_M \star g_M(x)| + \|f - f_M\|_p \|g\|_q + \|f_M\|_p \|g - g_M\|_q \quad (46)$$

$$\leq |f_M \star g_M(x)| + \|f - f_M\|_p \|g\|_q + \|f\|_p \|g - g_M\|_q. \quad (47)$$

But notice that when $|x| > 2M$, the sets $[-M, M]$ and $[x - M, x + M]$ are disjoint, so we have that

$$f_M \star g_M(x) = \int f(x - y)g(y)\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]}(x - y)\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M]}(y) \, dy \quad (48)$$

$$= \int f(x - y)g(y)\mathbb{I}_{[-M,M] \cap [x - M, x + M]}(y) \, dy \quad (49)$$

$$= 0. \quad (50)$$

Therefore, we see that for any M ,

$$\limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |f \star g(x)| \leq \|f - f_M\|_p \|g\|_q + \|f\|_p \|g - g_M\|_q. \quad (51)$$

Taking $M \rightarrow \infty$, the dominated convergence theorem yields that the right-hand side converges to 0. Hence, we conclude that $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} f \star g(x) = 0$.