

Measure

Where we left off

Last time:

- Experiments → outcomes → events
- Probability must be assigned to **sets of outcomes** (“questions”)
- Events are modeled using σ -fields
- σ -fields tell us which questions are allowed

Todays question:

- How do we assign probabilities to events?

What is a measure?

Let (Ω, \mathcal{A}) be a measurable space.

A measure is a nonnegative countably additive set function; that is, a function

$$\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{ with}$$

1. $\mu(A) \geq \mu(\phi) = 0$, for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and
2. If $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ is a countable sequence of disjoint sets, then,

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$$

The triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a measure space.

If $\mu(\Omega) = 1$, we call μ a probability measure, P .

Properties

Let μ be a measure on (Ω, \mathcal{A}) ,

1. **monotonicity:** If $A \subset B$ then $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$.
2. **subadditivity:** If $A \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$, then $\mu(A) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n)$
3. **continuity from below:** If $A_n \uparrow A$, then $\mu(A_n) \uparrow \mu(A)$.
4. **continuity from above:** If $A_n \downarrow A$, with $\mu(A_1) < \infty$, then $\mu(A_n) \downarrow \mu(A)$.

The Construction Problem

- σ -fields are typically very large.
- To define a probability measure, we would need to:
 - assign a number to every event
 - verify countable additivity

This is conceptually clear, but practically impossible.

Idea: Define probabilities on a smaller, manageable collection of sets and extend them systematically.

Fields

A collection \mathcal{F} of subsets of Ω is called a **σ -field** if:

1. $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$
2. If $A \in \mathcal{F}$ then $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$
3. If $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \in \mathcal{F}$

Difference from σ -fields: Closed under **finite** unions, not necessarily countable unions

Examples of fields

Every σ -field is a field, but not every field is a σ -field.

- Trivial fields: All subsets of Ω , $\{\phi, \Omega\}$
- Field induced by a finite partition: Let $\{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$ be a partition of Ω , then
$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i : I \subset \{1, \dots, N\} \right\}$$
is a field.
- Let $\Omega \neq \phi$ and $\mathcal{G} := \{A \subseteq \Omega \mid \text{Either } A \text{ or } A^c \text{ is finite}\}$, then \mathcal{G} is a field, and is called the “finite - cofinite” field. This is not a σ -field, why?
- $\mathcal{F} = \{\text{finite disjoint unions of intervals } (a, b] \subset (0, 1]\}$ is a field.

Why Fields Are Useful?

- Fields are **much smaller** than σ -fields
- They are often explicitly describable
- Probabilities can be defined on them directly

Idea: We can define a probability on a field \mathcal{F} and then extend it to a probability on $\sigma(\mathcal{F})$.

From Fields to σ -fields: Carathéodory extension

Let \mathcal{F} be a field of subsets of Ω , and $\mathcal{A} = \sigma(\mathcal{F})$. Suppose that P is a probability on \mathcal{F} . Then P has a unique extension as a probability to \mathcal{A} .

What this means:

- We do **not** need to define probabilities on the entire σ -field
- Defining them on a field is enough

Carathéodory extension

Two aspects:

- Existence of a measure on $\sigma(\mathcal{F})$ **Proof intuition:** We define the probability of any set as the *smallest total probability* of countable collections of simple sets that cover it. This agrees with the original probabilities on the field, and the sets where additivity holds form a σ -field containing the field, and hence contains $\sigma(\mathcal{F})$.
- Uniqueness. **Proof intuition:** The sets where the two measures agree form a σ -field containing the field; therefore they agree on the σ -field generated by the field