

# Homework 5

Due Tuesday, November 8, 2016

We are now moving beyond our old friend, the binary digit coin flips, to more general random variable theory. As a short farewell, take a look at the paper titled *Statistical independence in probability, analysis and number theory*, by Mark Kac. Mark was a probabilist working in the 1950s who wrote the famous article *Can One Hear the Shape of a Drum* and developed much of probabilistic number theory with Erdős. In that paper, Mark develops a lot of the same theory for Rademacher functions we developed but at a time before probability theory was a major branch of mathematics. Reading this article, you can tell that Mark was being very careful to frame the probabilistic statements in measure theoretic terms.

In Homework 2 we introduced the notion of inner-regularity of a measure on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ . When working with a probability measure  $P$  on a general metric space  $\Omega$  it is somewhat more common to use the term *tight* as a synonym for *inner-regular*. In particular, a probability measure  $P$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$  is **tight**, equivalently **inner-regular**, if  $P(B) = \sup\{P(K) : K \subset B, K \text{ compact}\}$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$  where a set  $K \subset \Omega$  is compact if each open cover of  $K$  has a finite sub-cover. Here is another definition of a tight probability measure, equivalent for probability measures, that is more convenient for our use case.

**Definition 1.** Suppose  $\Omega$  is a metric space. A probability measure  $P$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$  is **tight** if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a compact  $K \subset \Omega$  such that  $P(K) > 1 - \epsilon$ .

The fact that this is an equivalent definition follows, by similar arguments done for Exercise 6 (in Homework), since an extension of Theorem 1 (in Homework 2) holds for probability measures on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ . This new definition can now be extended to a collection of probability measures.

**Definition 2.** Suppose  $\Omega$  is a metric space and  $\mathcal{P}$  is a collection of probability measures on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}(\Omega))$ .  $\mathcal{P}$  is said to be **tight** if for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a compact  $K \subset \Omega$  such that  $P(K) > 1 - \epsilon$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .

The significance of tightness is seen in Prohorov's Theorem which says that when  $\Omega$  is separable and complete (i.e. a Polish space)  $\mathcal{P}$  is tight if and only if  $\mathcal{P}$  is relatively compact (in the sense that for every sequence of elements in  $\mathcal{P}$  there exists a subsequence which converges in distribution to a probability measure, not necessarily in  $\mathcal{P}$ ). We will get into this later. For now, you should think of a sequence of probability measures  $P_1, P_2, \dots$  as being **tight** if there is no "mass escaping to infinity". The following exercises explore this intuition.

**Definition 3.** Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are two random variables, not necessarily defined on the same probability space.  $Y$  is said to be **stochastically larger** than  $X$  if  $P[X \leq x] \geq P[Y \leq x]$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Exercise 1.** Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are random variables and that  $Y$  is stochastically larger than  $X$ . Show there exists random

variables  $X^*$  and  $Y^*$  defined on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  such that  $X^* \sim X$ ,  $Y^* \sim Y$  and  $X^*(\omega) \leq Y^*(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be an arbitrary index set and let  $X_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$  be a family of random variables where each  $X_i$  is defined on a probability space  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, P_i)$ . Let  $F_i(x) := P_i(X_i \leq x)$  be the distribution function of  $X_i$ . The  $X_i$ 's are said to be **stochastically dominated** by a random variable  $X$  if  $X$  is stochastically larger than  $|X_i|$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . The  $X_i$ 's are said to be **pointwise dominated** by  $X$  if all the random variables  $X, X_i$ , for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , are defined on the same probability space and  $|X_i(\omega)| \leq X(\omega)$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega$  and for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ .

**Exercise 2.** Let  $X_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ , be a family of random variables where each  $X_i$  is defined on a probability space  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, P_i)$ . Show that the following are equivalent

1. The collection of induced measures  $\{PX_i^{-1}\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$  are tight;
2. The  $X_i$ 's are stochastically dominated by some random variable;
3.  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} F_i(x) = 0$  and  $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}} F_i(y) = 1$ ;
4. There exists random variables  $X_i^*, i \in \mathcal{I}$ , all defined on a common probability space such that  $X_i^* \sim X_i$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  and the  $X_i^*$ 's are pointwise dominated by some random variable.