

# Chapter 1

## Independence

We enter the realm of probability theory at this point, where we define independence of events and random variables. In the following,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$  is a probability space and the sets  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  are the events. As soon as constructing probability spaces has become routine, the concrete probability space will lose its importance and it will be only the random variables that will interest us.

### 1.1 Independence of Events

If there is partial information on the outcome of a random experiment, the probabilities for the possible events may change.

**Example 1.1** (Rolling a die once). We throw a die and consider the events

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{\text{the face shows an odd number}\}. \\ B &:= \{\text{the face shows three or smaller}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We model the experiment with  $\Omega = \{1, \dots, 6\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = 2^\Omega$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \mathcal{U}_\Omega$ . Clearly,  $\mathbf{P}[A] = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\mathbf{P}[B] = \frac{1}{2}$ . However, what is the probability that  $A$  occurs if we already know that  $B$  occurs? Then

$$A = \{1, 3, 5\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{1, 2, 3\},$$

and intuitively

$$\mathbf{P}[A \mid B] := \frac{\#(A \cap B)}{\#(B)} = \frac{2}{3}.$$

□

Motivated by this example, we make the following definition.

**Definition 1.2** (Conditional probability). Let  $B$  be an event. We define the **conditional probability given  $B$**  for any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  by

$$\mathbf{P}[A | B] = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{P}[A \cap B]}{\mathbf{P}[B]} & \text{if } \mathbf{P}[B] > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

□

**Property 1.3.** Let  $B \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathbf{P}[B] > 0$ . Then  $\mathbf{P}[\cdot | B]$  is a probability measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ .

*Proof.* (Exercise)

□

We consider two events  $A$  and  $B$  as (stochastically) independent if the occurrence of  $B$  does not change the probability that  $A$  occurs, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}[B] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | B] = \mathbf{P}[A].$$

Thanks to the following property we can define (stochastic) independence of two events in different ways.

**Property 1.4.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two events. Then the following propositions are equivalent:

- (i)  $\mathbf{P}[A \cap B] = \mathbf{P}[A] \cdot \mathbf{P}[B]$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathbf{P}[B] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | B] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ ;
- (iii)  $\mathbf{P}[A] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[B | A] = \mathbf{P}[B]$ .

*Proof.* (Exercise.)

□

**Example 1.5** (Rolling a die twice). Consider the random experiment of rolling a die twice. We model the experiment with  $\Omega = \{1, \dots, 6\}^2$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = 2^\Omega$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \mathcal{U}_\Omega$ .

- (i) If an event  $A_1$  depends only on the outcome of the first roll and an event  $A_2$  depends only on the outcome of the second roll, then  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  should be independent. Formally, let  $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2 \subset \{1, \dots, 6\}$  and let

$$A_1 = \tilde{A}_1 \times \{1, \dots, 6\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = \{1, \dots, 6\} \times \tilde{A}_2.$$

Finally,

$$\mathbf{P}[A_1 \cap A_2] = \frac{\#(\tilde{A}_1 \times \tilde{A}_2)}{36} = \frac{\#\tilde{A}_1}{6} \cdot \frac{\#\tilde{A}_2}{6} = \mathbf{P}[A_1] \cdot \mathbf{P}[A_2].$$

- (ii) Stochastic independence can occur also in less obvious situations. For instance, let  $A$  be the event where the sum of the two rolls is odd,

$$A = \{ (\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega ; \omega_1 + \omega_2 \in \{3, 5, 7, 9, 11\} \},$$

and let  $B$  be the event where the first roll gives at most three,

$$B = \{ (\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega ; \omega_1 \in \{1, 2, 3\} \}.$$

Although it might seem that these two events are entangled in some way, they are stochastically independent. Indeed, it is not difficult to check that  $\mathbf{P}[A] = \mathbf{P}[B] = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\mathbf{P}[A \cap B] = \frac{1}{4}$ .

□

What is the condition for three events  $A, B, C$  to be independent? Of course, any of the pairs  $(A, B)$ ,  $(B, C)$  and  $(A, C)$  has to be independent. However, we have to make sure also that the simultaneous occurrence of  $B$  and  $C$  does not change the probability that  $A$  occurs, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}[B \cap C] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | B \cap C] = \mathbf{P}[A].$$

Thanks to the following property we can define (stochastic) independence of three events in different ways.

**Property 1.6.** Let  $A, B$  and  $C$  be three events. Then the following propositions are equivalent:

- (i) (a)  $\mathbf{P}[A \cap B] = \mathbf{P}[A] \cdot \mathbf{P}[B]$ ,  
 (b)  $\mathbf{P}[B \cap C] = \mathbf{P}[B] \cdot \mathbf{P}[C]$ ,  
 (c)  $\mathbf{P}[A \cap C] = \mathbf{P}[A] \cdot \mathbf{P}[C]$ ,  
 (d)  $\mathbf{P}[A \cap B \cap C] = \mathbf{P}[A] \cdot \mathbf{P}[B] \cdot \mathbf{P}[C]$ ;
- (ii) (a)  $\mathbf{P}[B] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | B] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ ,  
 (b)  $\mathbf{P}[C] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[B | C] = \mathbf{P}[B]$ ,  
 (c)  $\mathbf{P}[C] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | C] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ ,  
 (d)  $\mathbf{P}[B \cap C] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | B \cap C] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ ;
- (iii) (a)  $\mathbf{P}[B] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | B] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ ,  
 (b)  $\mathbf{P}[C] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[B | C] = \mathbf{P}[B]$ ,  
 (c)  $\mathbf{P}[C] > 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{P}[A | C] = \mathbf{P}[A]$ ,

$$(d) \mathbf{P}[A \cap C] > 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}[B | A \cap C] = \mathbf{P}[B].$$

*Proof.* (Exercise.) □

**Example 1.7** (Rolling a die three times). We roll a die three times. We model the experiment with  $\Omega = \{1, \dots, 6\}^3$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = 2^\Omega$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \mathcal{U}_\Omega$ .

- (i) If for any  $i = 1, 2, 3$  the event  $A_i$  depends only on the outcome of the  $i$ th roll, then the events  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  and  $A_3$  should be independent. Indeed, let  $\tilde{A}_1, \tilde{A}_2, \tilde{A}_3 \subset \{1, \dots, 6\}$  and let

$$A_1 = \tilde{A}_1 \times \{1, \dots, 6\} \times \{1, \dots, 6\},$$

$$A_2 = \{1, \dots, 6\} \times \tilde{A}_2 \times \{1, \dots, 6\},$$

$$A_3 = \{1, \dots, 6\} \times \{1, \dots, 6\} \times \tilde{A}_3.$$

Finally, if  $i \neq j$ ,  $\mathbf{P}[A_i \cap A_j] = \frac{\#\tilde{A}_i \cdot \#\tilde{A}_j \cdot \#\{1, \dots, 6\}}{216} = \frac{\#\tilde{A}_i}{6} \cdot \frac{\#\tilde{A}_j}{6} \cdot \frac{\#\{1, \dots, 6\}}{6} = \mathbf{P}[A_i] \cdot \mathbf{P}[A_j]$  and  $\mathbf{P}[A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3] = \frac{\#(\tilde{A}_1 \times \tilde{A}_2 \times \tilde{A}_3)}{216} = \frac{\#\tilde{A}_1}{6} \cdot \frac{\#\tilde{A}_2}{6} \cdot \frac{\#\tilde{A}_3}{6} = \mathbf{P}[A_1] \cdot \mathbf{P}[A_2] \cdot \mathbf{P}[A_3]$ .

- (ii) Consider now the events

$$A_1 := \{(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) \in \Omega ; \omega_1 = \omega_2\},$$

$$A_2 := \{(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) \in \Omega ; \omega_2 = \omega_3\},$$

$$A_3 := \{(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) \in \Omega ; \omega_1 = \omega_3\}.$$

Then  $\#A_1 = \#A_2 = \#A_3 = 36$ ; hence  $\mathbf{P}[A_1] = \mathbf{P}[A_2] = \mathbf{P}[A_3] = \frac{1}{6}$ . Furthermore,  $\#(A_i \cap A_j) = 6$  if  $i \neq j$ ; hence  $\mathbf{P}[A_i \cap A_j] = \frac{1}{36}$  if  $i \neq j$ . On the other hand, we have  $\#(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) = 6$ , thus  $\mathbf{P}[A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3] = \frac{1}{36} \neq \mathbf{P}[A_1] \cdot \mathbf{P}[A_2] \cdot \mathbf{P}[A_3]$ . Therefore, the events  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  and  $A_3$  are not independent. □

In order to define independence of larger families of events, we have to request the validity of product formulas, like in propositions (i) of properties 1.4 and 1.6, not only for pairs and triplets but for all finite subfamilies of events. We thus make the following definition.

**Definition 1.8** (Independence of events). Let  $I$  be an arbitrary index set and let  $(A_i)_{i \in I}$  be an arbitrary family of events. The family  $(A_i)_{i \in I}$  is called **independent** if for any finite subset  $J \subset I$  the product formula holds:

$$\mathbf{P} \left[ \bigcap_{j \in J} A_j \right] = \prod_{j \in J} \mathbf{P}[A_j].$$

□

The most prominent example of an independent family of infinitely many events is given by the perpetuated independent repetition of a random experiment.

**Example 1.9** (Rolling a die infinitely times). Let  $E$  be a nonempty finite set (the set of possible outcomes of the individual experiment) and let  $(p_e)_{e \in E}$  be a probability vector on  $E$ . We model the experiment with  $\Omega = E^{\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \sigma(\{[e_1, \dots, e_3] ; e_1, \dots, e_n \in E, n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \sum_{e \in E} p_e \delta_e^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ . Let  $\tilde{A}_i \subset E$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $A_i$  be the event where  $\tilde{A}_i$  occurs in the  $i$ th experiment; that is,

$$A_i = \{(e_1, e_2, \dots) \in \Omega ; e_i \in \tilde{A}_i\} = \bigcup_{(e_1, \dots, e_i) \in E^{i-1} \times \tilde{A}_i} [e_1, \dots, e_n].$$

Intuitively, the family  $(A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  should be independent if the definition of independence makes any sense at all. We check that this is indeed the case (Exercise.)  $\square$

If  $A$  and  $B$  are independent, then  $A^c$  and  $B$  also are independent since  $\mathbf{P}[A^c \cap B] = \mathbf{P}[B] - \mathbf{P}[A \cap B] = \mathbf{P}[B] - \mathbf{P}[A]\mathbf{P}[B] = (1 - \mathbf{P}[A])\mathbf{P}[B] = \mathbf{P}[A^c]\mathbf{P}[B]$ . We generalize this observation in the following property.

**Property 1.10.** Let  $I$  be an arbitrary index set and let  $(A_i)_{i \in I}$  be an arbitrary family of events. Define  $B_i^0 = A_i$  and  $B_i^1 = A_i^c$  for  $i \in I$ . Then the following three statements are equivalent.

- (i) The family  $(A_i)_{i \in I}$  is independent.
- (ii) There is an  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^I$  such that the family  $(B_i^{\alpha_i})_{i \in I}$  is independent.
- (iii) For any  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}^I$ , the family  $(B_i^{\alpha_i})_{i \in I}$  is independent.

*Proof.* (Exercise.)  $\square$

**Example 1.11** (Euler product formula). The [Riemann zeta function](#),  $\zeta(s)$ , is a function of a complex variable  $s$  that analytically continues the sum of the infinite series

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$$

which converges when the real part of  $s$  is greater than 1.  $\square$

## 1.2 Independent Random Variables

### 1.3 Kolmogorov's 0-1 Law

### 1.4 Example: Percolation