

Solutions

Chapter 2 Foundations of Probability

2.1 Since g is \mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H} -measurable, therefore $\forall C \in \mathcal{H}, \exists B = g^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{G}$. Similarly, since f is \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{G} -measurable, $\forall B \in \mathcal{G}, \exists A = f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus $\forall C \in \mathcal{H}, \exists A = f^{-1}(g^{-1}(C)) = (g \circ f)^{-1}(C) \in \mathcal{F}$ and the proof is complete.

2.2 We claim that $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ is $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ measurable. Define $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $a < b$. Since X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n is $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ measurable, therefore $\exists A_1 = X_1^{-1}((a_1, b_1)), A_2 = X_2^{-1}((a_2, b_2)), \dots, A_n = X_n^{-1}((a_n, b_n)) \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $A = A_1 \cap A_2 \cap \dots \cap A_n = \bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i$. It follows that $X^{-1}((a, b)) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n ((a, b)) = A \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore X is $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ measurable and X is random vector.

2.3

- (i) We need to show that Σ_X is closed under countable union. Let $U_i = X^{-1}(A_i), A_i \in \Sigma, i \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X^{-1}(A_i) = X^{-1}(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i)$. Since $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \Sigma$ (Σ is sigma algebra), $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i \in \Sigma_X$.
- (ii) We need to show that Σ_X is closed under set subtraction $-$. $\forall U_1, U_2 \in \Sigma_X, U_1 - U_2 = X^{-1}(A_1) - X^{-1}(A_2) = X^{-1}(A_1 - A_2)$. Since $A_1 - A_2 \in \Sigma$ (Σ is sigma algebra), $U_1 - U_2 \in \Sigma_X$.
- (iii) We need to show that Σ_X is closed to \mathcal{U} itself. Since $\mathcal{U} = X^{-1}(\mathcal{V})$ and $\mathcal{V} \in \Sigma$, it follows that $\mathcal{U} \in \Sigma_X$.

2.4

- (a) (i) We need to show that $\mathcal{F}|_A$ is closed under countable union. Let $X_1 = A \cap B_1, X_2 = A \cap B_2, \dots$ and $X' = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i$ and $B' = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$ where $B_1, B_2, \dots \in \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is sigma algebra, $B' \in \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, since $X' = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A \cap B_i = A \cap \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i \right) = A \cap B'$, we can see that $X' \in \mathcal{F}|_A$.
- (ii) We need to show that $\mathcal{F}|_A$ is closed under set subtraction $-$. $\forall X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{F}|_A, X_1 - X_2 = (A \cap B_1) - (A \cap B_2) = A \cap (B_1 - B_2)$. Since $B_1 - B_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ (\mathcal{F} is sigma algebra), it follows that $X_1 - X_2 \in \mathcal{F}|_A$.
- (iii) We need to show that Σ_X is closed to A itself. Since $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\emptyset = A \cap \emptyset \in \mathcal{F}|_A$ and $A = \emptyset^C \in \mathcal{F}|_A$.
- (b) Let $P = \{A \cap B : B \in \mathcal{F}\}, Q = \{B : B \subset A, B \in \mathcal{F}\}$.
 - (i) We claim that $P \subset Q$. Let $X = A \cap B, B \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $A \in \mathcal{F}, X = A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, $X \in Q = \{B : B \subset A, B \in \mathcal{F}\}$.
 - (ii) We claim that $Q \subset P$. $\forall X \in Q$, we have $X \subset A$ and $X \in \mathcal{F}$, which means that $X = X \cap A$ and $X \in \mathcal{F}$. It follows that $X \in P$.
 - (iii) Take both (i)(ii) into consideration, we can see that $P = Q$.

2.5

- (a) Clearly $\sigma(\mathcal{G})$ should be the intersection of all σ -algebras that contain \mathcal{G} . Formally speaking, let $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathcal{F} | \mathcal{F} \text{ is a } \sigma\text{-algebra and contains } \mathcal{G}\}$. Then $\bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$ contains exactly those sets that are in every σ -algebra that contains \mathcal{G} . Given its existence, we only need to prove that $\bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$ is the smallest σ -algebra that contains \mathcal{G} .

First we show $\bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$ is a σ -algebra. Since \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra and therefore $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}$, it follows that $\Omega \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$. Next, for any $A \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$, $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}$. Since they are all σ -algebras, $A^c \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$. Hence $A^c \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$. Finally, for any $\{A_i\}_i \subset \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$, $\{A_i\}_i \subset \mathcal{F}$ for all $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}$. Since they are all σ -algebras, $\bigcup_i A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ for all $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}$. Hence $\bigcup_i A_i \in \bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$.

It is quite obvious that $\bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F}$ is the smallest one as $\bigcap_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{F}'$ for all $\mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{K}$.

- (b) We first introduce a useful lemma: the map X is \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{G} -measurable if and only if $\sigma(X) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, where $\sigma(X) = \{X^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is the σ -algebra generated by X . With this lemma, the main idea to prove X is $\mathcal{F}/\sigma(\mathcal{G})$ -measurable is to show that $\sigma(X) = \{X^{-1}(A) : A \in \sigma(\mathcal{G})\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Let $X^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) = \{X^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}\}$. Clearly we have $X^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. $\sigma(X^{-1}(\mathcal{G}))$ is the smallest σ -algebra that contains $X^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$. And we know \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra that contains $X^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$. According to the result of the previous question, $\sigma(X^{-1}(\mathcal{G})) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, $\sigma(X^{-1}(\mathcal{G})) = X^{-1}(\sigma(\mathcal{G})) = \{X^{-1}(A) : A \in \sigma(\mathcal{G})\} = \sigma(X)$. Hence $\sigma(X) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Readers can further refer to the penultimate paragraph in Page 16, where the author provides a general idea to check whether a map is measurable.

- (c) The idea is to show $\forall B \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{I}\{A\}^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}$.

If $\{0, 1\} \in B$, $\mathbb{I}\{A\}^{-1}(B) = \Omega \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\{0\} \in B$, $\mathbb{I}\{A\}^{-1}(B) = A^c \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\{1\} \in B$, $\mathbb{I}\{A\}^{-1}(B) = A \in \mathcal{F}$. If $\{0, 1\} \cap B = \emptyset$, $\mathbb{I}\{A\}^{-1}(B) = \emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$.

2.6 As the hint suggests, Y is not $\sigma(X)$ -measurable under such conditions since $Y^{-1}((0, 1)) = (0, 1) \notin \sigma(X)$, where $\sigma(X) = \{X^{-1}(A) : A \in \mathcal{G}\} = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}\}$.

2.7 First we have $\mathbb{P}(\Omega | B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\Omega \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = 1$. Then, for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{P}(A | B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} \geq 0$. Next, for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{P}(A^c | B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A^c \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}((\Omega - A) \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B) - \mathbb{P}(A \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = 1 - \mathbb{P}(A | B)$. Finally, for all countable collections of disjoint sets $\{A_i\}_i$ with $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$ for all i , we have $\mathbb{P}(\bigcup_i A_i | B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}((\bigcup_i A_i) \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\bigcup_i (A_i \cap B))}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \sum_i \frac{\mathbb{P}(A_i \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \sum_i \mathbb{P}(A_i | B)$.

2.8 With the definition of conditional probability, we have $\mathbb{P}(A | B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(A \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B|A)\mathbb{P}(A)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}$.

2.9

- (a) There are 36 possible events:

1. $X_1 < 2, X_2 = \text{even}$:

$$X_1 = 1, X_2 = 2$$

$$X_1 = 1, X_2 = 4$$

$$X_1 = 1, X_2 = 6$$

$$\text{So, } \mathbb{P}(X_1 < 2, X_2 = \text{even}) = \frac{3}{36} = \frac{1}{12}$$

$$\text{and } \mathbb{P}(X_1 < 2) = \frac{1}{3}, \mathbb{P}(X_2 = \text{even}) = \frac{1}{2}$$

So, $\mathbb{P}(X_1 < 2, X_2 = \text{even}) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 < 2) * \mathbb{P}(X_2 = \text{even})$. According to the definition of independent event, two events are independent.

- (b) Prove $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$

2.10

- (a) Empty sets and complete sets are independent of any event:

$$P(A \cap \Omega) = P(A) = 1 * P(A) = P(\Omega) * P(A)$$

$$P(A \cap \phi) = P(\phi) = 0 = P(\phi) * P(A)$$

- (b) Prove when $P(A) = 0$ or 1 , A is independent of any event: for any $B \in \Omega$

$$P(A) \in \{0, 1\}$$

$$\text{When } P(A) = 1, P(A^c \cap B) \leq P(A^c) = 1 - P(A) = 0,$$

$$\text{we have } P(A \cap B) = P(A \cap B) + P(A^c \cap B) = P(B) = P(A)P(B)$$

$$\text{When } P(A) = 0, \text{ we have } P(A \cap B) \leq P(A) = 0 = P(A)P(B)$$

- (c) $P(A^c \cap A) = P(A)P(A^c)$

$$\text{we have } 0 = P(A)(1 - P(A)) \Rightarrow P(A) \in \{0, 1\}$$

- (d) $P(A \cap A) = P(A)P(A), P(A) = 0, 1$

- (e) $\Omega = (1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1), (0, 0)$

$$\text{Just verify that each case is independent : } P(A = 1, B = 1) = \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{2} = P(A)P(B)$$

$$P(A = 1, B = 0) = \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{2} = P(A)P(B)$$

$$P(A = 0, B = 1) = \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{2} = P(A)P(B)$$

$$P(A = 0, B = 0) = \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{2} = P(A)P(B)$$

- (f) $P(X_1 \leq 2) = 2/3$

$$P(X_1 = X_2) = 3/9 = 1/3$$

$$P(X_1 \leq 2, X_1 = X_2) = P(X_1 = X_2 = 1) + P(X_1 = X_2 = 2) = 1/9 + 1/9 = 2/9$$

$$\text{So, } P(X_1 \leq 2, X_1 = X_2) = P(X_1 = X_2)P(X_1 \leq 2)$$

- (g) Necessity : $\frac{|A \cap B|}{n} = P(A \cap B) = P(A)P(B) = \frac{|A|}{n} \frac{|B|}{n}$

$$\Rightarrow |A \cap B| * n = |A||B|$$

$$\text{Sufficiency : } |A \cap B| * n = |A||B| \Rightarrow \frac{|A|}{n} \frac{|B|}{n} = \frac{|A \cap B|}{n}$$

$$\Rightarrow P(A \cap B) = P(A)P(B)$$

- (h) $|A \cap B| * n = |A||B|, \Rightarrow n \leq |A| \leq n \Rightarrow A \neq \phi \text{ or } \Omega$

- (j) Let's take a counter example: roll a die and set the A event to $\{1, 2, 3\}$, B event is set to $\{1, 2, 4\}$, C event is set to $\{1, 4, 5, 6\}$

$$P(X_1 X_2 X_3) = \frac{1}{6}$$

$$P(X_1)P(X_2)P(X_3) = (1/2) * (1/2) * (2/3) = 1/6$$

$$\text{while } P(X_1 \cap X_2) = 1/3 \neq \frac{1}{2} * \frac{1}{2}$$

2.11

- (a) $X: \Omega \rightarrow x$

Because X, Y are independent equivalent to $\sigma(X), \sigma(Y)$ are independent;

For any $A \in \sigma(Y)$,

$$P(\phi \cap A) = P(\phi) = 0 = P(\phi)P(A)$$

$$P(\Omega \cap A) = P(A) = P(\Omega)P(A)$$

(b) We know that $P(X = x) = 1$

$$P(X = x|Y) = \frac{P((X = x) \cap Y)}{P(Y)} = 1 = P(X = x)$$

$$P(X \neq x|Y) = 1 - P(X = x|Y) = 0 = P(X \neq x)$$

(c) Notice the relation: $P(A) = P(X(A) = 1)$

$$P(B) = P(X(B) = 1)$$

$$P(A \cap B) = P(X(A \cap B) = 1)$$

The first two formulas follow the definition. Let's prove the third equation:

$$P(X(A \cap B) = 1) = P(X(A) + X(B) - X(A \cup B) = 1)$$

Let's discuss $X(A), X(B), X(A \cup B)$:

$X(A)$	$X(B)$	$X(A \cup B)$	$X(A) + X(B) - X(A \cup B)$
1	1	1	1
1	0	1	0
0	1	1	0
0	0	0	0

We can see that, $P(X(A \cap B) = 1) = P(X(A) + X(B) - X(A \cup B) = 1)$, this is only one case of the first row of the table.

that is $P(X(A \cap B) = 1) = P(X(A) = 1, X(B) = 1) = P(A \cap B)$

that is $P(X(A \cap B) = 1) = P(A \cap B)$

So, $P(A \cap B) = P(A)P(B)$ is equivalent to $P(X(A \cap B) = 1) = P(X(A) = 1)P(X(B) = 1)$

(d) A_i pairwise i $\Leftrightarrow I\{A_i\}$ pairwise i

$$\text{mutual i} \Leftrightarrow P(\bigcap_i A_i) = \prod_i P(A_i)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow P(\bigcap_{i \in K^I} A_i \cap \bigcap_{i \in K^I} A_i^c)$$

$$= \prod_{i \in K^I} P(A_i) \prod_{i \in K^I} P(A_i^c)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \{\phi, \Omega, A_i, A_i^c\} \text{ mutual independent}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sigma(I\{w \in A_i\}) \text{ mutual i}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow I\{w \in A_i\} \text{ mutual i}$$

2.12 X integrable $|X|$ integrable

(a) For any $A \in \mathcal{B}(R) \Rightarrow A$ is open,

so, $f^{-1}(A)$ is open, so $f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{B}(R)$

(b) X is known to be a random variable, $f(x) = |x|$ continuous.

r.v. X is $\mathbf{F}/\mathbf{B}(R)$ -measurable

$\Rightarrow |X|$ is $\mathbf{B}(R)/\mathbf{B}(R)$ -measurable

$\Rightarrow |X|$ is $\mathbf{F}/\mathbf{B}(R)$ -measurable

$\Rightarrow |X|$ is r.v.

From (a)(b), X integrable $\Leftrightarrow |X|$ integrable.

2.14

(a) Assume $\forall i, X_i$ is simple function.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i,j} \mathbb{I}_{A_{i,j}} \{\omega\} \right] \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i,j} \mathbb{I}_{A_{i,j}} \{\omega\} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i,j} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{I}_{A_{i,j}} \{\omega\} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i,j} \mathbb{P}(A_{i,j}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i]
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Assume $\forall i, X_i$ is non-negative random variable.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right] \\
&= \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} h d\mathbb{P} : h \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h \leq X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} h_i d\mathbb{P} : h_i \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h_i \leq X_i \right\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i]
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Assume $\forall i, X_i$ is arbitrary random variable.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^+ - X_i^-) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^+ \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^- \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i^+] - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i^-] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}[X_i^+] - \mathbb{E}[X_i^-]) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i]
\end{aligned}$$

(a) Assume X is simple function.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[cX] &= \mathbb{E}\left[c \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{I}_{A_i}\{\omega\}\right] \\
&= \int_{\Omega} c \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{I}_{A_i}\{\omega\} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= c \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{I}_{A_i}\{\omega\} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= c\mathbb{E}[X]
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Assume X is non-negative random variable.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[cX] &= \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} h d\mathbb{P} : h \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h \leq cX \right\} \\
&= c \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} h' d\mathbb{P} : h' \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h' \leq X \right\} \\
&= c\mathbb{E}[X]
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Assume X is arbitrary random variable.

(i) $c \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[cX] &= \mathbb{E}[(cX)^+] - \mathbb{E}[(cX)^-] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[c(X)^+] - \mathbb{E}[c(X)^-] \\
&= c\mathbb{E}[(X)^+] - c\mathbb{E}[(X)^-] \\
&= c\mathbb{E}[X]
\end{aligned}$$

(ii) $c < 0$

By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(cX)^+ &= cX \mathbb{I}\{cX > 0\} \\
&= cX \mathbb{I}\{X < 0\} \text{ (since } c < 0\text{)} \\
&= (-c)(-X) \mathbb{I}\{X < 0\} \\
&= (-c)(X)^-
\end{aligned}$$

Along the similar line, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(cX)^- &= -cX \mathbb{I}\{cX < 0\} \\
&= -cX \mathbb{I}\{X > 0\} \\
&= -c(X)^+
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[cX] &= \mathbb{E}[(cX)^+] - \mathbb{E}[(cX)^-] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(-c)(X)^-] - \mathbb{E}[-c(X)^+] \\
&= -c\mathbb{E}[(X)^-] + c\mathbb{E}[(X)^+] \\
&= c\mathbb{E}[X]
\end{aligned}$$

(a) Assume $X = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{I}_{A_i} \{\omega\}$, $Y = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \mathbb{I}_{B_j} \{\omega\}$ are simple functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[XY] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_i \beta_j \mathbb{I}_{A_i} \{\omega\} \mathbb{I}_{B_j} \{\omega\}\right] \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_i \beta_j \mathbb{I}_{A_i} \{\omega\} \mathbb{I}_{B_j} \{\omega\} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_i \beta_j \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap B_j) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_i \beta_j \mathbb{P}(A_i) \mathbb{P}(B_j) \text{ (by the definition of independence)} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbb{P}(A_i)\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \mathbb{P}(B_j)\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[Y]
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Assume X, Y are non-negative random variables.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[XY] &= \sup \{ \mathbb{E}[h] : h \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h \leq XY \} \\
&= \sup \{ \mathbb{E}[h_1 h_2] : h_1, h_2 \text{ are simple and } 0 \leq h_1 \leq X, 0 \leq h_2 \leq Y \} \\
&= \sup \{ \mathbb{E}[h_1] \mathbb{E}[h_2] : h_1, h_2 \text{ are simple and } 0 \leq h_1 \leq X, 0 \leq h_2 \leq Y \} \\
&= \sup \{ \mathbb{E}[h_1] : h_1 \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h_1 \leq X \} \cdot \sup \{ \mathbb{E}[h_2] : h_2 \text{ is simple and } 0 \leq h_2 \leq Y \} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[Y]
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Assume X, Y are arbitrary random variables.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[XY] &= \mathbb{E}[(X^+ - X^-)(Y^+ - Y^-)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X^+ Y^+ - X^+ Y^- - X^- Y^+ + X^- Y^-] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X^+] \mathbb{E}[Y^+] - \mathbb{E}[X^+] \mathbb{E}[Y^-] - \mathbb{E}[X^-] \mathbb{E}[Y^+] + \mathbb{E}[X^-] \mathbb{E}[Y^-] \\
&= (\mathbb{E}[X^+] - \mathbb{E}[X^-])(\mathbb{E}[Y^+] - \mathbb{E}[Y^-]) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[Y]
\end{aligned}$$

2.17 Before proving Ex.2.17, we need to make minor changes to the definition of conditional expectation and give a small lemma.

Definition 1. Assume $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space. $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} . $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a random variable. The conditional expectation of X given \mathcal{G} is denoted by any random variable Y which satisfies the following 2 properties:

- Y is \mathcal{G} -measurable
- $\forall A \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\int_A Y d\mathbb{P} = \int_A X d\mathbb{P}$$

Formally, we denote Y by notation $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$.

Lemma 1. If X is \mathcal{G} -measurable, then $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}] = X$ holds a.s.

Proof. Since X is \mathcal{G} -measurable, property1 holds. And property2 holds trivially. □

We can now handily prove Ex.2.17. Since $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_1]$ is \mathcal{G}_1 -measurable and $\mathcal{G}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_2$, we can see that $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_1]$ is \mathcal{G}_2 -measurable. By Lemma 1, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_1]|\mathcal{G}_2] = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_1]$ holds almost surely.

2.18 Suppose $X = Y$ with $\mathbb{V}[X] \neq 0$. Then, we have $\mathbb{E}[XY] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] = \mathbb{V}[X] + \mathbb{E}[X]^2 \neq \mathbb{E}[X]^2 = \mathbb{E}[X]\mathbb{E}[Y]$.

2.19 As the hint suggests, $X(\omega) = \int_{[0,\infty)} \mathbb{I}\{[0, X(\omega)]\}(x)dx$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X(\omega)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{[0,\infty)} \mathbb{I}\{[0, X(\omega)]\}(x)dx\right] \\ &= \int_{[0,\infty)} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{[0, X(\omega)]\}(x)]dx \\ &= \int_{[0,\infty)} P(X(\omega) > x)dx \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the second equality is given by Fubini–Tonell theorem.

2.20 We prove the following properties all by contradiction (for the sake of rigor).

- (1) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[X | \mathcal{G}](\omega) < 0\}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{G}$ since $\mathbb{E}[X | \mathcal{G}]$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable by definition. Now suppose $\mathbb{P}(G) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G X d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{G}) d\mathbb{P} \\ &< 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the equality holds by the definition of conditional expectation. Now we can find it contradictory as $X \geq 0$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(G) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[X | \mathcal{G}] \geq 0$ a.s.

- (2) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[1 | \mathcal{G}](\omega) \neq 1\}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{G}$ since $\mathbb{E}[1 | \mathcal{G}]$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable by definition. Now suppose $\mathbb{P}(G) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G 1 d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(1 | \mathcal{G}) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\neq 1 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where the equality holds by the definition of conditional expectation. Now we can find it contradictory as $\int_G 1 d\mathbb{P} = 1$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(G) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[1 | \mathcal{G}] = 1$ a.s.

- (3) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[X + Y | \mathcal{G}](\omega) \neq \mathbb{E}[X | \mathcal{G}](\omega) + \mathbb{E}[Y | \mathcal{G}](\omega)\}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{G}$ since $\mathbb{E}[X + Y | \mathcal{G}]$, $\mathbb{E}[X | \mathcal{G}]$, and $\mathbb{E}[Y | \mathcal{G}]$ are all \mathcal{G} -measurable by definition. Now suppose $\mathbb{P}(G) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G (X + Y) d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X + Y | \mathcal{G}) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\neq \int_G [\mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{G}) + \mathbb{E}(Y | \mathcal{G})] d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{G}) d\mathbb{P} + \int_G \mathbb{E}(Y | \mathcal{G}) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G X d\mathbb{P} + \int_G Y d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the first equality and the last one hold by the definition of conditional expectation. It contradicts the linearity of expectation in that $\int_G (X + Y) d\mathbb{P} \neq \int_G X d\mathbb{P} + \int_G Y d\mathbb{P}$. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(G) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}(X + Y | \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{G}) + \mathbb{E}(Y | \mathcal{G})$ a.s.

- (4) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[XY \mid \mathcal{G}](\omega) \neq Y(\omega)\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}](\omega)\}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{G}$ since $\mathbb{E}[XY \mid \mathcal{G}]$, Y , and $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}]$ are all \mathcal{G} -measurable by definition. Now suppose $\mathbb{P}(G) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G XY d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(XY \mid \mathcal{G}) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\neq \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Now our target is to show it is contradictory. This is a bit tricky, so we start from the simplest case and then generalize it step by step.

- a. Suppose $Y = \mathbb{I}_A$ for some $A \in \mathcal{G}$. Then

$$\int_G XY d\mathbb{P} = \int_{G \cap A} X d\mathbb{P} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} &= \int_{G \cap A} \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{G \cap A} X d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Hence it holds that $\int_G XY d\mathbb{P} = \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P}$.

- b. Suppose Y is non-negative and let $\{Y_n\}$ be sequence of non-negative simple functions converging to Y from below. Then by linearity, it holds that

$$\int_G X^+ Y_n d\mathbb{P} = \int_G Y_n \mathbb{E}[X^+ \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\int_G X^- Y_n d\mathbb{P} = \int_G Y_n \mathbb{E}[X^- \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \quad (9)$$

Applying the monotone convergence we end up with

$$\int_G X^+ Y d\mathbb{P} = \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X^+ \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\int_G X^- Y d\mathbb{P} = \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X^- \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \quad (11)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G XY d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G X^+ Y d\mathbb{P} - \int_G X^- Y d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G Y (\mathbb{E}[X^+ \mid \mathcal{G}] - \mathbb{E}[X^- \mid \mathcal{G}]) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X^+ - X^- \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G Y \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

- c. Finally, for arbitrary Y , we can separate $Y = Y^+ - Y^-$ and the contradiction still holds by linearity of expectation.

Therefore, in any case Eq.?? is contradictory. So $\mathbb{P}(G) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[XY \mid \mathcal{G}] = Y\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}]$ a.s.

- (5) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1](\omega) \neq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_2] \mid \mathcal{G}_1](\omega)\}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$ since both $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_2] \mid \mathcal{G}_1]$ are \mathcal{G}_1 -measurable by definition. Now suppose $\mathbb{P}(G) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G X d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G}_1) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\neq \int_G \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_2] \mid \mathcal{G}_1] d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G}_2) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G X d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The last equality stands since $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}_2$, which suggests $G \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Now we can find it contradictory. Therefore $\mathbb{P}(G) = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_2] \mid \mathcal{G}_1]$ a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G X d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G}_1) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\neq \int_G \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_2] \mid \mathcal{G}_1] d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X \mid \mathcal{G}_2) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_G X d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

- (6) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[X \mid \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)](\omega) \neq \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1](\omega)\}$. Notice that $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1]$ is not only \mathcal{G}_1 -measurable but also $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)$ -measurable. Thus we have $G \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)$. Now suppose $\mathbb{P}(G) > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G X d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}[X \mid \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)] d\mathbb{P} \\ &\neq \int_G \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1] d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

To show it is contradictory, we want to prove that $\forall G \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)$,

$$\int_G X d\mathbb{P} = \int_G \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1] d\mathbb{P} \tag{16}$$

The following techniques are closely related to ‘Dynkin system’, which is beyond my knowledge. The main idea is that if we assume X is non-negative, which can be generalized by linearity, it is enough to establish Eq.?? for some π -system that generates $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)$.

One possibility is $\mathcal{H} = \{G_1 \cap G_2 : G_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2\}$. Then, $\forall G_1 \cap G_2 \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G_1 \cap G_2} \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1] d\mathbb{P} &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1] \mathbb{I}_{G_1} \mathbb{I}_{G_2} d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1] \mathbb{I}_{G_1} d\mathbb{P} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{I}_{G_2} d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} X \mathbb{I}_{G_1} d\mathbb{P} \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{I}_{G_2} d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} X \mathbb{I}_{G_1} \mathbb{I}_{G_2} d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{G_1 \cap G_2} X d\mathbb{P} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the second and fourth equality holds due to independence between $\sigma(X)$ and \mathcal{G}_2 given \mathcal{G}_1 .

Hence, we find it contradictory. So $\mathbb{P}(G) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2)] = \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}_1]$ a.s.

(7) Let $G = \{\omega : \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}](\omega) \neq \mathbb{E}[X]\}$. Then $G \in \mathcal{G}$ since $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}]$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable by definition. And because \mathcal{G} is trivial, $G = \emptyset$ or $G = \Omega$.

a. If $G = \emptyset$, $P(G) = 0$ for sure.

b. If $G = \Omega$, which suggests $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] \neq \mathbb{E}[X]$ always holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_G X d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P} \\
 &\neq \int_G \mathbb{E}[X] d\mathbb{P} \\
 &= \int_\Omega \mathbb{E}[X] d\mathbb{P} \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[X]
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which is obviously contradictory since $\int_G X d\mathbb{P} = \int_\Omega X d\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{E}[X]$.

Therefore, $P(G) = 0$ and hence $\mathbb{E}[X \mid \mathcal{G}] = \mathbb{E}[X]$ a.s.

Chapter 3 Stochastic Processes and Markov Chains

3.1

- (a) On $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}, \lambda)$, for any $x \in [0, 1]$

Let $F_1(x), F_2(x), F_3(x), \dots$ be the binary expansion of x .

$$F_t(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & A \\ 0, & \bar{A} \end{cases} \quad (\bar{A} \text{ is the opposite case of } A)$$

$F_t(x)$ is Bernoulli random variable.

$$(b) \begin{cases} F_1 = 0 : 0 \leq x < 0.5 \\ F_1 = 1 : 0.5 \leq x < 1 \\ \dots \\ \begin{cases} F_2 = 0 : 0 \leq x' < 0.5 \\ F_2 = 1 : 0.5 \leq x' < 1 \end{cases} & x' = 2x - 1 \\ \dots \\ \begin{cases} F_t = 0 : 0 \leq x^t < 0.5 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(F_t = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \\ F_t = 1 : 0.5 \leq x^t < 1 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(F_t = 1) = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

- (c) It is obviously that $(F_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ are independent. It satisfies independent equation: $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$.
- (d) $(X_{m,t})_{t=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $(F_t)_{t=1}^\infty$ and $(X_{m,t})_{t=1}^\infty$ are mutually exclusive.
- (e) Such as (d).
- (f) Such as (d).

3.2

- (a) $S_t = \sum_{s=1}^t X_s 2^{s-1}$

X_t is a \mathcal{F} -adapted martingale.

$$(1) \mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = X_{t-1}.$$

$$(2) X_t \text{ is integrable} \Rightarrow S_t \text{ is integrable.}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[S_{t-1} + X_t 2^{t-1} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= S_{t-1} + \mathbb{E}[X_t 2^{t-1} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\ &= S_{t-1} + 2^t \times (1) \times \frac{1}{2} + 2^t \times (-1) \times \frac{1}{2} \\ &= S_{t-1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow (S_t)_{t=1}^\infty$$

- (b) $t=1$, if $S_t \neq 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, S_t = -1$
 $t=2$, if $S_t \neq 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, S_t = -3$
 $t=3$, if $S_t \neq 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, S_t = -7$

...

If avoid $S_t = 1$, the X_s sequence must be -1 .

$$\tau = \min\{t : S_t = 1\} = \min\{t : X_T = 1\}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\tau < n) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq n) = 1 - \frac{1}{2^n}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) = 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq n) = 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} = 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^n}$$

- (c) If $t = \tau$, then $S_t = 1$, so $S_\tau \equiv 1$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[S_\tau] = 1$$

- (d) Doob's(a) can be proved by 3.2(b)

$$\tau = 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = 1 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\tau = 1) = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\tau = 2 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, X_2 = 1 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\tau = 1) = \frac{1}{4}$$

$$\tau = 3 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, X_2 = -1, X_3 = 1 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\tau = 1) = \frac{1}{8}$$

...

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) = \mathbb{P}(\tau = 1) + \mathbb{P}(\tau = 2) + \mathbb{P}(\tau = 3) + \dots = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \dots = 1$$

because of $n \neq \infty$, $\mathbb{P}(\tau = n) = \frac{1}{n^2} \neq 0$.

Doob's(b)(c) can also be proved by 3.2(b)

$$t=1 \text{ , if } S_t \neq 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, S_t = -1$$

$$t=2 \text{ , if } S_t \neq 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, S_t = -3$$

$$t=3 \text{ , if } S_t \neq 1 \Rightarrow X_1 = -1, S_t = -7$$

...

It can be concluded that $|S_t|$ and $|S_{t-1}|$ can not be bounded, so $\mathbb{E}[|X_{t+1}| \mathcal{F}]$ and $|4X_{t \wedge \tau}|$ can not be bounded neither.

3.4 If $X_t \geq 0$ is dropped, $\mathbb{E}[X_\tau | \{\tau \leq n\}] \geq \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon | \{\tau \leq n\}]$ not always true.

Chapter 4 Stochastic Bandits

4.1 By definition

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(\pi, v) &= n\mu^*(v) - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^n X_t\right] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \mu^*(v) - \sum_{t=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_t] \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n [\mu^* - \mu_{A_t}] \end{aligned}$$

- (a) $\mu^* = \max \mu_a \geq \mu_{A_t} \Rightarrow R_n(\pi, v) = \sum_{t=1}^n [\mu^* - \mu_{A_t}] \geq 0.$
- (b) If π choose $A_t \in \arg \max_a \mu_a$ for all $t \in [n] \Rightarrow \sum_{t=1}^n [\mu^* - \mu_{A_t}] = 0.$
- (c) If $R_n(\pi, v) = 0$ for some policy π , then $A_t \in \arg \max_a \mu_a \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mu_{A_t} = \mu^*) = 1.$

Chapter 11 The Exp3 Algorithm

11.2 Let π be a deterministic policy, and we define $x_{ti} = 0$ if $A_t = i$ otherwise $x_{ti} = 1$. The deterministic policy collects zero rewards all time,

$$\max_{i \in [k]} \sum_{t=1}^n x_{ti} \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^k x_{ti} = \frac{n(k-1)}{k}$$

11.5 Let P be a probability vector with nonzero components and let $A \sim P$. Suppose \hat{X} is a function such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{X}(A, x_A) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i \hat{X}(i, x_i) = x_1$$

Show that there exists an $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $\langle a, P \rangle = 0$ and for all i and z in their respective domains, $\hat{X}(i, z) = a_i + \frac{\mathbb{I}_{\{i=1\}} z}{P_1}$

Proof. Let x, x' be arbitrary but agree on the first component $x_1 = x'_1$. Let $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k P_i \hat{X}(i, x_i)$ Note that,

$$0 = f(x) - f(x') = \sum_{i=j}^k P_j \hat{X}(j, x_j)$$

for all $j > 1$. Since x, x' are arbitrary, $\hat{X}(j, \cdot) = \text{const}$. Let a_j equal to $\hat{X}(j, \cdot)$.

Further, let $a_1 = \hat{X}(1, 0)$ and then given any $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\hat{X}(1, x_1) = a_1 + x_1/P_1$.

Finally, let x be such that $x_1 = 0$. Then $0 = f(x) = \sum_i P_i a_i$. □

11.7 First, note that if $G = -\log(-\log(U))$ then $\mathbb{P}(G \leq g) = e^{-\exp(-g)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\log a_i + G_i \geq \max_{j \in [k]} \log a_j + G_j \right) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j \neq i} \mathbb{P}(\log a_j + G_j \leq \log a_i + G_i \mid G_i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{j \neq i} \exp \left(-\frac{a_j}{a_i} \exp(-G_i) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[U_i^{\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{a_j}{a_i}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{a_j}{a_i}} \\ &= \frac{a_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k a_j} \end{aligned}$$

11.8 Let Z_{ti} be a standard Gambel. The follow-the-perturbed-leader algorithm chooses

$$A_t = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in [k]} \left(Z_{ti} - \eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \hat{Y}_{si} \right)$$

is the same as EXP3. Given (11.7)

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\log(a_i) + G_i = \max_{j \in [k]} (\log(a_j) + G_j) \right) = \frac{a_i}{\sum_{j=1}^k a_j}$$

Just simply take a_i as $-\eta \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} \hat{Y}_{si}$, then the form is identical.