## **SOLUTIONS SHEET 2**

## YANNIS BÄHNI

**Exercise 1.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  be a probability space. Recall, that for  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  with P(A) > 0 the conditional probability of B with respect to A is defined by

$$P(B|A) := \frac{P(B \cap A)}{P(A)}. (1)$$

1. Let  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $0 < P(A_2) < 1$ . Observe, that by  $0 < P(A_2) < 1$  the conditional probability  $P(B|A_2^c)$  is well-defined since  $P(A_2^c) = 1 - P(A_2) > 0$ . Thus

$$P(A_1) = P((A_1 \cap A_2) \cup (A_1 \cap A_2^c))$$

$$= P(A_1 \cap A_2) + P(A_1 \cap A_2^c)$$

$$= \frac{P(A_1 \cap A_2)}{P(A_2)} P(A_2) + \frac{P(A_1 \cap A_2^c)}{P(A_2^c)} P(A_2^c)$$

$$= P(A_1 | A_2) P(A_2) + P(A_1 | A_2^c) P(A_2^c).$$

2. We have

$$P(A_3|A_1\cap A_2) = \frac{P(A_3\cap A_1\cap A_2)}{P(A_1\cap A_2)} = \frac{P(A_3)P(A_1)P(A_2)}{P(A_1)P(A_2)} = P(A_3).$$

3. First we prove two auxiliary results.

LEMMA 0.1. Let  $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  be independent. Then  $A_1^c, \ldots, A_n^c$  are independent.

*Proof.* It is enough to consider the case  $A_1, \ldots, A_{i-1}, A_i^c, A_{i+1}, \ldots, A_n$  for some  $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ . Let  $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ . If  $i \notin I$ , there is nothing to prove. So assume  $i \in I$ . Then we have

$$P\left(A_i^c \cap \bigcap_{\iota \in I \setminus \{i\}} A_\iota\right) = P\left(\bigcap_{\iota \in I \setminus \{i\}} A_\iota\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{\iota \in I} A_\iota\right)$$

$$= \prod_{\iota \in I \setminus \{i\}} P(A_\iota) - \prod_{\iota \in I} P(A_\iota)$$

$$= (1 - P(A_i)) \prod_{\iota \in I \setminus \{i\}} P(A_\iota)$$

$$= P(A_i^c) \prod_{\iota \in I \setminus \{i\}} P(A_\iota).$$

(Yannis Bähni) UNIVERSITY OF ZURICH, RÄMISTRASSE 71, 8006 ZURICH *E-mail address*: yannis.baehni@uzh.ch.

LEMMA 0.2. Let  $f:[0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $f(x) := \log(1-x) + x$ . Then  $f \leq 0$ .

*Proof.* f is clearly differentiable on [0,1) with

$$f'(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 - x} = \frac{x}{x - 1} \le 0.$$
 (2)

Hence f is monotonically decreasing on [0,1). By f(0)=0 we conclude  $f\leq 0$ .  $\square$  If  $P(A_i)=1$  for some  $i\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$  we have

$$P\left(\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{n} A_j\right)^c\right) \le P(A_i^c) = 0 \le \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{n} P(A_j)\right)$$

since  $A_i \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j$ . Therefore it is enough to consider  $P(A_i) < 1$  for i = 1, ..., n. Using lemma 0.1 and 0.2 we get

$$P\left(\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} A_{i}\right)^{c}\right) = P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} A_{i}^{c}\right)$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{n} P(A_{i}^{c})$$

$$= \exp\left(\log\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} P(A_{i}^{c})\right)\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(P(A_{i}^{c}))\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(1 - P(A_{i}))\right)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} P(A_{i})\right)$$