

**1. (Durrett 4.1.3)** Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , then on all of  $\Omega$ , we get that

$$(E(X|G) + xE(Y|G))^2 = E(X|G)^2 + x^2E(Y|G)^2 + 2xE(XY|G) \geq 0$$

So this quadratic has discriminant  $\leq 0$  on all of  $\Omega$ , writing down the discriminant this gives us

$$(2E(XY|G))^2 - 4E(X|G)^2E(Y|G)^2 \leq 0$$

and dividing by 4 gives us

$$E(XY|G)^2 \leq E(X|G)^2E(Y|G)^2$$

Finally Jensen's inequality for conditional expectation implies that  $E(X|G)^2 \leq E(X^2|G)$  and  $E(Y|G)^2 \leq E(Y^2|G)$ , and since both are positive we get the following inequality

$$E(XY|G)^2 \leq E(X|G)^2E(Y|G)^2 \leq E(X^2|G)E(Y^2|G)$$

□

**2. (Durrett 4.1.7)** Since  $\mathcal{F} = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$ ,  $E(Z|\mathcal{F})$  must be a constant function for any random variable  $Z$ , since any non-constant function is not  $\mathcal{F}$  measurable. Because of this,

$$\text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F}) = P(\Omega)\text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F}) = \int \text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F})$$

Now we can just compute using the property of integrating conditional expectation.

$$\begin{aligned} E(\text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F})) + \text{Var}(E(X|\mathcal{F})) &= \int \text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F}) + \int E(X|\mathcal{F})^2 - \left( \int E(X|\mathcal{F}) \right)^2 \\ &= \int E(X^2|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{F})^2 + \int E(X|\mathcal{F})^2 - \left( \int X \right)^2 \\ &= \int E(X^2|\mathcal{F}) - (EX)^2 \\ &= \int X^2 - (EX)^2 = EX^2 - (EX)^2 = \text{Var}X \end{aligned}$$

□

**3. (Durrett 4.1.9)** The main step is a computation, note since  $X \in \mathcal{G}$ , so is  $X^2$  this gives us

$$E((X - Y)^2|\mathcal{G}) = E(X^2|\mathcal{G}) + E(Y^2|\mathcal{G}) - 2E(XY|\mathcal{G}) = X^2 + E(Y^2|\mathcal{G}) - 2XE(Y|\mathcal{G}) = E(Y^2|\mathcal{G}) - X^2$$

Now we can apply the assumption  $EY^2 = EX^2$ , by taking expectations to get

$$E[(X - Y)^2] = E[E((X - Y)^2|\mathcal{G})] = E[E(Y^2|\mathcal{G})] - EX^2 = EY^2 - EX^2 = 0$$

Assume for contradiction that  $X \neq Y$  a.s. then  $A = \{(X - Y)^2 > 0\}$  has  $P(A) > 0$ , since  $A = \bigcup_1^\infty A_n$  where  $A_n = \{(X - Y)^2 \geq \frac{1}{n}\}$ , we get that  $P(A_n) \rightarrow P(A)$  by continuity from below, hence for some  $n$  we have  $P(A_n) > 0$ , so that

$$0 = E[(X - Y)^2] \geq E[(X - Y)^2 1_{A_n}] \geq \int_{A_n} \frac{1}{n} = P(A_n)/n > 0$$

which is the desired contradiction. □

**4. (Durrett 4.1.10)** Let  $Z$  be a random variable on  $L^1(\mathcal{F})$ , and let  $X = E(Z|\mathcal{G})$ , further assume that  $X \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} Z$ , this of course implies that  $P(X > x) = P(Z > x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now we can apply layer cake to get that

$$EZ^+ = \int_0^\infty P(Z > x)dx = \int_0^\infty P(X > x)dx = EX^+$$

Then the property of conditional probability further implies that  $E[Z1_{X>0}] = E[X1_{X>0}] = EZ^+$ , which implies that  $EZ^+ = E[Z^+1_{X>0}]$ , so that  $Z > 0$  implies  $X > 0$  a.s. Moreover, there does not exist a set  $B$  of positive measure with  $Z < 0$  on  $B$ , and  $B \subset X > 0$ , else we would have

$$EZ^+ = E[Z1_{X>0}] = E[Z1_B] + E[Z1_{\{X>0\} \setminus B}] < E[Z1_{\{X>0\} \setminus B}] \leq E[Z^+1_{\{X>0\} \setminus B}] \leq EZ^+$$

which is a contradiction, hence  $Z < 0$  implies that  $X \leq 0$  a.s. Finally  $P(Z = 0) = P(X = 0)$ , and  $\int_{X=0} X = \int_{X=0} Z$  alongside  $Z > 0$  implying  $X > 0$  a.s. gives us that  $\{X = 0\} = \{Z = 0\}$  a.s.

Now for any  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  we can choose  $Z = Y - c$ , and since  $Y \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} E[Y|\mathcal{G}]$ , we have  $Y - c \stackrel{\text{dist}}{=} E[Y - c|\mathcal{G}] = E[Y|\mathcal{G}] - c$ , applying the above gives us that  $Y > c$  if and only if  $X := E[Y|\mathcal{G}]$  is. It follows that for  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  any set of the form  $\{q - \frac{1}{2n} < X \leq q + \frac{1}{2n} \text{ and } Y \notin (q - \frac{1}{2n}, q + \frac{1}{2n}]\}$  has probability zero, we can use this to get a contradiction. Suppose that  $\{X \neq Y\}$  has positive probability, then  $\{X \neq Y\} = \bigcup_1^\infty \{|X - Y| > \frac{1}{n}\}$ , so that for some  $n$ , one of these sets must have positive probability. Then

$$\left\{|X - Y| > \frac{1}{n}\right\} \subset \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{Q}} \left\{q - \frac{1}{2n} < X \leq q + \frac{1}{2n} \text{ and } Y \notin (q - \frac{1}{2n}, q + \frac{1}{2n}]\right\}$$

by countable subadditivity one of the sets in the union must have positive probability, but this is a contradiction. So we can conclude indeed  $P(X \neq Y) = 0$ .  $\square$

**5. (Durrett 4.2.1)** Since  $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{G}_n$ , so are the  $\sigma$ -algebra they generate, i.e.  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n) \subset \mathcal{G}_n$ , the properties that  $X_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ , and  $E|X_n| < \infty$  are immediate by definition of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $(X_n, \mathcal{G}_n)$  being a martingale. To check the Martingale property we use that  $E(E(X_{n+1}|\mathcal{G}_n)|\mathcal{F}_n) = E(X_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n)$ , this allows us to write

$$E(X_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n) = E(E(X_{n+1}|\mathcal{G}_n)|\mathcal{F}_n) = E(X_n|\mathcal{F}_n) = X_n$$

$\square$

**6. (Durrett 4.2.3)** First note that for measurable  $X, Y$  we can write

$$\max\{X, Y\} = \frac{1}{2}(X + Y) + \frac{1}{2}|X - Y| = \frac{1}{2}(X + Y) + \frac{1}{2}(X - Y)^+ + \frac{1}{2}(Y - X)^+$$

Applying this to  $\max\{X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}\}$  and using linearity of conditional expectation yields

$$2E(\max\{X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}\}|\mathcal{F}_n) = E(X_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n) + E(Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n) + E((X_{n+1} - Y_{n+1})^+|\mathcal{F}_n) + E((Y_{n+1} - X_{n+1})^+|\mathcal{F}_n)$$

Since  $X \mapsto X^+$  is convex, we can apply the submartingale property, along with Jensen's to get

$$2E(\max\{X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}\}|\mathcal{F}_n) \geq X_n + Y_n + E((X_{n+1} - Y_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n)^+ + E((Y_{n+1} - X_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n)^+$$

Now using the fact that  $X \mapsto X^+$  is increasing, alongside the submartingale property gives us

$$E((X_{n+1} - Y_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n)^+ \geq (X_n - Y_n)^+ \text{ and } E((Y_{n+1} - X_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n)^+ \geq (Y_n - X_n)^+$$

We can apply these inequalities to get

$$2E(\max\{X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}\}|\mathcal{F}_n) \geq X_n + Y_n + (X_n - Y_n)^+ + (Y_n - X_n)^+ = 2\max\{X_n, Y_n\}$$

Dividing out by 2, we get the submartingale property. Now note that since  $X_n, Y_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ , and  $\max$  is borel measurable we have  $\max\{X_n, Y_n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$  and  $\max X_n, Y_n \leq |X_n| + |Y_n| \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_n)$ , since  $L^1$  is a vectorspace.  $\square$

**7. (Durrett 4.2.6)**

(a) A non-negative Martingale is in particular a nonnegative super-Martingale so by the super-martingale convergence theorem, there is some random variable  $X_\infty$ , such that  $X_n \rightarrow X_\infty$ . Assume for contradiction that  $P(A) > 0$ , where  $A = \{X_\infty > 0\}$ . Then on  $A$ , we get that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_n 1_A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_n}{X_{n-1}} 1_A = 1_A \frac{X_\infty}{X_\infty} = 1_A$$

Since  $X_\infty \neq 0$  on  $A$ . Hence we get that  $Y_n \rightarrow 1$  on  $A$ . Note that by continuity from above, we get that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P(|Y_1 - 1| < \frac{1}{k}) = P(Y_1 = 1) < 1$ , the pointwise convergence on  $A$  tells us for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , there exists some  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  such that for  $n \geq N$ , we get  $|Y_n - 1| < \frac{1}{k}$  on  $A$ . Letting  $k$  be arbitrary, and choosing such an  $N$ , we get for any  $n \geq N$

$$P(A) \leq P\left(|Y_N - 1| < \frac{1}{k}, \dots, |Y_n - 1| < \frac{1}{k}\right) = P\left(|Y_1 - 1| < \frac{1}{k}\right)^{n-N}$$

So that for any  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , we have  $P(A) \leq P(|Y_1 - 1| < \frac{1}{k})^m$ , now since  $k$  was arbitrary, and  $A, m$  are independent of  $k$ , this holds for all  $k$ , so taking the limit

$$P(A) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P\left(|Y_1 - 1| < \frac{1}{k}\right)^m = P(Y_1 = 1)^m$$

And since this holds for any  $m$ , we get that

$$P(A) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} P(Y_1 = 1)^m = 0$$

which is a contradiction.  $\square$

(b)  $\frac{1}{n} \log X_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \log Y_j$ , by the strong law of large numbers this converges to  $E \log Y_1$ , so it suffices to check that  $E \log Y_1 < 0$ . We can rewrite  $E \log Y_1 = E[1_{Y_1 > 1} \log Y_1] + E[1_{Y_1 < 1} \log Y_1]$ , now since  $Y_1 \neq 1$  we get  $0 < \int_{Y_1 > 1} Y_1 + \int_{Y_1 < 1} Y_1 \leq EY_1 = 1$ , and moreover since the expectation is 1, if one of the two integrals is nonzero, then so is the other so that

$$0 < \int_{Y_1 > 1} Y_1, \int_{Y_1 < 1} Y_1 < 1$$

This means that we can apply the inequality (strict because both values are strictly between 0, 1)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \log(EY_1) \geq \log\left(\int_{Y_1 > 1} Y_1 + \int_{Y_1 < 1} Y_1\right) > \log\left(\int_{Y_1 > 1} Y_1\right) + \log\left(\int_{Y_1 < 1} Y_1\right) \\ &\geq \int_{Y_1 > 1} \log Y_1 + \int_{Y_1 < 1} \log Y_1 = E[1_{Y_1 > 1} \log Y_1] + E[1_{Y_1 < 1} \log Y_1] = E \log Y_1 \end{aligned}$$

To justify the inequality interchanging the log with the integral, we use Jensen's inequality with exponentiation and the fact log is increasing (i.e. suppose  $X$  is a random variable positive on  $A$ ), then

$$\exp\left(\int_A \log X\right) \leq \int_A \exp \log X = \int_A X$$

so since log is increasing, taking log of both sides preserves the inequality

$$\int_A \log X = \log \exp\left(\int_A \log X\right) \leq \log \int_A X$$

$\square$

**8. (Durrett 4.4.2)** Since  $N \geq M$ , we have  $1_{M < n} - 1_{N < n} \geq 0$ , so we can take  $H_n = 1_{M < n} - 1_{N < n}$  which is positive as above, obviously bounded and also predictable since  $\{M < n\} = \{M \leq n-1\} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$  and  $\{N < n\} = \{N \leq n-1\} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ , hence  $1_{M < n} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$  and  $1_{N < n} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ , which implies their difference is also in  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ . Since  $H$  constitutes a positive martingale transform and  $X_n$  is a martingale, so is  $(H \bullet X)_n$ , so that (on the set  $N \leq k$  which is a.s.)

$$\begin{aligned} (H \bullet X)_k &= \sum_1^k (1_{M < n} - 1_{N < n})(X_n - X_{n-1}) = \sum_1^k 1_{M < n}(X_n - X_{n-1}) - \sum_1^k 1_{N < n}(X_n - X_{n-1}) \\ &= \sum_1^k (1 - 1_{M \geq n})(X_n - X_{n-1}) + \sum_1^k (1_{N \geq n} - 1)(X_n - X_{n-1}) \\ &= X_k - X_{k \wedge M} + -X_k + X_{k \wedge N} = X_{k \wedge N} - X_{k \wedge M} = X_N - X_M \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $(H \bullet X)_n$  is a submartingale, we get

$$EX_N - EX_M = E[(H \bullet X)_k] \geq E[(H \bullet X)_0] = 0$$

□

**9. (Durrett 4.4.9)** Let  $1 \leq m \leq n$ , then

$$E[(X_m - X_{m-1})(Y_m - Y_{m-1})] = E[X_m Y_m] + E[X_{m-1} Y_{m-1}] - E[X_m Y_{m-1}] - E[Y_m X_{m-1}]$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_m Y_{m-1}] &= E[E(X_m Y_{m-1} | \mathcal{F}_{m-1})] = E[Y_{m-1} E(X_m | \mathcal{F}_{m-1})] = E[X_{m-1} Y_{m-1}] \\ E[Y_m X_{m-1}] &= E[E(Y_m X_{m-1} | \mathcal{F}_{m-1})] = E[X_{m-1} E(Y_m | \mathcal{F}_{m-1})] = E[X_{m-1} Y_{m-1}] \end{aligned}$$

so the above expression simplifies to

$$E[(X_m - X_{m-1})(Y_m - Y_{m-1})] = E[X_m Y_m] - E[X_{m-1} Y_{m-1}]$$

of course that means we can telescope the following series

$$\sum_1^n E[(X_m - X_{m-1})(Y_m - Y_{m-1})] = \sum_1^n E[X_m Y_m] - E[X_{m-1} Y_{m-1}] = E[X_n Y_n] - E[X_0 Y_0]$$

□

**10. (Durrett 4.6.1)** Denote  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ , and  $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\bigcup_1^\infty \mathcal{F}_n)$ , then since  $\mathcal{F}_n \uparrow \mathcal{F}$ , we get  $E(\theta | \mathcal{F}_n) \rightarrow E(\theta | \mathcal{F})$  a.s. and in  $L^1$  (Durrett theorem 4.6.8). From here the problem will be done if we can show that  $\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ , since denoting  $\phi = E(\theta | \mathcal{F})$ , then  $A = \{\theta > \phi\} \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $B = \{\phi > \theta\} \in \mathcal{F}$ , so that we can use the property of conditional expectation to conclude

$$E|\theta - \phi| = \int_A \theta - \phi + \int_B \phi - \theta = \int_A \theta - \theta + \int_B \theta - \theta = 0$$

so indeed  $\theta = \phi$  a.s. so that  $E(\theta | \mathcal{F}_n) \rightarrow \theta$  a.s. and in  $L^1$ . It remains to show that  $\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ , to do so we can use that the pointwise limit of measurable functions is measurable, and realize  $\theta$  as a pointwise limit of  $\mathcal{F}$  measurable functions, since  $E|Z_i| < \infty$ , and iid, the strong law of large numbers tells us that  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n Z_j \rightarrow EZ_1$  almost surely, but then this of course implies that

$$S_n := -EZ_1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n Y_j = -EZ_1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n Z_j + \theta \rightarrow \theta$$

almost surely. Since each  $S_n$  is  $\mathcal{F}$  measurable, so is its pointwise limit  $\theta$ . So  $\theta \in \mathcal{F}$  and we are done by the argument above. □