

# Athreya Lahiri Chapter 2 Solutions

Arthur Chen

June 4, 2025

## Problem 2.1

Prove de Morgan's laws. Let  $\Omega_i, i = 1, 2$  be two nonempty sets, and let  $T : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  be a map. For any collection  $\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in I\}$  of subsets of  $\Omega_2$ , prove that

$$\begin{aligned} T^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_\alpha\right) &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} T^{-1}(A_\alpha) \\ T^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} A_\alpha\right) &= \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} T^{-1}(A_\alpha) \\ (T^{-1}(A))^C &= T^{-1}(A^C) \end{aligned}$$

For the first,

$$\begin{aligned} T^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_\alpha\right) &= \{B \in \Omega_1 : T(B) \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} A_\alpha\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} \{B \in \Omega_1 : T(B) \in A_\alpha\} \\ &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} T^{-1}(A_\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

with a similar argument holding for the second. For the third,

$$(T^{-1}(A))^C = \{B \in \Omega_1 : T(b) \in A\}^C = \{B \in \Omega_1 : T(b) \in A^C\} = T^{-1}(A^C)$$

## Problem 2.3

Let  $f, g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable. Set

$$h(\omega) = \frac{f(\omega)}{g(\omega)} \mathbf{1}(g(\omega) \neq 0)$$

Verify that  $h$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.

Directly from the definition, we have that for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h^{-1}((-\infty, a]) &= \{\omega : \frac{f(\omega)}{g(\omega)} \mathbb{1}(g(\omega) \neq 0) \leq a\} \\ &= \{\omega : f(\omega) \leq ag(\omega), g(\omega) > 0\} \cup \{\omega : f(\omega) \geq ag(\omega), g(\omega) < 0\} \\ &= \{\omega : f(\omega) - ag(\omega) \leq 0, g(\omega) > 0\} \cup \{\omega : f(\omega) - ag(\omega) \geq 0, g(\omega) < 0\} \end{aligned}$$

$f(\omega) - ag(\omega)$  and  $g(\omega)$  are  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable functions, so for the left and right sets, the conditions individually define sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  so their intersection is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Thus  $h(\omega)$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.

## Problem 2.6

Let  $X_i, i = 1, 2, 3$  be random variables on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . Consider the equation (with  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ )

$$X_1(\omega)t^2 + X_2(\omega)t + X_3(\omega) = 0$$

### Part a

Show that  $A := \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{The above equation has two distinct roots}\} \in \mathcal{F}$ .

The condition for  $\omega \in A$  is equivalent to

$$\{\omega : X_1(\omega) \neq 0\} \cap \{\omega : X_2^2(\omega) - 4X_1(\omega)X_3(\omega) > 0\}$$

because this indicates that the polynomial is second-order and its discriminant is positive.  $X_1(\omega)$  and  $X_2^2(\omega) - 4X_1(\omega)X_3(\omega)$  are random variables on probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  and the sets  $(0, \infty)$  and  $(-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \infty)$  are Borel sets in  $\mathbb{R}$ , so both of the above sets are in  $\mathcal{F}$ , and their intersection is thus in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

### Part b

Let  $T_1(\omega)$  and  $T_2(\omega)$  denote the two roots of the above equation on  $A$ . Let

$$f_i(\omega) = \begin{cases} T_i(\omega) & \omega \in A \\ 0 & \omega \in A^C \end{cases}$$

Show that  $(f_1, f_2)$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \rangle$ -measurable.

**Lemma 1** *Let  $f$  be a non-negative  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable function. Then  $\sqrt{f}$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.*

**Proof:** For all  $a \geq 0$ ,

$$(\sqrt{f(\omega)})^{-1}((-\infty, a]) = \{\omega : 0 \leq \sqrt{f(\omega)} \leq a\} = \{\omega : 0 \leq f(\omega) \leq a^2\} \in F$$

□

By the quadratic formula (arbitrarily letting  $i = 1$  be the positive root), we have that

$$f_1(\omega) = \frac{-X_2(\omega) + \sqrt{X_2^2(\omega) - 4X_1(\omega)X_3(\omega)}}{2X_1(\omega)} \mathbf{1}_A$$

and  $f_2$  is the negative root. By Problem 2.3, since the numerator and denominator are  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable,  $A \in F$ , and the restriction in  $A$  prevents the denominator from being zero,  $f_i, i = 1, 2$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable, and the Cartesian product of  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable functions is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.

## Problem 2.7

Let  $M := ((X_{ij})), 1 \leq i, j \leq k$  be a random matrix of random variables  $X_{ij}$  defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ .

### Part a

Show that  $\det(M)$  and  $\text{tr}(M)$  are both  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.

The trace is trivial; the diagonal entries of  $M$  are  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable and so is their sum. The determinant follows by induction on the size of  $M$ . When  $k = 1$ , the determinant is the random variable  $X_{11}$ , which by assumption is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable. Assuming that the determinant of a size  $k - 1$  matrix of random variables in  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable, by the Laplace expansion, we can rewrite the determinant of the size  $k$  matrix as the sum of random variables multiplied by the determinant of size  $k - 1$  matrices, and this sum is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.

### Part b

Show that the largest eigenvalue of  $M'M$  is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable.

Using the hint, I will note that the largest eigenvalue is equal to

$$\sup_x \frac{x'M'Mx}{x'x} \mathbf{1}_{x \neq 0}$$

The numerator and denominator are the sums of products of random variables in  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$  and the denominator is restricted from zero, so the internal function is  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$ -measurable, and the supremum of a measurable function is measurable.

## Problem 2.15

Consider the probability space  $((0, 1), \mathcal{B}((0, 1)), m)$ , where  $m$  is the Lebesgue measure.

### Part a

Let  $Y_1$  be the random variable  $Y_1(x) = \sin(2\pi x)$  for  $x \in (0, 1)$ . Find the cdf of  $Y_1$ .

Looking at the graph of  $\sin(2\pi x)$ , for  $y \in (0, 1)$ , we have that  $\sin^{-1} y > 0$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y_1 \leq y) &= mY_1^{-1}((-\infty, y]) \\ &= m\left(\left(0, \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{2\pi}\right) \cup \left(1/2 - \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{2\pi}, 1\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for  $y \in (-1, 0)$ , we have that  $\sin^{-1} y < 0$ , thus

$$P(Y_1 \leq y) = m\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{2\pi}, 1 + \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{2\pi}\right) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{\pi}$$

Thus

$$P(Y_1 \leq y) = \begin{cases} 0 & y \leq -1 \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sin^{-1} y}{\pi} & y \in (-1, 1) \\ 1 & y \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

### Part b

Let  $Y_2$  be the random variable  $Y_2(x) = \log x$  for  $x \in (0, 1)$ . Find the cdf of  $Y_2$ .

We have that for  $y < 0$ ,

$$P(Y_2 \leq y) = mY_2^{-1}((-\infty, y]) = m((0, e^y)) = e^y$$

Thus

$$P(Y_2 \leq y) = \begin{cases} e^y & y < 0 \\ 1 & y \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

### Part c

Let  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a cdf. For  $x \in (0, 1)$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^{-1}(x) &= \inf\{y : y \in \mathbb{R}, F(y) \geq x\} \\ F_2^{-1}(x) &= \sup\{y : y \in \mathbb{R}, F(y) \leq x\} \end{aligned}$$

Let  $Z_i$  be the random variable defined by

$$Z_i = F_i^{-1}(x), x \in (0, 1), i = 1, 2$$

### Subpart i

#### IN PROGRESS

Find the cdf of  $Z_i, i = 1, 2$ .

We begin with a characterization of  $F_1^{-1}$  and  $F_2^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 2** *Let  $A_x = \{y : y \in \mathbb{R}, F(y) = x\}$ . Then  $A$  is either the empty set, a singleton, or an interval.*

**Proof:**  *$F$  is right-continuous and nondecreasing. If there is no  $y$  such that  $F(y) = x$ , then  $F$  has a jump discontinuity that jumps from below  $y$  to above  $y$ , since otherwise by the intermediate value theorem  $F$  would achieve the value  $x$ . If  $A_x$  is a nonempty nonsingleton, then there exist multiple  $y$  such that  $F(y) = x$ . This must occur when  $F$  is flat, and since  $F$  is nondecreasing, this can only happen on a connected interval.*  $\square$

**Lemma 3**  *$F_i^{-1}(x)$  can be broken up into cases. When  $F(y)$  is flat, letting  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  be the left and right endpoints of the interval,  $F_1^{-1}(x) = y_1$  and  $F_2^{-1}(x) = y_2$ . When  $F(y)$  has a jump discontinuity at  $y$  that jumps from  $x_1$  to  $x_2$ ,  $x : x \in [x_1, x_2] \rightarrow F_i^{-1}(x) = y$ . Otherwise,  $F$  is invertible at  $y$  and  $F_i^{-1}(x) = F^{-1}(F(y)) = y$ .*

**Lemma 4** *For any  $x \in (0, 1), t \in \mathbb{R}, F(t) \geq x \Leftrightarrow F_1^{-1}(x) \leq t$ .*

**Proof:** *For the forward, assume that  $F(t) \geq x$ . Because  $F$  is nondecreasing, the infimum of  $y$  such that  $F(y) \geq x$  must be less than or equal to  $t$ . For the reverse, assume that  $F_1^{-1}(x) \leq t$ . Because  $F$  is nondecreasing and right continuous, the sets  $F(y) \geq x$  are closed intervals, and thus their infimum lies within the set - specifically, at the left endpoint, which is  $F_1^{-1}(x)$ . Thus for  $t \geq F_1^{-1}(x)$ , we know that  $F(t) \geq F(F_1^{-1}(x)) = x$ , since  $F_1^{-1}(x)$  is the left endpoint and this is where the sets achieve their minimum.*  $\square$

Thus for  $Z_1$ ,

$$P(Z_1 \leq z) = mZ_1^{-1}((-\infty, z]) = m([0, F(z)]) = F(z)$$

where we used the lemma substituting  $z$  for  $t$ .

## Problem 2.16

### Part a

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space. Let  $T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$  measurable. Show by counterexample that the induced measure  $\mu T^{-1}$  need not be  $\sigma$ -finite.

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, \mu)$  be the Lebesgue measure on the Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , which is obviously  $\sigma$ -finite. Let  $T(x) = 0$ .  $T$  is continuous and thus  $\langle \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rangle$  measurable. However, the induced measure  $\mu T^{-1}(A)$  equals infinity if  $x \in A$ , zero otherwise. Thus there is no collection of sets with finite measure such that their union is  $\mathbb{R}$ , and thus  $\mu T^{-1}$  is not  $\sigma$ -finite.

## Part b

Let  $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  be measurable spaces for  $i = 1, 2$  and let  $T : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$  be  $\langle \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \rangle$ -measurable. Show that any measure  $\mu$  on  $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1)$  is  $\sigma$ -finite if  $\mu T^{-1}$  is  $\sigma$ -finite on  $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ .

By assumption of  $\sigma$ -finiteness of  $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{F}_2)$ , there is a countable collection of sets  $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{F}_2$  such that  $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} A_n = \Omega_2$  and  $\mu T^{-1}(A_n) < \infty$  for all  $n$ . By the first assumption,

$$\Omega_1 = T^{-1}(\Omega_2) = T^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{n \geq 1} A_n\right) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} T^{-1}(A_n)$$

By the second assumption,  $\mu(T^{-1}(A_n)) < \infty$  for all  $n$ . Thus the sets  $\{T^{-1}(A_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  show that  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite.