

# Advanced Probability

=====  
(2nd November, Friday)

## Chapter 5. Weak Convergence

### 5.1. Definitions

Let  $E$  be a metric space. Whenever we are talking about a metric space, the  $\sigma$ -algebra is given by the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Write  $C_b(E)$  for the set of bounded continuous functions on  $E$ .

- Let  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of probability measures and let  $\mu$  be another probability measure on  $E$ . We say that  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  **weakly** (as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) if  $\mu_n(f) \rightarrow \mu(f)$  for all  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Theorem 5.1.1)** The following are equivalent.

- (a)  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  weakly on  $E$
- (b)  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(U) \geq \mu(U)$  for all  $U$  open
- (c)  $\limsup_{\mu(F)} \leq \mu(F)$  for all  $F$  closed.
- (d)  $\mu_n(B) \rightarrow \mu(B)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mu(\partial B) = 0$ . (Boundary is the set of limit points of  $B$  that are not contained in  $B$ .)

**proof)** Exercise.

For an example, consider a sequence  $(x_n)_n \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We want to have  $\delta_{x_n} \rightarrow \delta_0$ . Indeed, this is true in the weak sense. However, the sequence has  $\delta_{x_n}(\{0\}) = 0$  for all  $n$ , hence we should have inequality in condition (c).

We have a similar version of the theorem for the real line.

**Proposition 5.1.2)** Consider the case  $E = \mathbb{R}$ . TFAE

- (a)  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  weakly for some probability measure  $\mu$ .
- (b)  $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $F(x^-) = F(x)$ . (Here,  $F(x) = \mu((-\infty, x])$  is the **distribution function** of  $\mu$ .) (Sometimes called convergence of distributions)
- (c) There exists a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and random variables  $X_n, X$  on  $\Omega$  such that  $X_n \sim \mu_n$ ,  $X \sim \mu$  and  $X_n \rightarrow X$  almost surely.

**proof)** See probability and measure notes.

## 5.2. Prohorov's Theorem

When does a sequence of probability measures has a converging subsequence?

Let  $E$  be a metric space and  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of probability measures on  $E$ .

- We say that  $(\mu_n)_n$  is **tight** if for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a compact set  $K \subset E$  such that

$$\mu_n(E \setminus K) \leq \epsilon \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

For example, the sequence  $(\delta_n)_n$  is *not* tight.

**Theorem 5.2.1** Let  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of probability measures on a metric space  $E$  and suppose that  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is tight. Then there exists a subsequence  $(n_k)_k \subset \mathbb{N}$  and probability measure  $\mu$  on  $E$  such that  $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu$  weakly as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

This gives a version of weakly sequential compactness of probability measures. We are only going to prove this for  $\mathbb{R}$ . This theorem is hard to prove in general.(e.g. there is a method using Monge-Kantorovich metric defined for Polish spaces. For this method, see "Topics in Optimal Transport", C.Villani, Ame.Soc.Math. For the general version, see the attached note)

**proof for  $E = \mathbb{R}$**  By a diagonal argument and by passing to a subsequence, it suffices to consider the case where  $F_n(x) \rightarrow g(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$  for some  $g(x) \in [0, 1]$ , where  $F_n$  is the distribution function of  $F_n$ . Now  $g : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is non-decreasing so  $g$  has a non-decreasing extension  $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , i.e.

$$G(x) = \lim_{q \searrow x, q \in \mathbb{Q}} g(q)$$

which has only countably many discontinuities.(because there should be a rational number in each discontinuity). Now we must have

$$F_n(x) \rightarrow G(x) \quad \forall x \text{ s.t. } G \text{ is continuous at } x$$

Set  $F(x) = G(x^+)$ , then  $F$  and  $G$  have same points of continuity, so  $F_n(x) \rightarrow F(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

We are only left to check that  $G(x) \rightarrow 1$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  using tightness condition.

Since  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is tight, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $R < \infty$  such that  $\mu_n(\mathbb{R} \setminus (-R, R)) \leq \epsilon$  for all  $n$  so  $F_n(-R) \leq \epsilon$ ,  $F_n(R) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow -\infty \\ F(x) &\rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

So  $F$  is distribution function. So there exists a probability measure  $\mu$  such that  $\mu((-\infty, x]) = F(x)$ . Then  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  by **Prop 5.1.2**.

(End of proof)  $\square$

## 5.3. Weak Convergence and Characteristic Functions

Take  $E = \mathbb{R}^d$ .

- For a probability measures  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , define its **characteristic function**  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$\phi(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\langle u, x \rangle} \mu(dx)$$

**Lemma 5.3.1** Fix  $d = 1$ . For all  $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ ,

$$\mu(\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\lambda, \lambda)) \leq C\lambda \int_0^\lambda (1 - \operatorname{Re}(\phi(u)))du$$

where  $C = (1 - \sin(1))^{-1} < \infty$ .

**proof)** Consider for  $t \geq 1$ . Let  $A(t) = t^{-1} \int_0^t (1 - \cos v) dv$ . Then

$$A(t) \geq A(0) = 1 - \sin(t)$$

(to see this, observe that  $A(t)$  is the average of  $(1 - \cos(v))$  on interval  $(0, t)$  and divide the cases  $|t| \leq \pi/2$  and  $|t| \geq \pi/2$ )

So  $Ct^{-1} \int_0^t (1 - \cos(v)) dv \geq 1$ . Substitute  $v = uy$ ,  $u = v/y$ ,

$$Ct^{-1} \int_0^{t/y} (1 - \cos(uy)) y du \geq 1$$

Put  $t/y = 1/\lambda$ ,  $\lambda = y/t$ ,  $t = y/\lambda \geq 1$  to see

$$C\lambda \int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \cos(uy)) du \geq 1$$

whenever  $t = y/\lambda \geq 1$  (this was the assumption we started with). Now for general  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , has

$$C\lambda \int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \cos(uy)) du \geq 1_{|y| \geq \lambda}$$

Now integrate with respect to  $\mu$  and use Fubini.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\lambda, \lambda)) &\leq C\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \cos(uy)) du \mu(dy) \\ &= C\lambda \int_0^{1/\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 - \cos(uy)) du \mu(dy) \end{aligned}$$

(End of proof)  $\square$

=====

(5th November, Monday)

**Theorem 5.3.2)** Let  $\mu_n, \mu$  be probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with characteristic functions  $\phi_n, \phi$ . Then the following are equivalent

- (a)  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  weakly on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
- (b)  $\phi_n(u) \rightarrow \phi(u)$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

We will prove only for the case  $d = 1$ .

**proof)** It is clear that (a) implies (b). Suppose (b) holds. We prove via a 'compactness argument'. We aim to show that the sequence  $(\mu_n)_n$  tight, and therefore has a converging subsequence, and show that the converging point is in fact  $\mu$ .

Note that  $\phi(0) = 1$  and  $\phi$  is continuous. Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\lambda < \infty$  such that

$$C\lambda \int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \operatorname{Re}(\phi(u))) du \leq \epsilon/2$$

with  $C = (1 - \sin(1))^{-1} < \infty$ . By dominated convergence,

$$\int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \operatorname{Re}(\phi_n(u))) du \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \operatorname{Re}(\phi(u))) du$$

so for sufficiently large  $n$ , by **Lemma 5.3.1**,

$$\mu_n(\mathbb{R} \setminus (-\lambda, \lambda)) \leq C\lambda \int_0^{1/\lambda} (1 - \operatorname{Re}(\phi_n(u))) du \leq \epsilon$$

Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, we see that  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is tight. By Prohorov's theorem, we have a converging subsequence  $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \nu$  for some probability measure  $\nu$ .

Suppose for a contradiction that  $\nu \neq \mu$ . Therefore, there exists  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that

$$|\mu_{n_k}(f) - \mu(f)| \geq \epsilon \quad \forall k$$

By above argument, we have  $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \nu$ . But then, since  $e^{inx}$  is a bounded continuous function,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{inx} \nu(dx) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_{n_k}(n) = \phi(n)$$

which indicates  $\mu = \nu$  by uniqueness of characteristic functions (see PM notes), a contradiction.

(End of proof)  $\square$

In fact, the proof of the theorem implies a slightly stronger statement, which is less useful.

**Theorem 5.3.3** (*Lévy's continuity theorem for characteristic functions*) Let  $(\mu_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with characteristic functions  $\phi_n$ . Suppose  $\phi_n(u) \rightarrow \phi(u)$  for all  $u$  for some function  $\phi$  (not necessarily a characteristic function) such that  $\phi$  is continuous at 0. Then  $\phi$  is the characteristic function of some probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$  weakly on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

## 6. Large Deviations

### 6.1. Cramér's theorem

**Theorem 6.1.1** Let  $(X_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of integrable *i.i.d.* random variables in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Set  $m = \mathbb{E}(X_1)$ ,  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ . We know  $S_n/n \rightarrow \delta_m$  in probability, so if  $(m - \epsilon, m + \epsilon) \cap B = \emptyset$  then  $\mathbb{P}(S_n/n \in B) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then in fact the convergence rate is given by  $\sim \exp(-n\alpha(B))$  for some  $\alpha$ . To be precise, for all  $a \geq m = \mathbb{E}(X_1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \rightarrow -\psi^*(a)$$

where  $\psi^*$  is the *Legendre transform* of the *cumulant generating function*  $\psi(\lambda) = \log(\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_1}))$ , where Legendre transform is given by

$$\psi^*(x) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \{\lambda x - \psi(\lambda)\}$$

In particular, for  $n$  sufficiently large and in case  $\psi^*(a) < \infty$ , we get

$$-\psi^*(a) - \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{n} \log(\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq a)) \leq -\psi^*(a) + \epsilon$$

and therefore

$$e^{-n(\psi^*(a) + \epsilon)} \leq \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \leq e^{-n(\psi^*(a) - \epsilon)}.$$

**Note :**  $\psi$  is always a convex function, so  $\psi^*$  is also a convex function.

**Examples :**

(i)  $X_1 \sim N(0, 1)$ , then  $\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_1}) = e^{\lambda^2/2}$ ,  $\psi(\lambda) = \lambda^2/2$  and  $\psi^*(x) = x^2/2$ . Hence

$$\frac{1}{n} \log(\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq a)) \rightarrow -\frac{a^2}{2} \quad \forall a \geq 0$$

Can check this directly, using the fact that  $S_n \sim N(0, n)$  in this case.

(ii)  $X_1 \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_1}) = \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda x} e^{-x} dx = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \lambda \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{1-\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda < 1 \end{cases}$$

so  $\psi(\lambda) = -\log(1-\lambda)$  if  $\lambda < 1$  and  $\infty$  otherwise, and  $\psi^*(x) = x - 1 - \log(x)$  for  $x > 0$ . Cramér's theorem implies that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \rightarrow -(a - 1 - \log(a)) \quad \forall a \geq 1$$

On the other hand,  $\text{Var}(X_1) = 1 < \infty$ , so  $\frac{S_n - n}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow N(0, 1)$  by CLT. So

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq n + a\sqrt{n}) \rightarrow \int_a^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} dx$$

so Cramér's theorem gives a result of a different flavour from CLT for distributions with bounded variation : while CLT provides a description for distribution near the average, Cramér gives an explanation of tail distribution of  $S_n$ .

**preparation for proof of Cramér's theorem** Let  $\mu(B) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B)$ . Exclude the easy case where  $\mu = \delta_m$ . Define for  $\lambda \geq 0$  with  $\psi(\lambda) < \infty$ , the **tilted distribution**  $\mu_\lambda$  by

$$\mu_\lambda(dx) \propto e^{\lambda x} \mu(dx)$$

For  $K \geq m = \mathbb{E}(X_1)$ , define the conditional distribution by

$$\mu_K(dx|x \leq K) \propto 1_{\{x \leq K\}} \mu(dx)$$

The CGF(cumulant generating function) of  $\mu_K$  is then given by

$$\psi_K(\lambda) = \log(\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_1} | X_1 \leq K))$$

=====  
(7th November, Wednesday)

We now start proving the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.1.1** Let  $(X_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of integrable *i.i.d.* random variables in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Set  $m = \mathbb{E}(X_1)$ ,  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ . Then for all  $a \geq m = \mathbb{E}(X_1)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \rightarrow -\psi^*(a)$$

where  $\psi(\lambda) = \log(\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_1}))$ , and  $\psi^*(x) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \{\lambda x - \psi(\lambda)\}$ .

**proof** (*Upper bound*) For all  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $n \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\lambda S_n} \geq e^{\lambda na}) \leq e^{-\lambda na} \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda S_n}) = e^{-(\lambda a - \psi(\lambda))n}$$

so  $\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \leq -(\lambda a - \psi(\lambda))$  and

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \leq -\psi^*(a)$$

(*Lower bound*) It remains to show the lower bound. That is, we aim to prove

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \geq -\psi^*(a)$$

Consider first the case where  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq a) = 1$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda(X_1 - a)}) \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_1 = a)$$

Call  $p = \mathbb{P}(X_1 = a)$ , so  $\lambda a - \psi(\lambda) \rightarrow -\log(p)$ . So in particular,

$$\psi^*(a) \geq -\log(p)$$

Now  $\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) = p^n$  so

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) = \log(p) \geq -\psi^*(a)$$

hence we can eliminate the case  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq a) = 1$ .

Next consider the case  $\psi(\lambda) < \infty$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 > a) > 0$ . Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  and set  $b = a + \epsilon$ ,  $c = a + 2\epsilon$ , choosing  $\epsilon$  small enough so  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 > b) > 0$ . Then there exists  $\lambda$  such that  $\psi'(\lambda) = b$  - where the differentiability and the existence is justified in the following proposition :

**Proposition 6.1.2)** Suppose  $X$  is integrable and not a.s. constant. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_K(\lambda) &= \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\lambda X_1} | X_1 \leq K) < \infty \quad \forall K < \infty \\ \text{and } \psi_K(\lambda) &\nearrow \psi(\lambda) \quad \text{as } K \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

Moreover in the case  $\psi(\lambda) < \infty$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,  $\psi$  has a continuous derivative on  $[0, \infty)$  and is  $C^2$  on  $(0, \infty)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(\lambda) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mu_\lambda(dx) \\ \psi''(\lambda) &= \text{Var}(\mu_\lambda) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

and  $\psi'$  is a homeomorphism from  $[0, \infty)$  to  $[m, \sup(\text{supp}(\mu))]$ .

**proof)** (Exercise)

Now we use the idea of tilting the probability measure. Define a new probability measure  $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$  by  $d\mathbb{P}_\lambda = e^{\lambda S_n - n\psi(\lambda)} d\mathbb{P}$ . Then observe that under  $\mathbb{P}_\lambda$  the random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent with distributions  $\mu_\lambda$  and that  $\mathbb{E}_\lambda(X_1) = b$ . Consider the event

$$A_n = \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{n} - b \right| \leq \epsilon \right\} = \{(b - \epsilon)n = an \leq S_n \leq (b + \epsilon)n = cn\}$$

By the weak law of large numbers,  $\mathbb{P}_\lambda(A_n) \rightarrow 1$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) &\geq \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left( 1_{A_n} e^{-\lambda S_n + \psi(\lambda)n} \right) \\ &\geq e^{-\lambda cn + \psi(\lambda)n} \mathbb{P}_\lambda(A_n) \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \geq -\lambda c + \psi(\lambda) + \frac{\log(\mathbb{P}_\lambda(A_n))}{n}$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \geq -(\lambda c - \psi(\lambda)) \geq -\psi^*(c)$$

Now  $\psi^*$  is continuous at  $a$  (recall,  $\psi^*$  is a Legendre transform of a convex function so is convex, and therefore continuous. Or, see **Lemma 6.1.3**) and  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary so the desired lower bound follows on letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Finally, consider the general case  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 > a) > 0$  but allowing  $\psi(\lambda) = \infty$  for some  $\lambda \geq 0$ . For  $K > a$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 > a | X_1 \leq K) > 0$  and  $\psi_K(\lambda) < \infty$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ . So preceding argument shows

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}_K(S_n > na) \geq -\psi_K^*(a)$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_K$  is the probability measure given by

$$d\mathbb{P}_K^{(n)} \propto 1_{\{X_1 \leq K, \dots, X_n \leq K\}} d\mathbb{P}$$

(To see this, note, under  $\mathbb{P}_K$ , random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent with distribution  $\mu(\cdot | x \leq K)$ ). But

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \geq \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na | X_1 \leq K, \dots, X_n \leq K) = \mathbb{P}_K(S_n \geq na)$$

and  $\psi_K^*(a) \searrow \psi^*(a)$  as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  (by **Lemma 6.1.3**) so we see

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq na) \geq -\psi_K^*(a) \nearrow -\psi^*(a)$$

(End of proof)  $\square$

One different way to see that  $\psi^*$  is continuous at  $a$  is presented in the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.1.3)** For all  $a \geq m$ , with  $\mathbb{P}(X_1 > 0) > 0$  we have  $\psi_K^*(a) \searrow \psi^*(a)$  as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover in the case  $\psi(\lambda) < \infty$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,  $\psi^*$  is continuous at  $a$  and we have  $\psi^*(a) = \lambda^*a - \psi(\lambda^*)$  where  $\lambda^*$  is uniquely determined by  $\psi'(\lambda^*) = a$ .

**proof)** Consider first the later case where  $\psi(\lambda) < \infty$  for  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Then by **Proposition 6.1.2** we see that

$$\psi^*(a) = \lambda^*a - \psi(\lambda^*)$$

where  $a = \psi'(\lambda^*)$  and  $\psi^*$  is continuous at  $a$  with  $\lambda^* = (\psi')^{-1}(a)$ .

For the first part, note that  $\psi_K^*$  is non-increasing in  $K$ . For  $K$  sufficiently large, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 > a | X_1 \leq K) > 0$$

and  $a \geq m \geq m_K$  (where  $m_K = \mathbb{E}(X_1 | \leq X_1 \leq K)$ ) and  $\psi_K(\lambda) < \infty$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$ , so we may apply the preceding argument to  $\mu_K$  to see that

$$\psi_K^*(a) = \lambda_K^*a - \psi_K(\lambda_K^*)$$

where  $\lambda_K^* \geq 0$  is determined by  $\psi'_K(\lambda_K^*) = a$ . Now  $\psi'_K(\lambda)$  is non-decreasing in  $K$  and  $\lambda$ , so  $\lambda_K^* \searrow \lambda^*$  for some  $\lambda^* \geq 0$ . Also  $\psi'_K(\lambda) \geq m_K$  for all  $\lambda \geq 0$  so

$$\psi_K(\lambda_K^*) \geq \psi_K(\lambda^*) + m_K(\lambda_K^* - \lambda^*)$$

Then

$$\psi_K^*(a) = \lambda_K^*a - \psi_K(\lambda_K^*) \leq \lambda_K^*a - \psi_K(\lambda^*) - m_K(\lambda_K^* - \lambda^*) \rightarrow \lambda^*a - \psi(\lambda^*) \leq \psi^*(a)$$

So  $\psi_K^*(a) \searrow \psi^*(a)$  as  $K \rightarrow \infty$  as claimed.

(End of proof)  $\square$

=====

(9th November, Friday)

## 7. Brownian Motion

### 7.1. Definition

Let  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a random process in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We say  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a **Brownian motion** if :

- (i) For all  $s, t \geq 0$ , the random variable  $X_{s+t} - X_s$  is Gaussian, of mean 0 and variance  $tI$  and is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_s^X = \sigma(X_r : r \leq s)$
- (ii) for all  $\omega \in \Omega$  the map  $t \mapsto X_t(\omega) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is *continuous*.

Condition (i) means that, for all  $s \geq 0, t > 0$ , all Borel sets  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and all  $A \in \mathcal{F}_s^X$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\{X_{s+t} - X_s \in B\} \cap A) = \mathbb{P}(A) \int_B (2\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-|y|^2/2t} dy$$

Or, in terms of conditional expectation, (i) is equivalent to : for all  $s, t \geq 0$  and all  $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(f(X)_{s+t} | \mathcal{F}_s^X) = P_t f(X_s) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where  $P_t$  is the **heat semigroup**, i.e.

$$P_0 f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p(t, x, y) f(y) dy, \quad p(t, x, y) = (2\pi t)^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-|y-x|^2/2t}$$

If  $X_0 = x$  then we call  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  a **Brownian motion starting from  $x$** . In this case, condition (i) is equivalent following property : for all  $t_1, \dots, t_n \geq 0$  with  $t_1 < \dots < t_n$  and all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{dn})$

$$\mathbb{P}((X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n}) \in B) = \int_B \prod_{i=1}^n p(s_i, x_{i-1}, x_i) dx_i$$

where  $t_0 = 0$ ,  $x_0 = x$ ,  $s_i = t_i - t_{i-1}$ .

Given independent Brownian motions  $(X_t^1)_{t \geq 0}, \dots, (X_t^d)_{t \geq 0}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  starting from 0 and given  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the process  $(x + (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^d))_{t \geq 0}$  is a Brownian motion in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  starting from  $x$  and we obtain all Brownian motion starting from  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in this way.

## 7.2. Wiener's theorem

Brownian motion was established as a mathematical object only after 1920's.

Let  $W_d = C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^d)$ , and  $x_t : W_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $x_t(w) = w(t)$  be the coordinate functions. We may endow  $W_d$  with  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{W}_d = \sigma(x_t : t \geq 0)$ .

Given a continuous process  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  on  $\Omega$ , we can define

$$X : \Omega \rightarrow W_d, \quad X(\omega)(t) = X_t(\omega)$$

then  $X$  is  $\mathcal{W}_d$ -measurable so  $X$  has a law on  $(W_d, \mathcal{W}_d)$ .

**Theorem 7.2.1.)** (*Wiener*) For all  $d \geq 1$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exist a unique probability measure  $\mu_x$  on  $(W_d, \mathcal{W}_d)$  such that  $(x_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a Brownian motion in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  starting from  $x$ . In particular, Brownian motion exists.

**proof)** Conditions (i) and (ii) determine the finite dimensional distributions of a Brownian motion and hence determine the law of any BM on  $(W_d, \mathcal{W}_d)$  (with given starting point - hence such probability measure is unique).

Suppose we have a measure  $\mu_0$  on  $(W_1, \mathcal{W}_1)$  such that  $(x_t)_{t \geq 0} \sim \text{BM}_0$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(x + x_t)_{t \geq 0} \sim \text{BM}_x$  so could take  $\mu_x$  as law of this process. Then for  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the measure  $\mu_{x_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_{x_d}$  has required properties. So we only have to work in 1 dimension, starting at 0.

Define  $\mathbb{D}_N = \{k2^{-N} : k \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$  and  $\mathbb{D} = \bigcup_{N \geq 0} \mathbb{D}_N$ . There exists some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  and a family  $(Y_t : t \in \mathbb{D})$  of independent  $N(0, 1)$  random variables. First define for  $t \in \mathbb{D}_0 = \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,

$$\xi_t = Y_1 + \dots + Y_t$$

Then  $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{D}_0}$  is Gaussian and  $(\xi_{t+1} - \xi_t : t \in \mathbb{D}_0)$  are independent and has distribution  $\sim N(0, 1)$ . We define recursively  $(\xi_t)_{t \in \mathbb{D}_N}$  as follows for  $t \in \mathbb{D}_{N+1} \setminus \mathbb{D}_N$  :

: set  $r = t - 2^{-N-1}$ ,  $s = t + 2^{-N-1} \in \mathbb{D}_N$ , set  $Z_t = 2^{-\frac{N+2}{2}} Y_t$  and define  $\xi_t = \frac{\xi_r + \xi_s}{2} + Z_t$ .

We will show by induction that for all  $N \geq 0$ ,  $(\xi_{t+2^{-N}} - \xi_t : t \in \mathbb{D}_N)$  are independent,  $\sim N(0, 2^{-N})$  random variables

: Suppose true for  $N$ . Take  $t \in \mathbb{D}_{N+1} - \mathbb{D}_N$  and  $r, s$  as above. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t - \xi_r &= \frac{\xi_s - \xi_r}{2} + Z_t, & \xi_s - \xi_t &= \frac{\xi_s - \xi_r}{2} - Z_t \\ \text{Var}\left(\frac{\xi_s - \xi_r}{2}\right) &= \frac{1}{4}2^{-N}, & \text{Var}(Z_t) &= 2^{-N-2} \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\xi_t - \xi_r) &= \frac{1}{4}2^{-N} + 2^{-N-2} = 2^{-N-1} = \text{Var}(\xi_s - \xi_r) \\ \text{cov}(\xi_t - \xi_r, \xi_s - \xi_t) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Also for any interval  $(u, v]$  disjoint from  $(r, s]$  with  $u, v \in \mathbb{D}_{N+1}$ ,

$$\text{cov}(\xi_s - \xi_r, \xi_v - \xi_u) = \text{cov}(\xi_s - \xi_t, \xi_v - \xi_u) = 0$$

So the induction proceeds.