

Probability theory II Assignment 1

2021-21116 Taeyoung Chang

Exercises in Section 4.1 Conditional Expectation

4.1.1 **Bayes' formula.** Let $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and show that

$$P(G|A) = \int_G P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP \Big/ \int_{\Omega} P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP$$

When \mathcal{G} is the σ -field generated by a partition, this reduces to the usual Bayes' formula

$$P(G_i|A) = P(A|G_i)P(G_i) \Big/ \sum_j P(A|G_j)P(G_j)$$

Remark. We didn't define 'conditional prob. given a set' in the lecture, but in the textbook, the author said that "To continue the connection with undergraduate notions, $P(A|B) := P(A \cap B) / P(B)$ "

Proof. $P(G|A) = P(G \cap A)/P(A)$. Note that $P(A|\mathcal{G}) = E[I_A|\mathcal{G}]$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP &= \int_G E[I_A|\mathcal{G}] dP = \int_G I_A dP = P(A \cap G) \\ \int_{\Omega} P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP &= \int_{\Omega} E[I_A|\mathcal{G}] dP = \int_{\Omega} I_A dP = P(A) \end{aligned}$$

The second equality in each of two equations above is due to the definition of conditional expectation and the fact that $G, \Omega \in \mathcal{G}$. Therefore the equality $P(G|A) = \int_G P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP / \int_{\Omega} P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP$ holds true. To prove the equation for Bayes' formula, we shall use a lemma learned in the lecture.

(Lemma) $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Omega_i$ is a partition of Ω with $\Omega_i \in \mathcal{F}_0$ and $P(\Omega_i) > 0 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$
 $\mathcal{F} = \sigma\{\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots\} = \{\bigcup_{j \in \kappa} \Omega_j : \kappa \subset \mathbb{N}\}$ (\mathcal{F} is a σ -field). Then we have

$$E[X|\mathcal{F}] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i I_{\Omega_i} \quad \text{with} \quad a_i = \frac{E[X I_{\Omega_i}]}{P(\Omega_i)}$$

Now, $\mathcal{G} = \sigma\{G_1, G_2, \dots\}$ with $\Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} G_i$ is a partition.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G_i} P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP &= \int_{G_i} E[I_A|\mathcal{G}] dP \stackrel{\text{lemma}}{=} \int_{G_i} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{E[I_A I_{G_j}]}{P(G_j)} I_{G_j} dP \stackrel{MCT}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{G_i} \frac{E[I_{A \cap G_j}]}{P(G_j)} I_{G_j} dP \\ &\stackrel{\text{partition}}{=} \int_{G_i} \frac{P(A \cap G_i)}{P(G_i)} \cdot 1 dP = P(A|G_i)P(G_i) \\ \int_{\Omega} P(A|\mathcal{G}) dP &= \int_{\Omega} E[I_A|\mathcal{G}] dP \stackrel{\text{lemma}}{=} \int_{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{E[I_A I_{G_j}]}{P(G_j)} I_{G_j} dP \stackrel{MCT}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} \frac{E[I_{A \cap G_j}]}{P(G_j)} I_{G_j} dP \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{G_j} \frac{P(A \cap G_j)}{P(G_j)} \cdot 1 dP = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(A|G_j)P(G_j) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the equality $P(G_i|A) = P(A|G_i)P(G_i) / \sum_j P(A|G_j)P(G_j)$ holds true. \square

4.1.2 Prove **Chebyshev's inequality**. If $a > 0$, then

$$P(|X| \geq a | \mathcal{F}) \leq a^{-2} E(X^2 | \mathcal{F})$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} P(|X| \geq a | \mathcal{F}) &= E[I(|X| \geq a) | \mathcal{F}] = E[I(X^2 \geq a^2) | \mathcal{F}] \leq E\left[\frac{X^2}{a^2} I(X^2 \geq a^2) | \mathcal{F}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{a^2} E[X^2 I(X^2 \geq a^2) | \mathcal{F}] \leq \frac{1}{a^2} E[X^2 | \mathcal{F}] \end{aligned}$$

□

4.1.3 Imitate the proof in the remark after Theorem 1.5.2 to prove the conditional Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

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

Proof. Take arbitrary $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume $E[X^2], E[Y^2] < \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq E[(aX + Y)^2 | \mathcal{G}] = a^2 E[X^2 | \mathcal{G}] + 2a E[XY | \mathcal{G}] + E[Y^2 | \mathcal{G}] \\ &= E[X^2 | \mathcal{G}] \left(a + \frac{E[XY | \mathcal{G}]}{E[X^2 | \mathcal{G}]}\right)^2 + E[Y^2 | \mathcal{G}] - \frac{E^2[XY | \mathcal{G}]}{E[X^2 | \mathcal{G}]} \end{aligned}$$

Since the inequality above holds for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $E[Y^2 | \mathcal{G}] - \frac{E^2[XY | \mathcal{G}]}{E[X^2 | \mathcal{G}]} \geq 0$ must hold, which implies that $E^2[XY | \mathcal{G}] \leq E[X^2 | \mathcal{G}] E[Y^2 | \mathcal{G}]$ □

4.1.4 Use regular conditional probability to get the conditional Hölder inequality from the unconditional one, i.e., show that if $p, q \in (1, \infty)$ with $1/p + 1/q = 1$, then

$$E(|XY| | \mathcal{G}) \leq E(|X|^p | \mathcal{G})^{1/p} E(|Y|^q | \mathcal{G})^{1/q}$$

Proof. Assume $X \in \mathcal{L}^p$ and $Y \in \mathcal{L}^q$.

p and q are conjugate exponents. Then by Young's inequality,

$$xy \leq \frac{x^p}{p} + \frac{y^q}{q} \quad \forall x, y > 0$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\frac{|X|}{(E[|X|^p | \mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/p}} \cdot \frac{|Y|}{(E[|Y|^q | \mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/q}} \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{|X|^p}{E[|X|^p | \mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{|Y|^q}{E[|Y|^q | \mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon} \quad \dots (\star)$$

Note that $E[|X|^p | \mathcal{G}]$ and $E[|Y|^q | \mathcal{G}]$ are \mathcal{G} -measurable. Also recall that if $Z > 0$ and Z is \mathcal{G} -measurable then $1/Z$ is also \mathcal{G} -measurable. Hence $1/(E[|X|^p | \mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)$ and $1/(E[|Y|^q | \mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)$ are all \mathcal{G} -measurable. We shall take $E[\cdot | \mathcal{G}]$ on both sides of inequality above. Before that, we should check that both sides

of the inequality (★) are integrable.

Note that XY is integrable by the assumption $X \in \mathcal{L}^p$, $Y \in \mathcal{L}^q$ and original Hölder inequality.

$$0 \leq E[LHS] = E\left[\frac{|X|}{(E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/p}} \cdot \frac{|Y|}{(E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/q}}\right] \leq E\left[\frac{|X|}{\varepsilon^{1/p}} \cdot \frac{|Y|}{\varepsilon^{1/q}}\right] = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} E|XY| < \infty$$

$$0 \leq E[RHS] = E\left[\frac{1}{p} \frac{|X|^p}{E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{|Y|^q}{E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon}\right] \leq E\left[\frac{1}{p} \frac{|X|^p}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{q} \frac{|Y|^q}{\varepsilon}\right] = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\frac{1}{p} E|X|^p + \frac{1}{q} E|Y|^q\right) < \infty$$

Thus the both sides of inequality (★) are integrable. (Actually, we add ε for this.) Now take $E[\cdot|\mathcal{G}]$ on both sides. Then by smoothing property and linearity of conditional expectation, we have

$$\frac{1}{(E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/p}} \frac{1}{(E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/q}} E[|XY| |\mathcal{G}] \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon} E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}] + \frac{1}{q} \frac{1}{E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon} E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}]$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$$

Hence we have

$$E[|XY| |\mathcal{G}] \leq (E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/p} (E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}] + \varepsilon)^{1/q} \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have $E[|XY| |\mathcal{G}] \leq E[|X|^p|\mathcal{G}]^{1/p} E[|Y|^q|\mathcal{G}]^{1/q}$ as desired. \square

Remark. The problem was intended to use regular conditional probability in textbook, but I think this proof is more intuitive.

4.1.5 Give an example on $\Omega = \{a, b, c\}$ in which

$$E(E(X|\mathcal{F}_1)|\mathcal{F}_2) \neq E(E(X|\mathcal{F}_2)|\mathcal{F}_1)$$

Proof. Set two σ -fields $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2 \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ as below :

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \sigma(\{a\}) = \{\phi, \{a\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \sigma(\{c\}) = \{\phi, \{c\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$$

$\mathcal{F}_0 := \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 are sub σ -fields of \mathcal{F}_0 . Define $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $X(a) = 0$, $X(b) = 1$, $X(c) = 0$

$$(X \geq k) = \begin{cases} \phi \in \mathcal{F}_0 & \text{if } k > 1 \\ \{b\} \in \mathcal{F}_0 & \text{if } 0 < k \leq 1 \\ \{a, b, c\} \in \mathcal{F}_0 & \text{if } k \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

X is a \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable random variable. Notice that X is neither \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable, nor \mathcal{F}_2 -measurable.

Also, we shall define probability measure P on (Ω, \mathcal{F}_0) by $P(\{a\}) = P(\{b\}) = P(\{c\}) = 1/3$

Our strategy for the proof is that find out $E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]$ and $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2]$ in order, and then claim that it is not \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable so that it cannot be equal to $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1]$.

i. Find out $E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]$

In \mathcal{F}_1 , unlike in \mathcal{F}_0 , $\{b\}$ and $\{c\}$ cannot be separated. Since $P(\{b\}) = P(\{c\}) = 1/3$ and $(X(b) + X(c))/2 = 1/2$, we can guess that Y defined by $Y(a) = 0$, $Y(b) = 1/2$, $Y(c) = 1/2$ might be $E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]$.

$$(Y \geq k) = \begin{cases} \phi \in \mathcal{F}_1 & \text{if } k > 1/2 \\ \{b, c\} \in \mathcal{F}_1 & \text{if } 0 < k \leq 1/2 \\ \{a, b, c\} \in \mathcal{F}_1 & \text{if } k \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

Hence Y is \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\phi} X dP &= 0 & \int_{\{b,c\}} X dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{b\}) + 1 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/3 \\
\int_{\{a\}} X dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{a\}) = 0 & \int_{\{a,b,c\}} X dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{a\}) + 1 \cdot P(\{b\}) + 0 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/3 \\
\int_{\phi} Y dP &= 0 & \int_{\{b,c\}} Y dP &= 1/2 \cdot P(\{b\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/3 \\
\int_{\{a\}} Y dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{a\}) = 0 & \int_{\{a,b,c\}} Y dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{a\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{b\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/3
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\int_A X dP = \int_A Y dP \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_1. \quad Y = E[X|\mathcal{F}_1] \text{ a.s.}$

ii. Find out $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2]$

In \mathcal{F}_2 , $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$ cannot be separated. Since $P(\{a\}) = P(\{b\})$ and $(Y(a) + Y(b))/2 = 1/4$, we can guess that Z defined by $Z(a) = 1/4$, $Z(b) = 1/4$, $Z(c) = 1/2$ might be $E[Y|\mathcal{F}_2] = E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2]$.

$$(Z \geq k) = \begin{cases} \phi \in \mathcal{F}_2 & \text{if } k > 1/2 \\ \{c\} \in \mathcal{F}_2 & \text{if } 1/4 < k \leq 1/2 \\ \{a, b, c\} \in \mathcal{F}_2 & \text{if } k \leq 1/4 \end{cases}$$

Hence Z is \mathcal{F}_2 -measurable.

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\phi} Y dP &= 0 & \int_{\{a,b\}} Y dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{a\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{b\}) = 1/6 \\
\int_{\{c\}} Y dP &= 1/2 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/6 & \int_{\{a,b,c\}} Y dP &= 0 \cdot P(\{a\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{b\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/3 \\
\int_{\phi} Z dP &= 0 & \int_{\{a,b\}} Z dP &= 1/4 \cdot P(\{a\}) + 1/4 \cdot P(\{b\}) = 1/6 \\
\int_{\{c\}} Z dP &= 1/2 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/6 & \int_{\{a,b,c\}} Z dP &= 1/4 \cdot P(\{a\}) + 1/4 \cdot P(\{b\}) + 1/2 \cdot P(\{c\}) = 1/3
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\int_A Y dP = \int_A Z dP \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_2. \quad Z = E[Y|\mathcal{F}_2] = E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2]$

iii. Conclusion

Observe that Z is not \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable. This is because $(Z \geq k) = \{c\} \notin \mathcal{F}_1$ whenever $1/4 < k \leq 1/2$. Suppose $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2] = E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1] \text{ a.s.}$. Then since $P(\{a\}) = P(\{b\}) = P(\{c\}) = 1/3 > 0$, $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1] = Z$ (exactly same). This means that $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1]$ is not \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, $E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_1]|\mathcal{F}_2] \neq E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_2]|\mathcal{F}_1]$ in this case.

□

4.1.6 Show that if $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and $EX^2 < \infty$, then

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

Dropping the second term on the left, we get an inequality that says geometrically, the larger the subspace the closer the projection is, or statistically, more information means a smaller mean square error.

Remark. $E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}^2] \leq E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2]$ whenever $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$, provided $X \in \mathcal{L}^2$. The more information given, the closer to the target random variable in \mathcal{L}^2 distance.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2] &= E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F}) + E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2] \\ &= E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}^2] + E[\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2] + 2E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}] \end{aligned}$$

Second equality holds because $X \in \mathcal{L}^2 \Rightarrow E(X|\mathcal{F}), E(X|\mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{L}^2$ and \mathcal{L}^2 is a vector space. Now, it suffices to show that the cross product $E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}]$ is zero. We shall take advantage of a simple fact that $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow$ Every \mathcal{G} -measurable r.v. is \mathcal{F} -measurable. $\dots (*)$

$$\begin{aligned} CP &= E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}] \\ &= E[E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}|\mathcal{F}]] \quad \because E[Z] = E[E(Z|\mathcal{F})] \\ &= E[\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}|\mathcal{F}]] \quad \because E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G}) \in \mathcal{F} \text{ by } (*) \\ &= E[0] \quad \because E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}|\mathcal{F}] = E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{F})E[1|\mathcal{F}] = E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{F}) = 0 \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2] = E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}^2] + E[\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2]$ □

4.1.7 An important special case of the previous result occurs when $\mathcal{G} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. Let $\text{var}(X|\mathcal{F}) = E(X^2|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{F})^2$. Show that

$$\text{var}(X) = E(\text{var}(X|\mathcal{F})) + \text{var}(E(X|\mathcal{F}))$$

Remark. $\text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F}) := E[X^2|\mathcal{F}] - E^2[X|\mathcal{F}] = E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}^2|\mathcal{F}]$

Proof. Note that $E(X|\mathcal{G}) = E(X)$ when $\mathcal{G} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. We shall plug in $\mathcal{G} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ on the equation derived at problem 4.1.6

- i. $E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2] = E[\{X - E(X)\}^2] = \text{Var}(X)$
- ii. $E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}^2] = E[E[\{X - E(X|\mathcal{F})\}^2|\mathcal{F}]] = E[\text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F})]$
- iii. $E[\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X|\mathcal{G})\}^2] = E[\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E(X)\}^2] = E[\{E(X|\mathcal{F}) - E[E(X|\mathcal{F})]\}^2] = \text{Var}(E(X|\mathcal{F}))$

Problem 4.1.6 tells us that i = ii + iii. Thus $\text{Var}(X) = E[\text{Var}(X|\mathcal{F})] + \text{Var}(E(X|\mathcal{F}))$ □

4.1.9 Show that if X and Y are random variables with $E(Y|\mathcal{G}) = X$ and $EY^2 = EX^2 < \infty$, then $X = Y$ a.s.

Proof. We again use the equation derived at problem 4.1.6 with plugging in trivial σ -field (which is a trick also used for problem 4.1.7)

$$E[\{Y - E[Y|\mathcal{F}]\}^2] = E[\{Y - E[Y|\mathcal{G}]\}^2] + E[\{E[Y|\mathcal{G}] - E[Y|\mathcal{F}]\}^2] \quad \text{whenever } \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}, E[Y^2] < \infty$$

Now plug in $\mathcal{F} = \{\phi, \Omega\}$. Then we have

- i. $E[\{Y - E[Y|\mathcal{F}]\}^2] = E[\{Y - E[Y]\}^2] = \text{Var}(Y)$
- ii. $E[\{Y - E[Y|\mathcal{G}]\}^2] = E[\{Y - X\}^2]$
- iii. $E[\{E[Y|\mathcal{G}] - E[Y|\mathcal{F}]\}^2] = E[\{X - E[Y]\}^2]$

Thus we have $\text{Var}(Y) = E[\{Y - X\}^2] + E[\{X - E[Y]\}^2] \dots (\star)$

Notice that $E[X] = E[E[Y|\mathcal{G}]] = E[Y]$. (\star) turns to $\text{Var}(Y) = E[\{Y - X\}^2] + \text{Var}(X)$.

Since $E(X) = E(Y)$ and $E(X^2) = E(Y^2) < \infty$ by assumption, we have $\text{Var}(X) = \text{Var}(Y) < \infty$

Therefore, we get $E[\{Y - X\}^2] = 0$. It implies that $(Y - X)^2 = 0$ a.s. $\because (Y - X)^2 \geq 0$

Thus $|Y - X| = 0$ a.s. and $X = Y$ a.s. □