

# FDA Homework 2

Seokjun Choi

October 18, 2019

## 1 Chapter 10

### 1.1 Problem 2

**Show that in any inner product space, the function  $y \rightarrow \langle x, y \rangle$  is continuous where  $x$  is arbitrary element of that inner product space.**

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an inner product space,  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{H}$  such that converges to  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  in norm sense. For  $x \in \mathcal{H}$ , consider below relation.

$$|\langle x, f_n \rangle - \langle x, f \rangle|^2 = |\langle x, f_n - f \rangle|^2 \leq \|x\|^2 \|f_n - f\|^2$$

Last inequality come from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Then when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , by our setting  $\|f_n - f\| \rightarrow 0$ , so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\langle x, f_n \rangle - \langle x, f \rangle|^2 \leq 0$$

Then, since square term has always nonnegative value,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle x, f_n \rangle - \langle x, f \rangle = 0$$

Thus  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle x, f_n \rangle = \langle x, f \rangle$ . From this, we show that the inner product operator preserves the limit. It is equivalent statement to that inner product operator is continuous.

### 1.2 Problem 6

**Suppose  $\{e_j, j \geq 1\}$  is a complete orthonormal sequence in a Hilbert space. Show that if  $\{f_j, j \geq 1\}$  is an orthonormal sequence satisfying**

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|e_j - f_j\|^2 < 1$$

**then  $\{f_j, j \geq 1\}$  is also complete.**

Firstly, I claim that  $e_j$  and  $f_j$  are not orthogonal.

Consider a simple case that only one component of fixed  $j$  index is different  $e_j$  from  $f_j$ . then, If  $e_j, f_j$  are orthogonal, by the Pythagorean theorem,  $\|e_j - f_j\|^2 = \|e_j\|^2 + \|f_j\|^2 = 1 + 1 = 2$  since  $e_j$  and  $f_j$  are unit elements. But under our assumption,  $\|e_j - f_j\|^2$  cannot reach the value 2.

More formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_j - f_j\|^2 &= \langle e_j - f_j, e_j - f_j \rangle = \langle e_j, e_j \rangle - \langle e_j, f_j \rangle - \langle f_j, e_j \rangle + \langle f_j, f_j \rangle \\ &= \|e_j\|^2 + \|f_j\|^2 - (\langle e_j, f_j \rangle + \langle f_j, e_j \rangle) = 2 - (\langle e_j, f_j \rangle + \langle f_j, e_j \rangle) < 1 \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\langle e_j, f_j \rangle + \langle f_j, e_j \rangle = \langle e_j, f_j \rangle + \overline{\langle e_j, f_j \rangle} = 2\operatorname{Re}(\langle e_j, f_j \rangle)$$

cannot become 0, neither can  $\langle e_j, f_j \rangle$ , so they are not orthogonal. Thus the claim is proved for simple case.

Next, consider many  $j$ -th components are different  $e_j$  from  $f_j$ . But above claim still holds, because  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|e_j - f_j\|^2 < 1$  and all norm values must be nonnegative, none of  $j$ -th component of  $\|e_j - f_j\|$  can be greater than 1 like the simple cases. It means that  $\langle e_j, f_j \rangle + \langle f_j, e_j \rangle = 2\operatorname{Re}(\langle e_j, f_j \rangle)$  cannot be 0 for all  $j$ . So above claim is proved for whole cases.

Then as what we get from above claim, if we express  $f_j$  as the linear combination of  $\{e_i\}$ ,  $f_j$  always has  $e_j$  component term with nonzero coefficient. (More precisely, use Gram-Schmidt process, or just project  $f_j$  onto  $e_j$  orthogonally. Then because  $f_j$  is not orthogonal to  $e_j$ , we get  $e_j$  component term of nonzero coefficient in  $f_j$ 's expression of linear combination using  $\{e_i\}$ .)

So, if we express whole space  $\mathcal{H}$  as  $\mathcal{H} = \operatorname{span}\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_j, \dots\}$ , then we can also re-express  $\mathcal{H}$  as  $\mathcal{H} = \operatorname{span}\{e_1, e_2, \dots, f_j, \dots\}$ . Then for each  $j$ , we replace  $e_j$  to  $f_j$  inductively from  $j = 1$  to  $\infty$  for above span expression. Then as a result we get  $\mathcal{H} = \operatorname{span}\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_j, \dots\}$  for  $\{f_j, j \geq 1\}$ , it's what we want.

### 1.3 Problem 10

**Suppose  $\{e_j, j \geq 1\}$  and  $\{f_i, i \geq 1\}$  are orthonormal bases in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Show that for any Hilbert-Schmidt operators  $\Psi, \Phi$**

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \Psi(f_i), \Phi(f_i) \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \Psi(e_j), \Phi(e_j) \rangle$$

Firstly note that  $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle f_i, e_j \rangle e_j$ , and since  $\Phi$  are Hilbert-Schmidt, there exists adjoint operator  $\Phi^*$ . Using these facts,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \Psi(f_i), \Phi(f_i) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \Phi^* \Psi(f_i), f_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle \Phi^* \Psi \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle f_i, e_j \rangle e_j, \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle f_i, e_k \rangle e_k \rangle$$

then

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle f_i, e_j \rangle \overline{\langle f_i, e_k \rangle} \langle \Phi^* \Psi(e_j), e_k \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle f_i, e_j \rangle \langle e_k, f_i \rangle \langle \Phi^* \Psi(e_j), e_k \rangle$$

Since the operator  $\Phi^* \Psi$  is also Hilbert-Schmidt, the value of absolute summation  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\langle f_i, e_j \rangle \langle e_k, f_i \rangle \langle \Phi^* \Psi(e_j), e_k \rangle| < \infty$  and we can interchange the summation order. then

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \langle \Phi^* \Psi(e_j), e_k \rangle \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle f_i, e_j \rangle \langle e_k, f_i \rangle \right)$$

If we think the linear operator  $L : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  such that maps each  $f_i$  to  $e_i$ , then since both  $\{f_i\}, \{e_i\}$  are orthonormal,  $LL^* = L^*L$  is identity operator. It means that, for  $j \neq k$ , the last summation's term (with  $i$ ) becomes 0, and for only  $j = k$  cases remain with value 1 because of using orthonormal set.

So we rewrite above equation (with  $j = k$ , using only 1 summation symbol) as

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \Phi^* \Psi(e_j), e_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \Psi(e_j), \Phi(e_j) \rangle$$

from the assumption that  $\{f_i\}$  is in orthonormal set.

### 1.4 Problem 12

**Show that if  $L$  is bounded then  $L^*$  is also bounded, and**

$$\|L^*\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \|L^*L\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}}^2$$

Firstly, I construct a lemma.

$$\|L\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \sup\{|\langle Lx, y \rangle| : \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1\}$$

For proof of the lemma, (1)  $\geq$  direction is simple consequence of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.  $|\langle Lx, y \rangle| \leq \|Lx\| \|y\| \leq \|Lx\|$  for  $\|x\| \leq 1$ . Take supremum (within  $\|x\| \leq 1$ ) both side. (2) To get  $\leq$  direction, for  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  s.t.  $\|x\| \leq 1$ , let  $x' = x/\|x\|$ ,  $y' = Lx/\|Lx\|$ . Then if  $\sup |\langle Lx, y \rangle| = M$  for some  $M \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $|\langle Lx', y' \rangle| \leq M$  by assumption, and observe that  $|\langle Lx', y' \rangle| = |\langle \frac{Lx}{\|x\|}, \frac{Lx}{\|Lx\|} \rangle| = \frac{\|Lx\|^2}{\|x\| \|Lx\|} = \frac{\|Lx\|}{\|x\|}$ , so  $\|Lx\| \leq M\|x\|$ . Take supremum (within  $\|x\| \leq 1$ ) both side. Note that the argument which gives supremum value always satisfies  $\|x\| = 1$ .

Let's start our main goal.

For boundedness and first identity, consider

$$\begin{aligned} \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}} &= \sup\{|\langle Lx, y \rangle| : \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1\} \\ &= \sup\{|\langle x, L^*y \rangle| : \|x\| \leq 1, \|y\| \leq 1\} = \|L^*\| \end{aligned}$$

So if  $L$  is bounded ( $\|L\|_{\mathcal{L}} < \infty$ ), then  $L^*$  is also bounded ( $\|L^*\|_{\mathcal{L}} < \infty$ ).

For second identity, let  $x \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\|x\| \leq 1$ , be argument of realizing supremum of definition of operator norm,  $\|L\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \|Lx\|$ . then consider

$$\begin{aligned} \|L\|_{\mathcal{L}} &= \sup\{|\langle Lx/\|Lx\|, Ly \rangle| : \|y\| \leq 1\} \\ &= \sup\{|\frac{\langle x, L^*Ly \rangle}{\|Lx\|}| : \|y\| \leq 1\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\|L\|_{\mathcal{L}}} \sup\{|\langle x, L^*Ly \rangle| : \|y\| \leq 1\} = \frac{\|L^*L\|_{\mathcal{L}}}{\|L\|_{\mathcal{L}}} \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by our assumption over  $x$ , the supremum would be realized at  $y = x$ . So if  $\|x\| \leq 1$  is omitted on condition of supremum like above expression, it does not become problem.

Then, Multiply  $\|L\|_{\mathcal{L}}$  both side.

## 2 Chapter 11

### 2.1 Problem 5

Suppose for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots, M$ ,  $Y_{k,n}, Y_k$  are random variables such that for every  $M \geq 1$ ,

$$[Y_{1,n}, Y_{2,n}, \dots, Y_{M,n}]^T \xrightarrow{d} [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_M]^T$$

in the Euclidean space  $\mathcal{R}^M$ . Suppose  $\{w_k, k \geq 1\}$  is a sequence of numbers such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |w_k| E(|Y_k|) < \infty \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |w_k| \sup_{n \geq 1} E|Y_{k,n} - Y_k| < \infty$$

Using Theorem 11.1.3, show that  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_{k,n} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_k$ .

To overview my procedure solving this problem easier to reader, especially the form of using the theorem 11.1.3, I will start to match our case to the notation of the theorem's assumption on the book.

our case  $\leftrightarrow$  theorem11.1.3

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^u w_k Y_{k,n} &\leftrightarrow X_n(u) \\ \sum_{k=1}^u w_k Y_k &\leftrightarrow X(u) \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_{k,n} &\leftrightarrow X_n \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_k &\leftrightarrow X \end{aligned}$$

More formally, since  $[Y_{1,n}, Y_{2,n}, \dots, Y_{M,n}]^T \xrightarrow{d} [Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_M]^T$  for every  $M \geq 1$  and  $\{w_k\}$  are just real number, if I momentarily fix  $M$  as  $u$ , I can get a condition that  $\sum_{k=1}^u w_k Y_{k,n} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{k=1}^u w_k Y_k$ . and by letting  $u$  increase to  $\infty$ , also can get  $\sum_{k=1}^u w_k Y_k \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_k$ . Note that the last term's convergence is guaranteed by our problem's assumption,  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |w_k| E(|Y_k|) < \infty$ . Nextly, from our problem's another assumption  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |w_k| \sup_{n \geq 1} E|Y_{k,n} - Y_k| < \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} E|w_k Y_{k,n} - w_k Y_k| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty$$

Since it converges to the constant, it directly implies some analogues without E - in this case a thing of integral operator - and with measure sense. If I write concretely,

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(d(\sum_{k=1}^u w_k Y_{k,n}, \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_{k,n}) > \epsilon) = 0$$

So theorem 11.1.3's condition are all set. Let's apply the theorem! Then we get  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_{k,n} \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k Y_k$ .

### 2.2 Problem 9

Suppose  $\mathcal{H}$  is an infinite dimensional separable Hilbert space and  $\{e_j, j \geq 1\}$  is an orthonormal system. Define the operator  $\Psi$  by

$$\Psi(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1} \langle x, e_j \rangle e_j$$

Show that  $\Psi$  is bounded, symmetric and nonnegative definite, but it is not a covariance operator.

Boundness is straightforward. To reach the supremum of a definition of operator norm(of  $\mathcal{H}$ ), we should choose simply  $e_1$  because  $j^{-1}$  decreases as  $j$  goes to  $\infty$ . And we can get  $\|\Psi\| = 1 < \infty$  incidently from the form of  $\Psi$ .

Next, since  $\Psi$  is clearly linear and bounded as we showed, there exists an adjoint  $\|\Psi^*\|$ . Then, with the fact that  $j$  has no imaginary part,

$$\langle \Psi(x), y \rangle = \langle \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1} \langle x, e_j \rangle e_j, y \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1} \langle \langle x, e_j \rangle e_j, \langle y, e_j \rangle e_j \rangle$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle \langle x, e_j \rangle e_j, j^{-1} \langle y, e_j \rangle e_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle x, j^{-1} \langle y, e_j \rangle e_j \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle x, \Psi(y) \rangle$$

So  $\Psi = \Psi^*$ , and it means that  $\Psi$  is symmetric operator.

To show  $\Psi$  is nonnegative,

$$\langle \Psi(x), x \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{-1} \langle \langle x, e_j \rangle e_j, x \rangle$$

and just note that  $j^{-1} > 0, \langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $x$ . (In fact, positive operator is also symmetric in Hilbert space.)

But,  $\Psi$  is not Hilbert-Schmidt, nor covariance operator. For seeing the reason, consider below.

Since  $\Psi$  is symmetric, we can apply spectral theorem to  $\Psi$ . For simplicity for our discussion, Without loss of generality (because Hilbert-Schmidt norm is basis-invariant) choose the original basis of  $\mathcal{H}, \{e_j\}$  to coincide to eigenvector (or eigenfunctions, etc. corresponded some eigen-element type consisting  $\mathcal{H}$ ) of  $\Psi$ . then, naturally  $\{j^{-1}\}$  become eigenvalues. And if we denote the set of Hilbert-Schmidt operator on  $\mathcal{H}$  as  $\mathcal{S}$ ,

$$\|\Psi\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (j^{-1})^2 = \infty$$

so  $\Psi \notin \mathcal{S}$ .

## 2.3 Problem 14

**Suppose  $X$  satisfies Definition 11.3.2 and let  $L$  be a bounded operator. Show that  $L(X)$  is Gaussian; find its expected value and covariance operator.**

Maybe in the problem, a condition  $L$  is linear map from  $\mathcal{H}$  to  $\mathcal{H}'$  is missed. I'll assume it.

Firstly, since  $L$  is bounded linear operator, there exists an adjoint operator  $L^*$ . Then, let's consider the characteristic functional of  $L(X)$ . For  $y \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\phi_{L(X)}(y) = E \exp\{i \langle y, LX \rangle\} = E \exp\{i \langle L^*y, X \rangle\} = \phi_X(L^*y)$$

Then, since  $X$  follows Gaussian by assumption (definition 11.3.2),

$$\phi_{L(X)}(y) = \phi_X(L^*y) = \exp\{i \langle \mu, L^*y \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle C(L^*y), L^*y \rangle\} = \exp\{i \langle L\mu, y \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle LC(L^*y), y \rangle\}$$

From above form of characteristic functional of  $L(X)$ , we can observe that  $L(X)$  follows Gaussian again, with mean function  $L\mu$ , covariance operator  $LCL^*$ .