

## 270A - Homework 1

---

1. (a) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of all finite subsets of  $\Omega$  and their complements. Is  $\mathcal{F}$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra?

*Solution.* If  $\Omega$  is finite then  $\mathcal{F}$  is simply the power set of  $\Omega$ , which is definitely a  $\sigma$ -algebra. However, if  $\mathcal{F}$  is infinite, then  $\mathcal{F}$  is never a  $\sigma$ -algebra. To see this, let  $(x_n)$  be a countable sequence of distinct elements in  $\Omega$  and consider the set of even-indexed terms

$$F = \{x_n : n = 2k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

This set is a countable union of singletons and all singletons belong to  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $F$  is clearly infinite, but so is its complement, which contains the (infinite) set of odd-indexed terms. We conclude that  $F$  is neither finite nor co-finite, so  $\mathcal{F}$  is not closed under countable unions when  $\Omega$  is an infinite set.  $\square$

- (b) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of all countable subsets of  $\Omega$  and their complements. Is  $\mathcal{F}$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra?

*Solution.*  $\mathcal{F}$  is indeed a  $\sigma$ -algebra. The empty set is clearly countable, and  $\Omega^C = \emptyset$ . Let  $F_n$  be a countable collection of sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  and consider their union,  $F = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n$ . If each  $F_n$  is countable, then  $F$  is just a countable union of countable sets: countable. If one of the  $F_n$ 's, say  $F_k$ , were co-countable, then  $F^C \subseteq F_k^C$ , which is countable, so  $F$  is co-countable. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  contains the empty set and  $\Omega$  and is closed under countable unions and complements, it is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.  $\square$

- (c) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be two  $\sigma$ -algebras of subsets of  $\Omega$ . Is  $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$  always a  $\sigma$ -algebra?

*Solution.*  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  both contain  $\emptyset$  and  $\Omega$ , so does their intersection. Let  $E_n$  be a countable collection of sets in  $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are both  $\sigma$ -algebras, the union  $E = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$  is in both  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  and each  $E_n^C$  is in both  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  as well.  $\square$

- (d) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be two  $\sigma$ -algebras of subsets of  $\Omega$ . Is  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G}$  always a  $\sigma$ -algebra?

*Solution.* The union need not be a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Let  $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ ,  $\mathcal{F} = \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{1\}, \{2, 3, 4\}\}$ , and  $\mathcal{G} = \{\emptyset, \Omega, \{2\}, \{1, 3, 4\}\}$ .  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  are  $\sigma$ -algebras, but the set  $\{1\} \cup \{2\} = \{1, 2\}$  is not in their union.  $\square$

2. A subset  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  is said to have asymptotic density if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A \cap \{1, \dots, n\}|}{n}$$

exists. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the collection of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  for which the asymptotic density exists. Is  $\mathcal{F}$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra?

*Solution.*  $\mathcal{F}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra. First let's construct a set not in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The idea is to build a set that has long gaps followed by even longer "runs". Let  $F_0 = \{1\}$  and  $F_i = \{2^i, \dots, 2^{i+1} - 1\}$ . Define the set  $A$  by  $A = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} F_{2^j}$ .  $A$  consists of a run of length  $2^{2^j}$  followed by a gap of length  $2^{2^{j+1}}$  for each  $j = 0, 1, \dots$ . Our set  $A$  does not have asymptotic density since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|A \cap [2^{2k}]|}{2^{2k}} &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{2^j} + 1}{2^{2k}} \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \end{aligned}$$

while on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|A \cap [2^{2k+1}]|}{2^{2k+1}} &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k 2^{2^j}}{2^{2k+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \left( 2 - \frac{1}{2^{2k+1}} \right) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{2}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $A$  is not in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since  $A$  is a countable union of singletons, which clearly have asymptotic density zero, we conclude that  $\mathcal{F}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra. □

3. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two random variables on the same probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , and let  $E \in \mathcal{F}$  be an event. Define

$$Z = \begin{cases} X & \text{if } E \text{ occurs} \\ Y & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Prove that  $Z$  is a random variable.

*Proof.* We can write  $Z = X \cdot \mathbb{1}_E + Y \cdot \mathbb{1}_{E^c}$ . Since  $E$  is an event, the indicator functions  $\mathbb{1}_E$  and  $\mathbb{1}_{E^c}$  are measurable. Since  $X$  and  $Y$  are measurable and products and sums of measurable functions are measurable, we have that  $Z$  is measurable, and hence a random variable. □

4. Let  $X$  be a random variable with density  $f$ . Compute the density of  $X^2$ .

*Solution.* First let's compute the distribution of  $X^2$ . Let  $t \geq 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[X^2 < t] &= \mathbb{P}[-\sqrt{t} < X < \sqrt{t}] \\ &= \int_{-\sqrt{t}}^{\sqrt{t}} f(s) \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the Lebesgue differentiation theorem, the above integral is an almost everywhere differentiable function of  $t$  and we can apply the fundamental theorem of calculus. If we let  $g$  be the density of  $X^2$  then

$$\begin{aligned} g(t) &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{-\sqrt{t}}^{\sqrt{t}} f(s) \, ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t}} [f(\sqrt{t}) + f(-\sqrt{t})], \end{aligned}$$

for  $t \geq 0$ . Since  $X^2$  is clearly nonnegative, we then have

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t}} [f(\sqrt{t}) + f(-\sqrt{t})], & t > 0 \\ 0, & t \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

□

5. Let  $X$  be a nonnegative random variable. Show that

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[X > t] \, dt.$$

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is nonnegative (this is important – the Lebesgue integral is orientation-independent, unlike the Riemann integral!),

$$X = \int_0^X dt.$$

We can then take the expectation of both sides and apply Fubini's theorem.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X] &= \int_{\Omega} \int_0^X dt \, d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{X>t}(t) \, dt \, d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{X>t}(x) \, d\mathbb{P} \, dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[X > t] \, dt. \end{aligned}$$

□

6. Let  $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a strictly convex function. Let  $X$  be a random variable such that  $\mathbb{E}[|X|] < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|\varphi(X)|] \leq \infty$ . Show that

$$\varphi(\mathbb{E}[X]) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] \implies X = \mathbb{E}[X] \text{ a.s.}$$

*Proof.* Since  $\varphi$  is strictly convex, for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists an affine linear function  $F_t(x)$  such that  $F_t(t) = \varphi(t)$  and  $F_t(x) < \varphi(x)$  for all  $x \neq t$ . We can set  $t = \mathbb{E}[X]$  compose with  $X$  to obtain  $F_t(X) \leq \varphi(X)$ , with equality if and only if  $X = \mathbb{E}[X]$ . Note that since  $F_t$  is affine linear we have that  $\mathbb{E}[F_t(X)] = F_t(\mathbb{E}[X])$ .

Suppose that  $\varphi(\mathbb{E}[X]) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)]$ . When  $t = \mathbb{E}[X]$ ,  $F_t$  and  $\varphi$  agree at  $\mathbb{E}[X]$ , so  $\varphi(\mathbb{E}[X]) = F_t(\mathbb{E}[X])$ , yielding

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)] &= \varphi(\mathbb{E}[X]) \\ &= F_t(\mathbb{E}[X]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F_t(X)].\end{aligned}$$

By the linearity of expectation we then have  $\mathbb{E}[\varphi(X) - F_t(X)] = 0$ . By convexity,  $\varphi(X) - F_t(X) \geq 0$ , so since this expectation is zero, we must have that  $\varphi(X) = F_t(X)$  almost surely. By strict convexity, this implies that  $X = t = \mathbb{E}[X]$  almost surely.  $\square$

7. Suppose  $0 \leq p_n \leq 1$  and put  $\alpha_n = \min(p_n, 1 - p_n)$ . Show that if  $\sum_n \alpha_n$  diverges, then no discrete probability space can contain independent events  $A_1, A_2, \dots$  such that  $\mathbb{P}[A_n] = p_n$ .

*Proof.* First let's strengthen the Borel-Cantelli lemma by proving a partial converse. Consider the tail  $\cup_{n=M}^\infty A_n$  for  $M$  large. We compute the probability of the tail's complement using the fact that  $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[\cap_{n=M}^N A_n^c] &= \prod_{n=M}^N (1 - \mathbb{P}[A_n]) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\sum_{n=M}^N \mathbb{P}[A_n]\right) \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Since the complement of the tail goes to zero in probability, we have that  $\mathbb{P}[\cup_{n=M}^\infty A_n] = 1$  for all  $M$ . Since  $\limsup A_n = \cap_{M=1}^\infty \cup_{n=M}^\infty A_n$ , continuity of measure tells us that  $\mathbb{P}[\limsup A_n] = 1$ .

Suppose that these events live in a discrete probability space  $\Omega$  (equipped with the power set  $\sigma$ -algebra). Since  $\Omega$  is discrete, there must be some  $\omega \in \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}[\{\omega\}] > 0$ . Define the sequence of events  $E_n$  by

$$E_n = \begin{cases} A_n^c, & \text{if } \omega \in A_n \\ A_n, & \text{if } \omega \notin A_n. \end{cases}$$

In particular, each  $E_n$  misses  $\omega$  and the  $E_n$ 's are independent. We also have that

$$\sum \mathbb{P}[E_n] \geq \sum \alpha_n = \infty.$$

By our strengthened Borel-Cantelli lemma,  $\mathbb{P}[\limsup E_n] = 1$ . By discreteness, we must then have that  $\Omega = \limsup E_n$ . But  $\omega$ , which has positive probability, isn't in  $\limsup E_n$  – a contradiction. We conclude that  $\Omega$  is not discrete.  $\square$

8. Prove that if random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, then so are  $f(X)$  and  $g(Y)$ , for any Borel measurable functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* We need to show that for any Borel sets  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ , the events  $(f \circ X)^{-1}[B_1]$  and  $(g \circ Y)^{-1}[B_2]$  are independent. We can rewrite these preimages as

$$(f \circ X)^{-1}[B_1] = X^{-1}[f^{-1}[B_1]], \quad (g \circ Y)^{-1}[B_2] = Y^{-1}[g^{-1}[B_2]].$$

Since  $f$  and  $g$  are measurable, the preimages  $f^{-1}[B_1]$  and  $g^{-1}[B_2]$  are Borel sets. Similarly, since  $X$  and  $Y$  are random variables, the preimages  $X^{-1}[f^{-1}[B_1]]$  and  $Y^{-1}[g^{-1}[B_2]]$  are events. Since  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, any preimage under  $X$  is independent of any preimage under  $Y$ .  $\square$

9. Let  $p \geq 3$  be prime. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be independent random variables that are uniformly distributed on  $\{0, \dots, p-1\}$ . Define

$$Z_n = (X + nY) \pmod{p}, \quad n = 0, \dots, p-1.$$

Show that the random variables  $Z_n$  are pairwise independent, but not jointly independent.

*Proof.* First, we claim it suffices to prove that for all  $s, t$  in  $S = \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = s, Z_{n_2} = t] = \mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = s] \cdot \mathbb{P}[Z_{n_2} = t]. \quad (1)$$

Define  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  as follows.

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \{\Omega\} \cup \{\{Z_{n_i} = s\} : s \in S\}.$$

$\mathcal{A}_i$  is a  $\pi$ -system that contains  $\Omega$ . Since the singletons generate the power set  $\sigma$ -algebra, we have that  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_i) = \sigma(Z_{n_i})$ . Since (1) says that  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are independent, we have that  $Z_{n_1}$  and  $Z_{n_2}$  are independent by the  $\pi - \lambda$  theorem.

Now let's actually verify (1). Let's start with the right-hand side. Since  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = s] &= \mathbb{P}[X = s - n_1 Y] \\ &= \sum_{y=0}^{p-1} \mathbb{P}[X = s - n_1 y, Y = y] \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{y=0}^{p-1} \mathbb{P}[X = s - n_1 y] \\ &= \frac{1}{p}.\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of (1) is then  $\frac{1}{p^2}$ . Now for the joint. If we assume that  $n_1 \neq n_2$  then the system

$$\begin{aligned}X + n_1 Y &= s \\ X + n_2 Y &= t\end{aligned}$$

has a unique solution  $(\alpha, \beta)$  for  $X, Y$  since  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  is a field. Since  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent, the joint probability becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = s, Z_{n_2} = t] &= \mathbb{P}[X = \alpha, Y = \beta] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[X = \alpha] \cdot \mathbb{P}[Y = \beta] \\ &= \frac{1}{p^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We have then verified (1), so the  $Z_{n_i}$ 's are pairwise independent.

To see that the  $Z_{n_i}$ 's are not jointly independent, consider three variables  $Z_{n_1}, Z_{n_2}, Z_{n_3}$ , with distinct  $n_i$ . Such a trio exists since we've assumed  $p \geq 3$ . The joint event  $\mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = r, Z_{n_2} = s, Z_{n_3} = t]$  represents the overdetermined system

$$\begin{aligned}X + n_1 Y &= r \\ X + n_2 Y &= s \\ X + n_3 Y &= t\end{aligned}$$

For any  $[r \ s \ t]^T$  not in the span of  $[1 \ 1 \ 1]^T$  and  $[n_1 \ n_2 \ n_3]^T$ , this system will have no solutions and  $\mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = r, Z_{n_2} = s, Z_{n_3} = t] = 0$ . However,  $\mathbb{P}[Z_{n_1} = r] \cdot \mathbb{P}[Z_{n_2} = s] \cdot \mathbb{P}[Z_{n_3} = t] = \frac{1}{p^3}$ . We conclude that the  $Z_{n_i}$ 's are not jointly independent.  $\square$

10. (a) For any given  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , show that there exists a random variable  $X$  with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  for which Chebyshev's inequality becomes an equality:

$$\mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] = \frac{1}{k^2}.$$

*Proof.* Let's construct a random variable  $X$  that takes values in  $\{-k\sigma, 0, k\sigma\}$ . To make things simple, let's construct  $X$  to have zero mean (we'll shift it to  $\mu$  later). In order for this to work, we need  $\mathbb{P}[X = -k\sigma] = \mathbb{P}[X = k\sigma] = \beta$  and  $\mathbb{P}[X = 0] = \alpha$  for some nonnegative  $\alpha, \beta$  with  $\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ . The variance of  $X$  will then be given by

$$\text{Var}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] = 2\beta k^2 \sigma^2.$$

In order for  $\text{Var}[X] = \sigma^2$  to hold, we need  $\beta = \frac{1}{2k^2}$ . Consider then the variable  $X$  with

$$X = \begin{cases} -k\sigma, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2k^2} \\ 0, & \text{with probability } 1 - \frac{1}{k^2} \\ k\sigma, & \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2k^2} \end{cases}.$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|X| \geq k\sigma] &= \mathbb{P}[X = \pm k\sigma] \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By linearity of expectation, the variable  $X + \mu$  will have mean  $\mu$ , variance  $\sigma^2$  and the above equality will still hold.  $\square$

(b) Show that for any random variable  $X$  with mean  $\mu$  and variance  $\sigma^2$ , one has

$$\mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] = o\left(\frac{1}{k^2}\right) \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* By Markov's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} k^2 \cdot \mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] &= k^2 \cdot \mathbb{P}[(X - \mu)^2 \geq k^2 \sigma^2] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma} (X - \mu)^2 d\mathbb{P}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Since  $X$  has finite variance, the function  $(X - \mu)^2$  is integrable. Consequently, the set function  $E \mapsto \int_E (X - \mu)^2 d\mathbb{P}$  is a measure absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ . This means that for any  $\epsilon$ , there is a  $\delta$  so that  $\mathbb{P}[E] < \delta$  implies that  $\int_E (X - \mu)^2 d\mathbb{P} < \epsilon$ .

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . If we can show that for  $k$  sufficiently large,  $\mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] < \delta$ , then the last line in (2) will tend to zero as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  by the above discussion. Consider the inequality

$$\frac{|X - \mu|}{\sigma} - 1 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma} \leq \frac{|X - \mu|}{\sigma}.$$

Integrating through this inequality with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$  and using the fact that  $\mathbb{P}$  is a finite measure shows that  $|X - \mu|/\sigma$  is integrable if and only if  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] < \infty$ . Since

$|X - \mu|/\sigma$  is indeed integrable, we have that  $\mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We can then pick  $k$  sufficiently large so that  $\int_{|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma} (X - \mu)^2 d\mathbb{P} < \epsilon$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} k^2 \cdot \mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma] &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \int_{|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma} (X - \mu)^2 d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $\mathbb{P}[|X - \mu| \geq k\sigma]$  is  $o(1/k^2)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . □