

## 1 The Portmanteau Theorem

**Theorem 1.1 (The Portmanteau Theorem, Theorem 2.1, [1])**

*Suppose:*

- $(S, \rho)$  is a metric space,  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  its the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra,  $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$  is the corresponding measurable space.
- $P, P_1, P_2, \dots \in \mathcal{M}_1(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$  are probability measures on  $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$ .

*Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $P_n$  converges weakly to  $P$ , i.e. for each bounded continuous  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued function  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f(s) dP_n(s) = \int_S f(s) dP(s).$$

- (ii) For each closed set  $F \subset S$ , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(F) \leq P(F).$$

- (iii) For each open set  $G \subset S$ , we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(G) \geq P(G).$$

- (iv) For each  $P$ -continuity set  $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ , i.e.  $P(\partial A) = 0$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(A) = P(A).$$

PROOF

(i)  $\implies$  (ii)

For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , by Lemma A.2(ii), choose a bounded continuous functions  $f_\varepsilon : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$I_F \leq f_\varepsilon \leq I_{F^\varepsilon}.$$

This implies, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$P_n(F) = \int_S I_F(x) dP_n(x) \leq \int_S f_\varepsilon(x) dP_n(x).$$

By (i), we thus have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(F) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f_\varepsilon(x) dP_n(x) = \int_S f_\varepsilon(x) dP(x) \leq \int_S I_{F^\varepsilon}(x) dP(x) = P(F^\varepsilon).$$

By Lemma A.2(i), we have  $F^\varepsilon \downarrow F$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . Hence,  $P(F^\varepsilon) \downarrow P(F)$  as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ . We may now conclude:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(F) \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} P(F^\varepsilon) = P(F).$$

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii)

Assume (ii) holds. Let  $G \subset S$  be an open subset. Then,  $F := S \setminus G$  is closed. By (ii), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(G) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{1 - P_n(G)\} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(S \setminus G) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(F) \\ &\leq P(F) = P(S \setminus G) = 1 - P(G), \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(G) \geq P(G). \quad (1.1)$$

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii)

Assume (iii) holds. Let  $F \subset S$  be a closed subset. Then,  $G := S \setminus F$  is open. By (iii), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(F) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{1 - P_n(F)\} = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(S \setminus F) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(G) \\ &\geq P(G) = P(S \setminus F) = 1 - P(F), \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(F) \leq P(F). \quad (1.2)$$

(ii) and (iii)  $\implies$  (iv)

Let  $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ . Then, by (ii) and (iii), we have:

$$P(A^\circ) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(A^\circ) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(A) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(A) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\bar{A}) \leq P(\bar{A}).$$

Hence, if  $\partial A := \bar{A} \setminus A^\circ$  is a  $P$ -continuity set, i.e.  $P(\partial A) = 0$ , hence  $P(A^\circ) = P(A) = P(\bar{A})$ , then (iv) follows.

(iv)  $\implies$  (i)

□

## A Technical Lemmas

**Lemma A.1** Suppose  $(S, \rho)$  is a metric space, and  $A \subset S$  is an arbitrary non-empty subset. Define

$$\rho(\cdot, A) : S \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} : x \longmapsto \inf_{y \in A} \{\rho(x, y)\}$$

Then,

- (i)  $\rho(\cdot, A)$  is a continuous  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued function on  $S$ .
- (ii) For each  $x \in S$ ,  $\rho(x, A) = 0$  if and only if  $x \in \bar{A}$ .

PROOF

- (i) Suppose  $x_n \longrightarrow x$ . We need to prove  $\rho(x_n, A) \longrightarrow \rho(x, A)$ , which follows immediately from the following two Claims:

**Claim 1:**  $\rho(x, A) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n, A)$ .

**Claim 2:**  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n, A) \leq \rho(x, A)$ .

Proof of Claim 1: For each  $y \in S$ , we have:

$$\rho(x, y) \leq \rho(x, x_n) + \rho(x_n, y).$$

Hence,

$$\rho(x, A) = \inf_{y \in A} \rho(x, y) \leq \rho(x, x_n) + \inf_{y \in A} \rho(x_n, y) = \rho(x, x_n) + \rho(x_n, A).$$

Since  $\rho(x, x_n) \rightarrow 0$ , the preceding inequality implies

$$\rho(x, A) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n, A).$$

This proves Claim 1.

Proof of Claim 2: For each  $y \in S$ , we have:

$$\rho(x_n, y) \leq \rho(x_n, x) + \rho(x, y).$$

Hence,

$$\rho(x_n, A) = \inf_{y \in A} \rho(x_n, y) \leq \rho(x_n, x) + \inf_{y \in A} \rho(x, y) = \rho(x_n, x) + \rho(x, A).$$

Since  $\rho(x, x_n) \rightarrow 0$ , the preceding inequality implies

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x_n, A) \leq \rho(x, A).$$

This proves Claim 2.

(ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, A) = 0 &\iff \inf_{y \in A} \rho(x, y) = 0 \\ &\iff \text{For each } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ there exists } y \in A \text{ such that } \rho(x, y) < \varepsilon \\ &\iff y \in \overline{A} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma A.2** Suppose  $(S, \rho)$  is a metric space, and  $A \subset S$  is an arbitrary non-empty subset. For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define

$$A^\varepsilon := \{ s \in S \mid \rho(s, A) < \varepsilon \}.$$

Then the following are true:

- (i)  $A^\varepsilon$  is an open subset of  $S$ . In particular,  $A^\varepsilon$  is a  $\mathcal{B}(S)$ -measurable subset of  $S$ .
- (ii)  $A^\varepsilon \downarrow \overline{A}$ , as  $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ .
- (iii) There exists a bounded continuous  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued function  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$I_{\overline{A}}(x) \leq f(x) \leq I_{A^\varepsilon}(x), \quad \text{for each } x \in S.$$

PROOF

(i)

(ii)

(iii) Define  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as follows:

$$f(x) := \max \left\{ 0, 1 - \frac{\rho(x, A)}{\varepsilon} \right\}.$$

Then, by Lemma A.1(i),  $f$  is continuous  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued function on  $S$ . Clear,  $0 \leq f(x) \leq 1$ , for each  $x \in S$ . By Lemma A.1(ii), we have

$$x \in \bar{A} \iff \rho(x, F) = 0 \iff f(x) = 1.$$

This proves  $I_{\bar{A}}(x) \leq 1 = f(x)$ , for each  $x \in \bar{A}$ , and hence for each  $x \in S$  (since  $I_{\bar{A}}(x) = 0$  for  $x \in S \setminus \bar{A}$ , and the inequality holds trivially). On the other hand,

$$x \in S \setminus A^\varepsilon \iff \varepsilon \leq \rho(x, A) \iff 1 - \frac{\rho(x, A)}{\varepsilon} \leq 0 \implies f(x) = 0.$$

This proves  $f(x) = 0 \leq I_{A^\varepsilon}(x)$ , for each  $x \in S \setminus A^\varepsilon$ , and hence for each  $x \in S$  (since  $I_{A^\varepsilon}(x) = 1$  for each  $x \in A^\varepsilon$  and the inequality holds trivially). This completes the proof of (ii).

□

## References

- [1] BILLINGSLEY, P. *Convergence of Probability Measures*, second ed. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.