

# STAT 7200

## Introduction to Advanced Probability

### Lecture 15

Taylor R. Brown

# “A First Look at Rigorous Probability Theory” (Jeffrey Rosenthal) Section 12.1

# Motivation

Let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ . We have seen examples of probability measures for discrete random variables, continuous random variables, and discrete/continuous mixture random variables. Are these the only types?

Goal: prove Lebesgue's Decomposition. Write any measure as the sum of three components: discrete, absolutely continuous and singular.

Roadmap: Definitions  $\rightarrow$  Hahn's Decomposition theorem  $\rightarrow$  Lebesgue's Decomposition Theorem

# Definitions

## 2.1: Definition: Measures dominating other measures

Let  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  be two measures. We say  $\mu$  is dominated by  $\lambda$  if for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\lambda(B) > 0 \implies \mu(B) > 0$ . It is written as  $\mu \ll \lambda$ .

## 2.2: Definition: Absolutely Continuous

Let  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  be two measures. We say  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\lambda$  if for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mu(B) = \int_B f d\lambda$  for some  $f \geq 0$ .

## 2.3: Definition: signed measure

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space. Then  $\phi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a signed measure if 1.)  $\phi(\emptyset) = 0$ , and 2.)  $\phi$  is countably additive.

Apply the proof of Proposition 3.3.1 to show that  $\phi$  is continuous.

# Decomposing $\Omega$

## 2.4: Lemma 12.1.4: Hahn's Decomposition

Let  $\phi$  be a signed measure on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ . Then there exists a two-set partition of  $\Omega$ :  $A^+, A^- \in \mathcal{F}$  such that whenever  $E \subseteq A^+$ , we have  $\phi(E) \geq 0$ , and whenever  $F \subseteq A^-$ , we have  $\phi(F) \leq 0$ .

# Hahn Decomposition: Proof

Define

$$\alpha = \sup \{ \phi(A) : A \in \mathcal{F} \}.$$

We want to find  $A^+$  such that  $\phi(A^+) = \alpha$ .

Choose  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\phi(A_i) \rightarrow \alpha$ . Then define  $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$ . Then define

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \left\{ \bigcap_{k=1}^n A'_k : A'_k = A_k \text{ or } A'_k = A \setminus A_k \right\}.$$

Then define

$$C_n = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{G}_n \text{ and } \phi(S) \geq 0} S$$

and set

$$A^+ = \limsup_n C_n = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k \geq n} C_k$$

## Hahn Decomposition: Proof

For any  $n$ ,  $\phi(C_n) \geq \phi(A_n)$ .

Next,

$$\phi(C_m \cup \cdots \cup C_{n-1} \cup C_n) \geq \phi(C_m \cup \cdots \cup C_{n-1})$$

therefore

$$\phi(C_m \cup \cdots \cup C_{n-1} \cup C_n) \geq \phi(C_m) \geq \phi(A_m).$$

Taking the limit on both sides, by continuity of  $\phi$ :

$$\phi\left(\bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} C_n\right) \geq \phi(A_m)$$

Finally

$$\phi(A^+) = \phi(\limsup_m C_m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \phi\left(\bigcup_{k \geq m}^{\infty} C_k\right) \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \phi(A_m) = \alpha.$$

# Hahn Decomposition: Proof

We had  $\phi(A^+) \geq \alpha$  from the previous slide. By definition of sup,  $\phi(A^+) \leq \alpha$ , so  $\phi(A^+) = \alpha$ .

Take  $E \subseteq A^+$ . Assume to the contrary that  $\phi(E) < 0$ . Then  $\phi(A^+ \setminus E) = \phi(A^+) - \phi(E) > \phi(A^+) = \sup\{\phi(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ , which contradicts the definition of supremum.

Define  $A^- = \Omega \setminus A^+$ . Again, we can show that for any  $E \subseteq A^-$ , we have  $\phi(E) \leq 0$ . Assume to the contrary that  $\phi(E) > 0$ . Then, by additivity of  $\phi$ :  $\phi(A^+ \cup E) = \phi(A^+) + \phi(E) > \phi(A^+)$ . Again, this is a contradiction, so  $\phi(E) \leq 0$ .



# Decomposing Probability Measures

Before we talk about the theorem that decomposes probability measures, we need another definition:

## 2.5: Definition: Singular Measures

Let  $\mu, \nu$  be two positive measures defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ .  $\mu$  is **singular** with respect to  $\nu$ , written  $\mu \perp \nu$ , if there exists an  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mu(S) = 0$  and  $\nu(S^c) = 0$ .

Intuitively, the two measures put probability on different places, and these two places partition the sample space.

# Decomposing Probability Measures

## 2.6: Lemma 12.1.1: Lebesgue's Decomposition

Any probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  can uniquely be decomposed as

$$\mu = \mu_{\text{disc}} + \mu_{\text{ac}} + \mu_{\text{sing}},$$

where

- ①  $\mu_{\text{disc}}(\mathbb{R}) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mu_{\text{disc}}(\{x\})$
- ②  $\mu_{\text{ac}}(A) = \int_A f d\lambda$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , where  $f$  is a nonnegative, Borel-measurable function  $f$ , and  $\lambda$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and
- ③  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(\{x\}) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  but  $\exists S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\lambda(S) = 0$  and  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(S^c) = 0$ .

# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

The first part is easy. We can just define

$$\mu_{\text{disc}}(A) := \sum_{x \in A} \mu(\{x\})$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ .

In this way,  $\mu - \mu_{\text{disc}}$  has no discrete part:

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{R}} [\mu - \mu_{\text{disc}}](\{x\}) = 0.$$

Without loss of generality, write  $\mu$  for  $\mu - \mu_{\text{disc}}$ .

# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

Now we construct an  $f$  so that and define

$$\mu_{\text{ac}}(A) = \int_A f d\lambda$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ . Before we do that, we have to define a **candidate density**.

## 2.7: Definition: candidate density

$g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is a **candidate density** if, for all  $E \in \mathcal{B}$ :

$$\mu(E) \geq \int_E g d\lambda$$

# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

If  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are candidate densities, then so is  $\max\{g_1, g_2\}$  because

$$\begin{aligned}\int_E \max\{g_1, g_2\} d\lambda &= \int_{E \cap \{g_1 \leq g_2\}} g_2 d\lambda + \int_{E \cap \{g_1 > g_2\}} g_1 d\lambda \\ &\leq \mu(E \cap \{g_1 \leq g_2\}) + \mu(E \cap \{g_1 > g_2\}) \\ &= \mu(E)\end{aligned}$$

Also, if  $h_n \nearrow h$  pointwise, and each  $h_n$  is a candidate density, then so is  $h$  because

$$\int_E h d\lambda = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_E h_n d\lambda \leq \mu(E).$$

So, for any arbitrary collection of candidate densities  $\{g_n\}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max\{g_1, \dots, g_n\} = \sup_n g_n$  is a candidate density.

# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

Define

$$\beta = \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathbf{R}} g d\lambda : g \text{ is a candidate density} \right\}.$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , select  $g_n$  such that  $\beta - n^{-1} < \int_{\mathbf{R}} g_n d\lambda$ .

Finally, choose  $f = \sup_{n \geq 1} g_n$ . Clearly  $\int_{\mathbf{R}} f d\lambda = \beta$ .

Last, define

$$\mu_{\text{ac}}(A) = \int_A f d\lambda,$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$

# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

Finally, define  $\mu_{\text{sing}} = \mu - \mu_{\text{ac}}(A)$ . We have to show that  $\mu_{\text{sing}} \perp \lambda$ .

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $\phi_n = \mu_{\text{sing}} - n^{-1}\lambda$ .

Let  $A_n^+, A_n^-$  be the Hahn decomposition for  $\phi_n$ , and call  $M = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n^+$ .

$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n^- = M^c \subseteq A_n^-$ , so, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $0 \leq \mu_{\text{sing}}(M^c) \leq n^{-1}\lambda(M^c)$ . So  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(M^c) = 0$ .

Now we have to show that  $\lambda(M) = 0$ .

## Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

Now we have to show that  $\lambda(M) = 0$ . Assume to the contrary that  $\lambda(M) = \lambda(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n^+) > 0$ .

There exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\lambda(A_n^+) > 0$ . For any  $E \subseteq A_n^+$ , we have  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(E) \geq n^{-1}\lambda(E)$ .

$g = f + n^{-1}1_{A_n^+}$  is a candidate density because, for any  $D \in \mathcal{F}$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_D g d\lambda &= \int_D f d\lambda + \frac{1}{n} \int 1_{A_n^+} 1_D d\lambda \\ &= \mu_{\text{ac}}(D) + \frac{1}{n} \lambda(A_n^+ \cap D) \\ &\leq \mu_{\text{ac}}(D) + \mu_{\text{sing}}(A_n^+ \cap D) \\ &\leq \mu_{\text{ac}}(D) + \mu_{\text{sing}}(D) \\ &= \mu(D)\end{aligned}$$

Unfortunately, this is a contradiction, though:  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} g d\lambda = \beta + \frac{1}{n} \lambda(A_n^+) > \beta$ .



# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

We showed that  $\mu_{\text{sing}} \perp \lambda$ . Now we show uniqueness.

Suppose there are two decompositions  $\mu = \mu_{\text{sing}} + \mu_{\text{ac}} = \nu_{\text{sing}} + \nu_{\text{ac}}$ .

Looking at the singular parts, there exists  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  such that  $\lambda(S_1) = \lambda(S_2) = 0$  and  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(S_1^C) = \nu_{\text{sing}}(S_2^C) = 0$ .

Looking at the absolutely continuous parts, there exists  $f, g$  such that  $\mu_{\text{ac}}(A) = \int_A f d\lambda$  and  $\nu_{\text{ac}}(A) = \int_A g d\lambda$ .

We will show  $\lambda(\{g = f\}) = 1$  by showing  $\lambda(\{g > f\}) = 0$  and  $\lambda(\{g < f\}) = 0$ . To show  $\lambda(\{g > f\}) = 0$  we will show  $\lambda(\{g > f\} \cap S) = 0$  and  $\lambda(\{g > f\} \cap S^c) = 0$ , where  $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ .

# Lebesgue Decomposition: Proof

First we show  $\lambda(\{g > f\} \cap S^c) = 0$ . Again, define  $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ . Also define  $B = S^c \cap \{g > f\}$ .

$g > f$  on  $B$ , and we have  $\int_B (g - f) d\lambda = \nu_{ac}(B) - \mu_{ac}(B) = \nu_{ac}(B) + \nu_{sing}(B) - \mu_{ac}(B) - \mu_{sing}(B) = \mu(B) - \mu(B) = 0$ . Together these mean  $\lambda(B) = 0$ .

Also,  $\lambda(S_1 \cup S_2) \leq \lambda(S_1) + \lambda(S_2) = 0$ . So  $\lambda(\{g > f\}) = 0$ .

Similarly,  $\lambda(\{g < f\}) = 0$ . So  $g = f$   $\lambda$ -a.s. So  $\mu_{ac} = \nu_{ac}$ . So  $\mu_{sing} = \nu_{sing}$ .

# The Radon-Nikodym Theorem

## 2.8: Corollary 12.1.2: Radon-Nikodym Theorem

A Borel probability measure  $\mu$  is dominated by  $\lambda$  if and only if there exists  $f \geq 0$  such that

$$\mu(A) = \int_A f d\lambda$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ .

# The Radon-Nikodym Theorem: Proof

Let  $\mu$  be a Borel probability measure. Then

$$\mu = \mu_{\text{sing}} + \mu_{\text{ac}} + \mu_{\text{disc}}.$$

Suppose  $\mu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\lambda$ , then

$\mu_{\text{sing}}(A) = \mu_{\text{ac}}(A) = 0$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ . Clearly, if  $\lambda(B) = 0$ , then  $\mu(B) = 0$  as well.

Suppose  $\mu \ll I$ . For any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\lambda(\{x\}) = 0$ . Also, if  $S$  is such that  $\lambda(S) = 0$  (and  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(S^c) = 0$ ), then  $\mu(S) = 0$ , and specifically  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(S) = 0$ . So  $\mu_{\text{sing}}(\Omega) = \mu_{\text{sing}}(S) + \mu_{\text{sing}}(S^c) = 0$ . The only part left over of the three is the absolutely continuous part.