

STAT 7200

Introduction to Advanced Probability

Lecture 21

Taylor R. Brown

1 (Levy's) Continuity Theorem

(Levy's) Continuity Theorem

Theorem 1 (The Continuity Theorem (11.1.14))

Let μ, μ_1, μ_2, \dots be probability measures with characteristic functions $\phi, \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots$. Then μ_n converges weakly to μ if and only if $\phi_n(t) \rightarrow \phi(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$. That is, the weak convergence is equivalent to the pointwise convergence of characteristic functions.

- **Proof:** (1) *Weak convergence implies pointwise convergence of characteristic functions:*
 - Since $\cos(x)$ and $\sin(x)$ are both bounded and continuous functions, then for any $t \in \mathbf{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n(t) &= \int \cos(tx) \mu_n(dx) + i \int \sin(tx) \mu_n(dx) \\ &\rightarrow \int \cos(tx) \mu(dx) + i \int \sin(tx) \mu(dx) = \phi(t),\end{aligned}$$

by the definition of weak convergence.

Continuity Theorem: Pointwise Convergence of Characteristic Function Implies Weak Convergence

- **Proof:** (2) On the other hand, if we have $\phi_n(t) \rightarrow \phi(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$, we do not even know if the limit of $\{\mu_n\}$ exists or not.
- We will need several theorems, lemmas and corollaries to show that this is indeed true. Many of these will need their own results to prove them.

Fourier Inversion Theorem

Theorem 2 (Fourier Inversion Theorem (11.1.1))

Let μ be a Borel probability measure on \mathbf{R} with characteristic function $\phi(t) = \int e^{itx} \mu(dx)$. Then for $a < b$ and $\mu(\{a\}) = \mu(\{b\}) = 0$:

$$\mu([a, b]) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt.$$

- **Remark 1:** We'll prove this with two Lemmas.
- **Remark 2:** The number of intervals $[a, b]$ with $\mu(\{a\}) \neq 0$ or $\mu(\{b\}) \neq 0$ is at most countable because the set $\{x : \mu(\{x\}) > 0\}$ is at most countable. That's from the previous lecture.

First Lemma to prove Fourier Inversion Theorem

Theorem 3 (Lemma 11.1.2)

For $T \geq 0$ and $a < b$

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-T}^T \left| \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} e^{itx} \right| dt \mu(dx) \leq 2T(b-a) < \infty.$$

First Lemma to prove Fourier Inversion Theorem

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} e^{itx} \right| &= \left| \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \right| |e^{itx}| \\ &= \left| \int_a^b e^{itr} dr \right| \\ &\leq \int_a^b |e^{itr}| dr \\ &= b - a\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-T}^T \left| \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} e^{itx} \right| dt \mu(dx) \leq \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-T}^T (b - a) dt \mu(dx) = 2T(b - a)$$

Second Lemma to prove Fourier Inversion Theorem

Theorem 4 (Lemma 11.1.3)

For $T \geq 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sin(\theta t)}{t} dt = \pi \operatorname{sign}(\theta)$$

where $\operatorname{sign}(\theta)$ is either 1, -1 or 0 depending on whether θ is positive, negative or 0, respectively.

We're omitting the proof because it's elementary integration, but it's fun and involves a lot of cool stuff (e.g. the sinc function, integration by parts, u-substitution, different trigonometric properties, etc.) so you should try it.

Fourier Inversion Theorem: Proof

WTS:

$$\mu([a, b]) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{itx} \mu(dx) \right) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{it(x-a)} - e^{it(x-b)}}{it} dt \mu(dx) \quad (\text{Fubini and first Lemma}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-T}^T \frac{i \sin(t(x-a)) - i \sin(t(x-b))}{it} dt \mu(dx) \end{aligned}$$

Fourier Inversion Theorem: Proof (continued)

Taking $T \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sin(t(x-a)) - \sin(t(x-b))}{t} dt \mu(dx) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sin(t(x-a)) - \sin(t(x-b))}{t} dt \mu(dx) \quad (\text{DCT}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \pi [\text{sign}(x-a) - \text{sign}(x-b)] \mu(dx) \quad (\text{Lemma 2}) \\ &= \mu((a, b)) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\{a\}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\{b\}) \\ &= \mu([a, b]) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows because $\mu(\{a\}) = \mu(\{b\}) = 0$.

Fourier Uniqueness Theorem: Characteristic Function Determines Distribution

Theorem 5 (Fourier Uniqueness Theorem)

Let X, Y be random variables. Then $\phi_X(t) = \phi_Y(t)$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(Y)$.

- **Proof:** The “if” part is trivial. For the “only if” part, to show $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(Y)$, we only need to show $\mathbf{P}(X \in I) = \mathbf{P}(Y \in I)$ for all intervals in \mathbf{R} (uniqueness of extension Prop. 2.5.8).
 - By Fourier Inversion theorem, $\mathbf{P}(X \in [a, b]) = \mathbf{P}(Y \in [a, b])$ whenever $a < b$ and $\mathbf{P}(X = a) = \mathbf{P}(X = b) = \mathbf{P}(Y = a) = \mathbf{P}(Y = b) = 0$.
 - For any interval I , we can always find a sequence of closed intervals $\{[a_i, b_i]\}$ that satisfy the above conditions, and $[a_i, b_i] \rightarrow I$. Thus, we can apply the continuity of probability to show that $\mathbf{P}(X \in I) = \mathbf{P}(Y \in I)$.

Helly Selection Principle

Theorem 6 (Helly Selection Principle)

Let $\{F_n\}$ be a sequence of cdfs, each corresponding with a measure μ_n . Then there exists a subsequence F_{n_k} , and a non-decreasing, right-continuous $0 \leq F \leq 1$, such that $F_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ for each $x \in \mathbf{R}$ that is a continuity point of F .

The proof will remind you of the uncountability proofs.

Also, F is not necessarily a cdf.

Helly Selection Principle: proof

List out rationals $\mathbf{Q} = \{q_1, q_2, \dots\}$. Note that $0 \leq F_n(q_1) \leq 1$ for all n . By Bolzano-Weirstrass, there exists a subsequence $I_k^{(1)}$ such that $\lim_k F_{I_k^{(1)}}(q_1)$ exists. Then there exists a subsequence of that subsequence, call it $I_k^{(2)}$, such that $\lim_k F_{I_k^{(2)}}(q_2)$ exists. Because it is a subsequence of the first one, we also have that $\lim_k F_{I_k^{(2)}}(q_1)$ exists. We can do this for each $m \in \mathbf{N}$.

For each $\{I_k^{(m)}\}$, we have $\lim_k F_{I_k^{(m)}}(q_j)$ exists for all $0 < j \leq m$.

Now define $n_k = I_k^{(k)}$. These are the diagonals. However, note that all these subsequences are nested, so for any k ,

- $\{n_k, n_{k+1}, \dots\} \subseteq \{I_k^{(k)}, I_{k+1}^{(k)}, \dots\}$
- $\{n_{k+1}, n_{k+2}, \dots\} \subseteq \{I_{k+1}^{(k+1)}, I_{k+2}^{(k+1)}, \dots\}$, etc.

These ensure that $\lim_k F_{n_k}(q) := G(q)$ exists for each $q \in \mathbf{Q}$. G is also clearly non-decreasing as well, just like each $F_{n,k}$.

Helly Selection Principle: proof

For each rational q , $F_{n_k}(q) \rightarrow G(q)$. G is defined on the rationals, only. Now we define

$$F(x) = \inf\{G(q) : q > x, q \in \mathbf{Q}\}$$

which is defined on the reals. It has a few properties that we'll need:

- F is non-decreasing
- $0 \leq F \leq 1$
- F is right-continuous, and
- $F(q) > G(q)$ for all $q \in \mathbf{Q}$

Next, we'll show that, for any continuity point of F , call it $x \in \mathbf{R}$, we have $F_{n_k}(x) \rightarrow F(x)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Pick any $\varepsilon > 0$, then pick $r, u, s \in \mathbf{Q}$ such that $r < u < x < s$ and $F(s) - F(r) < \varepsilon$.

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) - \varepsilon &\leq F(r) \\ &= \inf\{G(q) : q > r\} \\ &= \inf\{\lim_k F_{n_k}(q) : q > r\} \end{aligned}$$

Helly Selection Principle:proof

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) - \varepsilon &\leq \inf_{q > r} \liminf_k F_{n_k}(q) \\ &\leq \liminf_k F_{n_k}(u) && (u > r) \\ &\leq \liminf_k F_{n_k}(x) && (x > u) \\ &\leq \limsup_k F_{n_k}(x) \\ &\leq \limsup_k F_{n_k}(s) && (s > x) \\ &= G(s) \\ &\leq F(s) \\ &\leq F(x) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

QED

Tightness of Measure: Three More Results

Theorem 7 (11.1.10)

If $\{\mu_n\}$ is a tight sequence of prob. measures, then there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ and a probability measure μ such that μ_{n_k} converges weakly to μ .

Theorem 8 (Corollary 11.1.11)

Let $\{\mu_n\}$ be a tight sequence of prob. measures on \mathbf{R} . Also suppose that, whenever $\mu_{n_k} \Rightarrow \nu$, then ν is always equal to μ . Then $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.

Lemma 9 (11.1.13)

Let $\{\mu_n\}$ be a sequence of probability measures on \mathbf{R} , and $\{\phi_n(t)\}$ be the characteristic functions. If there is a function g that is continuous at 0, and $\phi_n(t) \rightarrow g(t)$ for all $|t| < t_0$ ($t_0 > 0$), then $\{\mu_n\}$ is tight.

Remember our goal is to prove the other direction of Levy's continuity theorem. Let's prove the third one first.

Tightness and Characteristic Functions

Lemma 10 (11.1.13)

Let $\{\mu_n\}$ be a sequence of probability measures on \mathbf{R} , and $\{\phi_n(t)\}$ be the characteristic functions. If there is a function g that is continuous at 0, and $\phi_n(t) \rightarrow g(t)$ for all $|t| < t_0$ ($t_0 > 0$), then $\{\mu_n\}$ is tight.

• **Proof:** Let $y > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{y} \int_{-y}^y [1 - \phi_n(t)] dt &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{1}{y} \int_{-y}^y (1 - e^{itx}) dt \right] \mu_n(dx) \\ &= 2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\sin yx}{yx} \right) \mu_n(dx) \\ &\geq 2 \int \left(1 - \frac{1}{|yx|} \right) \mu_n(dx) \\ &\geq \int_{|x| > 2/y} 1 \mu_n(dx) = \mu_n \left(\left\{ x : |x| \geq \frac{2}{y} \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Tightness and Characteristic Functions: continued

- **Proof continued:** The previous discussion shows that
$$\mu_n[\{x : |x| \geq \frac{2}{y}\}] \leq \frac{1}{y} \int_{-y}^y [1 - \phi_n(t)] dt.$$
- Now since $g(t)$ is continuous at 0, and $g(0) = \lim_n \phi_n(0) = 1$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can always find $y_0 \in (0, t_0)$ such that:

$$|1 - g(t)| < \varepsilon/4$$

whenever $|t| < y_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{y_0} \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} [1 - g(t)] dt \right| &\leq \frac{1}{y_0} \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} |1 - g(t)| dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{y_0} \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} \varepsilon/4 dt = \varepsilon/2 \end{aligned}$$

Tightness and Characteristic Functions: continued

- **Proof continued:** The previous discussion shows that

① $\mu_n[\{x : |x| \geq \frac{2}{y}\}] \leq \frac{1}{y} \int_{-y}^y [1 - \phi_n(t)] dt$ and

② $\left| \frac{1}{y_0} \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} [1 - g(t)] dt \right| \leq \varepsilon/2$

- On the other hand, as $\phi_n(t) \rightarrow g(t)$ for $|t| < t_0$, and $|\phi_n(t)| = 1$, we can apply the dominated convergence theorem:

$$\left| \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} [1 - \phi_n(t)] dt - \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} [1 - g(t)] dt \right| \leq \varepsilon/2$$

for $n > N$.

- Then for all $n > N$,

$$\mu_n[\{x : |x| \geq \frac{2}{y_0}\}] \leq \frac{1}{y_0} \int_{-y_0}^{y_0} [1 - \phi_n(t)] dt \leq \varepsilon$$

- It then follows that $\{\mu_n\}$ must be tight.