## Midterm 1

Jaden Wang

## Problem (1).

a) Given  $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$ , by definition of  $\mathcal{G}$  there exist  $A_1, B_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $A_2, B_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  such that  $A = A_1 \cap A_2$ ,  $B = B_1 \cap B_2$ . Then

$$A \cap B = (A_1 \cap A_2) \cap (B_1 \cap B_2)$$
$$= (A_1 \cap B_1) \cap (A_2 \cap B_2)$$

Since  $\sigma$ -fields  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$  are closed under intersections, it follows that  $A_1 \cap B_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, A_2 \cap B_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ . Hence  $A \cap B \in \mathcal{G}$ , and  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $\pi$ -system by definition.

b) We wish to show double containment. Given  $a \in \mathcal{G}$ , there exists  $A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  such that  $a \in A_1 \cap A_2$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$  are  $\sigma$ -fields, the complements  $A_1^c \in \mathcal{F}_1, A_2^c \in \mathcal{F}_2 \Rightarrow A_1^c \cup A_2^c \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$ . Then  $(A_1^c \cup A_2^c)^c = A_1 \cap A_2 \in \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2) \Rightarrow \mathcal{G} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2)$ . Since a  $\sigma$ -field is also a  $\lambda$ -system, by Dynkin's  $\pi$ - $\lambda$  theorem,  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2)$ .

Now let's show the other direction. Given  $b \in \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2$ , there exist  $B_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$  such that  $b \in B_1 \cup B_2 = (B_1^c \cap B_2^c)^c$ . Clearly  $B_1^c \in \mathcal{F}_1, B_2^c \in \mathcal{F}_2$ , so  $B_1^c \cap B_2^c \in \mathcal{G} \Rightarrow (B_1^c \cap B_2^c)^c \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}) \Rightarrow b \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}) \Rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2 \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{G})$ . Again by Dynkin's Theorem,  $\sigma(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{G})$ . Therefore, we obtain  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}) = \sigma(\mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathcal{F}_2)$ .

**Problem** (2). We would like to prove by contradiction. Suppose there exists an atom  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  such that P(A) > 0 and  $\forall B \in \mathcal{F}, B \subseteq A$ , we have P(B) = 0 or P(B) = P(A). Let's define

$$B_n = \begin{cases} A_n & \text{if } P(A_n \cap A) = P(A) \\ A_n^c & \text{if } P(A_n^c \cap A) = P(A) \end{cases}$$

Notice that since each  $B_n$  only depends on  $A_n$ , and  $A_n$  are independent, we know  $B_n$  are independent too. This definition intuitively means that all the

 $B_n$  always contain the mass of A. In other words,

$$P(A) \leq P(B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \ldots)$$
  
=  $P(B_1)P(B_2)\ldots$  by independence  
=  $p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot \ldots$ 

where we let  $p_n = P(B_n)$  for convenience. Recall that  $1 - x \le e^{-x} \Rightarrow x \le e^{-(1-x)}$ , applying to each  $p_n$  and we have

$$P(A) \le e^{-(1-p_1)}e^{-(1-p_2)}\dots$$

$$\ln P(A) \le -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1-p_n) \quad \text{by monotonicity of ln}$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1-p_n) \le -\ln P(A) = \ln \frac{1}{P(A)}$$

Since P(A) > 0,  $\ln \frac{1}{P(A)}$  is a constant so  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - p_n) < \infty$ . Now consider

$$\sum_{n} \min\{P(A_n), 1 - P(A_n)\} = \sum_{n} \min\{P(B_n), 1 - P(B_n)\} \le \sum_{n} (1 - p_n) < \infty.$$

This contradicts with our assumption, therefore we prove that the probability space must be non-atomic.

**Problem** (3). Naturally we apply Borel-Cantelli Lemma (i) and obtain  $P\left(\limsup_n (A_n \cap A_{n+1}^c)\right) = 0$ . Also by Theorem 4.1,  $P\left(\liminf_n A_n\right) \leq \liminf_n P(A_n) = 0 \Rightarrow P\left(\liminf_n A_n\right) = 0$ . By homework 2.6,

$$P\left(\limsup_{n} A_{n}\right) = P\left(\limsup_{n} (A_{n} \cap A_{n+1}^{c}) \cup \liminf_{n} A_{n}\right)$$

$$\leq P\left(\limsup_{n} (A_{n} \cap A_{n+1}^{c}) + P\left(\liminf_{n} A_{n}\right) \text{ by subadditivity}$$

$$= 0 + 0 = 0$$

Again by Theorem 4.1,  $\limsup_{n \to \infty} P(A_n) \leq P(\limsup_n A_n) = 0 \Rightarrow \limsup_n P(A_n) = 0 = \liminf_n P(A_n) \Rightarrow \lim_{n \to \infty} P(A_n) = 0$  by definition of the limit of reals.

**Problem** (4). We would like to show that  $\{\omega : X(\omega) \leq x\} \in \mathcal{F} \ \forall \ x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Case.  $x \geq 0$ , then

$$\{\omega: X(\omega) \le x\} = \{\omega: \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) \le x\} \cup \{\omega: \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) \text{ diverges}\}$$

In class we have already show that the first set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Notice that  $\{\omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) \text{ diverges}\} = \{\omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) \text{ exists}\}^c$ , which we showed in class that it is in the tail  $\sigma$ -field. Since the tail  $\sigma$ -field is the smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing the tail event, and the tail event is clearly contained in  $\mathcal{F}$ , the tail  $\sigma$ -field must be a subset of  $\mathcal{F}$ . It follows that  $\{\omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega)\} \in \mathcal{F}$ , which implies the complement  $\{\omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) \text{ diverges}\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Therefore, the union of two sets,  $\{\omega : X(\omega) \le x\} \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Case. x < 0, then  $\{\omega : X(\omega) \le x\} = \{\omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) \le x\} \in \mathcal{F}$  as shown in class.

Hence for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , we show that  $\{\omega : X(\omega) \leq x\}$ , proving that X is a random variable.