

1 Question 2

Show that $\mathcal{O}_P(1) + \mathcal{O}_P(1) = \mathcal{O}(1)$.

Note that $X_n = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ if $X_n \xrightarrow{p} 0$ and $X_n = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ if X_n is tight. Note that $X_n \xrightarrow{p} 0$ implies that $X_n \xrightarrow{d} 0$ and therefore X_n is tight.

Let $X_n = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ and $Y_n = \mathcal{O}(1)$. By the above logic, X_n is tight. So $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists B_x, B_y$ such that:

$$\inf_n \Pr(|X_n| \leq B_x) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

$$\inf_n \Pr(|Y_n| \leq B_y) \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

For any such $\epsilon > 0$, choose M such that

$$\frac{M}{2} > B_x \quad \frac{M}{2} > B_y$$

Define A and B such that:

$$A := \{|X_n| + |Y_n| > M\} \Rightarrow \left\{|X_n| > \frac{M}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{|Y_n| > \frac{M}{2}\right\} =: B$$

Note that:

$$\Pr(A) \leq \Pr(B) \leq \Pr\left(|X_n| > \frac{M}{2}\right) + \Pr\left(|Y_n| > \frac{M}{2}\right) < \epsilon$$

From the definition of tightness, and our choice of M .

Define $C := \{|X_n + Y_n| > M\}$. From the triangle inequality we know that $|X_n + Y_n| \leq |X_n| + |Y_n|$

Thus:

$$|X_n + Y_n| > M \Rightarrow |X_n| + |Y_n| > M$$

$$\Pr(|X_n + Y_n| > M) \leq \Pr(|X_n| + |Y_n| > M) < \epsilon$$

$$\Pr(|X_n + Y_n| \leq M) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

This tells us that $X_n + Y_n$ is tight, and therefore $\mathcal{O}_P(1) + \mathcal{O}_P(1) = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$. So:

$$\mathcal{O}_P(1) + \mathcal{O}_P(1) = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$$

2 Question 6

$$\mathbb{V}(Y|X) = \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y|X])^2|X]$$

Let $Z = Y^2$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y^2|X]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Z|X]] = \mathbb{E}[Z] = \mathbb{E}[Y^2]$$

2.1 A

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{V}(Y|X) &= \mathbb{E}[Y^2|X] - 2\mathbb{E}[Y\mathbb{E}[Y|X]|X] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|X]^2|X] \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[Y^2|X] - 2\mathbb{E}[Y|X]\mathbb{E}[Y|X] + \mathbb{E}[Y|X]^2 \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[Y^2|X] - \mathbb{E}[Y|X]^2
 \end{aligned}$$

2.2 B

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(Y|X)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y^2|X]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|X]^2] \\
 \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[Y|X]) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|X]^2] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|X]]^2
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(Y|X)] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[Y|X]) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y^2|X]] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y|X]]^2 \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y^2|X]] - \mathbb{E}[Y]^2 \\
 &= \mathbb{E}[Y^2] - \mathbb{E}[Y]^2 \\
 &= \mathbb{V}(Y)
 \end{aligned}$$

3 Question 10

Let (Y, X) be a bivariate normal random variable. Find $\mathbb{E}[Y|X]$.

$$(Y, X) \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} \mu_Y \\ \mu_X \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_Y^2 & \rho\sigma_Y\sigma_X \\ \rho\sigma_Y\sigma_X & \sigma_X^2 \end{pmatrix}\right)$$

Any bivariate normal random variable can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X &= \sigma_X Z_1 + \mu_X \\
 Y &= \sigma_Y \rho Z_1 + Z_2 \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} + \mu_Y
 \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to rewrite Z_1 and then Y .

$$\begin{aligned}
 Z_1 &= \frac{X - \mu_X}{\sigma_X} \\
 Y &= \sigma_Y \rho \left(\frac{X - \mu_X}{\sigma_X} \right) + Z_2 \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} + \mu_Y
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation conditioned on X .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Y|X] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sigma_Y \rho \frac{X - \mu_X}{\sigma_X} | X\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{1 - \rho^2} Z_2 | X\right] + \mathbb{E}[\mu_Y | X] \\
&= \frac{\sigma_Y \rho}{\sigma_X} \mathbb{E}[X | X] - \frac{\sigma_Y \rho \mu_X}{\sigma_X} + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} \mathbb{E}[Z_2 | X] + \mu_Y \\
&= \frac{\sigma_Y \rho}{\sigma_X} X - \frac{\sigma_Y \rho \mu_X}{\sigma_X} + \mu_Y
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[Z_2 | X] = \mathbb{E}[Z_2] = 0$ by the fact that Z_1, Z_2 are independent, and X is a function of Z_1 only.

4 Question 14

The best linear predictor of Y conditioned on \mathbf{X} is given by:

$$\min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X' \mathbf{b}]^2 \right]$$

Note that $X_1 b_1 + X_2 b_2 + X_3 b_3 = X_1 (b_1 + \alpha_1 b_3) + X_2 (b_2 + \alpha_2 b_3) := (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.

The best linear predictor of Y given (X_1, X_2) is given by:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X_1 \beta_1 - X_2 \beta_2]^2 \right]$$

It would not be possible to minimize over two dimensions and do better than minimizing over three. One could fix $b_3 = 0$ and then reach the same problem as minimizing over two dimensions.

This tells us that

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X_1 \beta_1 - X_2 \beta_2]^2 \right] \geq \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X' \mathbf{b}]^2 \right]$$

One cannot do any worse minimizing over the two dimensions either. For any value of \mathbf{b} , choose $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ as above, and $\mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X' \mathbf{b}]^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - (X_1, X_2)' \boldsymbol{\gamma}]^2 \right]$. Thus the two dimensional case can always do as well as the three dimensional case and:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X_1 \beta_1 - X_2 \beta_2]^2 \right] \leq \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X' \mathbf{b}]^2 \right]$$

This leads us to conclude that:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X_1 \beta_1 - X_2 \beta_2]^2 \right] = \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^3} \mathbb{E} \left[[Y - X' \mathbf{b}]^2 \right]$$

This means the best linear predictor of Y given \mathbf{X} is equivalent to the best linear predictor of Y given (X_1, X_2) . Since we know that there is no perfect colinearity between (X_1, X_2) we may apply the standard Linear Regression approach.

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbb{E}[(X_1, X_2)(X_1, X_2)'] \mathbb{E}[(X_1, X_2)Y]$$

The solution to the minimization problem over all X is any combination of b_1, b_2, b_3 such that $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (b_1 + \alpha_1 b_3, b_2 + \alpha_2 b_3)'$.