

Solutions for Problem Set One

Problem 1. (1) (i) We have

$$\mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{G}]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{G}]|\mathcal{G}]] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{G}]].$$

Similarly for $\mathbb{E}[Y\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]]$.

(ii) We say that a bounded measurable function satisfying property **P** if

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X, Y)|\mathcal{G}] = \mathbb{E}[f(x, Y)]|_{x=X}.$$

Let $\mathcal{E} = \{E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) : \mathbf{1}_E \text{ satisfies property } \mathbf{P}\}$. Then \mathcal{E} is a monotone class containing the π -system $\mathcal{C} \triangleq \{A \times B : A, B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^1)\}$. By the monotone class theorem in measure theory, we conclude that $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In other words, $\mathbf{1}_E$ satisfies property **P** for every $E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Note that the property **P** is linear in f . By writing $f = f^+ - f^-$, we only need to consider the case when f is bounded and non-negative. But then there exists a sequence f_n of simple functions on \mathbb{R}^2 such that $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$. We know that each f_n satisfies property **P**. By the monotone convergence theorem for both conditional and unconditional expectations, we conclude that f satisfies property **P**.

(iii) Since both sides are $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H})$ -measurable, it suffices to show that

$$\int_E X d\mathbb{P} = \int_E \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}] d\mathbb{P}, \quad \forall E \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}). \quad (1)$$

Let $\mathcal{E} = \{E \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) : \text{equation (1) holds}\}$, and let $\mathcal{C} = \{A \cap B : A \in \mathcal{G}, B \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Apparently, \mathcal{C} is a π -system. For any $A \in \mathcal{G}, B \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_B] = \mathbb{E}[X\mathbf{1}_A]\mathbb{P}(B) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]\mathbf{1}_A]\mathbb{P}(B) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]\mathbf{1}_A\mathbf{1}_B].$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$. Moreover, it is easy to see that \mathcal{E} is a monotone class. By the monotone class theorem, we conclude that $\sigma(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{E}$.

(2) By assumption, we know that for every $r \in \mathbb{R}^1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq r\}}] = \mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{Y \leq r\}}] = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq r, Y > r\}}] + \mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq r, Y \leq r\}}] &= 0, \\ \mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X > r, Y \leq r\}}] + \mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq r, Y \leq r\}}] &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X > r, Y \leq r\}}] + \mathbb{E}[(Y - X)\mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq r, Y > r\}}] = 0.$$

But the integrand inside each of the above expectations is non-negative. Therefore,

$$(X - Y)\mathbf{1}_{\{X > r, Y \leq r\}} = (Y - X)\mathbf{1}_{\{X \leq r, Y > r\}} = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(X > r, Y \leq r) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq r, Y > r) = 0.$$

And this is true for all $r \in \mathbb{R}^1$. The result then follows from the fact that

$$\{X \neq Y\} \subseteq \{X > Y\} \cup \{X < Y\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\{X > n \geq Y\} \cup \{Y > n \geq X\} \right).$$

Problem 2. (1) For $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}} \leq \mathbb{E}[|X||\mathcal{G}_i]\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}}.$$

Therefore, by taking expectations on both sides, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[|X|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}}].$$

But

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E}[|X|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|X|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}}; |X| > \sqrt{\lambda}] + \mathbb{E}[|X|\mathbf{1}_{\{|\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i]| > \lambda\}}; |X| \leq \sqrt{\lambda}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|X|; |X| > \sqrt{\lambda}] + \sqrt{\lambda} \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[|X||\mathcal{G}_i]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|X|; |X| > \sqrt{\lambda}] + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \mathbb{E}[|X|],\end{aligned}$$

which goes to zero uniformly in $i \in \mathcal{I}$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ since X is integrable. Therefore, $\{\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}_i] : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is uniformly integrable.

(2) Let $M = \sup_{t \in T} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(|X_t|)]$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, let $R = M/\varepsilon$. Then there exists some $\Lambda > 0$, such that for any $x > \Lambda$, we have $\varphi(x)/x > R$. Therefore, for $\lambda > \Lambda$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_t|\mathbf{1}_{\{|X_t| > \lambda\}}] \leq \frac{1}{R} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(|X_t|)] \leq \frac{M}{R} = \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \in T.$$

Consequently, $\{X_t : t \in T\}$ is uniformly integrable.

Problem 3. (1) $\mathbb{P}(X_n > \alpha \log n) = e^{-\alpha \log n} = 1/n^\alpha$. Therefore, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n > \alpha \log n \text{ for infinitely many } n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha > 1; \\ 1, & 0 < \alpha \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(2) Let $A_\alpha = \{X_n > \alpha \log n \text{ for infinitely many } n\}$. Since $\mathbb{P}(A_1) = 1$, we know that $L \geq 1$ almost surely. Moreover,

$$\{L > 1\} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{L > 1 + \frac{1}{k}\right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{1+\frac{1}{2k}}.$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}(L > 1) = 0$. Therefore, $L = 1$ almost surely.

(3) For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \leq x) = \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i \leq x + \log n\right) = (1 - e^{-x - \log n})^n,$$

provided that $x + \log n > 0$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(M_n \leq x) = e^{-e^{-x}}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^1.$$

Apparently, the function $F(x) \triangleq e^{-e^{-x}}$ defines a continuous distribution function on \mathbb{R}^1 . Therefore, M_n converges weakly to F .

Problem 4. (1) \implies (2). Suppose that \mathbb{P}_n converges weakly to \mathbb{P} . According to Theorem 1.7, we know that $\mathbb{P}_n(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^1)$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\partial A) = 0$. In particular, let x be a continuity point of F and let $A = (-\infty, x]$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\partial A) = dF(\{x\}) = 0$. Therefore,

$$F_n(x) = \mathbb{P}_n(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A) = F(x).$$

(2) \implies (1). Suppose that F_n converges in distribution to F . Let C_F be the set of continuity points of F . Since C_F^c is at most countable, we conclude that C_F is dense in \mathbb{R}^1 .

Let $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^1)$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $a, b \in C_F$ be such that $a < 0 < b$ and

$$F(a) < \varepsilon, \quad 1 - F(b) < \varepsilon.$$

Then there exists $N \geq 1$, such that for any $n > N$,

$$|F_n(a) - F(a)| < \varepsilon, |F_n(b) - F(b)| < \varepsilon.$$

It follows that

$$F_n(a) < 2\varepsilon, \quad 1 - F_n(b) < 2\varepsilon, \quad \forall n > N.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \varphi dF_n - \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \varphi dF \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{(a,b]} \varphi (dF_n - dF) \right| + \|\varphi\|_\infty (dF_n((a,b]^c) + dF((a,b]^c)) \\ & \leq \left| \int_{(a,b]} \varphi (dF_n - dF) \right| + 6\|\varphi\|_\infty \varepsilon \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for every $n > N$.

Since φ is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$, there exists $\delta > 0$, such that whenever $x, y \in [a, b]$ with $|x - y| < \delta$, we have $|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| < \varepsilon$. Choose a finite partition $\mathcal{P} : a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_k = b$ of $[a, b]$, such that $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k \in C_F$ and $|x_i - x_{i-1}| < \delta$ for each i . Define a step function ψ by taking $\psi(x) = \varphi(x_{i-1})$ for $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$. It follows that

$$\sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\varphi(x) - \psi(x)| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{(a,b]} \varphi (dF_n - dF) \right| \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{x \in [a,b]} |\varphi(x) - \psi(x)| + \left| \int_{(a,b]} \psi (dF_n - dF) \right| \\ & \leq 2\varepsilon + \sum_i |\varphi(x_{i-1})| \cdot ((F_n(x_i) - F(x_i)) - (F_n(x_{i-1}) - F(x_{i-1}))). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Note that the partition \mathcal{P} we chose before does not depend on n .

By substituting (3) into (2) and letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive at

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \varphi dF_n - \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \varphi dF \right| \leq (2 + 6\|\varphi\|_\infty)\varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we conclude that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \varphi dF_n \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^1} \varphi dF$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, \mathbb{P}_n converges weakly to \mathbb{P} .

Problem 5. (1) Necessity. Suppose that $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}$ is tight. Then there exists $M > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}_n([-M, M]) \geq \frac{3}{4}, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

It follows that $|\mu_n| \leq M$ for all n . Indeed, if this is not the case, suppose for instance that $\mu_n > M$ for some n . Then

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \mathbb{P}_n([\mu_n, \infty)) \leq \mathbb{P}_n((M, \infty)) < \frac{1}{4},$$

which is a contradiction. In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3}{4} &\leq \mathbb{P}_n([-M, M]) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_n} \int_{-M}^M e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_n)^2}{2\sigma_n^2}} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{-M-\mu_n}{\sigma_n}}^{\frac{M-\mu_n}{\sigma_n}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{-2M}{\sigma_n}}^{\frac{2M}{\sigma_n}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This implies that σ_n is bounded. Indeed, if $\sigma_n \uparrow \infty$ along a subsequence, then the right hand side of (4) goes to zero along this subsequence, which is a contradiction.

Sufficiency. Suppose that $|\mu_n| \leq M_1, \sigma_n \leq M_1$ for some $M_1 > 0$. Then for any $M > M_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_n([-M, M]) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\frac{-M-\mu_n}{\sigma_n}}^{\frac{M-\mu_n}{\sigma_n}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\frac{M-M_1}{\sigma_n}}^{\frac{M-M_1}{\sigma_n}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\frac{M-M_1}{M_1}}^{\frac{M-M_1}{M_1}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Since the right hand side of (5) converges to 1 as $M \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{P}_n([-M, M]) = 1.$$

In other words, $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}$ is tight.

(2) Sufficiency. Suppose that $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ and $\sigma_n^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2$. Then

$$e^{i\mu_n t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_n^2 t} \rightarrow e^{i\mu t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t}$$

for every $t \in \mathbb{R}^1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, \mathbb{P}_n converges weakly to $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$.

Necessity. Suppose that $\{\mathbb{P}_n\}$ is weakly convergent. From the first part we already know that $\{\mu_n\}$ and $\{\sigma_n^2\}$ are both bounded. Assume that μ and μ' are two limit points of μ_n . We may further assume without loss of generality that $\mu_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu, \sigma_{n_k}^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2$, and $\mu_{n'_i} \rightarrow \mu', \sigma_{n'_i}^2 \rightarrow \sigma'^2$ along two subsequences n_k and n'_i . By the sufficiency part and the uniqueness of weak limits, we know that $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) = \mathcal{N}(\mu', \sigma'^2)$, and hence $\mu = \mu'$ and $\sigma^2 = \sigma'^2$. Therefore, μ_n converges to some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^1$. Similarly, we conclude that σ_n^2 has exactly one limit point, which means that it converges to some $\sigma^2 \geq 0$.