

1.1 Define a  $\sigma$ -algebra as follows:

**Definition 1** For a nonempty set  $\Omega$ , a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of  $\omega$  (i.e.  $\mathcal{F} \subset 2^\Omega$ , where  $2^\Omega := \{A : A \subset \Omega\}$  is the power set of  $\Omega$ ) is called a  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $\Omega$  if

(i)  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$

(ii) if  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $A^C := \Omega \setminus A \in \mathcal{F}$  (that is,  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under complement taking)

(iii) if  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $(\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i) \in \mathcal{F}$  (that is,  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under countable union).

Show from this definition that a  $\sigma$ -algebra is closed under countable intersection, and under finite union and intersection.

**Solution:**

If  $B_1, B_2, \dots \in \mathcal{F}$  then  $A_i := \Omega \setminus B_i \in \mathcal{F}$  as well, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$  due to (ii), and thus  $C := (\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i) \in \mathcal{F}$  by (iii). Finally,  $\Omega \setminus C \in \mathcal{F}$  by (ii), but  $\Omega \setminus C = \cap_{i=1}^\infty B_i$  by the basics of set algebra, so we have shown that  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under countable intersection. For finite union, notice that if  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ , then we can choose  $A_{n+1} = A_{n+2} = \dots = \emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$  by (i), to get  $(\cup_{i=1}^n A_i) = (\cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i) \in \mathcal{F}$  by (iii). So  $\mathcal{F}$  is shown to be closed under finite union. Closedness under finite intersection can be seen similarly.

1.2 (a) We toss a biased coin, on which the probability of heads is some  $0 \leq p \leq 1$ . Define the random variable  $\xi$  as the indicator function of tossing heads, that is

$$\xi := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if tails} \\ 1, & \text{if heads} \end{cases} .$$

- i. Describe the distribution of  $\xi$  (called the Bernoulli distribution with parameter  $p$ ) in the “classical” way, listing possible values and their probabilities,
- ii. and also by describing the distribution as a measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ , giving the weight  $\mathbb{P}(\xi \in B)$  of every Borel subset  $B$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- iii. Calculate the expectation of  $\xi$ .

(b) We toss the previous biased coin  $n$  times, and denote by  $X$  the *number of heads* tossed.

- i. Describe the distribution of  $X$  (called the Binomial distribution with parameters  $(n, p)$ ) by listing possible values and their probabilities.
- ii. Calculate the expectation of  $X$  by integration (actually summation in this case) using its distribution,
- iii. and also by noticing that  $X = \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \dots + \xi_n$ , where  $\xi_i$  is the indicator of the  $i$ -th toss being heads, and using linearity of the expectation.

**Solution:**

- (a) i. The possible values are 0 and 1, their probabilities are  $\mathbb{P}(\xi = 0) = 1 - p$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\xi = 1) = p$ .

$$\text{ii. } \mu(B) = \mathbb{P}(\xi \in B) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 0 \in B \text{ and } 1 \in B, \\ 1 - p, & \text{if } 0 \in B \text{ but } 1 \notin B, \\ p, & \text{if } 1 \in B \text{ but } 0 \notin B, \\ 0, & \text{if } 0 \notin B \text{ and } 1 \notin B. \end{cases}$$

$$\text{iii. } \mathbb{E}\xi = 0 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\xi = 0) + 1 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\xi = 1) = 0 \cdot (1 - p) + 1 \cdot p = p.$$

(b) i. The possible values are  $0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ , their probabilities are

$$\mathbb{P}(X = k) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1 - p)^{n-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

ii. If we denote the distribution of  $X$  by  $\mu$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}X = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \, d\mu(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n k \cdot \mu(\{k\}) = \sum_{k=0}^n k \cdot \mathbb{P}(X = k) = \sum_{k=0}^n k \binom{n}{k} p^k (1 - p)^{n-k}.$$

To calculate this sum, one of the many ways is to consider the two-variable function

$$f(u, v) := \sum_{k=0}^n k \binom{n}{k} u^k v^{n-k}.$$

Then what we want to know is  $\mathbb{E}X = f(p, 1 - p)$ , but of course we are even more happy if we can calculate  $f(u, v)$  for every  $(u, v)$ . Now we notice that

$$f(u, v) = u \frac{\partial}{\partial u} g(u, v) \text{ where } g(u, v) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} u^k v^{n-k}.$$

This is now easy: by the binomial theorem  $g(u, v) = (u + v)^n$ , so

$$f(u, v) = u \frac{\partial}{\partial u} (u + v)^n = nu(u + v)^{n-1},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}X = f(p, 1 - p) = np(p + 1 - p)^n = np.$$

iii. This is much easier:

$$\mathbb{E}X = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\xi_i = \sum_{i=1}^n p = np.$$

### 1.3 The Fatou lemma is the following

**Theorem 1** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  a sequence of measurable functions  $f_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which are nonnegative, e.g.  $f_n(x) \geq 0$  for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and every  $x \in \Omega$ . Then

$$\int_{\Omega} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x) \, d\mu(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} f_n(x) \, d\mu(x)$$

(and both sides make sense).

Show that the inequality in the opposite direction is in general false, by choosing  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mu$  as the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ , and constructing a sequence of nonnegative  $f_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for which  $f_n(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , but  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_n(x) dx \geq 1$  for all  $n$ .

**Solution:** The standard counterexample is

$$f_n(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n \leq x \leq n+1, \\ 0, & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

The phenomenon behind the counterexample – as often – is that exchangeability of integral and limit can fail if mass “escapes to infinity”.

- 1.4 The *ternary* number  $0.a_1a_2a_3\dots$  is the analogue of the usual decimal fraction, but writing numbers in base 3. That is, for any sequence  $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots$  with  $a_n \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , by definition

$$0.a_1a_2a_3\dots := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{3^n}.$$

Now let us construct the ternary fraction form of a random real number  $X$  via a sequence of fair coin tosses, such that we rule out the digit 1. That is,

$$a_n := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if the } n\text{-th toss is tails,} \\ 2, & \text{if the } n\text{-th toss is heads} \end{cases},$$

and setting  $X = 0.a_1a_2a_3\dots$  (ternary). In this way,  $X$  is a “uniformly” chosen random point of the famous *middle-third Cantor set*  $C$  defined as

$$C := \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{3^n}, a_n \in \{0, 2\} (n = 1, 2, \dots) \right\}.$$

Show that

- The distribution of  $X$  gives zero weight to every point – that is,  $\mathbb{P}(X = x) = 0$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . (As a consequence, the cumulative distribution function of  $X$  is continuous.)
- The distribution of  $X$  is not absolutely continuous w.r.t the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

**Solution:**

- Similarly to a decimal expansion, the ternary expansion of a real number  $x \in [0, 1]$  is essentially unique: every  $x$  can be written in the form  $x = 0.a_1a_2a_3\dots$  in only one, or possibly two ways. (There are actually two ways for some rational numbers, since e.g.  $0.1022222\bar{2} = 0.1100000\bar{0}$ .) However, every individual sequence  $a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots$  has probability  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \dots = 0$ , so every  $x$  is given weight at most twice zero which is still zero.
- The distribution of  $X$  cannot be absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, since it gives positive measure to  $C$  ( $\mathbb{P}(X \in C) = 1$ ), which has Lebesgue measure zero ( $\text{Leb}(C) = 0$ ). To see that the Lebesgue measure of  $C$  is indeed zero, notice that the set in the  $n$ -t level of the construction of  $C$ ,

$$C_n := \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k}{3^k}, a_k \in \{0, 2\} \text{ for } k = 1, 2, \dots, n \text{ but } a_k \in \{0, 1, 2\} \text{ for } k \geq n+1 \right\},$$

has Lebesgue measure

$$\text{Leb}(C_n) = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n.$$

Now  $C \subset C_n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so

$$\text{Leb}(C) \leq \text{Leb}(C_n) = \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n \text{ for every } n,$$

which implies that  $\text{Leb}(C) = 0$ .

(Actually, this means not only that the distribution  $\mu$  of  $X$  is not absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, but that the two measures are singular w.r.t each other, which means that  $\mathbb{R}$  can be decomposed into two disjoint subsets (namely  $C$  and  $\mathbb{R} \setminus C$ ,) such that one is “unseen” by one measure ( $\text{Leb}(C) = 0$ ), while the other is “unseen” by the other measure ( $\mu(\mathbb{R} \setminus C) = 0$ .)