pfsl2.tex

## Lecture 2. 10.10.2013

Definition. A  $\sigma$ -field (or  $\sigma$ -algebra)  $\mathcal{A}$  is a class containing the whole set, closed under complements, and closed under countable disjoint unions (the " $\sigma$ " here is from the German Summe = sum – the old-fashioned notation for a union is a sum).

The natural domain of definition of a measure is a  $\sigma$ -field: Definition. A measurable space is a pair  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\sigma$ -field of sets  $A \subset \Omega$ .

A measure space is a triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is a measure defined on  $\mathcal{A}$  (that is,  $\mu(A)$  is defined on all the sets  $A \subset \Omega$ ).

A probability measure is a measure P of mass 1,  $P(\Omega) = 1$ ; then  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  is a probability space.

Axiomatic Probability Theory as Measure Theory for measures of mass 1 is due to A. N. KOLMOGOROV (1903-87) in his 1933 book *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*.

*Examples.* On the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ , the intervals I; [a,b] are (Lebesgue) measurable, with (Lebesgue) measure

$$\mu([a,b]) := b - a. \tag{L}$$

The  $\sigma$ -field generated by the intervals (= smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing the intervals, = intersection of all  $\sigma$ -fields containing the intervals – this is a  $\sigma$ -field) is called the *Borel*  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B}$ ; its sets are called the *Borel sets*  $\mathcal{B}$  (Emile BOREL (1871-1956, thesis of 1893). One can check that it does not matter whether we use closed intervals [a, b], open ones (a, b), half-open ones (a, b), semi-infinite intervals  $(-\infty, a]$ , etc. – they all generate the same  $\sigma$ -field.

A subset of a Borel set of measure 0 need not be a Borel set. Nevertheless, one feels that "a subset of a set of measure 0 should also have measure 0" – or, as we call sets of measure 0 null sets, "a subset of a nullset should also be a null set". It turns out that this is true for the  $\sigma$ -field generated by the intervals and the null sets together. These are called the Lebesgue measurable sets,  $\mathcal{L}$ . This process of including all subsets of null sets as null sets always works, and is called completion. Thus  $\mathcal{L}$  is the completion of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

The measure  $\mu$  obtained on  $\mathcal{L}$  from (L) in this way is called *Lebesgue measure*;  $\mathcal{L}$  is the natural domain of definition of  $\mu$ .

Of course, the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  has infinite Lebesgue measure (= length). But, it often suffices in Analysis, and even more in Probability, so work with the

unit interval [0,1]. Then  $([0,1], \mathcal{L}, \lambda)$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  here denotes the Lebesguemeasurable subsets of [0,1] and  $\mu$  Lebesgue measure on them, is called the Lebesgue probability space (see below).

Measurable functions; integrals. If f is a function from a measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  to the reals  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ , one calls f measurable if

$$f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}$$
 for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ 

– that is, inverse images of Borel sets are measurable.

These are the 'nice' functions, and we may restrict ourselves to them.

A (measurable) function of the form

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i I_{(a_i,b_i]}$$

is called a *simple function*. We can define the *integral*  $\int f d\mu$  of a simple function with respect to the measure  $\mu$  by

$$\int f d\mu := \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \mu((a_i, b_i])$$

when this is finite; we then say that f is  $\mu$ -integrable, and write  $f \in L_1(\mu)$  (L for Lebesgue; 1 for the first power, f). When it is  $+\infty$ ,  $\int f d\mu$  is undefined and f is not  $\mu$ -integrable.

It turns out that a non-negative measurable function f is always the increasing limit of simple functions  $f_n$ , and that

$$\int f d\mu := \lim_{n \to \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

defines  $\int f d\mu$  uniquely (there are many such increasing sequences  $f_n$ , but they all give the same limit above).

Writing

$$x_{+} := \max(x, 0), \qquad x_{-} := -\min(x, 0)$$

for the positive part and negative part of x, we may check that

$$|x| = x_+ + x_-, \qquad x = x_+ - x_-.$$

We can extend the definition above from non-negative measurable functions to general measurable functions by linearity:

$$\int f d\mu := \int f_+ d\mu - \int f_- d\mu.$$

Of course, this only holds when both integrals on the right are defined (are finite). So then

$$\int |f|d\mu = \int f_+ d\mu + \int f_- d\mu.$$

Thus f is  $\mu$ -integrable iff |f| is: the (measure-theoretic) integral here is an absolute integral, as we saw before. Also, the integral is easily seen to be linear: if  $f, g \in L_1(\mu)$  and a, b are constants, then  $af + bg \in L_1(\mu)$  and

$$\int (af + bg)d\mu = a \int fd\mu + b \int gd\mu.$$

As one might suspect from the definition above, one can change the values of f on a  $\mu$ -null set without changing the value of  $\int f d\mu$ . So: we are really dealing here with, not individual functions f themselves, but equivalence classes, under the equivalence relation

$$f \equiv g$$
 iff  $f = g$   $\mu - a.e.$ ,

where ' $\mu$ -a.e.' (' $\mu$ -almost everywhere' means 'except on a  $\mu$ -null set').

For us, our (positive) measure (or integrator)  $\mu$ , a set-function, will be obtained from a (non-decreasing) point function (which to save letters we also write  $\mu$ ), vanishing at some reference point  $x_0$ , by

$$\mu((a,b]) = \mu(b) - \mu(a).$$
 (LS)

The LS here is for Lebesgue-Stieltjes (the  $\mu$  on the left is a LS measure, that on the right is a LS measure function). Thus for Lebesgue measure  $\mu(x) \equiv x$  and  $x_0 = 0$ ; for probability measures P, the point function is the distribution function (below), and  $x_0 = -\infty$ .

Random variables. When the measure space is a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ , we call the sets  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  events. These are the sets A whose probabilities P(A) are defined (this is consistent, both with ordinary speech and with usage in one's first exposure to Probability). We call a measurable function a random variable. In this case, we will use notation such as X, Y etc. rather than f, g etc. We call  $\int_{\Omega} X dP$  the expectation of X, E[X]:

$$E[X] := \int_{\Omega} X dP.$$

By above, the expectation is *linear*:

$$E[aX + bY] = aE[X] + bE[Y].$$

Note. We need an absolute integral, as here, to get linearity of expectation. Without the restriction that E[X] exists iff E[|X|] exists, linearity of the expectation may fail. Recall from Analysis: absolutely convergent sums, integrals etc. may be rearranged at will. Conditionally convergent sums, integrals etc. are very dangerous: they result from 'cancelling infinities'. Note also that a+b makes sense, not just for real numbers a and b, but for one or both of a or  $b+\infty$  (then their sum is also  $+\infty$ ); similarly for  $-\infty$ . But we must avoid the meaningless symbol " $\infty - \infty$ ". In much the same way, we must avoid the meaningless "0/0", as we know from Calculus.

Distribution functions. If X is a random variable (measurable function), the inverse image  $X^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}$  for all Borel sets B – equivalently, this holds for all B in some set that generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B}$ . The half-lines  $(-\infty, x]$   $(x \in \mathbb{R})$  form such a set. So X is a random variable (rv) iff  $X^{-1}((-\infty, x]) \in \mathcal{A}$  for each x, that is,  $\{X \leq x\} \in \mathcal{A}$  (is an event), that is, iff

$$F(x) := P(\{X \le x\})$$

is defined. Now the function F here (or  $F_X$ , if we need to distinguish between  $F_X$  and  $F_Y$  say) is called the (probability) distribution function (or just distribution, or d/n fn) is defined: X is a random variable iff its distribution function is defined.

Densities. If for some function  $f \geq 0$  one has

$$F(x) := P(\lbrace X \le x \rbrace) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} f(u)du \qquad (x \in \mathbf{R}),$$

one calls f the (probability) density (function) of F, or X. Call this the density case, and such F absolutely continuous (SP L7). Then  $f \geq 0$  corresponds to F non-decreasing. Then F'(x) = f(x), but only a.e. (SP L7). Example: the uniform distribution U[0,1]. On the Lebesgue probability space, U is a uniformly distributed random variable:

$$P(U \in (a,b]) = b - a \qquad (0 \le a \le b \le 1)$$

('probability = length'). This has distribution and density functions

$$F(x) = 0 \quad (x \le 0), \quad x \quad (0 \le x \le 1), \quad 1 \quad (x \ge 1); \quad f(x) = I_{[0,1]}(x).$$

Here F fails to be differentiable at the end-points 0 and 1 of the support interval [0,1] – but this exceptional set is of measure 0.