

# MATH 507a Final Exam (Takehome Section)

Qilin Ye

December 7, 2022

## Problem 1

Let  $\{U_i, i \geq 1\}$  be i.i.d. uniform in  $[0, c]$  and define

$$V_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^k U_i, \quad W_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{i=k}^n U_i.$$

- (1) Show that  $V_n, W_n$  have the same distribution for each  $n$ .
- (2) Show that  $\{V_n\}$  has a limit; show that the limit is finite a.s. if  $c < e$ .
- (3) Let  $Y$  be a random variable with a density. Show that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(|X - Y| < \delta) < \epsilon$  for all  $X$  independent of  $Y$ .
- (4) Show that when  $c < 2$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(W_n)$  is bounded in  $n$ , but with probability 1,  $\{W_n\}$  does not have a limit.

*Proof.* (1)  $V_n = U_1 + U_1 U_2 + \dots + U_1 \dots U_n$ . Since the  $U_i$ 's are i.i.d.,  $U_1 \stackrel{d}{=} U_n$ , and similarly  $\prod_{i=1}^k U_i \stackrel{d}{=} \prod_{i=n-k}^n U_i$ . The claim then follows as  $V_n, W_n$  are finite sums of these forms.

(2) Note that  $V_{n+1} - V_n = \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} U_i \geq 0$ , so  $\{V_n\}$  is monotone. Thus it has a limit, possibly infinite.

If  $c < e$ ,  $k = \mathbb{E} \log U_i = \int_0^c \log t/c \, dt = c(\log c - 1) < 0$ , and so given  $\epsilon > 0$ , for sufficiently large  $n$ , using log transform in conjunction with SLLN yields (as in HW4)

$$\prod_{i=1}^n U_i \leq e^{(k+\epsilon)n} \leq e^{(k/2)n}.$$

Since  $\sum_{n \geq 1} e^{(k/2)n}$  converges for  $k < 0$ , the tail of  $\{V_n\}$  converges, and we are done.

(3) Let  $f$  be the density of  $Y$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. By the hint there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $m(A) < \delta$  (Lebesgue measure on any Borel  $A$ ) implies  $\int_A f \, dm < \epsilon$ . But then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X - Y| < \delta/2) &= \int_{\Omega_Y} \int_{\Omega_X} 1_{|X-Y| < \delta/2} f \, d\nu \, d\mu \\ &= \int_{\Omega_Y} \int_{(\omega-\delta/2, \omega+\delta/2)} f \, d\nu \, d\mu < \int_{\Omega_Y} \epsilon \, d\mu = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

(4) If  $c < 2$  then  $\mathbb{E}U_1 = c/2 < 1$ . then

$$\mathbb{E}(W_n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=k}^n U_i = \sum_{k=1}^n (c/2)^{n-k} = \sum_{k=1}^n (c/2)^k.$$

As  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (c/2)^k = (c/2)/(1 - c/2)$ , so indeed  $\mathbb{E}W_n$  is bounded in  $n$ .

By definition  $W_{n+1} = U_{n+1}(W_n + 1)$  so  $W_{n+1} - W_n = W_n(U_{n+1} - 1) + U_{n+1}$ .

[Given the hint I suspect the proof has something to do with applying (c) to  $W_{n+1} - W_n$ , but in doing that I need to show that this difference is independent in  $n$ , which I have been unable to. I really don't think this is true, but I'll assume it anyways.] Let  $X_n = W_{n+1} - W_n$ . Clearly it has a density, so by the previous part, for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and all  $n$  there exists  $\delta = \delta(n, \epsilon)$  with

$$\mathbb{P}(|W_n - W_m| < \delta) < \epsilon \quad \text{for all } m.$$

Since

$$\{\omega : \{W_n\} \text{ is Cauchy}\} \subset \{\omega : \text{for all } \delta, |W_n(\omega) - W_m(\omega)| < \delta \text{ for all } n, m > \text{some } N(\delta)\}$$

and later events are contained in the earlier event  $\{|W_{N(\delta)} - W_{N(\delta)+1}| < \delta\}$ , we therefore have

$$\mathbb{P}(\{W_n\} \text{ is Cauchy}) \leq \mathbb{P}(|W_{N(\delta)} - W_{N(\delta)+1}| < \delta) < \epsilon.$$

□

**Problem 2**

Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be i.i.d. symmetric random variables with

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 < -x) = \frac{1}{2x^2} \text{ for } x \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in (-1, 1)) = 0.$$

We want to show that  $X_1$  has infinite variance but still satisfies a CLT in the form

$$\frac{S_n - \mathbb{E}S_n}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \implies \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \tag{*}$$

(1) Show that for a general random variable  $Y$  and  $c > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^2 1_{\{|Y| \leq c\}}) = \int_0^c 2x[\mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq x) - \mathbb{P}(|Y| > c)] dx.$$

In particular, for  $X_1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_1^2 1_{\{|X_1| \leq c\}}) = 2 \log c \quad \text{for } c \geq 1.$$

(2) Let  $\{c_n\}$  satisfy  $c_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $c_n/\sqrt{n \log n} \rightarrow 0$ , and define  $Y_{n,i} = X_i 1_{\{|X_i| \leq c_n\}}$  for  $i \leq n$ , and let  $T_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{n,i}$ . Show that  $\{c_n\}$  can be chosen so that

$$\frac{T_n - \mathbb{E}T_n}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \implies \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

(3) Prove (\*) above.

*Proof.* (1) It is well-known that  $\mathbb{E}Y^2 = \int_0^\infty 2t\mathbb{P}(Y \geq t) dt$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y^2 1_{\{|Y| \leq c\}}) &= \int_0^\infty 2x\mathbb{P}(|Y| 1_{\{|Y| \leq c\}} \geq x) dx \\ &= \int_0^c 2x\mathbb{P}(|Y| \in [x, c]) dx \\ &= \int_0^c 2x[\mathbb{P}(|Y| \geq x) - \mathbb{P}(|Y| > c)] dx. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for  $X_1$  and  $c \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_1^2 1_{\{|X_1| \leq c\}}) &= \int_0^1 2x[\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq x) - \mathbb{P}(|X| > c)] dx + \int_1^c 2x[\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq x) - \mathbb{P}(|X| > c)] dx \\ &= \int_0^1 2x(1 - 1/c^2) dx + \int_1^c 2x(1/x^2 - 1/c^2) dx \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{c^2} - 1 + \frac{1}{c^2} + 2 \log c. \end{aligned}$$

(2) We first note that  $Y_{n,i}$  is symmetric, so  $T_n$  also is and  $\mathbb{E}T_n = 0$ . Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,i}/\sqrt{n \log n})^2 = \frac{1}{\log n} \mathbb{E}(X_1^2 1_{\{|X_1| \leq c_n\}}) = \frac{2 \log c_n}{\log n},$$

to satisfy the requirements of Lindeberg-Feller, we require  $\log(c_n^2)/\log(n) \rightarrow 1$ . One example is by setting  $c_n = \sqrt{n}$ .

Before invoking Lindeberg-Feller we need to check the second condition; for all  $\epsilon > 0$  we want to show

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}((Y_{n,i}/\sqrt{n \log n})^2 : |Y_{n,i}/\sqrt{n \log n}| > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0.$$

But this is obvious, once we plug in the definition of  $Y_{n,i}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}((Y_{n,i}/\sqrt{n \log n})^2 : |Y_{n,i}/\sqrt{n \log n}| > \epsilon) &= \frac{1}{\log n} \mathbb{E}(Y_{n,1}^2 : |Y_{n,1}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n \log n}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\log n} \mathbb{E}(X_1^2 : |X_1| \leq c_n \text{ and } |X_1| > \epsilon \sqrt{n \log n}). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption  $c_n/\sqrt{n \log n} \rightarrow 0$ , so for sufficiently large  $n$ , the expression above vanishes. Therefore Lindeberg-Feller gives the desired limiting distribution.

(3) Since  $\mathbb{E}S_n = 0$  as well it suffices to ensure  $\mathbb{P}(S_n \neq T_n) \rightarrow 0$ , so that the limits of  $S_n/\sqrt{n \log n}$  and  $T_n/\sqrt{n \log n}$  agree. That is, we want

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \neq T_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \neq Y_{n,i}) = n\mathbb{P}(X_1 \geq c_n) = \frac{n}{2c_n^2} \rightarrow 0.$$

One such example is  $c_n = n^{1/2} \log \log n$ : clearly  $c_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $c_n/\sqrt{n \log n} = \log \log n/(\log n)^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $n/(2c_n^2) = 1/(\log \log n)^2 \rightarrow 0$ , and all claims in (2) still hold.  $\square$

**Problem 3**

- (1) Suppose  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$  is a probability space,  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_0$ , and  $X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2$  are positive r.v.'s satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}(\log X_2 | \mathcal{F}) \geq \log X_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(\log Y_2 | \mathcal{F}) \geq \log Y_1.$$

Show that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_2 Y_2 | \mathcal{F}) \geq X_1 Y_1.$$

- (2) Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space and let  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$  be independent sub- $\sigma$ -fields. Let  $X$  be a r.v. with  $\mathbb{E}|X| < \infty$ . What is

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{G})?$$

*Proof.* (1) By linearity

$$\mathbb{E}(\log X_2 Y_2 | \mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}(\log X_1 + \log X_2 | \mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}(\log X_2 | \mathcal{F}) + \mathbb{E}(\log Y_2 | \mathcal{F}) \geq \log X_1 + \log Y_1 = \log(X_1 Y_1).$$

Then Jensen's inequality implies

$$\mathbb{E}(X_2 Y_2 | \mathcal{F}) = \exp(\mathbb{E} \log X_2 Y_2 | \mathcal{F}) = X_1 Y_1.$$

- (2) For  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_G \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{G}) \, d\mathbb{P} &= \int_G \mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{F}) \, d\mathbb{P} = \int_\Omega \mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{F}) 1_G \, d\mathbb{P} \\ &[\text{by independence}] = \mathbb{P}(G) \int_\Omega \mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{F}) \, d\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}(G) \mathbb{E}X, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X | \mathcal{F}) | \mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{E}X$ .

□