

# Chapter 1

## Laws of Large Numbers

### 1.1 Independence



First, some definitions/recaps on independence of events and  $\sigma$ -fields:

- Independence of two events: we say events  $A, B$  are independent,  $A \perp B$ , if  $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$ .
- Independence of two  $\sigma$ -fields:  $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$  are independent if  $\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{G}$ .
- For *more than 2 events*:  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are **mutually independent** if

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i\right) = \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(A_i) \quad \text{for all } I \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (*)$$

- Similarly, for more than 2 sigma fields, we say  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$  are independent if the above product identity holds for all  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ .
- We say events  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  are **pairwise independent** if

$$\mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j) = \mathbb{P}(A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_j) \quad \text{for all } i \neq j.$$

**Example:**  $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap A_i\right) = \prod \mathbb{P}(A_i)$  is **insufficient**. Consider two coin tosses. Let  $A := \{\text{first is head}\}$ ,  $B := \{\text{second is head}\}$ , and  $C := \{\text{both tosses are the same}\}$ . Then  $A \cap B \subset C$ , so they are not mutually independent, but

$$\mathbb{P}(A \cap B \cap C) = \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)\mathbb{P}(C) = \frac{1}{8}.$$

In fact, we also have  $A, B, C$  pairwise independent here.

- For an *infinite sequence* of  $A_i$ 's, we say they are independent if (\*) holds for any *finite*  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ .

Moving to independence of two random variables:

- Two random variables  $X, Y$  are independent if

$$\mathbb{P}(X \in A, Y \in B) = \mathbb{P}(X \in A)\mathbb{P}(Y \in B) \quad (**)$$

for all  $A, B$  in their corresponding  $\sigma$ -fields. It can be shown that this definition is equivalent to requiring  $\sigma(X)$  and  $\sigma(Y)$  to be independent.

- To show independence, it is sufficient to check (\*\*) for  $(-\infty, x] \times (-\infty, x]$  for all  $x, y$ . That is,

$$F_{(X,Y)}(x, y) = F_X(x)F_Y(y) \quad \text{for all } x, y.$$

**Example:  $\mathcal{A} \perp \mathcal{B}$  does not imply  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \perp \sigma(\mathcal{B})$ .** (The example given in lecture relies heavily on drawings so I will replace it with one easier to type in  $\text{\LaTeX}$ .) Let  $\mathcal{A} := \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}\}$  and let  $\mathcal{B} := \{\{2, 4\}\}$ . Then  $\{2, 4\} \in \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ .

#### Definition: $\pi$ -system and $\lambda$ -system

A collection  $\mathcal{G}$  is called a  **$\pi$ -system** if it is nonempty and closed under finite intersections (two suffice):

- $\mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$ , and
- For  $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $A \cap B \in \mathcal{G}$ .

A collection  $\mathcal{G}$  is called a  **$\lambda$ -system** if  $\mathcal{G}$  contains  $\Omega$ , is closed under set subtraction, and is closed under countable increasing union:

- $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}$ ,
- If  $A \subset B$  and  $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$  then  $B \setminus A \in \mathcal{G}$ , and
- If  $A_n \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $A_n \uparrow A$  then  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ .

The  **$\pi - \lambda$  theorem** states that if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a  $\pi$ -system and  $\mathcal{L}$  a  $\lambda$ -system with  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{L}$ , then  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}) \subset \mathcal{L}$ .

We will skip the proof and directly use the result to prove the following (the proof of which we again omit):

#### Theorem: D2.1.7

If  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$  are independent  $\sigma$ -fields and each  $\mathcal{A}_i$  a  $\pi$ -system, then the  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_i)$ 's are independent.

We now discuss the independence of functions of random variable in greater generality. Suppose we have an array of independent random variables

$$\{X_{i,j} : i \leq n, j \leq m(i)\}$$

and  $n$  functions

$$\begin{aligned} X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,m(1)} &\mapsto f_1(X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,m(1)}) \\ X_{2,1}, \dots, X_{2,m(2)} &\mapsto f_2(X_{2,1}, \dots, X_{2,m(2)}) \end{aligned}$$

and so on, where each  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^{m(i)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . **Question:** are these random variables  $f_i(\cdot)$  independent? The answer is yes, and we will formulate the question in terms of  $\sigma$ -fields:

**Theorem: D2.1.10**

Given an independent collection of  $\sigma$ -fields  $\{\mathcal{F}_{i,j} : i \leq n, j \leq m(i)\}$ , let  $\mathcal{B}_i := \sigma(\mathcal{F}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{i,m(i)})$  (i.e., the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row listed above). Then  $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$  are independent.

*Proof.* For each row, let

$$\mathcal{A}_i := \left\{ \text{all } \bigcap_{j=1}^{m(i)} A_{i,j} \text{ with } A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F}_{i,j} \right\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is a  $\pi$ -system that contains  $\Omega$  (intersection of all  $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}_{i,j}$ ) and also all  $\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$  (intersection of  $\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$  with a bunch of  $\Omega$ 's). Therefore  $\mathcal{A}_i$  generates  $\mathcal{B}_i$ . Finally, the  $\mathcal{A}_i$ 's are independent:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{m(i)} A_{i,j}\right)\right) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{m(i)} \mathbb{P}(A_{i,j}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{m(i)} A_{i,j}\right).$$

Therefore, by (D2.1.7) the  $\mathcal{B}_i$ 's are independent. □