

# 18.175: Lecture 3

## Random variables and distributions

Scott Sheffield

MIT

Characterizing measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$

Random variables

Characterizing measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$

Random variables

## Recall definitions

- ▶ **Probability space** is triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  where  $\Omega$  is sample space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is set of events (the  $\sigma$ -algebra) and  $P : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the probability function.

## Recall definitions

- ▶ **Probability space** is triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  where  $\Omega$  is sample space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is set of events (the  $\sigma$ -algebra) and  $P : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the probability function.
- ▶  **$\sigma$ -algebra** is collection of subsets closed under complementation and countable unions. Call  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  a measure space.

## Recall definitions

- ▶ **Probability space** is triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  where  $\Omega$  is sample space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is set of events (the  $\sigma$ -algebra) and  $P : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the probability function.
- ▶  **$\sigma$ -algebra** is collection of subsets closed under complementation and countable unions. Call  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  a measure space.
- ▶ **Measure** is function  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\mu(A) \geq \mu(\emptyset) = 0$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and countable additivity:  $\mu(\cup_i A_i) = \sum_i \mu(A_i)$  for disjoint  $A_i$ .

## Recall definitions

- ▶ **Probability space** is triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  where  $\Omega$  is sample space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is set of events (the  $\sigma$ -algebra) and  $P : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the probability function.
- ▶  **$\sigma$ -algebra** is collection of subsets closed under complementation and countable unions. Call  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  a measure space.
- ▶ **Measure** is function  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\mu(A) \geq \mu(\emptyset) = 0$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and countable additivity:  $\mu(\cup_i A_i) = \sum_i \mu(A_i)$  for disjoint  $A_i$ .
- ▶ Measure  $\mu$  is **probability measure** if  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ .

## Recall definitions

- ▶ **Probability space** is triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  where  $\Omega$  is sample space,  $\mathcal{F}$  is set of events (the  $\sigma$ -algebra) and  $P : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the probability function.
- ▶  **$\sigma$ -algebra** is collection of subsets closed under complementation and countable unions. Call  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  a measure space.
- ▶ **Measure** is function  $\mu : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\mu(A) \geq \mu(\emptyset) = 0$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and countable additivity:  $\mu(\cup_i A_i) = \sum_i \mu(A_i)$  for disjoint  $A_i$ .
- ▶ Measure  $\mu$  is **probability measure** if  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ .
- ▶ The **Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra**  $\mathcal{B}$  on a topological space is the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing all open sets.

## Recall $\sigma$ -algebra story

- ▶ Want, a priori, to define measure of *any* subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .

## Recall $\sigma$ -algebra story

- ▶ Want, a priori, to define measure of *any* subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Find that if we allow the axiom of choice and require measures to be countably additive (as we do) then we run into trouble. No valid translation invariant way to assign a finite measure to all subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .

## Recall $\sigma$ -algebra story

- ▶ Want, a priori, to define measure of *any* subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Find that if we allow the axiom of choice and require measures to be countably additive (as we do) then we run into trouble. No valid translation invariant way to assign a finite measure to all subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Could toss out the axiom of choice... but we don't want to. Instead we only define measure for certain “measurable sets”. We construct a  $\sigma$ -algebra of measurable sets and let probability measure be function from  $\sigma$ -algebra to  $[0, 1]$ .

## Recall $\sigma$ -algebra story

- ▶ Want, a priori, to define measure of *any* subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Find that if we allow the axiom of choice and require measures to be countably additive (as we do) then we run into trouble. No valid translation invariant way to assign a finite measure to all subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Could toss out the axiom of choice... but we don't want to. Instead we only define measure for certain “measurable sets”. We construct a  $\sigma$ -algebra of measurable sets and let probability measure be function from  $\sigma$ -algebra to  $[0, 1]$ .
- ▶ Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is generated by open sets. Sometimes consider “completion” formed by tossing in measure zero sets.

## Recall $\sigma$ -algebra story

- ▶ Want, a priori, to define measure of *any* subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Find that if we allow the axiom of choice and require measures to be countably additive (as we do) then we run into trouble. No valid translation invariant way to assign a finite measure to all subsets of  $[0, 1)$ .
- ▶ Could toss out the axiom of choice... but we don't want to. Instead we only define measure for certain “measurable sets”. We construct a  $\sigma$ -algebra of measurable sets and let probability measure be function from  $\sigma$ -algebra to  $[0, 1]$ .
- ▶ Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra is generated by open sets. Sometimes consider “completion” formed by tossing in measure zero sets.
- ▶ Caratheodory Extension Theorem tells us that if we want to construct a measure on a  $\sigma$ -algebra, it is enough to construct the measure on an algebra that generates it.

## Recall construction of measures on $\mathbb{R}$

- ▶ Write  $F(a) = P((-\infty, a])$ .

## Recall construction of measures on $\mathbb{R}$

- ▶ Write  $F(a) = P((-\infty, a])$ .
- ▶ **Theorem:** for each right continuous, non-decreasing function  $F$ , tending to 0 at  $-\infty$  and to 1 at  $\infty$ , there is a unique measure defined on the Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $P((a, b]) = F(b) - F(a)$ .

## Recall construction of measures on $\mathbb{R}$

- ▶ Write  $F(a) = P((-\infty, a])$ .
- ▶ **Theorem:** for each right continuous, non-decreasing function  $F$ , tending to 0 at  $-\infty$  and to 1 at  $\infty$ , there is a unique measure defined on the Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $P((a, b]) = F(b) - F(a)$ .
- ▶ Proved using Caratheodory Extension Theorem.

## Characterizing probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$

- ▶ Want to have  $F(x) = \mu(-\infty, x_1] \times (\infty, x_2] \times \dots \times (-\infty, x_n]$ .

## Characterizing probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$

- ▶ Want to have  $F(x) = \mu(-\infty, x_1] \times (-\infty, x_2] \times \dots \times (-\infty, x_n]$ .
- ▶ Given such an  $F$ , can compute  $\mu$  of any finite rectangle of form  $\prod (a_i, b_i]$  by taking differences of  $F$  applied to vertices.

## Characterizing probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$

- ▶ Want to have  $F(x) = \mu(-\infty, x_1] \times (-\infty, x_2] \times \dots \times (-\infty, x_n]$ .
- ▶ Given such an  $F$ , can compute  $\mu$  of any finite rectangle of form  $\prod (a_i, b_i]$  by taking differences of  $F$  applied to vertices.
- ▶ **Theorem:** Given  $F$ , there is a unique measure whose values on finite rectangles are determined this way (provided that  $F$  is non-decreasing, right continuous, and assigns a non-negative value to each rectangle).

## Characterizing probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$

- ▶ Want to have  $F(x) = \mu(-\infty, x_1] \times (-\infty, x_2] \times \dots \times (-\infty, x_n]$ .
- ▶ Given such an  $F$ , can compute  $\mu$  of any finite rectangle of form  $\prod (a_i, b_i]$  by taking differences of  $F$  applied to vertices.
- ▶ **Theorem:** Given  $F$ , there is a unique measure whose values on finite rectangles are determined this way (provided that  $F$  is non-decreasing, right continuous, and assigns a non-negative value to each rectangle).
- ▶ Also proved using Carathéodory Extension Theorem.

Characterizing measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$

Random variables

Characterizing measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$

Random variables

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  **$\mathcal{F}$ -measurable**.

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  **$\mathcal{F}$ -measurable**.
- ▶ Question: to prove  $X$  is measurable, is it enough to show that the pre-image of every open set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ?

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -**measurable**.
- ▶ Question: to prove  $X$  is measurable, is it enough to show that the pre-image of every open set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ?
- ▶ **Theorem:** If  $X^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  generates  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $X$  is a measurable map from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -**measurable**.
- ▶ Question: to prove  $X$  is measurable, is it enough to show that the pre-image of every open set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ?
- ▶ **Theorem:** If  $X^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  generates  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $X$  is a measurable map from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .
- ▶ Example of random variable: indicator function of a set. Or sum of finitely many indicator functions of sets.

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  **$\mathcal{F}$ -measurable**.
- ▶ Question: to prove  $X$  is measurable, is it enough to show that the pre-image of every open set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ?
- ▶ **Theorem:** If  $X^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  generates  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $X$  is a measurable map from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .
- ▶ Example of random variable: indicator function of a set. Or sum of finitely many indicator functions of sets.
- ▶ Let  $F(x) = F_X(x) = P(X \leq x)$  be **distribution function** for  $X$ . Write  $f = f_X = F'_X$  for **density function** of  $X$ .

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  **$\mathcal{F}$ -measurable**.
- ▶ Question: to prove  $X$  is measurable, is it enough to show that the pre-image of every open set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ?
- ▶ **Theorem:** If  $X^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  generates  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $X$  is a measurable map from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .
- ▶ Example of random variable: indicator function of a set. Or sum of finitely many indicator functions of sets.
- ▶ Let  $F(x) = F_X(x) = P(X \leq x)$  be **distribution function** for  $X$ . Write  $f = f_X = F'_X$  for **density function** of  $X$ .
- ▶ What functions can be distributions of random variables?

# Defining random variables

- ▶ Random variable is a *measurable* function from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B})$ . That is, a function  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the preimage of every set in  $\mathcal{B}$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Say  $X$  is  **$\mathcal{F}$ -measurable**.
- ▶ Question: to prove  $X$  is measurable, is it enough to show that the pre-image of every open set is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ?
- ▶ **Theorem:** If  $X^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F}$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  generates  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $X$  is a measurable map from  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  to  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .
- ▶ Example of random variable: indicator function of a set. Or sum of finitely many indicator functions of sets.
- ▶ Let  $F(x) = F_X(x) = P(X \leq x)$  be **distribution function** for  $X$ . Write  $f = f_X = F'_X$  for **density function** of  $X$ .
- ▶ What functions can be distributions of random variables?
- ▶ Non-decreasing, right-continuous, with  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) = 1$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x) = 0$ .

## Examples of possible random variable laws

- ▶ Other examples of distribution functions: uniform on  $[0, 1]$ , exponential with rate  $\lambda$ , standard normal, Cantor set measure.

## Examples of possible random variable laws

- ▶ Other examples of distribution functions: uniform on  $[0, 1]$ , exponential with rate  $\lambda$ , standard normal, Cantor set measure.
- ▶ Can also define distribution functions for random variables that are a.s. integers (like Poisson or geometric or binomial random variables, say). How about for a ratio of two independent Poisson random variables? (This is a random rational with a dense support on  $[0, \infty)$ .)

## Examples of possible random variable laws

- ▶ Other examples of distribution functions: uniform on  $[0, 1]$ , exponential with rate  $\lambda$ , standard normal, Cantor set measure.
- ▶ Can also define distribution functions for random variables that are a.s. integers (like Poisson or geometric or binomial random variables, say). How about for a ratio of two independent Poisson random variables? (This is a random rational with a dense support on  $[0, \infty)$ .)
- ▶ Higher dimensional density functions analogously defined.

## Other properties

- ▶ Compositions of measurable maps between measure spaces are measurable.

## Other properties

- ▶ Compositions of measurable maps between measure spaces are measurable.
- ▶ If  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are random variables in  $\mathbb{R}$ , defined on the same measure space, then  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is a random variable in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

## Other properties

- ▶ Compositions of measurable maps between measure spaces are measurable.
- ▶ If  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are random variables in  $\mathbb{R}$ , defined on the same measure space, then  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is a random variable in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- ▶ Sums and products of finitely many random variables are random variables. If  $X_i$  is countable sequence of random variables, then  $\inf_n X_n$  is a random variable. Same for  $\liminf$ ,  $\sup$ ,  $\limsup$ .

## Other properties

- ▶ Compositions of measurable maps between measure spaces are measurable.
- ▶ If  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are random variables in  $\mathbb{R}$ , defined on the same measure space, then  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is a random variable in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- ▶ Sums and products of finitely many random variables are random variables. If  $X_i$  is countable sequence of random variables, then  $\inf_n X_n$  is a random variable. Same for  $\liminf$ ,  $\sup$ ,  $\limsup$ .
- ▶ Given infinite sequence of random variables, consider the event that they converge to a limit. Is this a measurable event?

## Other properties

- ▶ Compositions of measurable maps between measure spaces are measurable.
- ▶ If  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are random variables in  $\mathbb{R}$ , defined on the same measure space, then  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is a random variable in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- ▶ Sums and products of finitely many random variables are random variables. If  $X_i$  is countable sequence of random variables, then  $\inf_n X_n$  is a random variable. Same for  $\liminf$ ,  $\sup$ ,  $\limsup$ .
- ▶ Given infinite sequence of random variables, consider the event that they converge to a limit. Is this a measurable event?
- ▶ Yes. If it has measure one, we say sequence converges almost surely.