

STOCHASTIC PROCESSES. SOLUTIONS

4. CONDITIONAL EXPECTATION

Problem 4.1

Let $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}) &= E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}\right) = \\
 &E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_{n-1})|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}\right) = \\
 &E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_{n-1})|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}\right) = \\
 &E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_{n-1})|\xi_{n-2}\right) = \\
 &E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1})|\xi_{n-2}\right) = \\
 &E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_{n-2})
 \end{aligned}$$

and by induction for any $m < n$,

$$E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) = E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_m), \quad P - a.s. \quad (4.1)$$

Let $n > m > \ell$

$$\begin{aligned}
 E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_\ell) &= E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell\right) = \\
 &E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_m)|\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\ell\right) = E\left(E(g(\xi_n)|\xi_m)|\xi_\ell\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

In terms of densities the latter reads

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(u) f_{\xi_n|\xi_\ell}(u, \xi_\ell) du = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(u) f_{\xi_n|\xi_m}(u, r) f_{\xi_m|\xi_\ell}(r, \xi_\ell) dr,$$

and the required equality follows from arbitrariness of g .

Problem 4.2

a) Given X_2 has unifrom distribution on $[0, X_1]$, conditioned on X_1

$$f_{X_2|X_1}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t} & s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly

$$f_{X_3|X_2}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t} & s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X_3|X_1}(s, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{X_3|X_2}(s, u) f_{X_2|X_1}(u, t) du = \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{u} I(0 \leq s \leq u) \frac{1}{t} I(0 \leq u \leq t) du = \\ &= I(0 \leq s \leq t) \int_s^t \frac{1}{ut} du = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t} \log(t/s), & s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

b) Following (a) we can write:

$$f_{X_{n+2}|X_n}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t} \log\left(\frac{t}{s}\right) & s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proceed by induction: assume (guess by iterating for $k = 3, 4$, etc.) that the formula

$$f_{X_{n+k}|X_n}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t^{(k-1)!}} \log^{k-1}\left(\frac{t}{s}\right) & s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

holds for some $k \geq 1$. By the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{X_{n+k+1}|X_n}(s, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{X_{n+k+1}|X_{n+k}}(s, u) f_{X_{n+k}|X_n}(u, t) du = \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{u} I(0 \leq s \leq u) \frac{1}{t^{(k-1)!}} \log^{k-1}\left(\frac{t}{u}\right) I(0 \leq u \leq t) du = \\ &= I(0 \leq s \leq t) \int_s^t \frac{1}{u t^{(k-1)!}} \log^{k-1}\left(\frac{t}{u}\right) du = \\ &= \frac{1}{tk!} \log^k\left(\frac{t}{s}\right) I(0 \leq s \leq t) \end{aligned}$$

which verifies (4.2).

c) Rewrite equation (4.2) for $n \geq 2$ as follows:

$$f_{X_n|X_1}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{t^{(n-2)!}} \log^{n-2}\left(\frac{t}{s}\right) & s \in [0, t] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{X_n}(s) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{X_n|X_1}(s, u) f_{X_1}(u) du = \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{t(n-2)!} \log^{n-2}\left(\frac{t}{s}\right) I(0 \leq s \leq t) I(0 \leq u \leq 1) du = \\
&= I(0 \leq s \leq 1) \int_s^1 \frac{1}{u(n-2)!} \log^{n-2}\left(\frac{u}{s}\right) du = \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \log^{n-1}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right), & s \in [0, 1] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

d) Intuitively X_n converges to zero. Let's look at the distribution of X_n

$$\begin{aligned}
F_n(t) &= P(X_n \leq t) = \int_0^t f_{X_n}(u) du = \int_0^t \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \log^{n-1}(u) du \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \left\{ t \log^{n-1}(t) - (n-1) \int_0^t \log^{n-2}(x) dx \right\} = \\
&= t \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{k!} \log^k\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} t \exp\{-\log(t)\} = 1, \quad \forall t > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(X_n > \varepsilon) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - P(X_n \leq \varepsilon)) = 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

i.e. X_n converges in probability. Since $X_n \leq 1$, the sequence converges in \mathbb{L}^p for any $p \geq 1$.

Problem 4.3

Clearly

$$\{S_n, S_{n+1}, \dots\} = \{S_n, \xi_{n+1}, \xi_{n+2}, \dots\}$$

So

$$E(\xi_1 | S_n, S_{n+1}, \dots) = E(\xi_1 | S_n, \xi_{n+1}, \dots) = E(\xi_1 | S_n)$$

Since ξ_i are i.i.d. r.v. we have (why?)

$$E(\xi_k | S_n) = E(\xi_m | S_n) \quad \forall k, m \leq n, \quad P - a.s.$$

so that

$$nE(\xi_1 | S_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n E(\xi_i | S_n) = E\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i | S_n\right) = E(S_n | S_n) = S_n$$

that is

$$E(\xi_1 | S_n) = \frac{1}{n} S_n$$

Problem 4.4

Let ξ be the distance from the center of the needle to the left boundary and θ be the angle, formed by the needle and the horizontal axis.

Since the needle is dropped at random it is natural to assume that ξ and θ are distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$ and $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$.

Introduce a set:

$$B = \left\{ (\theta, \xi) : |\theta| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}, \xi \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta\right] \cup \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \cos \theta, 1\right] \right\}$$

Obviously the needle crosses one of the boundaries if and only if B happens. Then the desired probability is:

$$p = EI_B(\omega) = EE(I_B(\omega)|\theta) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} E(I_B(\omega)|\theta = a) da$$

The inner conditional probability is

$$E(I_B(\omega)|\theta = a) = P \left\{ \omega : \xi \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2} \cos a\right] \cup \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \cos a, 1\right] \right\} = \cos a$$

and so

$$p = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \cos a da = \frac{2}{\pi}.$$

Problem 4.5

By definition

$$E(X|\eta) = g(\eta)$$

such that

$$Ef(\eta)(X - g(\eta)) = 0$$

for any bounded function $f(x)$. Then

$$Ef(\eta)[X - g(\eta)] = \int_0^{1/2} f(s)[s - g(s)]ds + \int_{1/2}^1 f(1/2)[s - g(1/2)]ds = 0$$

By uniqueness of cond. expectation we conclude:

$$g(s) = \begin{cases} s & 0 \leq s < 1/2 \\ 3/4 & s \geq 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Note that there exist many versions of conditional expectation, e.g.

$$\tilde{g}(s) = \begin{cases} s & 0 \leq s < 1/2 \\ \frac{3}{2}s & s \geq 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Clearly $g(\eta) = \tilde{g}(\eta)$ P -a.s.

Problem 4.6

a) If A does not depend on A :

$$P(A \cap A) = P^2(A)$$

But on the other hand $A \cap A = A$ so $P(A \cap A) = P(A)$
and thus

$$P^2(A) = P(A) \implies \begin{cases} P(A) = 0 \\ P(A) = 1 \end{cases}$$

b) Consider the case $P(A) = 0$. Clearly

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A \cap B) \leq P(A) = 0 \\ P(A \cap B) \geq 0 \end{array} \right\} \implies P(A \cap B) = 0$$

But also $P(A)P(B) = 0$, so $P(A \cap B) = P(A)P(B)$ i.e. the result holds.

Now consider the other case $P(A) = 1$ Since

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} P(A \cup B) \geq P(A) = 1 \\ P(A \cup B) \leq 1 \end{array} \right\} \implies P(A \cup B) = 1$$

we have

$$P(A \cap B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A \cup B) = P(B)$$

But $P(A) = 1$, and hence $P(A \cap B) = P(B)P(A)$

c) Assume $\xi(\omega) \equiv C$. Define a set (event)

$$A(x) = \{\omega : \xi(\omega) \leq x\}$$

Obviously

$$P(A(x)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \geq C \\ 0 & \text{if } x < C \end{cases}$$

Then by virtue of (b) $A(x)$ is independent of any other event and in particular of itself. This implies that $\xi(\omega)$ doesn't depend on itself. Now assume that $\xi(\omega)$ does not depend on itself. i.e.

$$P\{\xi \leq x_1 \cap \xi \leq x_2\} = P(\xi \leq x_1)P(\xi \leq x_2) \quad \forall x_1, x_2$$

in particular for $x_1 = x_2 = x$ the event $\{\xi \leq x\}$ is independent of itself. By (a) $P\{\xi \leq x\} = 1$ or $P\{\xi \leq x\} = 0$ this implies that $\xi(\omega) \equiv \text{const}$ P -a.s.

Problem 4.7

First note that for any i

$$\lambda\{\xi_i(\omega) = 1\} = \lambda\{\omega \in [0, 1) : i\text{-th bit of } \omega \text{ is } 1\} = \frac{1}{2}$$

This holds since there is a one-to-one correspondence between any number x with i -th bit equal to 1, to exactly one other number y with the same bit equal to 0, i.e.

$$x - y = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^i.$$

Now let us consider a binary vector $[a_1, \dots, a_n]$ with $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\{\xi_1 = a_1, \dots, \xi_n = a_n\} &= \lambda\left\{\omega : \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{2^i} \leq \omega < \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^n}\right\} = \\ &= \frac{1}{2^n} = \prod_{i=1}^n P\{\xi_i = a_i\} \end{aligned}$$

which together with the fact that $\lambda\{\xi_i = a_i\} = \frac{1}{2}$ proves the independency of $\{\xi_i\}$.

Problem 4.8

Since $f(x|y)$ is an even function of x we find that

$$E(X|Y) = \int_R xf(x|y)dx = 0$$

and thus

$$EE(X|Y) = 0$$

Let us find EX . The density of X is given by

$$f(x) = \int_{R_+} f(y)f(x/y)dy = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-y/2(x^2+1)} dy = \frac{1/\pi}{x^2+1}$$

that is X has Cauchy distribution and thus EX is not well defined and $EE(X|Y) \neq EX$. In fact it is consistent with the definition of $E(X|Y)$, which requires ¹ $E|X| < \infty$.

Problem 4.9

First let us check that X and Z are indeed independent: this is verified by straight forward calculations:

$$\lambda\{X = i \cap Z = j\} = \lambda\{X = i\} \lambda\{Z = j\}, \quad \begin{array}{l} i = 0, 1 \\ j = 0, 1 \end{array}$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{l} e.g. \quad \lambda\{X = 1, Z = 0\} = \lambda\{[0, 1/4]\} = \frac{1}{4} \\ \quad \quad \quad \lambda\{X = 1\} = \lambda\{[0, 1/2]\} = \frac{1}{2} \\ \quad \quad \quad \lambda\{Z = 0\} = \lambda\{[0, 1/4] \cup [3/4, 1]\} = \frac{1}{2} \end{array} \right)$$

Find the conditional expectation:

$$E(X|Y) \equiv g(Y)$$

so that

¹or at least $\min(EX^-, EX^+) < \infty$, where $X^+ = \max(0, X)$ and $X^- = -\min(0, X)$

$$E(X - g(Y))\varphi(Y) = 0 \quad \forall \varphi \text{ bounded} \quad (4.3)$$

The left hand side is found explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{1/2} [1 - g(1)]\varphi(1)ds + \int_{1/2}^{3/4} [0 - g(1)]\varphi(1)ds + \int_{3/4}^1 [0 - g(0)]\varphi(0)ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\varphi(1)(1 - g(1)) + \frac{1}{4}\varphi(1)(-g(1)) - \frac{1}{4}\varphi(0)g(0) = \\ &= \varphi(1)\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{4}g(1)\right) - \frac{1}{4}g(0)\varphi(0) \end{aligned}$$

If we choose $g(x)$ so that $g(1) = \frac{2}{3}$ and $g(0) = 0$, the eq. (4.3) will hold for any bounded φ . So one of the versions of the required cond. expectation is

$$E(X|Y) = \begin{cases} 2/3 & \omega \in [0, 3/4] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \equiv 2/3I(Y(\omega) = 1)$$

Similarly

$$E(X|Y, Z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \omega \in [3/4, 1] \\ 1/2 & \omega \in [1/4, 3/4] \\ 1 & \omega \in [0, 1/4] \end{cases}$$

Clearly $E(X|Z, Y) \neq E(X|Y)$ in spite of X and Z are independent.

Problem 4.10

Assume $E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_2, \xi_3] = E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]$ with probability one. This means that for any bounded $\psi(x, y)$

$$E[f(\xi_1) - E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]]\psi(\xi_2, \xi_3) = 0 \quad (4.4)$$

Take special $\psi(x, y) = \phi(x)\rho(y)$, then:

$$Ef(\xi_1)\phi(\xi_2)\rho(\xi_3) = EE[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]\phi(\xi_2)\rho(\xi_3)$$

or

$$Ef(\xi_1)\phi(\xi_2)\rho(\xi_3) = EE[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]E[\phi(\xi_2)|\xi_3]\rho(\xi_3)$$

that is:

$$E[f(\xi_1)\phi(\xi_2) - E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]E[\phi(\xi_2)|\xi_3]]\rho(\xi_3) = 0 \quad (4.5)$$

which by definition gives:

$$E[f(\xi_1)\phi(\xi_2)|\xi_3] = E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]E[\phi(\xi_2)|\xi_3]$$

Now assume that ξ_1 and ξ_2 are independent, conditioned on ξ_3 , i.e. assume that (4.5) holds for any bounded $f(x)$, $\phi(x)$ and $\rho(x)$. In fact, it is sufficient

to verify ² (4.4) for any $\psi(x, y) = \phi(x)\rho(y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} E[f(\xi_1) - E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]]\phi(\xi_2)\rho(\xi_3) &= E[E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]E[\phi(\xi_2)|\xi_3]\rho(\xi_3)] - \\ &\quad - E[E[f(\xi_1)|\xi_3]E[\phi(\xi_2)|\xi_3]\rho(\xi_3)] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Problem 4.11

Since Y is independent of X_2 , $E(Y|X_2) = EY = EX_1 + \alpha EX_2 = 0$. But $X_1 = Y - \alpha X_2$, so $E(X_1|X_2) = E(Y|X_2) - \alpha X_2 = -\alpha X_2$.

Problem 4.12

Show that (i) implies (ii).

$$\begin{aligned} E(ZY|X_n) &= E(E(ZY|X_0^n)|X_n) = E(YE(Z|X_0^n)|X_n) = \\ &= E(YE(Z|X_n)|X_n) = E(Z|X_n)E(Y|X_n) \end{aligned}$$

To show that (ii) implies (i), let η be an arbitrary random variable, generated by $\{X_0, \dots, X_k\}$, $k \leq n$ then

$$E\eta E(Z|X_k) = EE(\eta|X_k)E(Z|X_k) \stackrel{\dagger}{=} EE(\eta Z|X_k) = E\eta Z$$

where the equality \dagger is due to (ii). By the choice of η , the latter equation is nothing but definition of $E(Z|X_0^k)$.

²since any bounded two dimensional function can be approximated uniformly by series of one dimensional functions