

$$|ab| = |a||b|$$

$$\leq \int |e^{i(t+h)x} - e^{itx}| d\mu(x)$$

$$= \int \underbrace{|e^{itx}|}_1 |e^{ihx} - 1| d\mu(x) = \int |e^{ihx} - 1| d\mu(x)$$

Lec 22

(1a) As $h \rightarrow 0$, this decreases to 0 by the Bounded Convergence Thm (since $|e^{ihx} - 1| \leq 2$). Hence, $\phi_x(t)$ is always a uniformly continuous function.

Derivatives of $\phi_x(t)$ are straightforward.

Prop 11.0.1: Suppose X is a RV with $E[|X|^k] < \infty$.

Then for $0 \leq j \leq k$, ϕ_x has finite j^{th} derivative given by

$$\phi_x^{(j)}(t) = E[(iX)^j e^{itX}].$$

In particular, evaluate at $t=0$ to get

$$\phi_x^{(j)}(0) = i^j E[X^j].$$

Pf: Uses induction on j . See text for details.

The Continuity Theorem

Main Idea: Characteristic functions can be used to study limit distributions.

First, an inversion theorem - tells how to recover info about a probability distn from its char. function.

Thm 11.1.1 [Fourier Inversion Thm]: Let μ be a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with characteristic function $\phi(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itx} d\mu(x)$. Then if $a < b$ and $\mu(\{a\}) = \mu(\{b\}) = 0$

then

$$\mu([a, b]) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt$$

Pf requires 2 lemmas:

Lemma 1: For $T \geq 0$ and $a < b$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-T}^T \left| \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} e^{itx} \right| dt d\mu(x) \leq 2T(b-a) < \infty$$

Lemma 2: For $T \geq 0$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sin(\theta t)}{t} dt = \pi \operatorname{sgn}(\theta),$$

$$\text{where } \operatorname{sgn}(\theta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \theta > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \theta < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \theta = 0 \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, $\exists M < \infty$ s.t. $\left| \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sin(\theta t)}{t} dt \right| \leq M \quad \forall T \geq 0 \text{ \& } \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$

Pf of Thm 11.1.1 : Compute that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \left(\underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itx} d\mu(x)}_{\text{by def'n of } \phi(t)} \right) dt \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{it(x-a)} - e^{it(x-b)}}{it} dt d\mu(x) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{by Fubini's Thm} \\ \text{\& Lemma 1} \end{array} \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-T}^T \frac{\sin(t(x-a)) - \sin(t(x-b))}{t} dt d\mu(x) \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{(need finite } \int \text{ to use)} \end{array} \\
 &\quad \text{(note that } \frac{\cos(t(x-a)) - \cos(t(x-b))}{it} \text{ is an odd function in } t)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now use Lemma 2 along with Bounded Convergence Thm to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{e^{-ita} - e^{-itb}}{it} \phi(t) dt \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \pi (\operatorname{sgn}(x-a) - \operatorname{sgn}(x-b)) d\mu(x) \\
 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} (\operatorname{sgn}(x-a) - \operatorname{sgn}(x-b)) d\mu(x)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Recall that } \operatorname{sgn}(x-s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x > s \\ -1 & \text{if } x < s \\ 0 & \text{if } x = s \end{cases}$$

\& that $a < b$

$$\text{Then } \frac{1}{2}(\text{sgn}(x-a) - \text{sgn}(x-b)) \text{ is } \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0 \begin{cases} \text{if } x < a (< b) \\ \text{OR} \\ x > b (> a) \end{cases}$$

OR

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot 1 \begin{cases} \text{if } x = a < b \\ \text{OR } x = b (x = b > a) \end{cases}$$

OR

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2 \begin{cases} \text{if } a < x < b \end{cases}$$

Continuing from previous eqns,

$$= \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{a\}) + \mu((a,b)) + \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{b\}).$$

But if $\mu(\{a\}) = \mu(\{b\}) = 0$ as assumed, then

this is $\mu([a,b])$, as claimed. $\square$

Cor 11.1.7 [Fourier Uniqueness Thm]: Let $X \neq Y$ be RVs.

Then $\phi_X(t) = \phi_Y(t) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ iff $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(Y)$.

(i.e. iff $X \neq Y$ have the same distribution).

Pf: ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $\phi_X(t) = \phi_Y(t) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then (by Inversion Thm)

$P(a \leq X \leq b) = P(a \leq Y \leq b)$ provided that

$$P(X=a) = P(X=b) = P(Y=a) = P(Y=b) = 0,$$

i.e. for all but countably many choices for $a \neq b$.

Now take limits & use continuity of probabilities:

$$\Rightarrow P(X \in I) = P(Y \in I) \text{ for all intervals } I \subseteq \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows from Prop 2.5.8 (uniqueness of extensions of prob. meas.)

that $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(Y)$.

($\Leftarrow$) Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{L}(Y)$. Then

$$E[e^{itX}] = E[e^{itY}] \quad \text{by Cor 6.1.3.}$$

$$\Rightarrow \phi_X(t) = \phi_Y(t) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$$

by definition.

$E[f(X)] = E[f(Y)] \quad \forall$ Borel-meas
 $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t. exp. value is
 well-defined.

Need further results in order to prove the continuity theorem.

Lemma 11.1.8 [Helly Selection Principle]: Let $\{F_n\}$ be a sequence of CDFs ($F_n(x) = \mu_n((-\infty, x])$) for some probability distribution μ_n . Then there is a subsequence $\{F_{n_k}\}$ and a non-decreasing right-continuous function F with $0 \leq F \leq 1$ s.t. $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{n_k}(x) = F(x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. F is continuous at x .

[Pf: SKIP]

Note: This lemma does ensure that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} F(x) = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F(x) = 0 \quad \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{as we'd} \\ \text{expect from} \\ \text{a CDF} \end{array} \right)$$

To get around this, define a new term: tight

def: A collection $\{\mu_n\}$ of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ is

tight if $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists a < b$ with $\mu_n([a, b]) \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad \forall n$.

In words, all of the measures have "most" of their mass attributed to the same finite interval $[a, b]$. Mass does not escape off to ∞ .

Lecture 22

Stat 706

4/16/19 (3)

Example: Let $\mu_n = \delta_{n \bmod 3}$ — point mass at $n \bmod 3$.

$$\text{i.e. } \left. \begin{array}{l} \mu_1 = \delta_1 \\ \mu_2 = \delta_2 \\ \mu_3 = \delta_0 \end{array} \right\} \text{ repeats}$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mu_4 = \delta_1 \\ \mu_5 = \delta_2 \\ \mu_6 = \delta_0 \\ \vdots \end{array} \right\}$$

Q. Is $\{\mu_n\}$ tight?

Yes. Take $[a, b] = [0, 3]$.

Then $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \quad \exists \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n([0, 3]) &= \delta_n([0, 3])_{\bmod 3} \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{[0, 3]}(n) \big|_{n=0,1,2} \\ &= 1 > 1 - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Example: For $n \geq 1$, let $X_n \sim \text{Uniform}(a_n, 2+a_n)$

where $a_n = (-1)^n$. Then

$$X_1 = U(-1, 2-1=1) \quad \text{so } |X_1| \leq 1$$

$$X_2 = U(1, 2+1=3) \quad \text{so } |X_2| \leq 3$$

$$X_3 = U(-1, 1)$$

$$X_4 = U(1, 3)$$

$\vdots$

$$\Rightarrow |X_n| \leq 3 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sup_{n \geq 1} P(|X_n| > 3) < \varepsilon \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0$$

$\Rightarrow$ seq. of prob. distns of $\{X_n\}$ is tight