

So, $M_g(f) \mathbb{I}_{\{M_g(f) < 0\}}$ is a function taking negative values only and whose integral is zero. (in equivalent \equiv)

It follows that $M_g(f) \mathbb{I}_{\{M_g(f) < 0\}} \equiv 0$

so $M_g(f) \geq 0$.
 (iv) If $f(x) \leq c$ $\forall x \in \Omega$ then $c \mathbb{I}_\Omega - f \geq 0$
 thus $M_g(c \mathbb{I}_\Omega - f) \geq 0$ by (iii), using

(i) we get $c M_g(\mathbb{I}_\Omega) - M_g(f) \geq 0$ and using (v)
 $c - M_g(f) \geq 0$

or $c \geq M_g(f)$.

(vi) We show that $M_g(fg) - M_g(f) \cdot g$ is zero.
 Let $k \in L^2(\Omega, G, \mathbb{R})$, then $gk \in L^2(\Omega, G, \mathbb{R})$ and

$$\langle M_g(fg), k \rangle - \langle M_g(f) \cdot g, k \rangle = \langle M_g(fg), k \rangle - \langle M_g(f), gk \rangle$$

by property of $\int_\Omega \cdot d\mathbb{P}$ **

$$\langle M_g(fg), k \rangle - \langle M_g(f), gk \rangle = \langle M_g(fg), k \rangle - \langle M_g(f), gk \rangle$$

by **

$$\langle f, M_g(\mathbb{I}_\Omega) \rangle = 0$$

$$\langle M_g(f), \mathbb{I}_\Omega \rangle = \int_\Omega M_g(f) d\mathbb{P} = \int_\Omega M_g(f) \mathbb{I}_\Omega d\mathbb{P} = \langle M_g(f), \mathbb{I}_\Omega \rangle$$

Now we can return to our family of σ -fields, \mathcal{F}_n , for any f in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ our

"estimates" of f are given by the sequence $M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^n(f)$. Now the distance between f and $M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^n(f)$ gets smaller as n gets larger — this

should be clear since $M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^n(f)$ is the element of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$ closest to f and $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$ is a

subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{n+1}, \mathbb{P})$, so $M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^n(f)$ should be closer than $M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^n(f)$. It seems reasonable to

suppose then that if $\lim_n M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^n(f)$ exists it will be our "best" estimate of f given all

the information in $\bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n$. Before we take this further let us look at some explicit

examples of conditional expectations.

Example

Let us consider the σ -fields \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 on

$\Omega = (0, 1]$ discussed in our last example.

Recall that $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, (0, 1/2], (1/2, 1]\}$ while

$\mathcal{F}_2 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, (0, 1/4], (1/4, 1/2], (1/2, 3/4], (3/4, 1]\}$. Let

M denote the conditional expectation of

$L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{P})$ onto $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{P})$, of course \mathbb{P} is Lebesgue measure.

Now the random variables in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{P})$ have a simple form, if f is a

typical element of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_2, \mathbb{P})$ then,

while any $g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ has the form,

$$g(\omega) = \sum_{l=1}^2 B_l I_{(l-1/2, 1/2]}^{(l)}.$$

So $M(t)$ will have this form too.

Qu. Can we determine $M(t)$? The answer

is yes and we use the relationship $*$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \\ g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \end{array} \right\} \langle f, g \rangle = \langle M_\#(f), g \rangle$$

which maybe rewritten,

$$\int_{\Omega} M_\#(f) g d\mathbb{P} = \int_{\Omega} f g d\mathbb{P}.$$

If $f = \sum_{l=1}^4 \alpha_l I_{(l-1/2, 1/4]}^{(l)}$ and $g = I_{(0, 1/2]}$ this

gives, $\int_{\Omega} M_\#(f) I_{(0, 1/2]} d\mathbb{P} = \alpha_1 \frac{1}{4} + \alpha_2 \frac{1}{4}$. Now if

$M_\#(f) = B_1 I_{(0, 1/2]} + B_2 I_{(1/2, 1]}$ then $\int_{\Omega} M_\#(f) I_{(0, 1/2]} d\mathbb{P} = B_1 \frac{1}{2}$

So $B_1 = \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2}$, and, similarly, $B_2 = \frac{\alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2}$.

Thus if $f = \sum_{l=1}^4 \alpha_l I_{(l-1/2, 1/2]}^{(l)}$ then $M(f) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) I_{(0, 1/2]} +$

$(\alpha_3 + \alpha_4) I_{(1/2, 1]}$. So the expectation is obtained

by averaging the values of f_2 over the sets \mathcal{F}_1 . Could this result be of a more general character?

Any f in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$ has the form $\sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \alpha_i I_{(\omega^{-1/2^n}, i/2^n)}$,

if M is the conditional expectation of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$ onto $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_m, \mathbb{P})$, where $m \leq n$, then knowing that

$$M(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{2^m} \beta_i I_{(\omega^{-1/2^m}, i/2^m)}$$

$$\int_{\Omega} M(f) I_{(\omega^{-1/2^m}, i/2^m)} d\mathbb{P} = \int_{\Omega} f I_{(\omega^{-1/2^m}, i/2^m)} d\mathbb{P}$$

$$\beta_i \frac{2^m}{2^n} = \alpha_{i \cdot 2^{n-m}} + \alpha_{(i-1) \cdot 2^{n-m} + 1} + \dots + \alpha_{i \cdot 2^{n-m} + 2^{n-m} - 1}$$

$$\left(\text{terms} \right) \frac{2^n}{2^n} + \dots + \frac{2^n}{2^n}$$

$$\text{So that } \beta_i = \frac{\alpha_{i \cdot 2^{n-m}} + \alpha_{(i-1) \cdot 2^{n-m} + 1} + \dots + \alpha_{i \cdot 2^{n-m} + 2^{n-m} - 1}}{2^{n-m}}$$

ie. β_i is the average of the values of f on \mathcal{F}_1 . This gives an alternative way of viewing conditional expectations, they arise from averaging processes.

Let us return now to the situation

(\mathcal{F}_n) is an increasing sequence of σ -fields on some

set, Ω , and \mathbb{P} is a probability measure on a σ -field $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n$. We will assume,

from this point on, that \mathcal{F} is the σ -field generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n$. One would hope that with this assumption we could get good approximation

of f . Certainly, if \mathcal{F} is very much larger than the σ -field generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_n$ we cannot expect that the sequence of conditional expectations will give a good approximation

to $f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, you can see this by "dyadic" considering the special case where \mathcal{F}_n is the "large" σ -field on $(0, 1]$, for $m < n$ and $n-m$ large enough "the average of the values of $f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$ on the sets in \mathcal{F}_m can be arranged to be quite large (try this as an exercise)".

Theorem (M2)

Let $f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Then

$$\|M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^f - f\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

INSERT

Proof

Note first of all that $\forall n \|M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^f\|_2 \leq \|f\|_2$

(M1!!!). Secondly, observe that, if $m < n$, then our lemma tells us that,

$$\langle M_{\mathcal{F}_m}^f, M_{\mathcal{F}_n}^f \rangle = \langle M_{\mathcal{F}_m}^f, M_{\mathcal{F}_m}^f \rangle = \|M_{\mathcal{F}_m}^f\|_2^2$$

Lemma (M2)

If $m \leq n$

then $M_m \circ M_n = M_n \circ M_m = M_m$

Proof

Let $k \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Since $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$ then

$M_n(M_m(f)) = M_m(f)$ because $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_m, \mathbb{P}) \subseteq L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$

and $M_n(v)$ holds, in short, $M_n(h) = h$ for $h \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_m, \mathbb{P})$

So $M_m \circ M_n = M_m$.
 Now, using $**$, (recall $**$ is $\langle Rx, y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle \forall y \in K$).

$$\langle M_m \circ M_n(f), k \rangle = \langle M_n(M_m(f)), k \rangle$$

$$= \langle f, k \rangle$$

$$= \langle M_m(f), k \rangle$$

again by $**$.

$$\text{So } M_m \circ M_n = M_m$$

Finally that $z = f$. To do this we will employ $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Let $z = \lim_n M_n^f(t)$. We show, conclude that $(M_n^f(t))$ is a Cauchy sequence in L^2 by $\|f\|^2$. So it is a Cauchy sequence. We

Now $(\|M_n^f(t)\|_2)$ is increasing and bounded above

$$= \|M_n^f(t)\|_2 - \|M_m^f(t)\|_2$$

$$\|M_n^f(t) - M_m^f(t)\|_2^2 = \langle M_n^f(t), M_n^f(t) \rangle - \langle M_m^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle$$

So then $\langle M_n^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle = \langle M_m^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle$. Hence,

$$= \langle M_n^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle \quad \text{by **}$$

$$= \langle M_m^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle \quad \text{by **}$$

Now $\langle M_n^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle = \langle M_m^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle$

$$= \langle M_n^f(t), M_n^f(t) \rangle + \langle M_m^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle - \langle M_n^f(t), M_m^f(t) \rangle - \langle M_m^f(t), M_n^f(t) \rangle$$

expanding we get,

$$\|M_n^f(t) - M_m^f(t)\|_2^2 = \langle M_n^f(t) - M_m^f(t), M_n^f(t) - M_m^f(t) \rangle$$

So $(\|M_n^f(t)\|_2)$ is an increasing sequence of real numbers.

In particular, if $g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

Hence $\langle M_{\mathbb{F}}^n(f), g \rangle \rightarrow \langle f, g \rangle$ for each $g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$

So, $f_n \rightarrow f$ then $\langle f_n, g \rangle \rightarrow \langle f, g \rangle \forall g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$

$\rightarrow \circ$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\|f - f_n\| \leq \|g\|$$

Then $|\langle f, g \rangle - \langle f_n, g \rangle| = |\langle f - f_n, g \rangle|$

one point only. Suppose $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

For $f, g \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We require this to make

or

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} fg \, d\mathbb{P} \right| \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |f|^2 \, d\mathbb{P} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |g|^2 \, d\mathbb{P} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \leq \|f\| \|g\|$$

This result generalises to

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i \right| \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |b_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

For real numbers a_1, \dots, a_n and b_1, \dots, b_n .

You have met this in the following form.