

Almost everywhere continuity of conditional expectations

Alberto Alonso ^{*,a} and Fernando Brambila-Paz ^{†,a}

^aDepartment of Mathematics, Faculty of Science - UNAM, Mexico

Abstract

A necessary and sufficient condition on a sequence $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of σ -subalgebras that assures convergence almost every where of conditional expectations is given.

Keywords:

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathcal{A} be a σ -algebra of a set \mathbb{X} with a probability measure μ . Given a sequence $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of σ -subalgebras of \mathcal{A} , it is a natural problem to establish conditions under which the conditional expectations converge almost everywhere. In [] we analyzed the case for a sequence to converge in L^p and provided necessary and sufficient conditions for that to happen. We defined two σ -subalgebras \mathcal{A}_μ and \mathcal{A}^\perp and proved that we have convergence in L^p if and only if $\mathcal{A}_\mu = \mathcal{A}^\perp$. We also established a chain of σ -subalgebras.

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{A}_\mu \subset \mathcal{A}^\perp \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}}.$$

where $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$ are the inferior and the superior limit of the σ -subalgebras $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. That is $\underline{\mathcal{A}} = \bigvee_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n$ and $\overline{\mathcal{A}} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n$. As a corollary we had convergence in L^p in the special case $\underline{\mathcal{A}} = \overline{\mathcal{A}}$ which was a result previously obtained by Fetter []. In that paper she pondered if, as in the case of monotone convergence of σ -algebras, we have also convergence a.e.. However, in [] a negative answer was provided by establishing a counterexample. In this paper we will analyze a chain of families of sets

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{w.a.e.} \subset \mathcal{A}_\mu \subset \mathcal{A}^\perp \subset \mathcal{A}^{\perp a.e.} \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}}.$$

We will show that we have a.e. convergence if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{w.a.e.} = \mathcal{A}^{\perp a.e.}$ provided that these two sets are σ -subalgebras.

2. PREVIOUS-WORKS

As usual, we will use the notation $\mathcal{E}(f|\mathcal{A})$ for the conditional expectation of f given the σ -algebra \mathcal{A} . Some well-known results for a.e.-convergence and L^p -convergence ($1 \leq p < \infty$) are :

Theorem 2.1. (Martingales). *If $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone increasing sequence of σ -subalgebras of \mathcal{A} , that is, $\mathcal{A}_n \subset \mathcal{A}_{n+1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathcal{A}_n) \xrightarrow[L^p]{a.e.} \mathcal{E}\left(f \left| \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n \right.\right),$$

*Email address: alonsoalber@gmail.com

†Email address: fernandobrambila@gmail.com

for every $f \in L^p(\mathfrak{A})$, where $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n$ stands for the minimum σ -algebra that contains $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n$. (Or if $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone decreasing, that is, $\mathfrak{A}_n \supset \mathfrak{A}_{n+1}$, then $\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow[L^p]{a.e.} \mathcal{E}(f|\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n)$).

In [1], Boylan introduced a Hausdorff metric of the space of σ -algebras. It gives us a relationship between Cauchy sequences of σ -subalgebras and L^p -convergence of conditional expectations.

Theorem 2.2. (Boylan, Equiconvergence). Let $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Cauchy sequence on the space of σ -algebras with the Hausdorff metric, that is,

$$d(\mathfrak{A}_n, \mathfrak{A}_m) = \sup_{A \in \mathfrak{A}_n} \left(\inf_{B \in \mathfrak{A}_m} \mu(A \Delta B) \right) + \sup_{B \in \mathfrak{A}_m} \left(\inf_{A \in \mathfrak{A}_n} \mu(A \Delta B) \right),$$

here $A \Delta B = (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$. There is a subalgebra \mathfrak{D} such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\mathfrak{A}_n, \mathfrak{D}) = 0,$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow[L^p]{} \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{D}),$$

for every $f \in L^p(\mathfrak{A})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$ (see [2,3]).

Another approach was given by Fetter([1]). She proved that if the lim sup of a sequence of σ -algebras coincides with the lim inf, then we have convergence in L^p . Indeed

Theorem 2.3. (Fetter). If $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\underline{\mathfrak{A}} = \overline{\mathfrak{A}}$ where

$$\underline{\mathfrak{A}} = \bigvee_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathfrak{A}} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n,$$

then

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow[L^p]{} \mathcal{E}(f|\overline{\mathfrak{A}}),$$

for every $f \in L^p(\mathfrak{A})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$ (see [1,4]).

Since the condition of the above theorem is fulfilled when we have monotone sequences of σ -algebras, Fetter's result implies that of the martingale theorem in the case of L^p convergence. However, we point out that in [4] it was proved that the condition $\underline{\mathfrak{A}} = \overline{\mathfrak{A}}$ does not imply convergence almost everywhere. Given a sequence $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of σ -algebras, two relevant σ -algebras were defined in [1]:

$$\mathfrak{A}_\mu = \left\{ A \in \mathfrak{A} : \exists A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n \Delta A) = 0 \right\},$$

and if

$$W = \left\{ g \in L^2(\mathfrak{A}) : \exists A_{n_k} \in \mathfrak{A}_{n_k}, \text{ with } \chi_{A_{n_k}} \xrightarrow{\text{weakly}} g \right\}$$

\mathfrak{A}_\perp was defined as the minimum complete σ -algebra such that g is \mathfrak{A}_\perp measurable for all $g \in W$. The importance of these σ -algebras is clear due to the following theorem:

Theorem 2.4. (Alonso-Brambila). Let $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that there is a σ -subalgebra \mathfrak{A}_∞ with the property that $\mathfrak{A}_n \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathfrak{A}_\infty$ and $\mathfrak{A}_n \perp \mathfrak{A}_\infty$. Then and only then

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{L^p(\mathfrak{A})} \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_\infty),$$

for every $f \in L^p(\mathfrak{A})$, $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Since these σ -algebras satisfy the relationship

$$\underline{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_\mu \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_\perp \subseteq \overline{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

We have that if $\underline{\mathfrak{A}} = \overline{\mathfrak{A}}$ Fetter's theorem becomes an immediate corollary.

Finally we point out that none of the theorems but theorem 2.1 deal with the problem of convergence a.e.

3. A SIGMA-SUBALGEBRA

In [5] it was introduced the concept for a sequence of σ -subalgebras $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}$ to μ -approach a σ -subalgebra \mathfrak{D} if for each $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ there were $A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ such that $\mu(A_n \Delta D) \rightarrow 0$. It was established that in such a case and only in that case we have for $f \in L^p(\mathfrak{D})$ ($1 \leq p < \infty$) that

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{L^p} \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{D}) = f.$$

It is clear that in order to have convergence a.e. we need to introduce a more stronger concept for sets in $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}$ to approach those of \mathfrak{D} .

As usual, in the following A^c will stand for $\mathbb{X} \setminus A$, χ_A for the characteristic function of a set A , $A \Delta B$ for the symmetric difference of the sets A and B , and $A = B$ a.e for $\mu(A \Delta B) = 0$.

We begin by first establishing the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathfrak{A}, \mu)$ a probability space with σ -algebra \mathfrak{A} and measure μ . If $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of elements in \mathfrak{A} and $A \in \mathfrak{A}$, the following statements are equivalent:

i) $\chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{a.e} \chi_A$.

ii) $A = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n \geq N} A_n = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n \geq N} A_n$ a.e.

iii) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N} (A_n \Delta A) \right) = 0$.

Proof. Notice that $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow \chi_A$ a.e implies that, for all $x \in \mathbb{X} \setminus M$, where M is a set of measure zero, there is an $N_x \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $n > N_x$

$$|\chi_{A_n}(x) - \chi_A(x)| < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (1)$$

To prove i) \rightarrow ii), we first take a look at the elements of $A \setminus M$. Since

$$|\chi_{A_n}(x) - \chi_A(x)| = |\chi_{A_n^c}(x) - \chi_{A^c}(x)|, \quad (2)$$

(1) and (2) tell us that for $n > N_x$ and $x \in A \setminus M$; $\chi_{A_n^c}(x) < 1/2$, and so $x \in A_n$. Therefore

$$A \setminus M \subset \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n > N} A_n.$$

Using the same argument for A^c we get

$$A^c \setminus M \subset \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n^c.$$

Thus

$$A \cup M \supset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n.$$

Since

$$\bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n \subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n,$$

we have

$$\left(\bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n \right) \cap M^c \subset A \cap M^c \subset \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n \subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n.$$

So

$$\left(\bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n \right) \cap M^c = \left(\bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n \right) \cap M^c = A \cap M^c.$$

Therefore $i \rightarrow ii$).

We will prove now that $iii) \rightarrow i$). Let

$$M = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} (A_n \Delta A).$$

Then, by hypothesis $\mu(M) = 0$. Now, as

$$M^c = \mathbb{X} \setminus M = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} (A_n \Delta A)^c.$$

if $x \in \mathbb{X} \setminus M$ there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$x \in \bigcap_{n>N} (A_n \Delta A)^c,$$

and hence $x \in (A_n \Delta A)^c$ for all $n > N$. That is

$$0 = \chi_{A_n \Delta A}(x) = |\chi_A(x) - \chi_{A_n}(x)| < \epsilon, \quad \text{for } n > N.$$

Finally, to prove that ii) implies iii), we notice that:

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n>N} (A_n \Delta A) \right) = \mu \left(\left(\bigcup_{n>N} A_n \right) \cap A^c \right) + \mu \left(\left(\bigcup_{n>N} A_n^c \right) \cap A \right).$$

Since by hypothesis

$$0 = \mu \left(A \Delta \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n \right) \geq \mu \left(A \setminus \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n \right) = \mu \left(A \cap \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n^c \right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(A \cap \bigcup_{n>N} A_n^c \right),$$

and

$$0 = \mu \left(A \Delta \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n \right) \geq \mu \left(\bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n \setminus A \right) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n>N} A_n \cap A^c \right),$$

we get

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n>N} (A_n \Delta A) \right) = 0$$

□

Given a sequence $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of σ -subalgebras of \mathfrak{A} we will define the family of sets \mathcal{F} as

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ A \in \mathfrak{A} : A = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n \text{ a.e. for a sequence } \{A_n\} \text{ such that } A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n \right\}.$$

We will prove that \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra. To do this we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *If for any $r > 0$ there is a sequence $\{A_n^r : A_n^r \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ and $N_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n>N_r} (A_n^r \Delta B) \right) < r,$$

then $B \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let $S_m = 1/2^m$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{Q_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ a strictly increasing sequence such that $Q_m \geq N_{S_m}$. As $Q_n \geq N_{S_m}$ we have

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n>Q_m} (A_n^{S_m} \Delta B) \right) \leq \mu \left(\bigcup_{n>N_{S_m}} (A_n^{S_m} \Delta B) \right) < S_m.$$

For $n > Q_1$ define the sequence $\{A_n\}$ by:

$$A_n = A_n^{S_k} \quad \text{if } Q_k < n \leq Q_{k+1},$$

since $A_n^{S_k} \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ so is A_n . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n>Q_m} (A_n \Delta B) \right) &= \mu \left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} \bigcup_{Q_k < n \leq Q_{k+1}} (A_n^{S_k} \Delta B) \right) \leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{Q_k < n \leq Q_{k+1}} (A_n^{S_k} \Delta B) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n>Q_k} (A_n^{S_k} \Delta B) \right) < \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} S_k = \frac{1}{2^{m-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N} (A_n \triangle B) \right) = 0.$$

The proof follows from lemma 3.1 □

We can now prove that \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra.

Proposition 3.3. \mathcal{F} is a σ -subalgebra of \mathcal{A}

Proof. It is clear that \emptyset, \mathbb{X} are elements of \mathcal{F} since we can take $A_n = \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or $A_n = \mathbb{X}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $A \in \mathcal{F}$, by Proposition 3.1 there are $\{A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ such that

$$\chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A.$$

Since $A_n^c \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ and

$$\chi_{A_n^c} = 1 - \chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} 1 - \chi_A = \chi_{A^c},$$

we have that $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$.

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$. By proposition 3.1 there are two sequences $\{A_n\}, \{B_n\}$, with $A_n, B_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow \chi_A$ *a.e.* and $\chi_{B_n} \rightarrow \chi_B$ *a.e.* Since $A_n \cap B_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ and $\chi_{A_n \cap B_n} = \chi_{A_n} \chi_{B_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A \chi_B = \chi_{A \cap B}$ we have that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$.

Thus \mathcal{F} is an algebra.

To show that it is a σ -algebra, let $B = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} D_k$ with $D_k \in \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is an algebra, we can consider the sets $\{D_k\}$ disjoint.

Define $E_M = \bigcup_{k=1}^M D_k$ and let $r > 0$. Since the sets D_k are disjoint, there is an $M_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{k > M_1} D_k \right) < \frac{r}{2}.$$

On the other hand, since $E_{M_1} \in \mathcal{F}$. There is a sequence $\{A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N} (A_n \triangle E_{M_1}) \right) = 0.$$

Therefore, there is an $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (A_n \triangle E_{M_1}) \right) < r/2$.

As $E_{M_1} \subset B$, $A_n \setminus B \subset A_n \setminus E_{M_1}$. So

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} A_n \setminus B \right) \leq \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (A_n \setminus E_{M_1}) \right) \leq \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (A_n \triangle E_{M_1}) \right) < \frac{r}{2}.$$

Also, as B is the union of the disjoint sets E_{M_1} and $\bigcup_{k > M_1} D_k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (B \setminus A_n) \right) &= \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (E_{M_1} \setminus A_n) \right) + \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} \left(\bigcup_{k > M_1} D_k \right) \setminus A_n \right) \\ &\leq \mu \left(\bigcup_{k > N_1} (E_{M_1} \triangle A_n) \right) + \mu \left(\bigcup_{k > M_1} D_k \right) < \frac{r}{2} + \frac{r}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (A_n \triangle B) \right) < r$.

So, by lemma 3.2 B is in \mathcal{F} . □

Given a sequence of σ -subalgebras of \mathfrak{A} in [5] we found for the σ -algebra \mathfrak{A}_μ defined by

$$\mathfrak{A}_\mu = \left\{ A \in \mathfrak{A} : \exists A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A_n \Delta A) = 0 \right\},$$

the relationships

$$\bigvee_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n \equiv \underline{\mathfrak{A}} \subset \mathfrak{A}_\mu \subset \overline{\mathfrak{A}} \equiv \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n.$$

It is clear by its definition that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathfrak{A}_\mu$. Now, let $A \in \bigcap_{n=N}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n$, take $A_n = A$ for $n > N$, then trivially $\chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A$ and thus $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is a σ -algebra, we have

$$\mathcal{F} \supset \bigvee_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=N}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n.$$

Therefore

$$\underline{\mathfrak{A}} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathfrak{A}_\mu \subset \overline{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

What we have proven is that given a sequence of σ -algebras $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}$, if A is a set \mathcal{F} measurable, there are f_n functions \mathfrak{A}_n measurable such that $f_n \rightarrow \chi_A$ *a.e.* However that does not imply that $\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \rightarrow \chi_A$ *a.e.* even when the conditional expectations do so in L^p ($1 \leq p < \infty$).

In the example shown in [4] we have the property that $\underline{\mathfrak{A}} = \overline{\mathfrak{A}}$ and hence $\underline{\mathfrak{A}} = \mathcal{F}$, and a Borel set for which the conditional expectations do not converge *a.e.* to its characteristic function. Let us show an easier example for which the conditional expectations for a characteristic function in \mathcal{F} do not converge *a.e.* but they do so in L^p ($1 \leq p < \infty$).

Let $\mathbb{X} = [0, 1]$ and \mathfrak{A} the Lebesgue measurable sets. We are going to define a sequence $\{A_n\}$ that lie in $\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)$ and such that $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow \chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)}$ *a.e.* $\{J_k\}$ will be a sequence that lies in $\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right) \setminus A_n$ but with measure half its size Specifically

$$A_n = \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \right), \quad J_n = \left[1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}, 1 \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

On $\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ define a sequence of intervals that go back and forth in the interval and in each turn diminishing its size

$$I_{n,k} = \left[\frac{k}{4 \cdot 2^n}, \frac{k+1}{4 \cdot 2^n} \right) \quad \text{with } 0 \leq k < 2 \cdot 2^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We have that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\bigcup_{k=0}^{2 \cdot 2^n - 1} I_{n,k} = \left[0, \frac{1}{2} \right).$$

Let $B_{n,k} = I_{n,k} \cup J_n$ and $C_{n,k} = (A_n \cup B_{n,k})^c = A_n^c \cap B_{n,k}^c$. Consider the sequence of σ -subalgebras

$$\mathfrak{A}_{n,k} = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{X}, A_n, B_{n,k}, C_{n,k}\},$$

Since

$$\mathcal{E}\left(\chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)} \middle| \mathfrak{A}_{n,k}\right) = \frac{\langle \chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)}, \chi_{A_n} \rangle}{\mu(A_n)} \chi_{A_n} + \frac{\langle \chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)}, \chi_{B_{n,k}} \rangle}{\mu(B_{n,k})} \chi_{B_{n,k}} + \frac{\langle \chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)}, \chi_{C_{n,k}} \rangle}{\mu(C_{n,k})} \chi_{C_{n,k}},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}\left(\chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)} \middle| \mathfrak{A}_{n,k}\right) &= \chi_{A_n} + \frac{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}{\frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} \chi_{B_{n,k}} + \frac{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{n+2}}} \chi_{C_{n,k}} \\ &= \chi_{A_n} + \frac{2}{3} \chi_{B_{n,k}} + \frac{2}{1 + 2^{n+1}} \chi_{C_{n,k}} \\ &= \chi_{A_n} + \frac{2}{3} \chi_{I_{n,k}} + \frac{2}{3} \chi_{J_n} + \frac{2}{1 + 2^{n+1}} \chi_{C_{n,k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\chi_{A_n} \rightarrow \chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)}$ a.e., $\frac{2}{3} \chi_{J_n} \rightarrow 0$ a.e. and $\frac{2}{1 + 2^{n+1}} \chi_{C_{n,k}} \rightarrow 0$ a.e. but $\frac{2}{3} \chi_{I_{n,k}}$ does not convergence a.e., we have that $\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right) \in \mathcal{F}$ but $\mathcal{E}\left(\chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)} \middle| \mathfrak{A}_{n,k}\right) \not\rightarrow \chi_{\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right)}$ a.e.

4. NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR ALMOST EVERYWHERE CONVERGENCE.

4.1. ON ALMOST EVERYWHERE CONVERGENCE OF CHARACTERISTICS FUNCTIONS

Let \mathfrak{B} be a σ -subalgebra of \mathfrak{A} .

Definition 4.1. Define the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{B}}$ for $f \in L^\infty(d\mu)$ as

$$\|f\|_{\mathfrak{B}} = \|\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{B})\|_{\infty}.$$

In the following we are going to use the notation $\|A\|_{\mathfrak{B}} = \|\chi_A\|_{\mathfrak{B}}$ for any set $A \in \mathfrak{A}$. We have the property

Lemma 4.2. Let A be a measurable set in \mathfrak{A} and χ_A its characteristic function. Then

$$\|A\|_{\mathfrak{B}} = \|\chi_A\|_{\mathfrak{B}} = \sup_{\substack{B \in \mathfrak{B} \\ \mu(B) > 0}} \frac{\mu(A \cap B)}{\mu(B)}.$$

Proof. Let $B \in \mathfrak{B}$. We have then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A \cap B) &= \int \chi_{A \cap B} d\mu = \int \chi_A \chi_B d\mu \\ &= \int \mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B}) \chi_B d\mu \leq \|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_{\infty} \mu(B). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $\mu(B) > 0$

$$\frac{\mu(A \cap B)}{\mu(B)} \leq \|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_{\infty}.$$

Since the case $\|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_{\infty} = 0$ is trivial, take any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_{\infty} - \varepsilon > 0.$$

By definition the set

$$C = \{x : \mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B}) > \|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_\infty - \varepsilon\}$$

is \mathfrak{B} -measurable and

$$\int_C \mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B}) d\mu \geq (\|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_\infty - \varepsilon) \mu(C).$$

as

$$\int_C \mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B}) d\mu = \int \chi_C \mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B}) d\mu = \int \chi_C \chi_A d\mu = \mu(C \cap A),$$

we have then

$$\frac{\mu(C \cap A)}{\mu(C)} \geq \|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A|\mathfrak{B})\|_\infty - \varepsilon.$$

□

Definition 4.3. We say that $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ is uniformly covered by the sequence of σ -subalgebras $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if there is a sequence $\{A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$i) A = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n \geq N} A_n = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n \geq N} A_n.$$

$$ii) \|\chi_{A \setminus A_n}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next lemma shows that actually, we can relax a little bit condition *ii*).

Lemma 4.4. A is uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ if and only if for any $r > 0$ there is a sequence $\{A_n^r\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $A_n^r \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ and $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$i) A = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n > N} A_n^r = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n > N} A_n^r.$$

$$ii) \|A \setminus A_n^r\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} < r \text{ if } n > M_r.$$

Proof. By lemma 3.1 the condition *i*) means that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N} (A \Delta A_n^r) \right) = 0.$$

Thus, for $r = 1$ let $N_1 > M_1$ and such that

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n > N_1} (A \Delta A_n^r) \right) < 1$$

In general let $r_k = 2^{-k}$ and \tilde{N}_k such that

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{n > \tilde{N}_k} (A \Delta A_n^k) \right) < r_k,$$

and N'_k such that

$$\|A \setminus A_n^{r_k}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} < r_k \quad \text{for } n > N'_k.$$

It is clear that we can define a strictly increasing sequence N_k such that $N_k > \max(\tilde{N}_k, N'_k)$. Define $A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ as $A_n^{r_k}$ if $N_k \leq n \leq N_{k+1}$. Then

$$\|A \setminus A_n\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} = \|A \setminus A_n^{r_k}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} < \frac{1}{2^k},$$

we also have

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n \geq \tilde{N}_{k'}} (A \Delta A_n)\right) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{k=k'}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\tilde{N}_k \leq n < \tilde{N}_{k+1}} (A \Delta A_n)\right) \leq \sum_{k=k'}^{\infty} \mu\left(\bigcup_{\tilde{N}_k \leq n < \tilde{N}_{k+1}} A \Delta A_n^{r_k}\right) < \sum_{k=k'}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} = \frac{1}{2^{k'-1}}.$$

Therefore since $\mu(\bigcup_{n > N} A \Delta A_n)$ is monotone

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \geq N} A \Delta A_n\right) = 0. \quad (3)$$

and thus finally

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|A \setminus A_n\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} = 0. \quad \square$$

We are going to say that a sequence of sets $\{A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ uniformly covers a set $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ if conditions *i*) and *ii*) of definition XXX are satisfied. A couple of results regarding uniform covering are:

Lemma 4.5. *If $\{A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ uniformly covers a set $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $\{A'_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ is such that $A_n \subset A'_n$ for all $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\chi_{A'_n} \rightarrow \chi_A$ a.e. then it uniformly covers A .*

Proof. The proof is trivial since for $0 \leq f \leq g$, and \mathfrak{B} σ -subalgebra $\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{B}) \leq \mathcal{E}(g|\mathfrak{B})$ and so, as $A \setminus A'_n \subset A \setminus A_n$,

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A'_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \leq \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.6. *If A and B are sets in \mathfrak{A} uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then so are $A \cup B$ and $A \cap B$.*

Proof. Let $A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ and $B_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ sequences of sets that uniformly cover A and B respectively. Consider first the sequence $C_n = A_n \cap B_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$. Since by property *i*) of the definition of uniform covering we have that $\chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A$ and $\chi_{B_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_B$:

$$\chi_{A_n \cap B_n} = \chi_{A_n} \chi_{B_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A \chi_B = \chi_{A \cap B}$$

We have also that

$$A \cap B \setminus (A_n \cap B_n) = A \cap B \cap (A_n^c \cup B_n^c) \subset (A \cap A_n^c) \cup (B \cap B_n^c)$$

Therefore

$$\|A \cap B \setminus (A_n \cap B_n)\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} \leq \|(A \cap A_n^c) \cup (B \cap B_n^c)\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} \leq \|A \cap A_n^c\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} + \|B \cap B_n^c\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e.}$$

For the case of the union of two sets we have

$$\chi_{A_n \cup B_n} = \chi_{A_n} + \chi_{B_n} - \chi_{A_n} \chi_{B_n} \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A + \chi_B - \chi_A \chi_B = \chi_{A \cup B}$$

and

$$(A \cup B) \setminus (A_n \cup B_n) = (A \cup B) \cap (A_n^c \cap B_n^c) \subset (A \cap A_n^c) \cup (B \cap B_n^c) \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.7. *If A is uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then*

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n))(x) \leq \chi_A(x) \text{ a.e.}$$

Proof. Let $\{A_n\}$ be a sequence with the properties of **Definition 4.8**. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) &= \mathcal{E}(\chi_A \chi_{A_n} + \chi_A \chi_{A_n^c} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \\ &= \chi_{A_n} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) + \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \\ &\leq \chi_{A_n} + \|\chi_{A \setminus A_n}\|_{\mathfrak{A}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

as A is uniformly covered by the sequence $\{A_n\}$ then *i*) of **Definition 4.8** implies that

$$\chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A.$$

So

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \leq \chi_A \text{ a.e.}$$

□

xxx222

In view of the proof we can actually relax somewhat the condition of uniformly covering to get a similar result.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of σ -subalgebras. If $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ is such that there is a sequence $\{A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying*

$$i) A = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n \geq N} A_n = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n \geq N} A_n.$$

$$ii) \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.e. as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n))(x) \leq \chi_A(x) \text{ a.e.}$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as the one of the above lemma.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) &= \mathcal{E}(\chi_A \chi_{A_n} + \chi_A \chi_{A_n^c} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \\ &= \chi_{A_n} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) + \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \\ &\leq \chi_{A_n} + \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Notice that if A is uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}$ the conditions of lemma 4.8xx are satisfied.

The interesting case occurs when both A and A^c are uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}$ or satisfy the conditions of the above lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *If $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ is such that A and A^c are uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}$ (or satisfy the conditions of lemma 4.9x) then*

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A^c} | \mathfrak{A}_n) &= \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(1 - \chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \\ &= \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n)) \\ &= 1 - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n).\end{aligned}$$

Since A^c is uniformly covered

$$\chi_{A^c} = 1 - \chi_A \geq 1 - \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n),$$

and so

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \geq \chi_A \text{ a.e.}$$

finally, as A is uniformly covered

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \leq \chi_A \leq \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \text{ a.e.}$$

And then

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A.$$

□

Now the necessary lemma for *a.e.* convergence of characteristic functions.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $A \in \mathfrak{A}$ and $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ σ -subalgebras such that*

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A.$$

Then A and A^c are uniformly covered by $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. Let $0 < r < 1$. Define $A_n \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ as

$$A_n = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n)(x) \geq r\},$$

since $\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A$. We have that

$$\chi_{A_n} \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A,$$

and therefore

$$A = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n.$$

It is also clear that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\leq \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n) = \mathcal{E}(\chi_A \chi_{A_n^c} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \\ &= \chi_{A_n^c} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) < \chi_{A_n^c} r \leq r.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\|\mathcal{E}(\chi_{A \setminus A_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n)\|_{\infty} \leq r$ and by the above lemma A is uniformly covered.

Since $\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_A$ implies that $\mathcal{E}(\chi_{A^c} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.e.}} \chi_{A^c}$, we have that A^c is also uniformly covered.

□

From **Lemma 4.9** and **Lemma 4.10** we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of σ -algebras and let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathcal{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_A,$$

if and only if A and A^c are uniformly covered by $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

In view of the above theorem it is clear that it is convenient to establish the following definition.

Definition 4.12. *Define $\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ as*

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.} = \{A \in \mathcal{A} : A \text{ and } A^c \text{ are uniformly covered by } \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\}$$

Before we proceed we observe that if $\{A_n \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$ is a sequence of sets that uniformly covers A and $\{C_n \in \mathcal{A}_n\}$ is a sequence of sets that uniformly covers A^c , the sequence $A_n \cup C_n$ uniformly covers A and A^c .

We have then that $\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ is an algebra of sets. XXXX No de hecho necesitamos que complemento este. Si ese es el caso si pero ¿por que?

Notice that if $\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ is σ -subalgebra then

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mu} \subset \mathcal{A}^{\perp} \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Lemma 4.13. *If $\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ is σ -subalgebra then*

i) $f \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.})$ we have that

$$\mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} \mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}) = f.$$

ii) If there is a σ -subalgebra \mathcal{B} such that for all $f \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.})$

$$\mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} \mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{B}) \text{ then } \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}.$$

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$. As $f \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.})$, there is a simple function g , $\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ -measurable such that $\|f - g\|_{\infty} < \epsilon/2$. It is clear that **Lemma 4.10** implies that $\mathcal{E}(g | \mathcal{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} g$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_n) - f|(x) &\leq |\mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_n) - \mathcal{E}(g | \mathcal{A}_n)|(x) + |\mathcal{E}(g | \mathcal{A}_n) - g|(x) + |g - f|(x) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{E}(f - g | \mathcal{A}_n)|(x) + |\mathcal{E}(g | \mathcal{A}_n) - g|(x) + \|g - f\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \epsilon + |\mathcal{E}(g | \mathcal{A}_n) - g|(x). \end{aligned}$$

So $\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_n) - f|(x) \leq \epsilon$ a.e. for every ϵ and therefore $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(f | \mathcal{A}_n) = f$ a.e.

To prove *ii)*, let $A \in \mathcal{B}$. By hypothesis $\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathcal{A}_n) \rightarrow \chi_A$ a.e..

For $0 < \epsilon < 1$ define $A_n = \{x : \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathcal{A}_n) > \epsilon\} \in \mathcal{A}_n$.

Since for almost all $x \in A$, $\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathcal{A}_n)(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$, $x \in A_n$ for n big enough. So $\chi_A(x) \chi_{A_n}(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \chi_A(x)$ a.e.. The case for A^c is similar. In this case, for almost all $x \notin A$, $\mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathcal{A}_n)(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Hence $x \notin A_n$ for n big enough. Thus $\chi_{A^c}(x) \chi_{A_n}(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ a.e.. And thus $\chi_{A_n}(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \chi_A(x)$ a.e..

$$A = \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n>N} A_n = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n>N} A_n.$$

we also have

$$\|A \setminus A_n\|_{\mathcal{A}_n} = \|\mathcal{E}(\chi_A \chi_{A_n^c} | \mathcal{A}_n)\|_{\infty} = \|\chi_{A_n^c} \mathcal{E}(\chi_A | \mathcal{A}_n)\|_{\infty} < \epsilon \|\chi_{A_n^c}\|_{\infty} < \epsilon.$$

And so by **Lemma 3.2** A is uniformly covered by $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}$. □

We can improve the above lemma by considering functions in L^p .

Lemma 4.14. *If $\mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ is σ -subalgebra and $1 \leq p < \infty$ then for all $f \in L^2(\mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.})$ we have that*

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} \mathcal{E}(f|\mathcal{A}_{\mu.a.e.}) = f.$$

How do the above results look in the case of \mathfrak{A}_n are monotone?. In the case we have a monotone decreasing sequence of σ -subalgebras it is clear that $\mathfrak{A}_N = \bigvee_{n=N}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n$ and that for any N , $\bigcap_{n=N}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n$. Therefore

$$\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n = \underline{\mathfrak{A}} \subset \mathcal{F} \subset \overline{\mathfrak{A}} \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{A}_n$$

So if $A \in \mathcal{F}$ the sequence $A_n = A \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ and trivially uniformly covers A .

XXXXXX falta la demostracion

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

4.2. NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS TO HAVE

In [4.x] we defined a σ -subalgebra \mathfrak{A}^\perp by first considering the set W

$$W = \left\{ g \in L^2(\mathfrak{A}) : \exists A_{n_k} \in \mathfrak{A}_{n_k} \text{ with } \chi_{A_{n_k}} \xrightarrow{L^2\text{-weakly}} g \right\},$$

\mathfrak{A}_\perp was defined as the minimum σ -algebra generated by W . We are going to do something similar. First we notice the obvious fact $\chi_{A_n} = \mathcal{E}(\chi_{A_n}|\mathfrak{A}_n)$. Define then, given a sequence $\{\mathfrak{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ σ -subalgebras, the set

$$C_N = \left\{ h \in L^1(\mu) : h = \sum_{k \geq N} \mathcal{E}(\chi_{B_k}|\mathfrak{A}_k), B_k \in \mathfrak{A}, \text{ disjoint, and such that there are only finite many of such } B'_k \text{'s} \right\}.$$

Notice that if $h \in C_N$

$$\|h\|_1 = \int \sum_{n \geq N} \mathcal{E}(\chi_{B_n}|\mathfrak{A}_n) d\mu = \sum_{n \geq N} \mu(B_n) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n \geq N} B_n\right) \leq 1.$$

XXX""""XXX""""

We will define

Definition 4.15.

$$W^{\perp a.e.} = \left\{ f \in L^\infty(\mu) : \text{for every subsequence } \{h_{N_k}\}, h_{N_k} \in C_{N_k}, \langle f, h_{N_k} \rangle \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0 \right\}.$$

Theorem 4.16. *If $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$ then*

$$\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} 0, \tag{4}$$

if and only if $f \in W^{\perp a.e.}$.

Proof. \Rightarrow) Let $f \in L^\infty(\mu)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$. First, notice that if $h \in C_N$ we have

$$\langle h, f \rangle = \sum_{n \geq N} \langle \mathcal{E}(\chi_{B_n}, \mathfrak{A}_n), f \rangle = \sum_{n \geq N} \langle \chi_{B_n}, \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \rangle.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $\mathcal{E}(f, \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} 0$, Egoroff's theorem implies that there is a set M_ϵ and $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \geq N_1$

$$\mu(M_\epsilon^c) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\chi_{M_\epsilon} \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n)\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Thus if $N > N_1$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle h_N, f \rangle| &= \left| \sum_{n \geq N} \langle \chi_{B_n}, \mathcal{E}(f, \mathfrak{A}_n) \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{n \geq N} \left(\left| \langle \chi_{B_n}, \chi_{M_\epsilon} \mathcal{E}(f, \mathfrak{A}_n) \rangle \right| + \left| \langle \chi_{B_n} \chi_{M_\epsilon^c}, \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \rangle \right| \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \sum_{n \geq N} \langle \chi_{B_n}, \chi_{M_\epsilon} \rangle + \sum_{n \geq N} \|\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n)\|_\infty \|\chi_{B_n} \chi_{M_\epsilon^c}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \mu(M_\epsilon) + \|f\|_\infty \mu(M_\epsilon^c) \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

thus $\langle h_N, f \rangle \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 0$.

(\Leftarrow) To prove the theorem in the other direction first we notice that since we can take f or $-f$, without loss of generality we can assume that there is an ϵ such that

$$\mu \left(\bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n \geq N} \{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n)(x) \geq \epsilon\} \right) > 0.$$

That is, there is an $r > 0$ such that for any N there is an M with

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{N \leq n < M} \{x \in \mathbb{X} : \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n)(x) \geq \epsilon\} \right) > r.$$

Let $A_n = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : |\mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n)(x)| > \epsilon\}$ and as usual

$$B_N = A_N, \quad B_k = A_k \setminus \bigcup_{j=N}^{k-1} B_j \quad \text{for } N < k < M, \quad (5)$$

$\{B_k\}$ is a disjoint family and

$$\bigcup_{N \leq n < M} B_n = \bigcup_{N \leq n < M} A_n.$$

Let

$$h_N = \sum_{N \leq n < M} \mathcal{E}(\chi_{B_n} | \mathfrak{A}_n),$$

we have that

$$\langle h_N, f \rangle = \sum_{N \leq n < M} \langle \chi_{B_n}, \mathcal{E}(f|\mathfrak{A}_n) \rangle > \epsilon \sum_{N \leq n < M} \mu(\chi_{B_n}) = \epsilon \mu \left(\bigcup_{N \leq n < M} B_n \right) > \epsilon r.$$

We have then constructed a sequence $\{h_N\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all N , $\langle h_N, f \rangle > \epsilon r$. Therefore $f \notin W^{\perp a.e.}$ □

In XXX we defined the orthogonal conditional expectation induced by \mathbb{D} as the operator $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} = I - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}$, which in $L^2(\mathcal{A})$ is the orthogonal projection $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} : L^2(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{B})^{\perp}$. Let \mathbb{D} be the following family of σ -subalgebras

$$\mathbb{D} = \left\{ \mathbb{B} \in \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} f \in W^{\perp a.e.} \text{ for all } f \in L^{\infty}(\mathcal{A}) \right\}$$

It is clear that \mathbb{D} is not empty since it trivially contains \mathcal{A} .
An immediate property is the following.

Proposition 4.17. *Let \mathcal{C}, \mathbb{B} be two σ -subalgebras. If $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{B} \supset \mathcal{C}$, then $\mathbb{B} \in \mathbb{D}$*

Proof. Notice that in this case $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\perp} \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp}$. So, as f in L^{∞} implies that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} f$ is also in L^{∞} ,

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} f = \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\perp} (\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp} f) \in W^{\perp a.e.}$$

□

Definition 4.18. \mathcal{A}_{min} will be the minimum complete σ -subalgebra such that contains the set

$$\tilde{W} = \left\{ g \in L^2(\mathcal{A}) : \text{there is } \{h_{N_k}\}, h_{N_k} \in C_{N_k} \text{ such that } h_{N_k} \xrightarrow{w} g \text{ weakly in } L^2 \right\}$$

Lemma 4.19. *If $\mathbb{B} \in \mathbb{D}$ then $\mathcal{A}_{min} \subset \mathbb{B}$.*

Proof. Let $g \in \tilde{W}$ and $h_N \in C_N$ such that $h_N \xrightarrow{w} g$. Since \mathbb{B} is in \mathbb{D} we have that for all f in $L^p \cap L^{\infty}$

$$\langle f, \mathcal{E}(g|\mathbb{B}) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{E}(f|\mathbb{B}), g \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathcal{E}(f|\mathbb{B}), h_N \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle (I - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp})f, h_N \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, (I - \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{B}}^{\perp})h_N \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle f, h_N \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle$$

Therefore g is equal almost everywhere to $\mathcal{E}(g|\mathbb{B})$ and so is \mathbb{B} measurable. Since by definition \mathcal{A}_{min} is the minimum σ -subalgebra such that makes all such g measurable so $\mathcal{A}_{min} \subset \mathbb{B}$. □

Definition 4.20. *We will call the sequence $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ 2-bounded if for all h_N in C_N $\sup \|h_N\|_2 < \infty$.*

Lemma 4.21. *If $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ is 2-bounded and \mathbb{B} is a σ -subalgebra, then $\mathbb{B} \in \mathbb{D}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{min} \subset \mathbb{B}$.*

Proof. In view of lemma xxx we only need to prove the assertion in the sense (\Leftarrow) Assume $\mathcal{A}_{min} \subset \mathbb{B}$ and suppose that \mathcal{A}_{min} is not in \mathbb{D} . That means that there is an $f \in L^{\infty}$ such that its orthogonal projection with respect to \mathcal{A}_{min} is not in $W^{\perp a.e.}$. That is, there is a sequence $\{h_N \in C_N\}$ such that $\langle f, h_N \rangle$ does not converge to zero. Hence, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ and a subsequence $\{h_{N_k}\}$ such that $\left| \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_{min}}^{\perp} f, h_{N_k} \rangle \right| > \epsilon$. By hypothesis the sequence of σ -subalgebras is 2-bounded, so there is a subsequence, which we still denote by h_{N_k} , that weakly converges to an h in L^2 . By definition h is in \tilde{W} and therefore is \mathcal{A}_{min} measurable. But that leads us to a contradiction since $0 < \epsilon < \left| \langle \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_{min}}^{\perp} f, h \rangle \right| = \left| \langle f, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_{min}}^{\perp} h \rangle \right| = 0$.

Of course the 2-boundedness condition is a very strong restriction. In the following we will show that the main property is the fact that \mathbb{D} has a minimum σ -subalgebra. In those cases we will denote that minimum by $\mathcal{A}_{\perp a.e.}$. Of course in the case the sequence is 2-bounded $\mathcal{A}_{\perp a.e.} = \mathcal{A}_{min}$

□

HOoooooooooooooooooLA XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

4.3. NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS TO HAVE CONVERGENCE A.E.

Theorem 4.22. *If $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}$ is a sequence of σ -subalgebras such that*

- i)
- ii)

for all $f \in L^{\infty}$, $\mathcal{E}(f|\mathcal{A}_n)$ converges a.e. then $\mathcal{A}_{\mu a.e.}$ is a σ -subalgebra, \mathbb{D} has a minimum σ -subalgebra and $\mathcal{A}_{\mu a.e.} = \mathcal{A}_{\perp a.e.}$

Proof. By definition $\mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.} = \{A \in \mathfrak{A} \mid A \text{ and } A^c \text{ are uniformly covered}\}$ Let us recall that for xxx $\mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ is an algebra. Thus, in order to prove that is a σ -subalgebra we need only to check that if we have a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets $\{B_k\}$, with $B_k \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$, then $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k \in \mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$.

In view of theorem 4.11, we need to prove that $\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k}$. Now, since the B_k are in $\mathfrak{A}_{\mu.a.e.}$ for any natural M we have

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \geq \mathcal{E}(\chi_{\cup_{k=1}^M B_k} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^M B_k}$$

By hypothesis, the conditional expectations converge almost everywhere for any $f \in L^{\infty}$. Therefore there is a $g \in L^{\infty}$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} | \mathfrak{A}_n) \xrightarrow{a.e.} g$$

and thus $g \geq \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^M B_k}$. Since this is true for any M, we conclude that $g \geq \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k}$.

Using the dominated convergence theorem we have that

$$0 \leq \langle 1, g - \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} \rangle = \lim \langle 1, \mathcal{E}(\chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} | \mathfrak{A}_n) - \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} \rangle = \mu(\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k) - \mu(\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k) = 0$$

$$0 \leq \int g - \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} d\mu = \lim \int \mathcal{E}(\chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} | \mathfrak{A}_n) - \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k} d\mu = \mu(\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k) - \mu(\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k) = 0$$

And hence $g = \chi_{\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k}$ a.e..

□