

ON CONDITIONAL MEDIANS¹

BY R. J. TOMKINS

University of Regina

This article examines the properties of conditional medians, especially vis-à-vis those of conditional expectations.

1. Introduction. While the notion of a conditional median has been defined (see Loève (1963) page 385) and employed (for example, see Csörgö (1970) page 316), the literature does not appear to contain an *exposition* of the properties of conditional medians. This paper aims to present such an exposition.

Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space and let \mathcal{G}_0 be the trivial sigma-field. Let R represent the set of real numbers and let $I(A)$ denote the indicator function of an event $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

DEFINITION. Let X be a random variable (rv) and let \mathcal{G} be a sigma-field with $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. An rv M is called a *conditional median* (CM) of X with respect to \mathcal{G} if and only if

(CM1) M is \mathcal{G} -measurable, and

(CM2) $P(X \geq M | \mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \leq P(X \leq M | \mathcal{G})$ almost surely (a.s.).

A conditional median M shall be denoted by $\mu(X | \mathcal{G})$.

It seems natural to say that a CM M is *unique* if, given any other CM M^* , we have $M = M^*$ a.s. Note that $\mu(X | \mathcal{G}_0)$ is just a usual (constant) median of X which is, of course, not necessarily unique; it is easy to concoct examples to show that this is also the case when \mathcal{G} is not trivial. Hence, inequalities and equalities involving CM's will be carefully explained.

Loève ((1963) page 385) has defined M to be a CM of X if and only if (CM2) holds. Thus our definition is tougher.

Note that if ϕ is any strictly monotone function on R and if M is any CM of X , then $\phi(M)$ is a CM of $\phi(X)$.

THEOREM 1. *Let \mathcal{G} be a sigma-field. Then every rv X has a CM with respect to \mathcal{G} .*

PROOF. Assume that $P(X \leq x | \mathcal{G})(\omega)$, where $x \in R$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, is a regular conditional distribution function for X given \mathcal{G} (cf. Ash (1972) page 263). For each $\omega \in \Omega$, define $M(\omega) \equiv \inf \{x \in R : P(X \leq x | \mathcal{G})(\omega) > \frac{1}{2}\}$. Clearly M is a rv and (CM1) holds. Moreover, for any (fixed) positive integer n , and any

Received November 9, 1973; revised June 14, 1974.

¹ This work was supported by a grant from the National Research Council of Canada.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 60A05, 60E05; Secondary 60F99.

Key words and phrases. Conditional median, Jensen's inequality.

integer k ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X < M - n^{-1} | \mathcal{G}) &\leq P(X \leq (k - 1)/n | \mathcal{G}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \leq P(X \leq k/n | \mathcal{G}) \leq P(X \leq M + n^{-1} | \mathcal{G}) \end{aligned}$$

a.s. on the event $[k - 1 < nM \leq k]$. Hence $P(X \leq M + n^{-1} | \mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. and $P(X \geq M - n^{-1} | \mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. for all $n \geq 1$. (CM2) now follows readily from the monotone convergence theorem for conditional expectations (Loève, page 348). \square

REMARK. Our definition of CM can be shown to be equivalent to that of Brunk and Johansen (1970) so that Theorem 1 is a consequence of their Theorem 1.5. Theorem 1 may also be obtained by proving it first for simple rv and then employing Lemma 1 (below) twice.

2. Some properties of conditional medians. Since conditional medians are measures of central tendency in their own right, it behooves us to examine their properties in light of the well-known traits of conditional expectations. We will commence such an examination with a convergence lemma.

LEMMA 1. *Let \mathcal{G} be a sigma-field. Let $\{X_n\}, \{M_n\}, n \geq 1$, be sequences of rv such that*

- (a) M_n is a CM of X_n with respect to \mathcal{G} , and
- (b) rv X, M exist such that $X_n \rightarrow X$ in probability (i.p.) and $M_n \rightarrow M$ i.p.

Then M is a CM of X with respect to \mathcal{G} .

PROOF. Note first that M is \mathcal{G} -measurable. To start with, assume $X_n \rightarrow X$ a.s. and $M_n \rightarrow M$ a.s. Clearly $I(X \geq M) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(X_n \geq M_n)$ a.s. Hence, by Fatou's lemma for conditional expectations (Loève, page 348), $\frac{1}{2} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(X_n \geq M_n | \mathcal{G}) \leq P(X \geq M | \mathcal{G})$ a.s. Similarly $P(X \leq M | \mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. Finally, if (b) holds, a subsequence $\{n_k\} \uparrow \infty$ exists satisfying $X_{n_k} \rightarrow X$ a.s. and $M_{n_k} \rightarrow M$ a.s. so that the preceding argument applies. \square

REMARK 1. Lemma 1 remains true if (b) is replaced by the weaker condition (b'): $P(\cdot | \mathcal{G})$ is a regular conditional probability, $M_n \rightarrow M$ i.p., and an event $C \in \mathcal{F}$ exists such that $P(C) = 1$ and, for each $\omega \in C$, the distributions $P(X_n \leq x | \mathcal{G})(\omega)$ converge completely to $P(X \leq x | \mathcal{G})(\omega)$. This follows, by Exercise 2 on page 214 of Loève.

REMARK 2. It is worthy of note that, even when $X_n \rightarrow X$ a.s., it is not necessary that a sequence of respective CM's $\{M_n\}$ exists and converges to a CM of X . For example, let Y be uniformly distributed on $(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0$, and define $X_n \equiv I(Y \leq (-1)^n/n)$, $n \geq 1$, and $X \equiv I(Y < 0)$. Then $X_n \rightarrow X$ a.s., and, for each $n \geq 1$, X_n has a unique median $M_n = 0$ or 1 accordingly as n is odd or even. But, clearly, $\{M_n\}$ does not converge.

THEOREM 2. *Let X, Y be rv and let \mathcal{G} be a sigma-field. Let $\mu(X | \mathcal{G})$ be any CM of X . If Y is \mathcal{G} -measurable, then the following statements hold.*

- (i) If $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$ is any CM of Y then $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G}) = Y$ a.s.
- (ii) $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}) + Y$ is a CM of $X + Y$; i.e. $\mu(X + Y|\mathcal{G}) = \mu(X|\mathcal{G}) + Y$.
- (iii) $Y\mu(X|\mathcal{G})$ is a CM of XY ; i.e. $\mu(XY|\mathcal{G}) = Y\mu(X|\mathcal{G})$.

PROOF. To prove (i), note that $P(Y \geq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) = I(Y \geq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. Similarly, $I(Y \leq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. These inequalities are true only if $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G}) \leq Y \leq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$ a.s., establishing (i).

The proof of (ii) is trivial, so proceed to the proof of (iii). On the (\mathcal{G} -measurable) event $[Y = 0]$, $P(XY \geq Y\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) = P(0 \geq 0|\mathcal{G}) = 1 > \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. On the event $[Y > 0]$, $P(XY \geq Y\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) = P(X \geq \mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. Finally, on $[Y < 0]$, $P(XY \geq Y\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) = P(X \leq \mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. That $P(XY \leq Y\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. follows similarly. \square

THEOREM 3. Let X, Y be rv, let $a \in R$, let \mathcal{G} be a sigma-field, and let $\mu(X|\mathcal{G})$ be any CM of X . Then the following assertions are true.

- (i) If M is any CM of the constant rv a , then $M = a$ a.s.
- (ii) $a\mu(X|\mathcal{G})$ is a CM of aX ; i.e. $\mu(aX|\mathcal{G}) = a\mu(X|\mathcal{G})$.
- (iii) If $X \geq Y$ a.s. then a CM $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$ exists such that $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}) \geq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$.
- (iv) If $X \geq a$ a.s. then $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}) \geq a$ a.s.
- (v) If X is independent of \mathcal{G} , then every median $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}_0)$ of X is a CM of X with respect to \mathcal{G} .
- (vi) If, for each $n \geq 1$, $\mu_n(X|\mathcal{G})$ is a CM of X and if M is a \mathcal{G} -measurable rv satisfying $\inf_{n \geq 1} \mu_n(X|\mathcal{G}) \leq M \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \mu_n(X|\mathcal{G})$ a.s., then M is also a CM of X .
- (vii) There exist CM's M^* and M^{**} of X such that $M^* \leq M \leq M^{**}$ a.s. for all CM's M of X .

PROOF. (i) and (ii) are immediate from theorem 2 by taking $Y = a$, while (iv) follows from (i) and (iii).

To prove (iii), let M be any CM of Y and define $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G}) = \min(M, \mu(X|\mathcal{G}))$. Clearly $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$ is \mathcal{G} -measurable, $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G}) \leq \mu(X|\mathcal{G})$, and $P(Y \geq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) \geq P(Y \geq M|\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. Moreover $P(Y \leq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) = P(Y \leq M|\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ on the event $[M < \mu(X|\mathcal{G})]$ while, on the complement of that event, $P(Y \leq \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) = P(Y \leq \mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) \geq P(X \leq \mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ a.s. Thus $\mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$ is indeed a CM of Y .

To prove (v), let $m \in R$ be any \mathcal{G}_0 -median of X . Then, by independence, $P(X \geq m|\mathcal{G}) = P(X \geq m) \geq \frac{1}{2} \leq P(X \leq m|\mathcal{G})$.

In view of the definition of CM and of part (ii), it will be enough to show that (vi) holds in the case $M = \sup_{n \geq 1} \mu_n(X|\mathcal{G})$.

Note that, given any two CM's M_1, M_2 of X , $\max(M_1, M_2)$ is also a CM of X ; this can be proved readily by an argument similar to the proof of (iii). Hence, letting $M_n \equiv \max_{k \leq n} \mu_k(X|\mathcal{G})$, $n \geq 1$, it follows by induction that each M_n is a CM of X . Moreover $M_n \uparrow M$, where M is easily seen to be a rv. Hence M is a CM of X by Lemma 1.

For (vii), note that it will suffice to establish the existence of M^{**} , since that of M^* follows by part (ii). To this end, let \mathcal{M} be the collection of all CM's of X with respect to \mathcal{G} , and let M^{**} be the essential supremum of \mathcal{M} . (vii) is an immediate consequence of part (vi) and Theorem 1.5 of Chow, Robbins, and Siegmund (1971). \square

REMARK. If X is independent of \mathcal{G} , it does not necessarily follow that every CM of X is constant (cf. (v) above). For example, let X and Y be independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) rv with $P[X = 1] = P[X = 0] = \frac{1}{2}$, and let \mathcal{G} be the sigma-field generated by Y ; then Y is a CM of X .

THEOREM 4 (*Jensen's inequality for conditional medians*). *Let ϕ be any real-valued convex function which is defined on an open interval I , bounded or unbounded, in R . Then, given any sigma-field \mathcal{G} , any rv X with $P[X \in I] = 1$, and any CM $\mu(X|\mathcal{G})$, a CM of the rv $\phi(X)$ exists satisfying $\mu(\phi(X)|\mathcal{G}) \geq \phi(\mu(X|\mathcal{G}))$ a.s.*

In particular, CM's $\mu(|X|\mathcal{G})$ and $\mu(X^2|\mathcal{G})$ exist such that $\mu(|X|\mathcal{G}) \geq |\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|$ a.s. and $\mu(X^2|\mathcal{G}) \geq \mu^2(X|\mathcal{G})$ a.s.

PROOF. Note that real sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ exist such that $\phi(x) = \sup_{n \geq 1} (a_n x + b_n)$ for all $x \in I$ (see Ash (1972) page 286). Since $P[X \in I] = 1$, $\phi(X) \geq a_n X + b_n$ a.s. for all $n \geq 1$. By Theorem 2(ii) and (iii), $a_n \mu(X|\mathcal{G}) + b_n$ is a CM of $a_n X + b_n$. Moreover, Theorem 3(iii) shows that a CM $\mu_n(\phi(X)|\mathcal{G})$ exists which is a.s. at least as great as $a_n \mu(X|\mathcal{G}) + b_n$.

Let $\mu(\phi(X)|\mathcal{G}) \equiv \sup_{n \geq 1} \mu_n(\phi(X)|\mathcal{G})$; this is a CM of $\phi(X)$ by Theorem 3(vi). Note that $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}) \in I$ a.s. by Theorem 3(iv). Hence $\mu(\phi(X)|\mathcal{G}) \geq \sup_{n \geq 1} (a_n \mu(X|\mathcal{G}) + b_n) = \phi(\mu(X|\mathcal{G}))$ a.s.

The special cases follow by taking $I = R$, and $\phi(x) = |x|$ or $\phi(x) = x^2$. \square

THEOREM 5. *Let X, Y be rv and let \mathcal{G} be a sigma-field. Then*

(i) *it is not always possible to find CM's satisfying $\mu(X + Y|\mathcal{G}) = \mu(X|\mathcal{G}) + \mu(Y|\mathcal{G})$;*

(ii) *it is not always possible to find CM's satisfying $\mu(\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}_1) = \mu(X|\mathcal{G}_1)$ where $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ is a sigma-field;*

(iii) *it is not always possible to find CM's satisfying $\mu^2(|XY|\mathcal{G}) \leq \mu(X^2|\mathcal{G})\mu(Y^2|\mathcal{G})$; i.e. the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality does not always hold for CM's.*

PROOF. The counterexamples given below only involve rv with unique CM's.

That (i) holds is well known. In fact, it holds even if $XY = 0$: let X_1, X_2 be i.i.d. with $P[X_1 = 0] = \frac{1}{3} = 1 - P[X_1 = 1]$, put $X = X_1 X_2, Y = X_1 - X_1 X_2$ so that $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}_0) = \mu(Y|\mathcal{G}_0) = 0$ while $\mu(X + Y|\mathcal{G}_0) = \mu(X_1|\mathcal{G}_0) = 1$.

For (ii), define X, Y such that $P[Y = k] = \frac{1}{3}, k = 0, 1, 2, P(X = 1 | Y = k) = \frac{3}{8} = 1 - P(X = 0 | Y = k), k = 0, 1$ and $P(X = 1 | Y = 2) = \frac{7}{8} = 1 - P(X = 0 | Y = 2)$. Let \mathcal{G} be the sigma-field generated by Y . Since $P(X = 1) = \frac{1}{2}, \mu(X|\mathcal{G}_0) = 1$. But $\mu(X|\mathcal{G}) = \mu(X|Y) = I(Y = 2)$ so that $\mu(\mu(X|\mathcal{G})|\mathcal{G}_0) = 0$.

To prove (iii), let X, Y be i.i.d. rv with $P[X = 1] = .6 = 1 - P[X = 2]$. Then $\mu(X | \mathcal{G}_0)\mu(Y | \mathcal{G}_0) = 1 \cdot 1 = 1$. But $P[XY = 1] = .36$ and $P[XY = 2] = .48$ so $\mu(XY | \mathcal{G}_0) = 2$. Hence, by a remark in Section 1, $\mu^2(|XY| | \mathcal{G}_0) = \mu^2(XY | \mathcal{G}_0) > \mu^2(X | \mathcal{G}_0)\mu^2(Y | \mathcal{G}_0) = \mu(X^2 | \mathcal{G}_0)\mu(Y^2 | \mathcal{G}_0)$. \square

3. Acknowledgment. The author thanks the referee for pointing out the relevance of the Brunk and Johansen paper, and for other useful comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] ASH, ROBERT B. (1972). *Real Analysis and Probability*. Academic Press, New York.
- [2] BRUNK, H. D. and JOHANSEN, S. (1970). A generalized Radon-Nikodym derivative. *Pacific J. Math.* **34** 585-617.
- [3] CHOW, Y. S., ROBBINS, HERBERT and SIEGMUND, DAVID (1971). *Great Expectations: The Theory of Optimal Stopping*. Houghton Mifflin, New York.
- [4] CSÖRGÖ, M. (1970). On a law of the iterated logarithm for strongly multiplicative systems. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **21** 315-321.
- [5] LOÈVE, M. (1963). *Probability Theory*, 3rd ed. Van Nostrand, Princeton.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF REGINA
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA