

## Measures With Prescribed Marginals, Extreme Points and Measure Preserving Transformations

Let  $(X, \mathcal{A}, \lambda)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$  be two probability spaces. Let  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  be the collection of all probability measures  $\mu$  on the product  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  of  $X \times Y$  such that the first and second marginals of  $\mu$  are  $\lambda$  and  $\nu$ , respectively, i.e.,  $\mu_1(A) = \mu(A \times Y) = \lambda(A)$  for every  $A$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mu_2(B) = \mu(X \times B) = \nu(B)$  for every  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ . The set  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  is convex. The extreme points of this set have been characterized by Douglas (1964, Theorem 1, p.243) and Lindenstrauss (1965) when  $X = Y$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\lambda = \nu$  and the probability space has some additional structure. Let  $T$  be a measure preserving transformation from  $X$  to  $Y$ , i.e.,  $T$  is a measurable transformation from  $X$  to  $Y$ , and  $\lambda(T^{-1}B) = \nu(B)$  for every  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ . We show that every such transformation gives an extreme point of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$ . The basic idea is to build a probability measure  $\mu_T$  in  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  sitting on the graph  $G = \{(x, Tx); x \in X\}$  of  $T$ . But the graph  $G$  of  $T$  need not be available in the product  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ . See Rao and Rao (1981, p.17) or Rao (1969). We overcome this difficulty by proceeding as follows and obtain a measure  $\mu_T$  for which  $G$  is a thick set.

Let  $P_1$  be the projection map from  $X \times Y$  to  $X$ . We claim that the graph  $G$  has the property: for every  $E$  in  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ ,  $P_1(E \cap G) \in \mathcal{A}$ . For, let  $\mathcal{E} = \{E \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}; P_1(E \cap G) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . One can show that  $\mathcal{E}$  is closed under complementation and countable unions, and contains all measurable rectangle sets. Hence  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ . Define a set function  $\mu_T$  on  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  by

$$\mu_T(E) = \lambda(P_1(E \cap G)) \text{ for } E \text{ in } \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}.$$

**THEOREM.**  $\mu_T$  is an extreme point of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$ .

**Proof.** It is easy to check that  $\mu_T$  is a probability measure on  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ . We now check that  $\mu_T$  has the prescribed marginals. Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\mu_1(A) = \mu_T(A \times Y) = \lambda[P_1((A \times Y) \cap G)] = \lambda(A \cap T^{-1}Y) = \lambda(A)$ . Let  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . Then

$\mu_2(B) = \mu_T(X \times B) = \lambda[P_1((X \times B) \cap G)] = \lambda(X \cap T^{-1}B) = \lambda(T^{-1}B) = \nu(B)$ , since  $T$  is measure preserving. We now claim that  $G$  is a thick subset of  $X \times Y$  under  $\mu_T$ , i.e., the outermeasure of  $G$ ,  $\mu_T^*(G) = 1$ . For, if  $E$  is any set in  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  containing  $G$ , then  $P_1(E \cap G) = X$ . Finally, we assert that  $\mu_T$  is an extreme point of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$ . Suppose  $\mu_T = (1/2)(\zeta + \eta)$  for some  $\zeta$  and  $\eta$  in  $M(\lambda, \nu)$ . It is obvious that  $\zeta^*(G) = \eta^*(G) = 1$ . Further, for any  $E$  in  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\zeta^*(E \cap G) = \zeta(E)$  and  $\eta^*(E \cap G) = \eta(E)$ . See Halmos (1950, Theorem A, p.75). If  $A \times B \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , then  $(A \times B) \cap G \subset (A \cap T^{-1}B) \times Y$ . Consequently,

$$\zeta(A \times B) \leq \zeta[(A \cap T^{-1}B) \times Y] = \lambda(A \cap T^{-1}B) = \mu_T(A \times B),$$

and

$$\eta(A \times B) \leq \eta[(A \cap T^{-1}B) \times Y] = \lambda(A \cap T^{-1}B) = \mu_T(A \times B).$$

Hence  $\mu_T(A \times B) = \zeta(A \times B) = \eta(A \times B)$  for every  $A$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Therefore,  $\mu_T = \zeta = \eta$ . This completes the proof.

**Remarks. 1.** Brown (1966, p.17-19) proved the above result when  $X = Y$ ,  $\lambda = \nu$ , and the probability space  $(X, \mathcal{A}, \lambda)$  is homogeneous and nonatomic.

**2.** There are cases that every extreme point of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  comes from some measure preserving transformation. As an example, let  $X = Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\lambda(\{1\}) = \lambda(\{2\}) = \lambda(\{3\}) = 1/3$  and  $\nu(\{1\}) = \nu(\{2\}) = \nu(\{3\}) = 1/3$ . The set  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  can be identified as the collection of all doubly stochastic matrices of order  $3 \times 3$  with each row and column sum equal to  $1/3$ . By the well-known Birkhoff's theorem, the extreme points of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  can be identified with the six permutation matrices of order  $3 \times 3$ . Every one-to-one and onto transformation from  $X$  to  $Y$  is measure preserving. All these six transformations give all the extreme points of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$ .

**3.** There are cases that only some extreme points of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$  come from measure preserving transformations. As an example, let  $X = Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\lambda(\{1\}) = 1/6$ ,  $\lambda(\{2\}) = 1/3$ ,  $\lambda(\{3\}) = 1/2$ ,  $\nu(\{1\}) = 1/6$ ,  $\nu(\{2\}) = 1/3$ , and  $\nu(\{3\}) = 1/2$ . The only measure preserving transformation in this case is the identity transformation. Surely, there are more extreme points of  $M(\lambda, \nu)$ .

**4.** There are cases in which no measure preserving transformation exists. As an example, let  $X = Y = \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $\lambda(\{1\}) = \lambda(\{2\}) = \lambda(\{3\}) = 1/3$ ,  $\nu(\{1\}) = 1/8$ ,  $\nu(\{2\}) = 2/8$ , and  $\nu(\{3\}) = 5/8$ .

**5.** Let  $X = Y = [0, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} =$  Lebesgue  $\sigma$ -field on  $X$ , and  $\lambda = \nu =$  Lebesgue measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then there are uncountably many measure preserving transformations on  $X$  preserving the Lebesgue measure. Further, if  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are

two distinct invertible measure preserving transformations modulo a null set, i.e.,  $\lambda(x \in X; T_1x = T_2x) \neq 1$ , then  $\mu_{T_1}$  and  $\mu_{T_2}$  are distinct. For, if  $\mu_{T_1} = \mu_{T_2}$ , then  $\mu_{T_1}(A \times B) = \mu_{T_2}(A \times B) = \lambda(A \cap T_1^{-1}B) = \lambda(A \cap T_2^{-1}B)$  for every  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ . This implies that  $\lambda(T_1^{-1}B \Delta T_2^{-1}B) = 0$  for every  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Consequently, as set transformations from  $\mathcal{B}$ (modulo  $\lambda$ -null sets) to  $\mathcal{B}$ (modulo null sets),  $T_1^{-1}$  and  $T_2^{-1}$  are identical. Hence  $T_1 = T_2$  a.e.  $[\lambda]$ . Not every extreme point of  $M(\lambda, \lambda)$  comes from an invertible measure preserving transformation. An example can be given. This is in contrast to the case when  $X = Y$ ,  $X$  is a finite set,  $\lambda = \nu$ ,  $\lambda$  is the uniform probability measure on  $X$  in which every extreme point of  $M(\lambda, \lambda)$  comes from a measure preserving transformation.

**Acknowledgment.** The authors are grateful to Professor Isaac Cornfeld for some useful discussions.

## References

- [1] J.R. Brown, Approximation Theorems for Markov Operators, Pacific J. Math., 16 (1966), 13-23.
- [2] R.G. Douglas, On Extremal Measures and Subspace Density, Michigan Math. J., 11 (1964), 242-246.
- [3] P.R. Halmos, Measure Theory, Van Nostrand, New York, 1950.
- [4] J. Lindenstrauss, A Remark on Extreme Doubly Stochastic Measures, Amer. Math. Monthly, 72 (1965), 379-382.
- [5] B.V. Rao, On Discrete Borel Spaces and Projective Sets, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 75 (1969), 614-617.
- [6] K.P.S. Bhaskara Rao and B.V. Rao, Borel Spaces, Dissertationes Mathematicae, 190 (1981), Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.

*Received June 4, 1990*