

A NOTE ON SEPARABLE STOCHASTIC PROCESSES¹

BY PATRICK BILLINGSLEY

The University of Chicago

Some sets L of sample paths have the desirable property that if there exists a process with given finite-dimensional distributions and with paths in L (with probability 1), then every separable process with these finite-dimensional distributions has paths in L . A class of such sets is constructed.

Suppose L is a subset of the space R^T of all real functions on $T = [0, 1]$. Certain sets L have the following property, in which $X = [X(t) : t \in T]$ and $X' = [X'(t) : t \in T]$ are stochastic processes, on spaces (Ω, \mathcal{B}, P) and $(\Omega', \mathcal{B}', P')$, with sample paths $X(\cdot, \omega)$ and $X'(\cdot, \omega')$.

PROPERTY ρ . For all X and X' , if X and X' have the same finite-dimensional distributions, if $[\omega : X(\cdot, \omega) \in L]$ lies in \mathcal{B} and has P -measure 1, and if X' is separable, then $[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in L]$ lies in \mathcal{B}' and has P' -measure 1.

This property of L can be restated: If there *exists* a process with given finite-dimensional distributions and with paths in L (with probability 1), then *every separable* process with these finite-dimensional distributions has paths in L . Or, loosely: If a process with given finite-dimensional distributions *should* have paths in L , it *will* have paths in L if it is separable.

In [1] it is shown that the set of continuous functions (page 66) and the set of functions with discontinuities of the first kind (page 136) have Property ρ . The purpose of this note is to extend the property to a broad class of path-sets.

If D is a countable, dense subset of T , let S_D be the set of functions x in R^T that are separable with respect to D ; that is, $x \in S_D$ if and only if for each t in T there is a sequence $\{t_n\}$ in D such that $t_n \rightarrow t$ and $x(t_n) \rightarrow x(t)$. In this terminology, the process X' on $(\Omega', \mathcal{B}', P')$ is separable with respect to D if $(\Omega', \mathcal{B}', P')$ is complete and if the set $[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in S_D]$ lies in \mathcal{B}' and has P' -measure 1; X' is separable if it is separable with respect to some countable, dense D (see [2] page 86).

Let \mathcal{R}^T be the σ -field in R^T generated by the sets of the form $[x : x(t) \leq a]$. Let \mathcal{L} consist of those L in R^T such that, for each countable, dense D in T , there exists in R^T a set \bar{L}_D such that

$$(1) \quad \bar{L}_D \in \mathcal{R}^T, \quad \bar{L}_D \supset L, \quad \bar{L}_D - L \subset R^T - S_D.$$

THEOREM. Each L in \mathcal{L} has Property ρ .

PROOF. Consider the processes X and X' involved in the definition of Property

Received June 18, 1973; revised September 17, 1973.

¹ Supported by NSF GP 32037X.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 60G17; Secondary 60G05.

Key words and phrases. Separable stochastic processes, sample paths.

ρ , and suppose X' is separable with respect to D . Since $[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in \bar{L}_D] - [\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in L]$ is a subset of $[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in R^T - S_D]$, it lies in \mathcal{B}' and has P' -measure 0. Hence, by (1) and the fact that X and X' have the same finite-dimensional distributions,

$$\begin{aligned} P'[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in L] &= P'[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in \bar{L}_D] \\ &= P[\omega : X(\cdot, \omega) \in \bar{L}_D] \geq P[\omega : X(\cdot, \omega) \in L] = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $[\omega' : X'(\cdot, \omega') \in L]$ lies in \mathcal{B}' and has P' -measure 1, which completes the proof.

Here follow some general observations and some applications.

1°. The class \mathcal{L} is closed under the formation of countable unions and intersections.

2°. If $L \in \mathcal{R}^T$, then of course $L \in \mathcal{L}$.

3°. A natural candidate for \bar{L}_D is

$$(2) \quad \alpha_D(L) = [x : x \text{ agrees on } D \text{ with some } y \text{ in } L].$$

This set will satisfy the requirements (1) if

$$(3) \quad \alpha_D(L) \in \mathcal{R}^T, \quad \alpha_D(L) \cap S_D \subset L.$$

To prove that $\alpha_D(L)$ lies in \mathcal{R}^T , one usually proves that it lies in the σ -field \mathcal{R}^D generated by the sets of the form $[x : x(t) \leq a]$ with t in D .

4°. From 3° it follows that

$$(4) \quad E(I, F) = \bigcap_{t \in I \cap T} [x : x(t) \in F]$$

lies in \mathcal{L} if I is open and F is closed.

5°. Let C be the class of continuous functions on T . If $x \in S_D$ and $y \in C$, and if x and y agree on D , then $x = y$. It follows by 3° that $\alpha_D(L)$ will satisfy (1) if

$$(5) \quad L \subset C, \quad \alpha_D(L) \in \mathcal{R}^T.$$

6°. Clearly

$$(6) \quad \alpha_D(C) = \bigcap_\epsilon \bigcup_\delta \bigcap [x : |x(s) - x(t)| < \epsilon],$$

where ϵ and δ range over the positive rationals (as in all that follows) and the inner intersection extends over the pairs, s, t in D with $|s - t| < \delta$. Since (6) lies in \mathcal{R}^D , $C \in \mathcal{L}$ follows from 5°. Alternatively, $C \in \mathcal{L}$ follows from 1°, 4°, and the representation

$$C = \bigcap_\epsilon \bigcup \bigcap_{i=1}^{k-1} E\left(\left(\frac{i-1}{k}, \frac{i+1}{k}\right), [\beta_i, \beta_i + \epsilon]\right),$$

in which E is defined by (4) and the union extends over the systems $(k; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k)$, where k is an integer and the β_i are rational.

7°. Let J consist of those x in R^T with discontinuities of at most the first kind; $x \in J$ if and only if $x(t+) = \lim_{s \downarrow t} x(s)$ exists for $0 \leq t < 1$, $x(t-) = \lim_{s \uparrow t} x(s)$ exists for $0 < t \leq 1$, and $x(t)$ lies between $x(t+)$ and $x(t-)$ for

$0 < t < 1$. Consider the general system $V = (k; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k; r_1, \dots, r_k; s_1, \dots, s_k)$, where k is an integer, the $\beta_i, r_i,$ and s_i are all rational, and

$$(7) \quad r_1 < 0 < s_1 < r_2 < s_2 < \dots < r_k < 1 < s_k.$$

Put

$$G_V = \bigcap_{i=1}^k E((r_i, s_i), [\beta_i, \beta_i + \varepsilon]) \cap \bigcap_{i=2}^k E((s_{i-1}, r_i), [\min\{\beta_{i-1}, \beta_i\}, \max\{\beta_{i-1}, \beta_i\} + \varepsilon]).$$

As pointed out in [1], page 135, $J = \bigcap_\varepsilon \bigcup_k \bigcap_\delta \bigcup G_V$, where k ranges over the positive integers and the inner union extends over those systems V having a fixed value of k and satisfying

$$(8) \quad r_i - s_{i-1} < \delta, \quad i = 2, \dots, k.$$

It follows by 1° and 4° that $J \in \mathcal{L}$.

8°. For open I, \mathcal{L} contains the set $H(I)$ of x that are constant over I , as follows from 3°. Let J' be the set of x that are step functions in the sense that, for some $\{t_i\}$ with $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = 1$, x is constant over each (t_{i-1}, t_i) . Then $J' \in \mathcal{L}$ because $J' = \bigcup_k \bigcap_\delta \bigcup H(r_i, s_i)$, the inner union extending over systems $(r_1, \dots, r_k; s_1, \dots, s_k)$ of rationals satisfying (7) and (8).

9°. Let C_k consist of the functions with k continuous derivatives and, for $x \in C_k$, let $D_k(x, t)$ be the k th derivative at t ; here $C_0 = C$ and $D_0(x, t) = x(t)$. We shall prove inductively that $\alpha_D(C_k) \in \mathcal{R}^D$ and $D_k(\cdot, t)$ is measurable \mathcal{R}^D on C_k . This is true for $k = 0$ by 6°. The induction step follows from

$$\alpha_D(C_{k+1}) = \alpha_D(C_k) \cap \bigcap_\varepsilon \bigcup_\delta \bigcap \left[x : \left| \frac{D_k(x, s) - D_k(x, t)}{s - t} - \frac{D_k(x, u) - D_k(x, v)}{u - v} \right| < \varepsilon \right],$$

where the final intersection extends over sets s, t, u, v ($s \neq t, u \neq v$) of points in D within δ of one another, together with the fact that, if $x \in C_{k+1}$, then $D_{k+1}(x, t) = \lim (D_k(x, s) - D_k(x, s')) / (s - s')$, where in the limit s and then s' approach t through values in D .

Thus all the C_k lie in \mathcal{L} , and so does $C_\infty = \bigcap_k C_k$. If A is the set of functions having power series expansions about 0, then

$$\alpha_D(A) = \alpha_D(C_\infty) \cap \bigcap_{t \in D} [x : x(t) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty D_k(x, 0)t^k/k!].$$

Therefore $A \in \mathcal{L}$. We can put other restrictions on the derivatives in a measurable way, and it follows that \mathcal{L} contains the class of completely monotonic functions, the class of analytic functions, the class of polynomials, etc.

10°. If $L \subset C$ and L is a Borel set in C , then $\alpha_D(L)$ lies in \mathcal{R}^D , so that $L \in \mathcal{L}$. To see this, observe first that, if L is the closed sphere in C with radius r and center $z \in C$, then $\alpha_D(L)$ is the set (6) intersected with $\bigcap_{t \in D} [x : |x(t) - z(t)| \leq r]$, and hence $\alpha_D(L) \in \mathcal{R}^D$. Therefore, it is enough to show that $[L : L \subset C, \alpha_D(L) \in \mathcal{R}^D]$ is a σ -field in C . That this class is closed under the formation of countable unions is obvious; that it is closed under the formation of complements (in C)

follows from the fact that, if an x in R^T agrees on a dense D with a y in C , then that y is unique.

11°. For a set that does not have Property ρ , and hence does not lie in \mathcal{L} , consider the set of functions continuous from the right. With θ uniformly distributed over $(0, 1)$, let $X(t) = I_{[0, \theta)}(t)$ and $X'(t) = I_{[\theta, 1]}(t)$; then X and X' have the same finite-dimensional distributions and are separable, but X has right-continuous paths whereas X' does not. Another set that does not have Property ρ is $R^T - C$. It might be interesting to have an example of a set that has Property ρ but lies outside \mathcal{L} .

Most of the arguments above hold if $T = [0, 1]$ is replaced by an arbitrary subset of the line.

REFERENCES

- [1] BILLINGSLEY, PATRICK (1968). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley, New York.
- [2] NEVEU, JACQUES (1965). *Mathematical Foundations of the Calculus of Probability*. Holden-Day, San Francisco.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
1118 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS