

## A Class of Random Variables which are not Continuous Functions of Several Independent Random Variables

Juha Alho

Northwestern University, Dept. of Mathematics, Lunt Hall, Evanston, IL 60201, USA

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  be a probability space. A random variable  $Z: \Omega \rightarrow R$  is  $F_{m,n}$ -distributed, if it has a density

$$\begin{aligned} f_{m,n}(x) &= C(m, n) x^{\frac{m}{2}-1} (mx+n)^{-\frac{m+n}{2}}, & x > 0, \\ &= 0, & x \leq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $C(m, n) = \Gamma\left(\frac{m+n}{2}\right) m^{\frac{m}{2}} n^{\frac{n}{2}} / \left(\Gamma\left(\frac{m}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)\right)$ . If  $X: \Omega \rightarrow R$  and  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow R$  are independent and  $\chi^2$ -distributed, with  $m$  and  $n$  degrees of freedom respectively, then the r.v.

$$Z = (X/m)/(Y/n) \quad (2)$$

is  $F_{m,n}$ -distributed ([2], p. 167). Our main result shows that there are many r.v.'s having a density of the form (1) which cannot be written in the form (2) on the same space  $\Omega$ . The result is more general so that it applies in an analogous way to r.v.'s having e.g. a  $t$ - or a  $\chi^2$ -distribution ([2], pp. 166–167, 170–171). The result applies also to the representations of r.v.'s with infinitely divisible distributions.

Consider the space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ . Let  $g: \Omega \rightarrow R$  be a r.v. which is *injective* and has the property:  $g(F)$  is a Borel set for all  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . It can be shown that if  $\Omega$  is a *Polish* space or a *Lusin* space, then the above property holds for any  $g$  which is injective and continuous (see [1], p. 135). Denote by  $P_g$  the probability measure induced by  $g$  on  $R$ .

For  $i=1, 2$ , let  $I_i$  be an interval on the real line, and  $\mathcal{B}(I_i)$  be the corresponding set of Borel sets. Consider a measurable mapping  $(X, Y): \Omega \rightarrow I_1 \times I_2$ . This defines two r.v.'s  $X: \Omega \rightarrow I_1$  and  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow I_2$ . Moreover,  $X$  induces a probability  $P_X$  on  $I_1$  and  $Y$  induces a probability  $P_Y$  on  $I_2$ .

**Theorem.** Assume that  $X$  and  $Y$  are independent and that both the support of  $P_X$  and of  $P_Y$  have a non-empty interior. Then there is no continuous function

$f: I_1 \times I_2 \rightarrow R$  such that

$$g(\omega) = f(X(\omega), Y(\omega)) \text{ a.s. } (P). \tag{3}$$

*Proof.* Assume that (3) does hold. Let  $\Omega' \subset \Omega$  be a measurable set where  $g(\omega) = f(X(\omega), Y(\omega))$  with  $P(\Omega') = 1$ . Define functions  $g_0, f_0$  and  $(X_0, Y_0)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g_0: \Omega' &\rightarrow g(\Omega'), & g_0(\omega) &= g(\omega), \\ (X_0, Y_0): \Omega' &\rightarrow (X, Y)(\Omega'), & (X_0(\omega), Y_0(\omega)) &= (X(\omega), Y(\omega)), \\ f_0: (X, Y)(\Omega') &\rightarrow g(\Omega'), & f_0(x, y) &= f(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

These are essentially the restrictions of  $g, f$  and  $(X, Y)$ . Since  $g_0$  is bijective, and  $(X_0, Y_0)$  and  $f_0$  are surjective, we have that  $(X_0, Y_0)$  and  $f_0$  are also bijective. By assumption the set  $g(\Omega')$  is measurable.

Let  $\mu$  be the probability on  $I_1 \times I_2$  induced by  $(X, Y)$ . The independency of  $X$  and  $Y$  implies:

$$\mu(C \times D) = P_X(C) P_Y(D) \quad \text{for all } C \times D \in \mathcal{B}(I_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(I_2).$$

Since the supports of  $P_X$  and  $P_Y$  both have a non-empty interior, we can find two numbers  $a$  and  $b$  such that the sets

$$\begin{aligned} C_a &= \{\omega_1 \in I_1 \mid \omega_1 \geq a\}, \\ D_b &= \{\omega_2 \in I_2 \mid \omega_2 \geq b\} \end{aligned}$$

satisfy:  $0 < P_X(C_a) < 1$  and  $0 < P_Y(D_b) < 1$ . It follows that the probability of each of the sets  $C_a \times D_b, C_a^c \times D_b, C_a \times D_b^c, C_a^c \times D_b^c$  is strictly between zero and one. Furthermore there is an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that simultaneously

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \mu([a, a + \varepsilon) \times [b, b + \varepsilon)) &< \mu(C_a \times D_b), \\ 0 < \mu((a - \varepsilon, a) \times [b, b + \varepsilon)) &< \mu(C_a^c \times D_b), \\ 0 < \mu([a, a + \varepsilon) \times (b - \varepsilon, b)) &< \mu(C_a \times D_b^c), \\ 0 < \mu((a - \varepsilon, a) \times (b - \varepsilon, b)) &< \mu(C_a^c \times D_b^c). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the ‘‘quadrants’’ of the rectangular  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood

$$N_\varepsilon(a, b) = (a - \varepsilon, a + \varepsilon) \times (b - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon)$$

satisfy these inequalities.

Since  $f$  is continuous and  $C_a \times D_b, C_a^c \times D_b, C_a \times D_b^c, C_a^c \times D_b^c$  are connected, the sets  $f(C_a \times D_b), f(C_a^c \times D_b), f(C_a \times D_b^c), f(C_a^c \times D_b^c)$  must be intervals. Denote them in the above order by  $J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4$ . These intervals are a.s.  $(P_g)$  disjoint, because if e.g. we would have  $P_g(J_1 \cap J_2) > 0$ , then we would also have  $P_g(J_1 \cap J_2 \cap g(\Omega')) > 0$ , which is a contradiction since

$$\begin{aligned} P_g(J_1 \cap J_2 \cap g(\Omega')) &= P(g_0^{-1}(J_1 \cap J_2)) \\ &= P((X_0, Y_0)^{-1}(C_a \times D_b) \cap (X_0, Y_0)^{-1}(C_a^c \times D_b)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

These intervals must be in some order on the real line so that we may assume e.g. that the elements of  $J_1$  are smaller than those of  $J_2$  (except perhaps for the points of their intersection, which has  $P_g$ -measure zero), those of  $J_2$  smaller than those of  $J_3$ , and those of  $J_3$  smaller than those of  $J_4$ .

Consider now the “quadrants” of  $N_g(a, b)$ . The set  $[a, a + \varepsilon) \times [b, b + \varepsilon)$  is a connected subset of  $C_a \times D_b$ . Hence  $f([a, a + \varepsilon) \times [b, b + \varepsilon))$  is an interval. Denote it by  $J'_1$ . Let  $J''_1 = J_1 - J'_1$ . With an analogous notation we decompose all  $J_i$ 's:

$$J_i = J'_i \cup J''_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4,$$

where  $J'_i$  is an image of a “quadrant”. Then

$$f(N_g(a, b)) = J'_1 \cup J'_2 \cup J'_3 \cup J'_4.$$

This is a connected set since  $N_g(a, b)$  is connected. Consider now  $J'_1$  and  $J'_3$ . With the order of  $J_i$ 's that we have the set  $J'_2$  is between them. This is a contradiction, since  $P_g(J'_2) > 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* If  $X$  and  $Y$  have continuous densities, then the condition on the support of  $P_X$  and  $P_Y$  is satisfied.

*Example 1.* Take  $\Omega = R_+$ ,  $P$  = measure corresponding to  $F_{m,n}$ -distribution and  $g$  = identity mapping. Let  $f: R_+ \times R_+ \rightarrow R_+$  be defined by

$$f(x, y) = (x/m)/(y/n).$$

Obviously  $f$  is continuous. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be any two independent  $\chi^2$ -distributed r.v.'s on  $\Omega$ . Then the theorem shows that it is not true that

$$g(\omega) = f(X(\omega), Y(\omega)) \text{ a.s.}$$

*Example 2.* Let  $\Omega = R_+$ ,  $g: \Omega \rightarrow R_+$  be strictly increasing and choose  $P$  so that  $g$  has  $\chi^2$ -distribution with two degrees of freedom. Define  $f: R^2 \rightarrow R$  by

$$f(x, y) = x^2 + y^2.$$

If  $X: \Omega \rightarrow R$  and  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow R$  are any two independent r.v.'s with  $N(0, 1)$ -distributions then by our theorem it is not true that  $g(\omega) = f(X(\omega), Y(\omega))$  a.s. Note also that this result can easily be extended to  $\chi^2$ -distributions with  $n > 2$  degrees of freedom. Namely if  $g$  is as before but now with  $n$  degrees of freedom, and if we would have

$$g(\omega) = X_1^2(\omega) + \dots + X_n^2(\omega) \text{ a.s.,}$$

where  $X_i$ 's are independent and  $N(0, 1)$ -distributed, then by taking  $X = X_1^2$ ,  $Y = X_2^2 + \dots + X_n^2$  and  $f(x, y) = x + y$  we arrive at a contradiction with our theorem.

Let  $g: \Omega \rightarrow R$  be as in the theorem and suppose that the support of  $P_g$  has a non-empty interior. Assume that r.v.'s  $X: \Omega \rightarrow I_1$  and  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow I_2$  are not only independent but also *identically distributed*. If the support of  $P_X$  has an empty interior, then so does the support of  $P_Y$ . In that case it is not hard to see that

we cannot have a continuous function  $f$  such that (3) would hold. If the support of  $P_X$  does have a non-empty interior, then the impossibility of (3) follows from the theorem. Thus we have the following corollary.

**Corollary.** *Let  $g$  be as in the theorem and assume that the support of  $P_g$  has a non-empty interior. Then  $g$  cannot be represented as a finite sum of i.i.d. random variables.*

This corollary shows that in the case of infinitely divisible distributions we often have to go outside our original space to find such independent r.v.'s that their sum would have the same distribution as our original variable.

*Example 3.* Let  $g$  be as in the corollary and define a continuous function  $f: R^2 \rightarrow R$  by  $f(x, y) = x$ . Suppose  $X = g$ , and let  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow R$  be any other r.v. such that the measure  $P_Y$  has a non-empty interior. Then it follows from the theorem that  $X$  and  $Y$  cannot be independent.

*Acknowledgement.* The author is indebted to C. Ionescu Tulcea for bibliographic reference.

## References

1. Bourbaki, N.: Topologie générale, ch. 9, 2ème éd. Paris: Hermann, 1958
2. Rao, C.R.: Linear Statistical Inference and Its Applications, 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 1973

Received April 29, 1981; in revised form February 15, 1982