

Bernoulli Law of Large Numbers and Weierstrass' Approximation Theorem

Márton Balázs* and Bálint Tóth*

October 13, 2014

This little write-up is part of important foundations of probability that were left out of the unit Probability 1 due to lack of time and prerequisites. Here we give an elementary proof of the Bernoulli Weak Law of Large Numbers. As a corollary, we prove Weierstrass' Approximation Theorem regarding Bernstein's polynomials.

We need the notion of the *mode* of a discrete distribution: this is simply the most likely value(s) of our random variable. In other words, this is the value(s) x_i where the mass function $p_X(x_i)$ is maximal.

Proposition 1 *The mode of the Binomial distribution of parameters n, p is $\lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor$ (lower integer part). If $(n+1)p$ happens to be an integer number, then $(n+1)p - 1$ and $(n+1)p$ are both modes of this distribution.*

Proof. Let $0 < i \leq n$, then

$$\frac{p_X(i)}{p_X(i-1)} = \frac{\binom{n}{i} p^i (1-p)^{n-i}}{\binom{n}{i-1} p^{i-1} (1-p)^{n-i+1}} = \frac{(n-i+1)p}{i(1-p)}.$$

Therefore, the following are equivalent:

$$\begin{aligned} p_X(i) &\geq p_X(i-1) \\ \frac{p_X(i)}{p_X(i-1)} &\geq 1 \\ \frac{(n-i+1)p}{i(1-p)} &\geq 1 \\ (n+1)p &\geq i \\ \lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor &\geq i. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $p_X(i)$ increases until i reaches the value $\lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor$, after which we see a decrease of the mass function. We also see that $p_X(i) = p_X(i-1)$ happens if and only if $i = (n+1)p$ (which requires $(n+1)p$ to be an integer), in this case we have two modes. \square

Recall that the Binomial(n, p) distribution counts the number of successes in a given n number of trials. When this number is large, it is natural to expect that the proportion of successes approximates the success probability p . This is the content of the Bernoulli Law of Large Numbers:

Theorem 2 (Bernoulli Law of Large Numbers) *Fix $0 < p < 1$, and for given n let $X \sim \text{Binom}(n, p)$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{X}{n} - p \right| > \varepsilon \right\} = 0.$$

The Law of Large Numbers can be proved in various versions with various methods, see a general one at the end of the Probability 1 slides, or stronger versions in more advanced texts on probability.

Proof. For the sake of simplicity we use the abbreviation $q = 1 - p$. Let $r \geq (n+1)p$ and $k \geq 1$ be integers. Then a simple computation for the ratio of the Binomial mass functions shows

$$\frac{p_X(r+k)}{p_X(r+k-1)} = \frac{n-r-k+1}{r+k} \cdot \frac{p}{q} \leq \frac{n-r}{r+k} \cdot \frac{p}{q} \leq \frac{n-r}{r} \cdot \frac{p}{q} =: K.$$

This number K is bounded by 1, since

$$K = \left(\frac{n}{r} - 1 \right) \cdot \frac{p}{q} \leq \left(\frac{n}{(n+1)p} - 1 \right) \cdot \frac{p}{q} = \frac{n - np - p}{(n+1)p} \cdot \frac{p}{q} < \frac{n - np + 1 - p}{(n+1)p} \cdot \frac{p}{q} = \frac{(n+1) \cdot (1-p)}{(n+1)p} \cdot \frac{p}{q} = 1.$$

*University of Bristol / Budapest University of Technology and Economics

With this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{X \geq r\} &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} p_X(r+k) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} p_X(r) \cdot \underbrace{\frac{p_X(r+1)}{p_X(r)} \cdot \frac{p_X(r+2)}{p_X(r+1)} \cdots \frac{p_X(r+k)}{p_X(r+k-1)}}_{k \text{ terms}} \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} p_X(r) \cdot K^k = p_X(r) \cdot \frac{1-K^{n-r+1}}{1-K} \leq \frac{p_X(r)}{1-K}. \end{aligned}$$

Next is an estimate for $p_X(r)$, for which we use Proposition 1. By our assumption $r \geq (n+1)p$, therefore $r \geq \lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor$, and the mass function decreases between $\lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor$ and r . Thus for all $\lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor \leq i \leq r$ we have $p_X(r) \leq p_X(i)$, and a rather crude estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \sum_{i=0}^n p_X(i) &\geq \sum_{i=\lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor}^r p_X(i) \geq \sum_{i=\lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor}^r p_X(r) = (r - \lfloor (n+1)p \rfloor + 1) \cdot p_X(r) \geq \\ &\geq (r - (n+1)p + 1) \cdot p_X(r) \geq (r - np) \cdot p_X(r), \text{ that is} \\ p_X(r) &\leq \frac{1}{r - np}. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed from here and the definition of K with estimating the probability:

$$\mathbf{P}\{X \geq r\} \leq \frac{1}{r - np} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{n-r}{r} \cdot \frac{p}{q}} = \frac{rq}{(r - np)^2}.$$

With ε and p given, $n\varepsilon > p$ will hold for all large enough n 's, and we can make the choice $r = \lceil np + n\varepsilon \rceil$ (upper integer part) in the previous estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{X}{n} - p > \varepsilon\right\} &= \mathbf{P}\{X > np + n\varepsilon\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{X \geq \lceil np + n\varepsilon \rceil\} \leq \frac{\lceil np + n\varepsilon \rceil q}{(\lceil np + n\varepsilon \rceil - np)^2} \leq \frac{(np + n\varepsilon + 1)q}{n^2\varepsilon^2} = \\ &= \frac{pq}{\varepsilon^2 n} + \frac{q}{\varepsilon n} + \frac{q}{\varepsilon^2 n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof we also need a lower bound on X . To do this, we notice that $Y := n - X$, the number of failures, is Binom(n , q) distributed. All the above applies to this variable, and we can write

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{X}{n} - p < -\varepsilon\right\} = \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{n-Y}{n} - p < -\varepsilon\right\} = \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{-Y}{n} + 1 - p < -\varepsilon\right\} = \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{Y}{n} - q > \varepsilon\right\} = \frac{pq}{\varepsilon^2 n} + \frac{p}{\varepsilon n} + \frac{p}{\varepsilon^2 n^2}.$$

finally,

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\left|\frac{X}{n} - p\right| > \varepsilon\right\} \leq \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{X}{n} - p > \varepsilon\right\} + \mathbf{P}\left\{\frac{X}{n} - p < -\varepsilon\right\} \leq \frac{2pq}{\varepsilon^2 n} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon n} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 n^2} \leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2 n} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon n} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 n^2}, \quad (1)$$

where in the last step we used that $pq = p(1-p)$ can never be larger than $1/4$. \square

Notice that we actually proved more than the statement of the theorem: for any $\varepsilon > p/n$ (1) holds. As an example, we can choose $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(n)$ to be a function of n , we just have to make sure it decreases slow enough for $\varepsilon(n) \cdot \sqrt{n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \infty$ to hold. Then we still have

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\left|\frac{X}{n} - p\right| > \varepsilon(n)\right\} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

As an application we prove Weierstrass' approximation theorem:

Theorem 3 (Weierstrass' approximation theorem) *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist $n < \infty$ and a polynomial $B_n(x)$ of degree n , such that*

$$\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} |f(x) - B_n(x)| < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Given $x \in [0, 1]$, let $X \sim \text{Binom}(n, x)$, and define the *Bernstein-polynomial* of degree n by

$$B_n(x) := \mathbf{E}\left[f\left(\frac{X}{n}\right)\right] = \sum_{i=0}^n f\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \binom{n}{i} (1-x)^{n-i} x^i.$$

f is continuous on a closed interval, hence it is bounded, and it is also uniformly continuous by Heine's theorem. Therefore with $\varepsilon/2$ we have $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \varepsilon/2$ for all $0 \leq x, y \leq 1$, $|x - y| \leq \delta$. With this δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x) - B_n(x)| &= |f(x) - \mathbf{E}[f(X/n)]| = |\mathbf{E}[f(x) - f(X/n)]| \leq \\ &\leq |\mathbf{E}[(f(x) - f(X/n)) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|x - X/n| > \delta\}]| + |\mathbf{E}[(f(x) - f(X/n)) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{|x - X/n| \leq \delta\}]| \leq \\ &\leq 2M \cdot \mathbf{P}\{|x - X/n| > \delta\} + \varepsilon/2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we bounded f by its maximum M in $[0, 1]$, used uniform continuity in the second term, and the fact that an indicator never exceeds 1. Using (1) we obtain that

$$|f(x) - B_n(x)| \leq 2M \left[\frac{1}{2\delta^2 n} + \frac{1}{\delta n} + \frac{1}{\delta^2 n^2} \right] + \varepsilon/2.$$

For a given ε and the appropriately chosen δ we have a large enough n that makes the right hand-side smaller than ε , and this finishes the proof. \square