

# On the construction and the cardinality of finite $\sigma$ -fields

P. Vellaisamy, S. Ghosh, and M. Sreehari

**Abstract.** In this note, we first discuss some properties of generated  $\sigma$ -fields and a simple approach to the construction of finite  $\sigma$ -fields. It is shown that the  $\sigma$ -field generated by a finite class of  $\sigma$ -distinct sets which are also atoms, is the same as the one generated by the partition induced by them. The range of the cardinality of such a generated  $\sigma$ -field is explicitly obtained. Some typical examples and their complete forms are discussed. We discuss also a simple algorithm to find the exact cardinality of some particular finite  $\sigma$ -fields. Finally, an application of our results to statistics, with regard to independence of events, is pointed out.

**Keywords.** Finite  $\sigma$ -fields, induced partition of sets, cardinality, independence of events.

**2010 MSC.** Primary: 28A05; Secondary: 60A05 .

## 1. Introduction

The role of  $\sigma$ -fields in probability and statistics is well known. A  $\sigma$ -field generated by a class of subsets of a give space  $\Omega$ , also known as the generated  $\sigma$ -field, is defined to be the intersection of all  $\sigma$ -fields containing that class. However, a constructive approach to obtain the  $\sigma$ -field generated by finite number of subsets has not been well studied in the literature. Indeed, no easy constructive method is available. It is a challenging task to construct a  $\sigma$ -field generated by, say, four arbitrary subsets and to know its exact cardinality. Given a finite class of  $\sigma$ -distinct sets (see Definition 2.2) which are also atoms, we discuss a simple approach to obtain the generated  $\sigma$ -field based on the partition induced by the given class and then look at the  $\sigma$ -field generated by this partition. In this direction, we first obtain the cardinality of the induced partition by a finite class of such sets. Using this result, we obtain the cardinality of the generated  $\sigma$ -field. When all members of the induced partition are non-empty, the cardinality of the generated  $\sigma$ -field is  $2^{2^n}$ , a known result in the literature (see Ash and Doleans-Dade (2000), p 457).

Let  $\mathbb{R}$  denote the set of real numbers. Then the cardinality of  $\mathbb{R}$  (also called cardinality of the continuum) is given by  $2^{\aleph_0}$ , where  $\aleph_0$  is the cardinality of  $\mathbb{N}$ ,

---

The research of S. Ghosh was supported by UGC, Govt. of India grant F.2-2/98 (SA-I).

the set of natural numbers. One of the fascinating results in measure theory is that there is no  $\sigma$ -field whose cardinality is countably infinite. In other words, the cardinality of a  $\sigma$ -field can be either finite or equal to  $2^{\aleph_0}$  (uncountable) (Billingsley (1995), p. 34). Our focus is on the cardinality of a  $\sigma$ -field, generated by a finite class of  $n$  sets, and to show that it assumes only particular values within a fixed range. To the best of our knowledge, this problem has been addressed only for some special cases (Ash and Doleans-Dade (2000), p. 11). Several typical examples are discussed to bring out the nature of the finitely generated  $\sigma$ -fields. An algorithm to find the exact cardinality of some specific  $\sigma$ -fields of interest is also presented. Finally, we discuss an application to statistics with regard to the independence of some events and establish some new results in this direction.

## 2. Range for Cardinality of a finite $\sigma$ -field

Let us begin with a simple example. Let  $\Omega$  be the given space, and consider two distinct subsets  $B$  and  $C$  of  $\Omega$  such that  $B \cup C \neq \Omega$  and  $B \cap C \neq \phi$ . We henceforth suppress the intersection symbol  $\cap$ , unless the context demands it. For instance,  $A \cap B$  will be denoted by  $AB$ .

It is well known that the  $\sigma$ -field generated by the class  $\{B, C\}$ , denoted by  $\sigma(B, C)$ , is obtained by the usual operations of complementations, unions and intersections, as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(B, C) = \{ & \phi, \Omega, B, C, B^c, C^c, B \cup C, B \cup C^c, B^c \cup C, B^c \cup C^c, BC, \\ & BC^c, B^c C, B^c C^c, (BC^c) \cup (B^c C), (BC) \cup (B^c C^c) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} = \{BC, B^c C, BC^c, B^c C^c\}$  denote the partition (see Definition 2.3) of  $\Omega$  induced by  $B$  and  $C$ . The elements of the  $\sigma$ -field generated by a partition consist of the empty set  $\phi$ , the sets in the partition and all possible (finite) unions of them. The resulting class is evidently closed under complementation. Hence, the  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{B,C}) &= \sigma(BC, B^c C, BC^c, B^c C^c) \\ &= \{ \phi, \Omega, BC, B^c C, BC^c, B^c C^c, (BC) \cup (B^c C), \\ & \quad (BC) \cup (BC^c), (BC) \cup (B^c C^c), (B^c C) \cup (BC^c), \\ & \quad (B^c C) \cup (B^c C^c), (BC^c) \cup (B^c C^c), \\ & \quad (BC) \cup (B^c C) \cup (BC^c), (BC) \cup (B^c C) \cup (B^c C^c), \\ & \quad (BC) \cup (BC^c) \cup (B^c C^c), (B^c C) \cup (BC^c) \cup (B^c C^c) \} \\ (2.1) \quad &= \{ \phi, \Omega, BC, B^c C, BC^c, B^c C^c, C, B, (BC) \cup (B^c C^c), \\ & \quad (B^c C) \cup (BC^c), B^c, C^c, B \cup C, B^c \cup C, C^c \cup B, B^c \cup C^c \}, \end{aligned}$$

as some unions in (2.1) admit simple forms which can be obtained using De Morgan's laws. It is interesting to note that  $\sigma(B, C) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{B,C})$ . Note that  $|\sigma(B, C)| = 16$ .

Consider next the case when  $BC = \phi$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{B,C} &= \{BC^c, B^cC, B^cC^c\} = \{B, C, B^cC^c\}; \\ \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{B,C}) &= \{\phi, \Omega, B, C, B^cC^c, B \cup C, B \cup (B^cC^c), C \cup (B^cC^c)\} \\ &= \{\phi, \Omega, B, C, B^cC^c, B \cup C, C^c, B^c\}. \\ &= \sigma(B, C)\end{aligned}$$

and  $|\sigma(B, C)| = 8$  here. Thus, when  $BC = \phi$  also, we have  $\sigma(B, C) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{B,C})$ .

Consider next the cardinality of  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ , denoted by  $|\mathcal{P}_{B,C}|$ , where  $B$  and  $C$  are arbitrary subsets of  $\Omega$ . Two cases arise: (i)  $B \cup C = \Omega$  and (ii)  $B \cup C \neq \Omega$ .

Case (i): If  $BC = \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} = \{B, C\}$ . If  $BC \neq \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} = \{BC, B^cC, BC^c\}$  or  $\{B, B^cC\}$  (if  $B \subset C$ ) or  $\{C, BC^c\}$  (if  $C \subset B$ ). Hence, in this case,  $|\mathcal{P}_{B,C}| \in \{2, 3\}$ .

Case (ii): If  $BC = \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} = \{B, C, B^cC^c\}$ . If  $BC \neq \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} = \{BC, B^cC, BC^c, B^cC^c\}$  or  $\{B, B^cC, B^cC^c\}$  (if  $B \subset C$ ) or  $\{C, BC^c, B^cC^c\}$  (if  $C \subset B$ ). Hence, in this case,  $|\mathcal{P}_{B,C}| \in \{3, 4\}$ .

Thus, from cases (i) and (ii), we have  $|\mathcal{P}_{B,C}| \in \{2, 3, 4\}$  for arbitrary subsets  $B$  and  $C$ .

It is of interest to know the cardinality of the partition based on  $n$  arbitrary sets. To answer the question, we first introduce the following formal definitions.

**Definition 2.2.** We call a class  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  of sets  $\sigma$ -distinct if no set in  $\mathcal{A}$  can be obtained from other sets by an operation of union or intersection or complementation.

Let  $A^1 \equiv A$  and  $A^0 \equiv A^c$  henceforth. A formal definition of the partition induced by  $n$  sets is the following.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  be a  $\sigma$ -distinct class of subsets of  $\Omega$ . Then the finest partition induced by  $\mathcal{A}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$ , is the collection of sets of the form

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n} = \left\{ \bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i^{\epsilon_i} \mid \epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, 0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \leq n \right\} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}},$$

where the empty sets are excluded.

**Remark 2.5.** Note that  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, A_1 \cup A_2} = \mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, A_1 A_2} = \mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, A_1^c} = \mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2}$ . That is,  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, B} = \mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2}$  for  $B \in \sigma(A_1, A_2)$ . Hence, we consider, without loss of generality, only the  $\sigma$ -distinct sets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

The following definition is well known.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a collection of sets. A set  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  is called an atom of  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $B \subseteq A$ , and  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ , imply  $B = A$ ; that is, no proper subset of  $A$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We start with a simple fact.

**Lemma 2.7.** *If  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  themselves form a partition of  $\Omega$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  and  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = n$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  forms a partition of  $\Omega$ ,  $A_1^c \dots A_n^c = \phi$  and all intersections of  $A_j$ 's order 2 to  $n$  are empty. This implies that all the sets in

$\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$  with  $2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \leq n$  are empty. Consider next the sets of the form

$A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n}$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i = 1$ . Then, for example,  $A_1 A_2^c \dots A_n^c = A_1 \cap (\bigcup_{i=2}^n A_i)^c =$

$A_1 \neq \phi$ , since  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i = \Omega$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  and hence  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = n$ . ■

The following example clearly shows the nature of the partition and its cardinality.

**Example 2.8.** Consider the class  $\{A, B, C, D\}$  of 4 subsets of  $\Omega$ . Then the partition  $\mathcal{P}_{A, B, C, D}$  induced by them is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{A, B, C, D} = \{ & ABCD, A^c BCD, AB^c CD, ABC^c D, ABCD^c, A^c B^c CD, A^c BC^c D, A^c BCD^c, \\ & AB^c C^c D, AB^c CD^c, ABC^c D^c, A^c B^c C^c D, A^c B^c CD^c, A^c BC^c D^c, AB^c C^c D^c, \\ & A^c B^c C^c D^c \}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $A, B, C$  and  $D$  themselves form a partition of  $\Omega$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A, B, C, D} = \{A, B, C, D\}$  and  $|\mathcal{P}_{A, B, C, D}| = 4$ . If  $A \cup B \cup C \cup D \neq \Omega$ , there may be two cases as follows.

- (a) If  $ABCD \neq \phi$  and all other elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{A, B, C, D}$  are also non-empty, then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A, B, C, D}| = 2^4 = 16$ .
- (b) If  $ABCD = \phi$ , there can be the following sub cases :

- (i) If only  $ABCD = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 15$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^cBCD, AB^cCD, ABC^cD, ABCD^c, A^cB^cCD, A^cBC^cD, A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (ii) If only  $BCD = \phi$ , along with the implied case (i) (not mentioned later), then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 14$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{AB^cCD, ABC^cD, ABCD^c, A^cB^cCD, A^cBC^cD, A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (iii) If only  $BCD = ACD = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 13$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{ABC^cD, ABCD^c, A^cB^cCD, A^cBC^cD, A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (iv) If only  $BCD = ACD = ABD = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 12$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{ABCD^c, A^cB^cCD, A^cBC^cD, A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (v) If only  $BCD = ACD = ABD = ABC = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 11$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^cB^cCD, A^cBC^cD, A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (vi) If only  $ABD = ABC = CD = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 10$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^cBC^cD, A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (vii) If only  $ABC = CD = BD = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 9$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^cBCD^c, AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (viii) If only  $CD = BD = BC = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 8$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{AB^cC^cD, AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (ix) If only  $CD = BD = BC = AD = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 7$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{AB^cCD^c, ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$
- (x) If only  $CD = BD = BC = AD = AC = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 6$  and
- $$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{ABC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD, A^cB^cCD^c, A^cBC^cD^c, AB^cC^cD^c, A^cB^cC^cD^c\}.$$

- (xi) If only  $CD = BD = BC = AD = AC = AB = \phi$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 5$  and

$$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^c B^c C^c D, A^c B^c C D^c, A^c B C^c D^c, A B^c C^c D^c, A^c B^c C^c D^c\}.$$

Hence, we observe that  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| \in \{4, 5, 6, \dots, 16\}$ .

**Remark 2.9.** Two or more different partitions  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$  may have the same cardinality. For example, if  $\mathcal{A} = \{A, B, C, D\}$  such that  $A \cup B \cup C \cup D \neq \Omega$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D}| = 9$  corresponds to the following distinct cases :

- (i) If only  $AB = CD = \phi$ , along with the implied empty intersections, then

$$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^c B C^c D, A^c B C D^c, A B^c C^c D, A B^c C D^c, A^c B^c C^c D, A^c B^c C D^c, A^c B C^c D^c, A B^c C^c D^c, A^c B^c C^c D^c\}.$$

- (ii) If only  $AB = AC = AD = \phi$ , along with the implied empty intersections, then

$$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^c B C D, A^c B^c C D, A^c B C^c D, A^c B C D^c, A^c B^c C^c D, A^c B^c C D^c, A^c B C^c D^c, A B^c C^c D^c, A^c B^c C^c D^c\}.$$

- (iii) If only  $AB = AC = BCD = \phi$ , along with the implied empty intersections, then

$$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C,D} = \{A^c B C^c D, A^c B C D^c, A B^c C^c D, A^c B^c C D, A^c B^c C^c D, A^c B^c C D^c, A^c B C^c D^c, A B^c C^c D^c, A^c B^c C^c D^c\}.$$

In the above cases, the partitions are different, though their cardinality is same.

We next look at the cardinality of  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$  induced by  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$ . It looks difficult to argue for the arbitrary sets. However, we have the following result for a fairly large and reasonable class of sets.

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$ ,  $n \geq 3$ , be a class of  $\sigma$ -distinct sets of  $\Omega$ , where each  $A_i$  is an atom of  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$  be the partition induced by  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$ . Then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n, n+1, \dots, 2^n\}$ .*

**Proof.** Let

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{Q}_j = \left\{ \bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i^{\epsilon_i} \mid \epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, 1 \leq i \leq n, \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i = j \right\},$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq n$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$  can be represented as

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n} = \bigcup_{j=0}^n \mathcal{Q}_j,$$

where only non-empty elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ 's are considered. This is because some  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ 's may contain empty sets. Note that  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  consists of at most  $\binom{n}{j}$  distinct non-empty sets corresponding to a selection of  $j$  of the  $n$   $\epsilon_i$ 's as 1 and the rest as 0. So  $|\mathcal{Q}_j| \leq \binom{n}{j}$ , and hence

$$(2.13) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = \left| \bigcup_{j=0}^n \mathcal{Q}_j \right| \leq \sum_{j=0}^n |\mathcal{Q}_j| \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} = 2^n.$$

Note that the elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq n-1$  are all disjoint. Indeed, if  $D_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_i$  and  $D_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_j$ , for some  $j \neq i$ , then  $D_1 D_2 = \phi$ . Therefore, an element  $E \in \mathcal{Q}_j$  being empty or non-empty does not affect the nature (emptiness or non-emptiness) of another element  $D$  coming from  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  or  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  for all  $i \neq j$ , in general. Consider next the four exhaustive cases.

Case (i):  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \Omega$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \phi$ . In this case, our claim is

$$(2.14) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n+2, n+3, \dots, 2^n\}.$$

Here, both  $\mathcal{Q}_0$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  contain non-empty sets, so that  $|\mathcal{Q}_0| = |\mathcal{Q}_n| = 1$ . Suppose now  $A_i$ 's are such that all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{n-2}$  are empty. We show that none of the elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$  is empty. Suppose an element of  $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$ , say,  $A_1^c A_2 \dots A_n = \phi$ . Note first that  $\bigcup_{0 \leq \sum_{j=3}^n \epsilon_j \leq n-2} A_3^{\epsilon_3} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} = \Omega$ , since the LHS is the union of sets

in  $\mathcal{P}_{A_3 \dots A_n}$ . Hence,

$$(2.15) \quad (A_3 \dots A_n)^c = \bigcup_{0 \leq \sum_{j=3}^n \epsilon_j \leq n-3} A_3^{\epsilon_3} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n}.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^c A_2 &= A_1^c A_2 A_3 \dots A_n + A_1^c A_2 (A_3 \dots A_n)^c \\ &= A_1^c A_2 \cap \left( \bigcup_{0 \leq \sum_{j=3}^n \epsilon_j \leq n-3} A_3^{\epsilon_3} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} \right) \quad (\text{using (2.15)}) \\ &= \bigcup_{0 \leq \sum_{j=3}^n \epsilon_j \leq n-3} A_1^c A_2 A_3^{\epsilon_3} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} \\ &= \phi, \end{aligned}$$

since each element  $A_1^c A_2 A_3^{\epsilon_3} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n}$ , with  $1 \leq \sum_{j=3}^n \epsilon_j \leq n-3$  belongs to one of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{n-2}$ . So  $A_2 \subset A_1$ , a contradiction, since each  $A_i$  is an atom of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Also, in this case,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2 + \binom{n}{n-1} = n+2$ .

Let now  $2 \leq k \leq n-1$ . Consider the case where all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$  are non-empty, only  $r$  elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  are empty, and all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_l$  for  $k+1 \leq l \leq n-1$  are empty. In this case,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2 + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{n}{j} + r$ , where  $1 \leq r \leq \binom{n}{k}$ . If  $k = n-1$  and  $r = \binom{n}{n-1} = n$ , then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} \binom{n}{j} + n = 2^n$ . That is, when all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_0$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  are non-empty, we get  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2^n$ . Thus,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n+2, n+3, \dots, 2^n\}$ .

Case (ii):  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i = \Omega$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \phi$ . In this case, we claim

$$(2.16) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n+1, n+2, \dots, 2^n-1\}.$$

Here  $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \{\phi\}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_n \neq \{\phi\}$  and so  $|\mathcal{Q}_n| = 1$ . The argument for the minimum value of  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}|$  is the same as that in Case (i). Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}|$  is exactly 1 less than that in Case (i), and so  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n+1, n+2, \dots, 2^n-1\}$ .

Case (iii):  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \Omega$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i = \phi$ . In this case also, we claim

$$(2.17) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n+1, n+2, \dots, 2^n-1\}.$$

Here  $\mathcal{Q}_0 \neq \{\phi\}$  and  $|\mathcal{Q}_0| = 1$ , while  $\mathcal{Q}_n = \{\phi\}$ . Suppose  $A_i$ 's are such that all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_{n-1}$  are empty. Let now an element of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$ , say,  $A_1 A_2^c \dots A_n^c = \phi$ . Then  $A_1 = \bigcup_{0 \leq \sum_{i=2}^n \epsilon_i \leq n-1} (A_1 A_2^{\epsilon_2} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n}) = \phi$ , by assumptions, which is a contradiction. Thus, all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  are non-empty, so that  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 1 + \binom{n}{1} = n+1$  in this case. The rest of the arguments are similar to those in Case (i). Hence,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n+1, n+2, \dots, 2^n-1\}$ .

Case (iv):  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i = \Omega$ ,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i = \phi$ . Our claim in this case is

$$(2.18) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n, n+1, \dots, 2^n-2\}.$$

Here,  $\mathcal{Q}_0 = \mathcal{Q}_n = \{\phi\}$ . Observe first that it is not necessary that  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  themselves form a partition of  $\Omega$ . The argument for the minimum value of  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}|$  is the same as that in Case (i). Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}|$  is exactly 1 less than that in Case (iii), and so  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n, n+1, \dots, 2^n-2\}$ .

Thus, from all the above cases,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| \in \{n, n+1, \dots, 2^n\}$ . ■



**Remark 2.19.** If  $R_j = \bigcup_i B_i$ , where  $B_i \in \mathcal{Q}_j$ , for  $0 \leq j \leq n$ , then  $\Omega = \bigcup_{j=0}^n R_j$ .

Note that  $\mathcal{R} = \{R_0, \dots, R_n\}$  forms a partition of  $\Omega$ .

Our main interest is on the construction and the cardinality of finite  $\sigma$ -fields. Our approach is via the partition induced by the generating class  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$ . Note first that  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n})$  is obtained by including the empty set and taking all the sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$ , and all possible unions taken two at a time, three at a time, and so on till the union of all the sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$ . The following result justifies our approach.

**Theorem 2.20.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  be a class of  $n$  subsets of  $\Omega$  that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.10. Then*

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ (ii) \quad & |\sigma(\mathcal{A})| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}|}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** Let  $\epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Since  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have  $A_i^{\epsilon_i} \in \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and hence  $A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} \in \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} \subset \sigma(\mathcal{A})$  and hence  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ .

Conversely, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= A_i \cap \left( \bigcup_{\epsilon_j: j \neq i} A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_{i-1}^{\epsilon_{i-1}} A_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} \right) \\ &= \bigcup_{\epsilon_j: j \neq i} (A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_{i-1}^{\epsilon_{i-1}} A_i A_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n}) \\ &\in \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}), \end{aligned}$$

since each  $A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_{i-1}^{\epsilon_{i-1}} A_i A_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Thus,  $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\} = \mathcal{A} \subset \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) \implies \sigma(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}})$ . Thus,  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}})$ .

Let now  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = k$ . Since  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n})$  is the  $\sigma$ -field obtained by taking all possible unions of the sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n})| &= 1 + \binom{k}{1} + \binom{k}{2} + \dots + \binom{k}{k} \\ &= 2^k, \end{aligned}$$

where the unity is added for the empty set. Hence,  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}|}$ . ■

It is known that the cardinality of a finite  $\sigma$ -field is of the form  $2^m$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  (see, for example, Rosenthal (2006), p. 24). The following corollary, which follows from Theorems 2.10 and 2.20, gives the explicit range for  $m$ .

**Corollary 2.22.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a finitely generated  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of  $\Omega$ . Then  $|\mathcal{F}| = 2^m$ , for some  $n \leq m \leq 2^n$  and  $n \geq 1$ .*

Suppose  $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(\mathcal{B})$  for some class  $\mathcal{B}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the largest  $\sigma$ -distinct subclass of atoms (of  $\mathcal{B}$ ). Then  $m = |\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}|$ .

**Remark 2.23.** (i) Suppose  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  themselves form a partition of  $\Omega$ . Then, from Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 2.20,  $|\sigma(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)| = 2^n$ .

(ii) Suppose  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \Omega$  and  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \phi$ . Also, if all elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n-1$  are non-empty, then  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2^n$  (Case (i) of the proof of Theorem 2.20) and hence,  $|\sigma(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)| = 2^{2^n}$ , a known result (Ash and Doleans-Dade (2000), p 457.)

**Example 2.24.** (i) Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{A, A^c\}$  and

$$|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}| = 2, \sigma(A) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \{\phi, \Omega, A, A^c\}, |\sigma(A)| = |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}})| = 4.$$

(ii) Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A, B, C\}$  be a collection of three  $\sigma$ -distinct subsets such that  $A \cup B \cup C \neq \Omega$ . Then

$$\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C} = \{ABC, A^cBC, AB^cC, ABC^c, A^cB^cC, A^cBC^c, AB^cC^c, A^cB^cC^c\}.$$

The different possible values of  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}|$  are listed in the following cases:

- (i) If  $ABC \neq \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C} = \{ABC, A^cBC, AB^cC, ABC^c, A^cB^cC, A^cBC^c, AB^cC^c, A^cB^cC^c\}$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}| = 8$  and  $|\sigma(A, B, C)| = |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C})| = 2^8 = 256$ .
- (ii) If only  $ABC = \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C} = \{A^cBC, AB^cC, ABC^c, A^cB^cC, A^cBC^c, AB^cC^c, A^cB^cC^c\}$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}| = 7$  and  $|\sigma(A, B, C)| = |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C})| = 2^7 = 128$ .
- (iii) If  $AB = \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C} = \{A^cBC, AB^cC, A^cB^cC, A^cBC^c, AB^cC^c, A^cB^cC^c\}$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}| = 6$  and  $|\sigma(A, B, C)| = |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C})| = 2^6 = 64$ .
- (iv) If  $AB = AC = \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C} = \{A^cBC, A^cB^cC, A^cBC^c, AB^cC^c, A^cB^cC^c\}$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}| = 5$  and  $|\sigma(A, B, C)| = |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C})| = 2^5 = 32$ .
- (v) If  $AB = AC = BC = \phi$ , then  $\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C} = \{A^cB^cC, A^cBC^c, AB^cC^c, A^cB^cC^c\}$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}| = 4$  and  $|\sigma(A, B, C)| = |\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C})| = 2^4 = 16$ .

Also, in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(A, B, C) &= \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,B,C}) \\ &= \{\phi, \Omega, A, B, C, A^c, B^c, C^c, A \cup B, A \cup C, B \cup C, \\ &\quad A \cup B \cup C, A^cB^cC^c, A^cB^c, A^cC^c, B^cC^c\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see that  $|\sigma(A, B, C)| \in \{16, 32, 64, 128, 256\}$ . This result easily follows also from (2.14) and (2.17) and Theorem 2.20.

### 3. Exact cardinality of some finite $\sigma$ -fields

Let  $\bar{n} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Given a class  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  of  $\sigma$ -distinct sets, we call henceforth  $A_i A_j$ ,  $i \neq j$ , 2-factor intersections,  $A_i A_j A_k$ ,  $i \neq j \neq k$ , 3-factor intersections, and so on. Clearly, there is only one  $n$ -factor intersection, namely  $A_1 A_2 \dots A_n$ . We denote  $A_{i_1} A_{i_2} \dots A_{i_k} = A_S$ , where  $S = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ . We now discuss a simple algorithm to find the exact cardinality of some special  $\sigma$ -fields:

Let  $\bigcup_1^n A_i \neq \Omega$ , so that  $|Q_0| = 1$ . Note that an element  $A_1 A_2^c \dots A_n^c \in Q_1$  is empty if  $A_1 \subset (\bigcup_{j \neq 1}^n A_j)$ . Also, let  $s_1$  denote the number of  $A_i$ 's such that  $A_i \subset \bigcup_{j=1; j \neq i}^n A_j$ . Then,  $n - s_1 = |Q_1|$ , the cardinality of  $Q_1$ .

Let now  $3 \leq l \leq n$ . Suppose none of the  $j$ -factor intersections, for  $2 \leq j \leq l - 1$ , is empty and only  $k$  of the  $l$ -factor intersections, say,  $A_{L_1}, \dots, A_{L_k}$  are empty for some  $L_i \subseteq \bar{n}$  with  $|L_i| = l$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Define

$$S_{L_i} = \{B \mid L_i \subseteq B \subseteq \bar{n}\}.$$

We call  $S_{L_i}$  the set of indices of implied empty intersections of  $L_i$ , as  $A_B = \phi$ ,  $\forall B \in S_{L_i}$ . Then

$$(3.1) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2^n - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^k S_{L_i} \right| - s_1,$$

if none of the higher order intersections  $A_M$  is empty, where  $l < |M| \leq n - 1$  and  $M \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}$ .

If there exist  $M_1, \dots, M_r$  such that  $l < |M_i| \leq n - 1$  and  $M_i \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^k S_{L_i}$ , then

$$(3.2) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2^n - \left| \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^k S_{L_i} \right) \bigcup \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^r S_{M_j} \right) \right| - s_1.$$

Indeed, it suffices to consider only those  $M_j$ 's such that

$$M_j \notin \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^k S_{L_i} \right) \bigcup \left( \bigcup_{r=1}^{j-1} S_{M_r} \right),$$

for  $2 \leq j \leq n - 1$ .

We next consider some particular cases of interest under the case  $s_1 = 0$ .

(i) When none of the intersections of  $A_j$ 's of order two or more is empty,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2^n.$$

(ii) When only the  $(n - 1)$ -factor intersections, say  $q_{n-1}$  in number, are empty, then

$$|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = 2^n - q_{n-1} - 1,$$

since  $A_1 \dots A_n$  is the only implied empty intersection.

(iii) When all the 2-factor intersections  $A_i A_j = \phi$ , then all the collections  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  to  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  are empty and in this case all the elements of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  are non-empty. Thus,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n}| = n + 1,$$

since  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \Omega$  which implies  $\mathcal{Q}_0$  is nonempty.

Two typical examples follow.

**Example 3.3.** Let  $\Omega = \{5, 6, \dots, 20\}$  and consider the sets  $A_1 = \{8, 10, 14, 16, 17\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{6, 7, 18\}$ ,  $A_3 = \{7, 8, 9, 14, 16, 19\}$  and  $A_4 = \{9, 10, 11, 14, 20\}$ . Then

$\bigcup_{i=1}^4 A_i \neq \Omega$ , and only  $A_1 A_2 = A_2 A_4 = \phi$ . Hence,  $L_1 = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $L_2 = \{2, 4\}$  and

- (i)  $S_{L_1} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}$ ,
- (ii)  $S_{L_2} = \{\{2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}$ .

Thus,  $|S_{L_1} \cup S_{L_2}| = 6$ . Also, here  $s_1 = 0$ . Using (3.1), we get  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4}| = 2^4 - 6 = 10$  and by Theorem 2.20,  $|\sigma(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)| = 2^{10} = 1024$ .

**Example 3.4.** Consider the case where  $\Omega = \{5, 6, \dots, 15\}$ ,  $A_1 = \{8, 9, 10\}$ ,  $A_2 = \{7, 11, 12, 15\}$ ,

$A_3 = \{7, 11, 12, 13\}$  and  $A_4 = \{8, 10, 13, 15\}$ . Then  $\bigcup_{i=1}^4 A_i \neq \Omega$  and  $A_1 A_2 = A_1 A_3 = \phi$  are the only 2-factor intersections so that  $L_1 = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $L_2 = \{1, 3\}$  and

- (i)  $S_{L_1} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}$ ,
- (ii)  $S_{L_2} = \{\{1, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}$ ,

Also,  $A_2 A_3 A_4 = \phi$  so that  $M = \{2, 3, 4\} \notin S_{L_1} \cup S_{L_2}$  and  $S_M = \{\{2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4\}\}$ .

Therefore,  $|S_{L_1} \cup S_{L_2} \cup S_M| = 7$ . Note also that  $A_2 \subset \bigcup_{j \neq 2}^4 A_j$ ,  $A_3 \subset \bigcup_{j \neq 3}^4 A_j$  and

$A_4 \subset \bigcup_{j \neq 4}^4 A_j$ , so that  $s_1 = 3$ . Using (3.2),  $|\mathcal{P}_{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4}| = 2^4 - 7 - 3 = 6$  and, by Theorem 2.20,  $|\sigma(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)| = 2^6 = 64$ .

Finally, we look at the question of cardinality  $\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D)$ , where  $D \notin \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(\mathcal{A})$  is a  $\sigma$ -field. Here, we need to talk about  $\mathcal{P}\{\mathcal{B}, D\}$ , where the members are not  $\sigma$ -distinct.

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  be an arbitrary class of  $n$  subsets of  $\Omega$ . Then the partition  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^*$  induced by  $\mathcal{A}$  is defined as the subclass of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , defined in (2.1), where each element of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^*$  is an atom. That is, the sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$  which can be obtained as the union of other sets, are removed from  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$  to obtain  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^*$ .

For simplicity and continuity, we denote  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}^*$  by  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$  only.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  be a class of  $\sigma$ -distinct sets, and  $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(\mathcal{A})$  be the generated  $\sigma$ -field. Let  $D \subset \Omega$  and  $D \notin \mathcal{B}$ . Then

$$(3.7) \quad |\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D)| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}|}.$$

**Proof.** Let  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}$  be the finest partition induced by the class  $\{\mathcal{A}, D\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D} &= \left\{ A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} D^{\epsilon_{n+1}} \mid \epsilon_j \in \{0, 1\}, 0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \epsilon_j \leq n+1 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} D \mid \epsilon_j \in \{0, 1\}, 0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_j \leq n \right\} \\ &\quad \cup \left\{ A_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots A_n^{\epsilon_n} D^c \mid \epsilon_j \in \{0, 1\}, 0 \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \epsilon_j \leq n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

When none of the elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}$  is empty,

$$(3.8) \quad |\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}| = 2|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}|.$$

Note also that  $\mathcal{P}_{\sigma(\mathcal{A})} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ , since  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$  is the collection of all possible unions of the sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence,

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{P}_{\sigma(\mathcal{A}), D} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}$$

for  $D \notin \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ . Observe also that the sets in  $\{\mathcal{A}, D\}$  are  $\sigma$ -distinct. Now

$$\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{B}, D}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\sigma(\mathcal{A}), D}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}).$$

Hence, from Theorem 2.20,

$$|\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D)| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}, D}|},$$

which proves the result. ■

**Remark 3.10.** (i) When none of the elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{A,D}$  is empty, we have from (3.7) and (3.8),

$$(3.11) \quad |\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D)| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_{A,D}|} = 2^{2^{|\mathcal{P}_A|}} = (2^{|\mathcal{P}_A|})^2 = |\mathcal{B}|^2.$$

(ii) It follows from (3.9) that

$$(3.12) \quad \sigma(\sigma(\mathcal{A}), D) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{\sigma(\mathcal{A}), D}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{A,D}) = \sigma(\mathcal{A}, D),$$

an expected result.

**Example 3.13.** Consider the simplest case, where  $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(A) = \{\phi, \Omega, A, A^c\}$ . Let  $D \notin \mathcal{B}$  be such  $AD \neq \phi$  and  $A \cup D \neq \Omega$ . Then  $\{\mathcal{B}, D\} = \{\phi, \Omega, A, A^c, D\}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{A,D} = \{AD, A^cD, AD^c, A^cD^c\} = \mathcal{P}_{A,D}$ . Note here all the elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{A,D}$  are non-empty. Hence,  $|\mathcal{P}_{B,D}| = |\mathcal{P}_{A,D}| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_A|} = 4$  and  $|\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D)| = |\mathcal{B}|^2 = 16$ .

**Example 3.14.** Consider the case when  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are two  $\sigma$ -distinct subsets of  $\Omega$  such that  $A_1 \cup A_2 \neq \Omega$  and  $A_1 \cap A_2 = \phi$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ . Here  $\mathcal{P}_A = \{A_1^c A_2, A_1 A_2^c, A_1^c A_2^c\}$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \{\phi, \Omega, A_1, A_2, A_1^c, A_2^c, A_1 \cup A_2, A_1^c \cap A_2^c\}$ . Let  $D \notin \mathcal{B}$  be a non-empty subset of  $\Omega$ , so that  $\{\mathcal{B}, D\} = \{\phi, \Omega, A_1, A_2, A_1^c, A_2^c, A_1 \cup A_2, A_1^c \cap A_2^c, D\}$  and  $\{\mathcal{A}, D\} = \{A_1, A_2, D\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}_{B,D} = \{A_1^c A_2 D, A_1 A_2^c D, A_1^c A_2^c D, A_1^c A_2 D^c, A_1 A_2^c D^c, A_1^c A_2^c D^c\} = \mathcal{P}_{A,D}$ . Assume all elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{A,D}$  to be non-empty. Then  $|\mathcal{P}_{B,D}| = |\mathcal{P}_{A,D}| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_A|} = 6$ . Hence,  $|\sigma(\mathcal{B}, D)| = 2^{|\mathcal{P}_{B,D}|} = 2^{2^{|\mathcal{P}_A|}} = |\sigma(\mathcal{A})|^2 = |\mathcal{B}|^2 = 64$ .

## 4. An Application to Independence of Events

Let us consider three events  $A, B$  and  $C$  such that  $A$  is independent of  $B$  (denoted by  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ ) and  $A$  is independent of  $C$  (denoted by  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ ). It is known that these assumptions neither imply  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B \cup C)$  nor  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (BC)$ , unless  $B$  and  $C$  are disjoint (see Whittaker (1990) p. 27). However, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$  and  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C$ . Then  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B \cup C)$  iff  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (BC)$ .*

**Proof.** Consider

$$\begin{aligned} P[A \cap (B \cup C)] &= P[(AB) \cup (AC)] \\ &= P(AB) + P(AC) - P(ABC) \\ &= P(A)[P(B) + P(C)] - P(ABC) \quad (\text{by assumption}) \\ &= P(A)[P(B \cup C) + P(BC)] - P(ABC), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(4.2) \quad P[A \cap (B \cup C)] - P(A)[P(B \cup C)] = P(A)[P(BC)] - P(ABC).$$

Hence,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B \cup C)$  (that is, L.H.S. of (4.2) = 0) iff  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (BC)$  (that is, R.H.S. of (4.2) = 0). ■

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ ,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  and  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B \cup C)$ , then  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ .*

**Proof.** We need to show that under the assumptions,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp E$ , for every  $E \in \{BC, B^cC, BC^c, B^cC^c\} = \mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ . Using Lemma 4.1 and the assumptions, we have  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (BC)$ . Since,

$$\begin{aligned} P[A \cap (B^cC)] &= P(AC) - P(ABC) \\ &= P(A)P(C) - P(A)P(BC) \\ &= P(A)[P(C) - P(BC)] \\ &= P(A)P(B^cC) \end{aligned}$$

shows that  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B^c \cap C)$ . Similarly,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (BC^c)$ , by symmetry. Further,  $A$  is independent of  $B \cup C$  implies  $A$  is independent of  $(B \cup C)^c = B^cC^c$ . Hence,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ .  $\blacksquare$

The following stronger form of independence of three events is used especially in graphical models (see Whittaker (1990) p. 27).

**Definition 4.4.**  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp [B, C]$  if  $A$  is independent of  $E$ , for every  $E \in \mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ .

As another application Theorem 2.20, we have the following result which states that  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp [B, C]$  implies the independence of  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp E$ , where  $E \in \sigma(B, C)$  and  $4 \leq |\sigma(B, C)| \leq 16$ .

**Theorem 4.5.** *The following statements are equivalent.*

- (i)  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp [B, C]$ .
- (ii)  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ ,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  and  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B \cup C)$ .
- (iii)  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \sigma(B, C)$ .

**Proof.** Assume (i) holds. Since the elements of  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} = \{BC, B^cC, BC^c, B^cC^c\}$  are disjoint,  $A$  is independent of all possible unions of elements in  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ . Note that  $B = BC \cup BC^c$ ,  $C = BC \cup B^cC$  and  $B \cup C = BC \cup B^cC \cup BC^c$ . So,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp B$ ,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp C$  and  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp (B \cup C)$ . Hence, (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Assume now (ii) holds. Then by Lemma 4.3,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ . Since  $\sigma(\mathcal{P}_{B,C})$  consists the collection of all possible unions of sets in  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C}$ , we have  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \sigma(\mathcal{P}_{B,C}) = \sigma(B, C)$ , by Theorem 2.20. So, (ii)  $\implies$  (iii). Consider now statements (i) and (iii). Since  $\mathcal{P}_{B,C} \subset \sigma(B, C)$ ,  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \sigma(B, C)$  implies  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{P}_{B,C}$  and thus  $A \perp\!\!\!\perp [B, C]$ , by Definition 4.4. Hence, (iii)  $\implies$  (i). Thus, statements (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.  $\blacksquare$

## References

- [1] Billingsley, P. (1995). *Probability and Measure*. 3rd edition. Wiley Interscience, New York.
- [2] Ash, R. B. and Doleans-Dade, C. A. (2000). *Probability and Measure Theory*. 2nd Edition. Academic Press, CA, USA.
- [3] Rosenthal, J. S. (2006). *A First Look at Rigorous Probability Theory*. 2nd Edition. World Scientific Publishing, Singapore.
- [4] Whittaker, J. (1990). *Graphical Models in Applied Multivariate Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

*P. Vellaisamy* ADDRESS: *P. Vellaisamy, Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai 400076, INDIA.*

E-MAIL: `pv@math.iitb.ac.in`

*S. Ghosh* ADDRESS: *Sayan Ghosh, Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai 400076, INDIA.*

E-MAIL: `sayang@math.iitb.ac.in`

*M. Sreehari* ADDRESS: *M. Sreehari, 6-B, Vrundavan Park, New Sama Road, Vadodara-390024, INDIA.*

E-MAIL: `msreehari03@yahoo.co.uk`