Brownian motion with variable drift

Perla Sousi [1]

joint work with Yuval Peres [2]

[2]Microsoft Research, Redmond
[1]University of Cambridge

Planar Brownian motion



Planar Brownian motion



Theorem (Lévy 1940)

Let B be a planar Brownian motion. Then

$$\mathcal{L}(B[0,1]) = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Area of planar Brownian motion with drift

Question

Let f be a continuous function. Does $(B + f)[0, 1]$ still have 0 area?

Area of planar Brownian motion with drift

Question

Let f be a continuous function. Does $(B + f)[0, 1]$ still have 0 area?

An a.s. property insensitive to the drift:

For any f continuous, $B + f$ is nowhere differentiable a.s.

Cameron–Martin Theorem

Denote by $D[0,1]$ the **Dirichlet space**

$$D[0,1] = \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \exists g \in \mathbf{L}^2[0,1] \text{ s.t. } f(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds, \forall t \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

Cameron–Martin Theorem

Denote by $D[0,1]$ the **Dirichlet space**

$$D[0,1] = \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \exists g \in \mathbf{L}^2[0,1] \text{ s.t. } f(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds, \forall t \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

Theorem (Cameron–Martin 1944)

If $f \in D[0,1]$, then the law of B is mutually absolutely continuous w.r.t. the law of $B + f$.

Cameron–Martin Theorem

Denote by $D[0,1]$ the **Dirichlet space**

$$D[0,1] = \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \exists g \in \mathbf{L}^2[0,1] \text{ s.t. } f(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds, \forall t \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

Theorem (Cameron–Martin 1944)

If $f \in D[0,1]$, then the law of B is mutually absolutely continuous w.r.t. the law of $B+f$.

Hence, if $f \in D[0,1]$, then $\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] = 0$ a.s.

Graversen's result

Theorem (Graversen 1982)

For all $0 < \alpha < 1/2$, *there exists a Hölder*(α) *continuous function* $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^2$ *s.t.* $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(B + f)[0,1]] > 0$.

Le-Gall's result

The condition $\alpha < 1/2$ in Graversen's theorem was not an accident, because

Le-Gall's result

The condition $\alpha < 1/2$ in Graversen's theorem was not an accident, because

Theorem (Le-Gall 1988)

If f is Hölder(1/2), then

$$\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

Le-Gall's result

The condition $\alpha < 1/2$ in Graversen's theorem was not an accident, because

Theorem (Le-Gall 1988)

If f is Hölder(1/2), then

$$\mathcal{L}(B + f)[0,1] = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

We will see: same transition from Hölder(α) for $\alpha < 1/2$ to $\alpha = 1/2$ applies to a large variety of properties of Brownian motion.

Very recently, Antunović, Peres and Vermesi strengthened Graversen's result and they proved

Antunović, Peres and Vermesi result

Very recently, Antunović, Peres and Vermesi strengthened Graversen's result and they proved

Theorem (Antunović et al 2010)

For any $\alpha < 1/2$, there exists a Hölder(α) function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^2$ for which $(B + f)[0, 1]$ completely covers an open set a.s.

A remaining question

In all these works it was not clear whether for any continuous f

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] > 0) \in \{0,1\}.$$

A remaining question

In all these works it was not clear whether for any continuous f

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1]>0) \in \{0,1\}.$$

This was the impetus for our work.

0-1 Laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function.

0-1 Laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function.

Theorem (Peres and S.)

0-1 Laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function.

Theorem (Peres and S.)

- $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] > 0) \in \{0,1\}$.

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function.

Theorem (Peres and S.)

- $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] > 0) \in \{0,1\}$.
- $\mathbb{P}(\text{interior of } (B+f)[0,1] \neq \emptyset) \in \{0,1\}$.

0-1 Laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \le t \le 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function.

Theorem (Peres and S.)

- $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] > 0) \in \{0,1\}$.
- $\mathbb{P}(\text{interior of } (B+f)[0,1] \neq \emptyset) \in \{0,1\}$.
- $\dim(B+f)[0,1] = c$ *a.s., where c is a positive constant and* dim *is the Hausdorff dimension.*

Beyond the Cameron–Martin theorem

Again the same setting, B is a standard Brownian motion and $D[0,1]$ is the Dirichlet space

$$D[0,1] = \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \exists g \in \mathbf{L}^2[0,1] \text{ s.t. } f(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds, \forall t \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

Beyond the Cameron–Martin theorem

Again the same setting, B is a standard Brownian motion and $D[0,1]$ is the Dirichlet space

$$D[0,1] = \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \exists g \in \mathbf{L}^2[0,1] \text{ s.t. } f(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds, \forall t \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

Theorem (Cameron–Martin 1944)

If $f \notin D[0,1]$, then the law of B and the law of $B+f$ are singular.

Beyond the Cameron–Martin theorem

Again the same setting, B is a standard Brownian motion and $D[0,1]$ is the Dirichlet space

$$D[0,1] = \left\{ f \in C[0,1] : \exists g \in \mathbf{L}^2[0,1] \text{ s.t. } f(t) = \int_0^t g(s)ds, \forall t \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

Theorem (Cameron–Martin 1944)

If $f \notin D[0,1]$, then the law of B and the law of $B+f$ are singular.

As a consequence, when $f \notin D[0,1]$, there is some a.s. property of Brownian motion that fails for $B+f$.

Hitting probabilities

Cauchy–Scwartz inequality gives that if $f \in D[0,1]$, then f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

Cauchy–Scwartz inequality gives that if $f \in D[0,1]$, then f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

The space of Hölder(α) continuous functions is much larger than $D[0,1]$. Indeed, for any $\alpha \in (0,1/2]$, most Hölder(α) continuous functions are nowhere differentiable.

Hitting probabilities

Cauchy–Scwartz inequality gives that if $f \in D[0,1]$, then f is Hölder(1/2).

The space of Hölder(α) continuous functions is much larger than $D[0,1]$. Indeed, for any $\alpha \in (0,1/2]$, most Hölder(α) continuous functions are nowhere differentiable.

Question

Does $B + f$ hit the same sets as B, if f is Hölder(1/2)?

Hitting probabilities

Theorem (Peres and S.)

Let A be a closed set of $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$, and f a Hölder(1/2) continuous function. If $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathbb{P}_x(B + f \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Hitting probabilities

Theorem (Peres and S.)

Let A be a closed set of $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$, and f a Hölder(1/2) continuous function. If $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathbb{P}_x(B + f \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In 2 dimensions, if $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, then by neighborhood recurrence, $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) = 1$. The same is true for $B + f$, if f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

Hitting probabilities

Theorem (Peres and S.)

Let A be a closed set of $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$, and f a Hölder(1/2) continuous function. If $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathbb{P}_x(B + f \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In 2 dimensions, if $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, then by neighborhood recurrence, $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) = 1$. The same is true for $B + f$, if f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

Concerning the existence of multiple points, $B + f$ behaves in the same way as B, if f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

Theorem (Peres and S.)

Let A be a closed set of $\mathbb{R}^d$, for $d \geq 2$, and f a Hölder(1/2) continuous function. If $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathbb{P}_x(B + f \text{ hits } A) > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

In 2 dimensions, if $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) > 0$, then by neighborhood recurrence, $\mathbb{P}_x(B \text{ hits } A) = 1$. The same is true for $B + f$, if f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

Concerning the existence of multiple points, $B + f$ behaves in the same way as B, if f is Hölder$(1/2)$.

(This can fail if f is not Hölder$(1/2)$, e.g. for f fractional Brownian motion.)

Hausdorff dimension

Hausdorff dimension

Definition (Hausdorff dimension)

For every $\alpha \geq 0$, the α-Hausdorff content of a metric space E is defined

$$\mathcal{H}^{\alpha}_{\infty}(E) = \inf\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(\mathrm{diam}(E_i))^{\alpha} : E_1, E_2, \ldots \text{ is a covering of } E\}.$$

Hausdorff dimension

Definition (Hausdorff dimension)

For every $\alpha \geq 0$, the α-Hausdorff content of a metric space E is defined

$$\mathcal{H}^{\alpha}_{\infty}(E) = \inf\{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\mathrm{diam}(E_i))^{\alpha} : E_1, E_2, \ldots \text{ is a covering of } E\}.$$

The **Hausdorff dimension** of E is defined to be

$$\dim E = \inf\{\alpha \geq 0 : \mathcal{H}^{\alpha}_{\infty}(E) = 0\}.$$

Hausdorff dimension

Let B be a standard Brownian motion in $d \geq 1$ dimensions and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

Hausdorff dimension

Let B be a standard Brownian motion in $d \geq 1$ dimensions and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

From our 0-1 law, we know that $\dim(B + f)[0,1]$ is a constant a.s.

Hausdorff dimension

Let B be a standard Brownian motion in $d \geq 1$ dimensions and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

From our 0-1 law, we know that $\dim(B+f)[0,1]$ is a constant a.s.

Question

Can we provide bounds for $\dim(B+f)[0,1]$*?*

Hausdorff dimension

Let B be a standard Brownian motion in $d \geq 1$ dimensions and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

Hausdorff dimension

Let B be a standard Brownian motion in $d \geq 1$ dimensions and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

Recall that $\dim B[0, 1] = 2 \wedge d$ a.s.

Hausdorff dimension

Let B be a standard Brownian motion in $d \geq 1$ dimensions and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

Recall that $\dim B[0,1] = 2 \wedge d$ a.s.

Theorem (Peres and S.)

$$\dim(B+f)[0,1] \geq \max\{2 \wedge d, \dim f[0,1]\} \text{ a.s.}$$

Back to the 0-1 law

Let B be a d dimensional standard Brownian motion and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

Back to the 0-1 law

Let B be a d dimensional standard Brownian motion and let f be a continuous function, $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$.

Theorem (0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$)

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}(B+f)[0,1] > 0) \in \{0,1\}.$$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

For an interval $I \subset [0, 1]$, define $\Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B + f)(I)$.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

For an interval $I \subset [0,1]$, define $\Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)$.

Write $\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{ \left[\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n}\right] : k = 1, \ldots, 2^n \right\}$.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

For an interval $I \subset [0,1]$, define $\Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)$.

Write $\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{\left[\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n}\right] : k = 1, \ldots, 2^n\right\}$.

Declare $I \in \mathcal{D}_n$ **good** if $\Psi(I) > 0$. Write $p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)$.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

For an interval $I \subset [0,1]$, define $\Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)$.

Write $\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{ \left[\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n} \right] : k = 1, \ldots, 2^n \right\}$.

Declare $I \in \mathcal{D}_n$ **good** if $\Psi(I) > 0$. Write $p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)$.

Let Z_n be the number of good intervals of $\mathcal{D}_n$. Then Z_n is increasing in n.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

For an interval $I \subset [0,1]$, define $\Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)$.

Write $\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{ \left[\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n} \right] : k = 1, \ldots, 2^n \right\}$.

Declare $I \in \mathcal{D}_n$ **good** if $\Psi(I) > 0$. Write $p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)$.

Let Z_n be the number of good intervals of $\mathcal{D}_n$. Then Z_n is increasing in n.

Hence $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I$ must be increasing.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

For an interval $I \subset [0,1]$, define $\Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)$.

Write $\mathcal{D}_n = \left\{ \left[\frac{k-1}{2^n}, \frac{k}{2^n} \right] : k = 1, \ldots, 2^n \right\}$.

Declare $I \in \mathcal{D}_n$ **good** if $\Psi(I) > 0$. Write $p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)$.

Let Z_n be the number of good intervals of $\mathcal{D}_n$. Then Z_n is increasing in n.

Hence $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I$ must be increasing.

The limit of $\mathbb{E}[Z_n]$ exists and can be either infinite or finite.

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\boxed{p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\boxed{p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0,1]) = 0)$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\boxed{p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0,1]) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\forall I \in \mathcal{D}_n : \Psi(I) = 0)$$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\boxed{p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0,1]) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\forall I \in \mathcal{D}_n : \Psi(I) = 0) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} (1 - p_I)$$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B + f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\boxed{p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0,1]) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\forall I \in \mathcal{D}_n : \Psi(I) = 0) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} (1 - p_I) \le e^{-\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I}$$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 1: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$\boxed{p_I = \mathbb{P}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

$$\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0,1]) = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\forall I \in \mathcal{D}_n : \Psi(I) = 0) = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} (1 - p_I) \leq e^{-\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I}$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ gives $\mathbb{P}(\Psi([0,1]) = 0) = 0$.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Declare $x \in [0,1]$ **good** if all dyadic intervals that contain it are good.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Declare $x \in [0,1]$ **good** if all dyadic intervals that contain it are good.

I contains a good point $\Leftrightarrow \Psi(I) > 0$.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbf{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Declare $x \in [0,1]$ **good** if all dyadic intervals that contain it are good.

I contains a good point $\Leftrightarrow \Psi(I) > 0$.

If $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| = \infty \Rightarrow Z_n \to \infty$, contradiction.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbf{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Declare $x \in [0,1]$ **good** if all dyadic intervals that contain it are good.

I contains a good point $\Leftrightarrow \Psi(I) > 0$.

If $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| = \infty \Rightarrow Z_n \to \infty$, contradiction.

Hence, $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| < \infty$.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbf{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Declare $x \in [0,1]$ **good** if all dyadic intervals that contain it are good.

I contains a good point $\Leftrightarrow \Psi(I) > 0$.

If $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| = \infty \Rightarrow Z_n \to \infty$, contradiction.

Hence, $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| < \infty$.

$[0,1]$ is the union of the good points and the dyadic intervals that do not contain any good points.

Proof of the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{L}$

Case 2: $\mathbb{E}[Z_n] = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} p_I \uparrow C < \infty$

$\boxed{\text{Recall } \Psi(I) = \mathcal{L}(B+f)(I)}$

$\boxed{Z_n = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{1}(\Psi(I) > 0)}$

Declare $x \in [0,1]$ **good** if all dyadic intervals that contain it are good.

I contains a good point $\Leftrightarrow \Psi(I) > 0$.

If $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| = \infty \Rightarrow Z_n \to \infty$, contradiction.

Hence, $|\{\text{good points } \in [0,1]\}| < \infty$.

$[0,1]$ is the union of the good points and the dyadic intervals that do not contain any good points.

Since $\Psi(\text{good points}) = 0 \Rightarrow \Psi([0,1]) = 0$ a.s.

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \le t \le 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$
- $\{B \text{ is 1-1 on } A\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \le t \le 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$
- $\{B \text{ is 1-1 on } A\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$
- $\{B \text{ is 1-1 on } A\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$
- $\{B \text{ is 1-1 on } A\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$ $\surd$
- $\{B \text{ is 1-1 on } A\}$

More on 0-1 laws

Let $(B_t, 0 \le t \le 1)$ be a standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$, let $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a continuous function and A a closed set in $[0,1]$.

Which of the following events satisfy a 0-1 law?

- $\{\mathcal{L}(B+f)(A) > 0\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\text{interior of } (B+f)(A) \neq \emptyset\}$ $\surd$
- $\{\dim(B+f)(A) > c\}$ $\surd$
- $\{B \text{ is 1-1 on } A\}$ X