

Bootcamp Theorem Proof

1 Lemma Statement

For Z_n, B_n, C_n, D_n finite, non-negative RVs adapted to \mathcal{F}_n

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \leq (1 + B_n)Z_n + C_n - D_n$$

on the set $\{\sum_n B_n < \infty, \sum_n C_n < \infty\}$ we have

$$\sum_n D_n < \infty \quad \text{almost surely} \quad (1a)$$

$$Z_n \rightarrow Z < \infty \quad \text{almost surely} \quad (1b)$$

2 Proof of Lemma

2.1 Proof that U_n is supermartingale

Let us define the following stochastic process

$$U_n := \frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 + B_k)} - \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{C_m - D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1 + B_k)}$$

We want to show that this is a super-martingale. Taking the expectation of

$$U_{n+1} := \frac{Z_{n+1}}{\prod_{k=1}^n (1 + B_k)} - \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{C_m - D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1 + B_k)}$$

conditional on the sigma algebra \mathcal{F}_n gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{\prod_{k=1}^n (1 + B_k)} - \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{C_m - D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1 + B_k)} \\ &\leq \frac{(1 + B_n)Z_n + C_n - D_n}{\prod_{k=1}^n (1 + B_k)} - \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{C_m - D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1 + B_k)} \\ &= \frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 + B_k)} - \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{C_m - D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1 + B_k)} \\ &:= U_n \end{aligned}$$

So that U_n is a super-martingale.

2.2 Proof that $a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$ is supermartingale

Next, we define the following random variable

$$\nu_a := \inf \left\{ n : \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1 + B_k)} > a \right\} \quad a > 0$$

With the convention that $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. This is a stopping time because $\{\nu_a = n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$, or equivalently, because it depends only on the information present at time n , and not on any future information. Next we define the stopped process

$$U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$$

where $n \wedge \nu_a$ indicates the minimum between n and $\nu_a(\omega)$, for a given outcome ω . In other words, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} n \wedge \nu_a &= \min \{n, \nu_a\} = \nu_a \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a < n\}} + n \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \geq n\}} \\ U_{n \wedge \nu_a} &= U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a < n\}} + U_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \geq n\}} \end{aligned}$$

Since U_n is a super-martingale, we can show that also the stopped process $U_{\nu_a \wedge n}$ is a super martingale

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_{(n+1) \wedge \nu_a} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] &= \mathbb{E}[U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a < n+1\}} + U_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \geq n+1\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a < n+1\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[U_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \geq n+1\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \leq n\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[U_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a > n\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \\ &= U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \leq n\}} + \mathbb{E}[U_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a > n\}} \\ &\leq U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \leq n\}} + U_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a > n\}} && U_n \text{ is super-martingale} \\ &=: U_{n \wedge \nu_a} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we can show that the stochastic process $a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$ with $a > 0$ is also a super-martingale because

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{(n+1) \wedge \nu_a} + a \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \leq U_{n \wedge \nu_a} + a$$

by linearity of the expectation operator.

2.3 Proof that $a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$ is bounded in \mathcal{L}^1

Notice that $(B_n)_{n \geq 1}$ are non-negative, finite, \mathcal{F}_n -measurable random variables. This means that

$$\left(\prod_{k=1}^n (1 + B_k) \right)_n$$

are finite, positive, non-decreasing, and \mathcal{F}_n -measurable random variables. Similarly, U_n are finite and \mathcal{F}_n -measurable random variables. Since

$$a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a} = a + U_{\nu_a} \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a < n\}} + U_n \mathbb{1}_{\{\nu_a \geq n\}} \quad a > 0$$

we have that also $(a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a})_n$ are finite and \mathcal{F}_n -measurable random variables, and we can choose a so that they are also positive random variables

$$a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a} > 0 \quad \forall n$$

Putting together the fact that $a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$ is a positive supermartingale, and that $\mathbb{E}[a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}]$ forms a non-negative, decreasing sequence, thus we can find a value $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}] = \sup_n \mathbb{E}[a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}] < M < \infty$$

In other words, $a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$ is bounded in \mathcal{L}^1 .

2.4 Proof of Convergence of $U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$

By Doob's convergence theorem we therefore know that there exists a random variable $U^a \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ such that

$$a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U^a$$

Using the definition of almost sure convergence for random variables we can re-write this as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\omega \in \Omega : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a + U_{n \wedge \nu_a} = U^a\right\}\right) = 1$$

which can be equivalently written as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\omega \in \Omega : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_{n \wedge \nu_a} = U^a - a\right\}\right) = 1$$

So we see that

$$U_{n \wedge \nu_a} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U^{\text{stopped}} \in \mathcal{L}^1$$

2.5 Proof of Convergence of U_n on $\{\nu_a = +\infty\}$

Now consider the following set, where we've used $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$

$$\{\nu_a = +\infty\} := \{\omega \in \Omega : \nu_a(\omega) = +\infty\} = \left\{\omega \in \Omega : \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \leq a\right\} \quad a > 0$$

Because of how we've defined $U_{n \wedge \nu_a}$ we have that on such a set clearly $n < \nu_a$ and thus

$$U_{n \wedge \nu_a} = U_{n \wedge \infty} = U_n$$

Therefore on the set $\{\nu_a = +\infty\}$ the stopped process and U_n are equivalent, and so

$$U_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U^{\text{stopped}} \quad \text{on } \{\nu_a = +\infty\}$$

2.6 Proof of Convergence of U_n on Ω_0

Now we want to show that actually U_n converges to a finite random variable not only on such a set, but on the set

$$\Omega_0 := \left\{\omega \in \Omega : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n < \infty\right\}$$

Notice that on Ω_0

$$B_n \geq 0 \implies \prod_{k=1}^n (1+B_k) \geq 1 \implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_n}{\prod_{k=1}^n (1+B_k)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n < \infty$$

Now let us define the following family of sets

$$\Omega_a := \Omega_0 \cap \{\nu_a = +\infty\} = \left\{\omega \in \Omega : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n < \infty\right\} \cap \left\{\omega \in \Omega : \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \leq a\right\}$$

Then we notice that as a goes to $+\infty$, the second set becomes Ω as $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \leq +\infty$ is not giving any restriction on the outcomes $\omega \in \Omega$, and therefore

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_a = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_0 \cap \{\nu_a = +\infty\} = \Omega_0 \cap \Omega = \Omega_0$$

Since this holds for every $a > 0$, and for every such a we have that U_n converges to U^{stopped} almost surely on $\{\nu_a = +\infty\}$, then we have that

$$U_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U^{\text{stopped}}$$

on the set Ω_0 which can be written as

$$\Omega_0 = \bigcup_{a>0} \Omega_a = \bigcup_{a>0} (\Omega_0 \cap \{\nu_a = +\infty\})$$

2.7 Proof that $\sum_n \frac{D_n}{\prod_{m=1}^n (1+B_m)}$ converges

In the following we will work on our desired set

$$\Omega_{\text{final}} := \Omega_0 \cap \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n < \infty \right\} = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n < \infty \right\}$$

where we know that U_n converges to U^{stopped} almost surely, so

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)} - \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \\ &= U^{\text{stopped}} \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the expression above, and keeping in mind that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_n}{\prod_{k=1}^n (1+B_k)} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n < \infty \quad \text{for } \omega \in \Omega_{\text{final}}$$

we obtain that the following expression converges, and thus is bounded.

$$\frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} U^{\text{stopped}} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)}$$

Notice also that because Z_n, D_n and B_n are non-negative, we have the following inequality

$$\frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)} \geq \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{D_m}{\prod_{k=1}^m (1+B_k)}$$

which tells us that also the term on the right hand side is bounded. To show that it converges, we can observe that it is a sum of non-negative terms, thus it is non-decreasing and therefore monotone. A monotone, bounded sequence converges and so it has a finite limit almost surely

$$D_{\infty}(\omega) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{D_n}{\prod_{k=1}^n (1+B_k)} < \infty$$

2.8 Proof of Convergence of Z_n

In a similar way, we have that the first term in the definition of U_n converges to some finite limit $Z_{\infty}(\omega)$:

$$\frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} Z_{\infty}(\omega)$$

To prove that Z_n also converges to a finite limit, we can re-write it as follows

$$Z_n = \frac{Z_n}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (1+B_k)$$

Now recall that for a non-negative real number $\alpha \geq 0$ we have the following inequality

$$1 + \alpha \leq e^{\alpha}$$

We can use this result together with

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n < \infty$$

as we're working in Ω_{final} to get

$$\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 + B_n) \leq \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp(B_n) = \exp\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n\right) < \infty$$

So that on the set

$$\left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n < \infty \right\}$$

we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_n = Z_{\infty}(\omega) \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 + B_k) =: Z < \infty$$

2.9 Proof that $\sum_n^{\infty} D_n < \infty$ almost surely

In a similar fashion we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{D_n}{\prod_{m=1}^n (1 + B_m)} \prod_{m=1}^n (1 + B_m) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{D_n}{\prod_{m=1}^n (1 + B_m)} \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1 + B_m) \right) && \text{as } \prod_{m=1}^n (1 + B_m) \leq \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1 + B_m) \\ &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{D_n}{\prod_{m=1}^n (1 + B_m)} \right) \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1 + B_m) && \text{independent of } n \\ &= D_{\infty}(\omega) \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1 + B_m) \\ &< \infty && \text{almost surely} \end{aligned}$$

3 Theorem Assumptions

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + \gamma_{n+1} H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \int g(\theta_n, x) \mu_{\theta_n}(dx) \quad \text{for } g \text{ positive and Borel-measurable} \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma^2(\theta) = \int |H(\theta, x)|^2 \mu_{\theta}(dx) \leq C(1 + |\theta|^2) \quad C \text{ constant} \quad (4)$$

$$h(\theta) = \int H(\theta, x) \mu_{\theta}(dx) \quad (5)$$

$$\exists \theta_* : \sup_{\epsilon \leq |\theta - \theta_*| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}} (\theta - \theta_*)^{\top} h(\theta) < 0 \quad \forall \epsilon > 0 \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_n \gamma_n = +\infty \quad (7)$$

$$T_n := \theta_n - \theta_* \quad (8)$$

$$Z_n := |T_n|^2 \quad (9)$$

4 Theorem Proof

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{n+1} &= |T_{n+1}|^2 \\
&= |\theta_{n+1} - \theta_*|^2 \\
&= \theta_{n+1}^2 + \theta_*^2 - 2\theta_{n+1}\theta_* \\
&= (\theta_n + \gamma_{n+1}H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}))^2 + \theta_*^2 - 2(\theta_n + \gamma_{n+1}H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}))\theta_* && \text{Def (2)} \\
&= \theta_n^2 + \gamma_{n+1}^2|H(\theta_n, X_{n+1})|^2 + 2\theta_n\gamma_{n+1}H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) + \theta_*^2 - 2\theta_n\theta_* - 2\theta_*\gamma_{n+1}H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) \\
&= |\theta_n - \theta_*|^2 + 2\gamma_{n+1}(\theta_n - \theta_*)^\top H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) + \gamma_{n+1}^2|H(\theta_n, X_{n+1})|^2 \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) + \gamma_{n+1}^2|H(\theta_n, X_{n+1})|^2 && \text{Defs (8) and (9)}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation with respect to the sub σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_n we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] &= \mathbb{E}[Z_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + 2\gamma_{n+1}\mathbb{E}[T_n^\top H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + \gamma_{n+1}^2\mathbb{E}[|H(\theta_n, X_{n+1})|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n] && \mathbb{E} \text{ linear} \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top \mathbb{E}[H(\theta_n, X_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n] + \gamma_{n+1}^2\mathbb{E}[|H(\theta_n, X_{n+1})|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n] && Z_n \text{ and } T_n \text{ known} \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2\sigma^2(\theta_n) && \text{Def (5) and (4)} \\
&\leq Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2C(1 + |\theta_n|^2) && \text{By (4)} \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2C + \gamma_{n+1}^2|\theta_n|^2 \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2C + \gamma_{n+1}^2|T_n + \theta_*|^2C && \text{Def (8)} \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2C + \gamma_{n+1}^2(|T_n|^2 + \theta_*^2 + 2T_n\theta_*)C \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2C + \gamma_{n+1}^2|T_n|^2C + \gamma_{n+1}^2\theta_*^2C + 2\gamma_{n+1}^2T_n\theta_*C \\
&= Z_n + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) + \gamma_{n+1}^2C + \gamma_{n+1}^2Z_nC + \gamma_{n+1}^2\theta_*^2C + 2\gamma_{n+1}^2T_n\theta_*C && \text{Def (9)} \\
&= Z_n(1 + \gamma_{n+1}^2C) + \gamma_{n+1}^2(C + \theta_*^2C + 2T_n\theta_*C) + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) \\
&= Z_n(1 + \gamma_{n+1}^2C) + \gamma_{n+1}^2\bar{C} + 2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) && \bar{C} \text{ const.}
\end{aligned}$$

where we've defined $\bar{C} := C + \theta_*^2C + 2T_n\theta_*C$, which is a constant with respect to the sub- σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_n .

From condition (6) we have that $T_n^\top h(\theta_n) < 0$. This means that we can rewrite $\mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n]$ as

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = (1 + B_n)Z_n + C_n - D_n$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
B_n &:= \gamma_{n+1}^2C \\
C_n &:= \gamma_{n+1}^2\bar{C} \\
D_n &:= -2\gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n)
\end{aligned}$$

which are all finite, non-negative random variables. Therefore we can apply (1a) and (1b) on the set

$$\left\{ C \sum_n \gamma_{n+1}^2 < \infty, \bar{C} \sum_n \gamma_{n+1}^2 \right\} = \left\{ \sum_n \gamma_{n+1}^2 \right\}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sum_n \gamma_{n+1}T_n^\top h(\theta_n) &< \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \\
Z_n &\rightarrow Z < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}
\end{aligned}$$

To prove that θ_n converges to θ_* almost surely, we want to show that Z is the zero random variable. We prove this by contraddiction. Suppose that Z is not the zero random variable. That is, suppose that there exists an outcome $\omega \in \Omega$ such that

$$Z(\omega) \neq 0$$

Recall that Z_n is a non-negative random variable. We have two cases:

- If $Z_n(\omega) = 0$ for all n then $Z(\omega) = 0$ with probability 1, contradicting our assumption, and proving the theorem.
- $Z_n(\omega) \neq 0$ for some n . That is $Z_n(\omega) > 0$ for some n .

In this second case, consider those n for which $Z_n(\omega) \neq 0$. This means that there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ after which we can find some $\epsilon^2 > 0$

$$\epsilon^2 \leq Z_n(\omega) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \quad n > N$$

This is true because

- If $Z_n(\omega) \in [1, \infty)$ then we can simply set $\epsilon^2 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \geq Z_n(\omega)$ (for instance, if $Z_n(\omega) \neq 0$ we can choose $\epsilon^2 := \frac{1}{Z_n(\omega)}$).
- If $Z_n(\omega) \in (0, 1)$ then by the Archimedean property we can always find an $0 < \epsilon^2 \leq Z_n(\omega)$. Clearly then, $\epsilon^2 \in [1, \infty)$.

In other words, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon^2 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\epsilon^2 \leq |T_n(\omega)|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \quad \forall n > N$$

that is,

$$\epsilon \leq |T_n(\omega)| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \quad \forall n > N$$

Using the fact that for any non-empty set S we have $\sup(S) = -\inf(-S)$ together with condition (6) we have that

$$\sup_{n > N} T_n(\omega)^\top h(\theta_n(\omega)) < 0$$

or equivalently

$$\inf_{n > N} -T_n(\omega)^\top h(\theta_n(\omega)) > 0$$

We can use the well-known fact that for any sequence $x_n \in \mathbb{R}$ the following holds

$$\inf_n x_n \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$$

to show

$$0 < \inf_{n > N} -T_n(\omega)^\top h(\theta_n(\omega)) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -T_n(\omega)^\top h(\theta_n(\omega))$$

This means that we can find some constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $0 < \alpha \leq -T_n(\omega)^\top h(\theta_n(\omega))$ for all $n > N$. Using this fact together with assumption (7) and the result

$$-\sum_n \gamma_{n+1} T_n^\top h(\theta_n) < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

we get

$$\sum_n -\gamma_{n+1} T_n^\top(\omega) h(\theta_n(\omega)) \geq \alpha \sum_n \gamma_{n+1} = +\infty$$

But this contradicts our earlier result found thanks to the lemma. Therefore our assumption that $\exists \omega \in \Omega$ such that $Z(\omega) \neq 0$ is wrong and Z_n converges almost surely to the zero random variable, that is

$$\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_* \quad \text{almost surely}$$

5 Doob's Theorem

Let X be a supermartingale that is bounded in \mathcal{L}^1 . That is, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}[|X_n|] < M$$

then there exists a random variable $X_\infty \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ such that

$$X_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} X_\infty$$

where $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \sigma(\bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n)$ is the smallest σ -algebra containing $\bigcup_n \mathcal{F}_n$.