## MA414 STOCHASTIC ANALYSIS: SOLUTIONS TO MOCK EXAMINATION, 2011

Q1. (i) Q is non-negative as P is, and Q has total mass 1. If A is the disjoint union of  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$Q(A) = E[XI(A)]/E[X]$$

$$= E[X \sum_{n} I(A_n)]/E[X] \qquad (I(A) = \sum_{n} I(A_n))$$

$$= \sum_{n} E[XI(A_n)]/E[X] \qquad \text{(by monotone convergence applied to the partial sums)}$$

$$= \sum_{n} Q(A_n),$$

giving  $\sigma$ -additivity of Q. So Q is a probability measure. [2]

(ii) 
$$Q(A) = \int_A X dP/E[X]$$
, so if  $P(A) = 0$ , then also  $Q(A) = 0$ :  $Q$  is absolutely continuous w.r.t.  $P$ .

(iii) For each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$\int_{A} dQ = Q(A) = E[XI(A)]/E[X] = \int_{A} (X/E[X])dP.$$

Since this holds for all A, dQ = (X/E[X])dP: dQ/dP = (X/E[X]). [2]

(iv) 
$$E_Q[Z] = \int Z dQ = \int Z (dQ/dP) dP = \int (ZX/E[X]) dP$$
  
=  $E[ZX]/E[X]$ . [2]

Jensen's Inequality says that for  $\phi$  convex and  $X, \phi(X) \in L_1$ ,

 $\phi(E[X]) \le E[\phi(X)]. \tag{2}$ 

 $(E[ZX^p]/E[X^p])^q < E[Z^qX^p]/E[X^p].$ 

For 
$$p > 1$$
,  $q > 1$  also, so  $\phi(x) := x^q$  is convex. So  $(E_Q[Z])^p \le E_Q[Z^q]$ :

Taking  $Z := Y/X^{p-1}$  as suggested, and using q(p-1) = p:

$$(E[XY]/E[X^p])^q \le E[Y^q.X^p/X^{q(p-1)}]/E[X^p] = E[Y^q]/E[X^p].$$

Taking qth roots,  $E[XY]/E[X^p] \le (E[Y^q])^{1/q} \cdot E[X^p]^{-1/q} = ||Y||_q \cdot E[X^p]^{-1/q}$ . That is,

$$E[XY] \le ||Y||_q \cdot E[X^p]^{1-1/q} = ||Y||_q \cdot E[X^p]^{1/p} = ||Y||_q \cdot ||X||_p :$$

$$||XY||_1 \le ||X||_p.||Y||_q,$$

giving Hölder's Inequality, as required. //

Q2. Fatou's Lemma: if 
$$X_n \ge 0$$
,  $E[\liminf X_n] \le \liminf E[X_n]$ . [3]

Given  $X, Y \geq 0, Y \in L_p$  for p > 1, and

$$xP(X \ge x) \le E[YI(X \ge x)]$$
 for all  $x \ge 0$ . (\*)

To prove: (i)  $X \in L_p$ ; (ii)  $||X||_p \le \frac{p}{p-1} ||Y||_p$ .

Proof. Let  $X_n := \min(X, n)$ . Then  $P(X_n \ge x) = I(n \ge x)P(X \ge x)$  and  $I(X_n \ge x) = I(n \ge x)I(X \ge x)$ . So if (X, Y) satisfy (\*) (given), so do  $(X_n, Y)$  (both sides are 0 if x > n and as in (\*) if not), and  $X_n$  is (bounded, so) in  $L_q$  (we use Hölder's Inequality below). [3] For  $x \ge 0$ ,

$$x^{p} = p \int_{0}^{x} u^{p-1} du = p \int_{0}^{\infty} u^{p-1} I(x \ge u) du.$$
 [3]

Replace x by  $X_n := \min(X, n)$  and take expectations:

$$E[X_n^p] = p \int_0^\infty u^{p-1} P(X_n \ge u) du$$

$$\le p \int_0^\infty u^{p-2} E[YI(X_n \ge u)] du \qquad \text{(by (*))}$$

$$= p E[Y \int_0^\infty u^{p-2} I(X_n \ge u) du]$$

$$= \frac{p}{p-1} E[Y.X_n^{p-1}].$$

[7]

By Hölder's Inequality, with q = p/(p-1) the conjugate index to p,

$$E(Y \cdot X_n^{p-1}) \le (E[Y^p])^{1/p} \cdot (E[X_n^{(p-1)q}]^{1/q} = (E[Y^p])^{1/p} \cdot (E[X_n^p]^{(p-1)/p} = ||Y||_p \cdot ||X_n||_p^{p-1}.$$

Combining,

$$||X_n||_p^p \le \frac{p}{p-1} ||Y||_p \cdot ||X_n||_p^{p-1},$$

giving

$$||X_n||_p \le \frac{p}{p-1} ||Y||_p.$$
 [3]

Now let  $n \to \infty$ :  $X_n \to X$ , so by Fatou's Lemma (applied to  $X_n^p$ ), this extends from  $X_n$  to X, giving (i) and (ii). [3]

Q3. (i) Markov's Inequality says that for  $X \geq 0$  in  $L_1$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ ,

$$P(X \ge \lambda) \le E[X]/\lambda.$$
 [2]

Proof.

$$E[X] = \int_{\Omega} X dP = \int X I(X \ge \lambda) dP + \int X I(X \le \lambda) dP \ge \int X I(X \ge \lambda) dP$$

$$\geq \lambda \int I(X \geq \lambda) dP = \lambda E[I(X \geq \lambda)] = \lambda P(X \geq \lambda).$$
 [4]

(ii)  $L_1$ -convergence implies convergence in measure. If  $X_n, X \in L_1, X_n \to X$  in  $L_1, E[|X_n - X|] \to 0$ , so by Markov's Inequality

$$P(|X_n - X| \ge \epsilon) \le E[|X_n - X|]/\epsilon \to 0,$$

so 
$$X_n \to X$$
 in probability.

[5]

(iii) Conditional expectation is a contraction. If C is a sub- $\sigma$ -field and  $X \in L_1$ ,  $E|E[X|C]| \leq E[|X|]$ .

*Proof.* If  $A := \{E[X|\mathcal{C}] \ge 0\}$ , then  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ , and

$$E|E[X|\mathcal{C}]| = E[E[X|\mathcal{C}]I(A)] + E[E[X|\mathcal{C}]I(A^c)] = E[E[X]I(A)] + E[E[X]I(A^c)],$$

by definition of conditional expectation, as  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ . As

$$|E[XI(A)]| \le E[|X|I(A)], \qquad |E[XI(A^c)]| \le E[|X|I(A^c)]$$

and  $I(A) + I(A^c) = 1$ , this gives

$$E|E[X|\mathcal{C}]| \le E[|X|]. \quad //$$
 [8]

(iv) 
$$(X_n)$$
 is uniformly integrable (UI) if  $\sup_n \{ E[X_n I(|X_n| \ge x)] \} \to 0 \ (n \to \infty).$  [2]

(v) As  $X_n$  is UI and converges to X a.s., it converges to X in  $L_1$  (lectures). So by (iii),

$$|E[X_n|\mathcal{C}] - E[X_n|\mathcal{C}]| \le E[|X_n - X||\mathcal{C}] \le E[|X_n - X|] \to 0,$$

so 
$$E[X_n|\mathcal{C}] \to E[X|\mathcal{C}]$$
 in  $L_1$ , so by (i) in probability. //

Q4. (i) A stopping time  $\tau$  for a filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$  is a random variable such that for each t,  $\min(t,\tau)$  (or  $t \wedge \tau$ )  $\in \mathcal{F}_t$ . [2]

A local martingale  $X=(X_t)$  is a stochastic process such that for some localising sequence of stopping times  $\tau_n \uparrow \infty$ ,  $(X_{t \land \tau_n})$  is a martingale. [2]

If X is a local martingale and  $\tau$  is a stopping time: let  $\tau_n$  be a localising sequence. Then  $X_{t \wedge \tau_n}$  is a mg for each n. By Doob's Stopping Time Theorem,  $X_{t \wedge \tau_n \wedge \tau}$  is a mg, for each n. This says that  $Y_{t \wedge \tau_n}$  is a mg for each n, which in turn says that Y is a local mg. [4]

(ii) Choose a localising sequence  $\tau_n \uparrow \infty$ . For  $t \geq 0$  and  $s \in [0, t]$ , the mg property of  $X_{t \wedge \tau_n}$  gives

$$E[X_{t \wedge \tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] = X_{s \wedge \tau_n}.$$

As  $n \to \infty$ ,  $X_{t \wedge \tau_n} \to X_t$ , and  $X_{s \wedge \tau_n} \to X_s$ . As X is bounded,  $|X_t| \le M < \infty$  say, we can let  $n \to \infty$  above and use dominated convergence to get

$$E[X_t|\mathcal{F}_s] = X_s$$
.

This says that X is a mg.

(iii) For  $\tau_n$  a localising sequence, by the local mg property,

$$X_{s \wedge \tau_n} = E[X_{t \wedge \tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] \qquad (0 \le s \le t).$$

Let  $n \to \infty$ : by Fatou's Lemma,

$$X_s \ge E[X_t | \mathcal{F}_s] \qquad (0 \le s \le t). \tag{*}$$

[5]

This says that X is a supermg.

(iv) If now the time-set is [0,T], then the above holds with  $0 \le s \le t \le T$ . Taking expectations gives

$$E[X_0] \ge E[X_s] \ge E[X_t] \ge E[X_T].$$

We are given  $E[X_0] = E[X_T]$ , so the inequalities above are all equalities. If we had strict inequality in (\*), we would get  $E[X_s] > E[X_t]$  on taking expectations. As we do not, we must have *equality* in (\*). This says that X is a mg.

Q5. (i)

$$\psi(t) = E[e^{itY}] = E[\exp\{it(X_1 + \dots + X_N)\}]$$

$$= \sum_{n} E[\exp\{it(X_1 + \dots + X_N)\} | N = n].P(N = n)$$

$$= \sum_{n} e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{n} / n!.E[\exp\{it(X_1 + \dots + X_n)\}]$$

$$= \sum_{n} e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{n} / n!.(E[\exp\{itX_1\}])^{n}$$

$$= \sum_{n} e^{-\lambda} \lambda^{n} / n!.\phi(t)^{n}$$

$$= \exp\{-\lambda(1 - \phi(t))\}.$$

[7]

Differentiate:

$$\psi'(t) = \psi(t).\lambda\phi'(t),$$
  
$$\psi''(t) = \psi'(t).\lambda\phi'(t) + \psi(t).\lambda\phi''(t).$$

As  $\phi(t) = E[e^{itX}]$ ,  $\phi'(t) = E[iXe^{itX}]$ ,  $\phi''(t) = E[-X^2e^{itX}]$ . So  $(\phi(0) = 1$  and)  $\phi'(0) = i\mu$ ,  $\phi''(0) = -E[X^2]$ ,

$$\psi'(0) = \lambda \phi'(0) = \lambda . i\mu,$$

and as also  $\psi'(0) = iEY$ , this gives  $EY = \lambda \mu$ . [5] Similarly,

$$\psi''(0) = i\lambda\mu . i\lambda\mu + \lambda\phi''(0) = -\lambda^2\mu^2 - \lambda E[X^2],$$

and also  $(\psi(0) = 1, \psi'(0) = i\lambda\mu \text{ and }) \psi''(0) = -E[Y^2]$ . So

$$var Y = E[Y^2] - [EY]^2 = \lambda^2 \mu^2 + \lambda E[X^2] - \lambda^2 \mu^2 = \lambda E[X^2].$$
 [5]

(ii) Given  $N, Y = X_1 + \ldots + X_N$  has mean  $NEX = N\mu$  and variance  $N \ var \ X = N\sigma^2$ . As N is Poisson with parameter  $\lambda$ , N has mean  $\lambda$  and variance  $\lambda$ . So by the Conditional Mean Formula,

$$EY = E[E(Y|N)] = E[N\mu] = \lambda\mu.$$
 [4]

By the Conditional Variance Formula,

$$var \ Y = E[var(Y|N)] + var \ E[Y|N] = E[Nvar \ X] + var[N \ EX]$$
  
=  $EN.var \ X + var \ N.(EX)^2 = \lambda [E(X^2) - (EX)^2] + \lambda.(EX)^2 = \lambda E[X^2].$  [4]

Q6. (i). Write  $f(B,t) := (B^2 - t)^2$ . By Itô's formula,

$$df = f_B dB + f_t dt + \frac{1}{2} [f_{BB} (dB)^2 + 2f_{Bt} dB dt + f_{tt} (dt)^2].$$

In the [...] on RHS,  $(dB)^2 = dt$ , dBdt = 0,  $(dt)^2 = 0$ . Also

$$f_B = 2.2B(B^2 - t), \quad f_t = -2(B^2 - t), \quad f_{BB} = 4(B^2 - t) + 4B.2B = 12B^2 - 4t.$$

So

$$df = 4B(B^2 - t)dB - 2(B^2 - t)dt + (6B^2 - 2t)dt = 4B(B^2 - t)dB + 4B^2dt.$$

As  $M = f - 4 \int_0^t B_s^2 ds$ , the stochastic differential of M is

$$dM = df - 4B_t^2 dt = 4B(B^2 - t)dB.$$
 [8]

(ii) So integrating, M is the Itô integral

$$M_t = 4 \int_0^t B_s(B_s^2 - s) dB_s.$$
 [5]

The Itô integral on the RHS is a continuous local martingale starting from 0. Now  $B_t =_d t^{1/2}.Z$  where Z is N(0,1). As Z has all moments finite, each  $E[B_t^n]$  is a polynomial in t. So the integrand  $h = h(B_t, t)$  on RHS satisfies the integrability condition  $\int_0^t E[h_s^2]ds < \infty$  for all t. So the RHS is a (true) continuous mg starting from 0. [5]

(iii) With  $([M_t])$  the quadratic variation of M,

$$d[M]_t = (dM)_t^2;$$
  $dM_t = 4B_t(B_t^2 - t)dB_t.$ 

So

$$d[M]_t = 16B_t^2(B_t^2 - t)^2(dB_t)^2 = 16B_t^2(B_t^2 - t)^2dt:$$

$$[M]_t = 16\int_0^t B_s^2(B_s^2 - s)^2ds.$$
 [7]

N. H. Bingham