

# Discrete Time Martingales

Week 4

January 27, 2023

LECTURER: SIVA ATHREYA

SCRIBE: ABHITI MISHRA, DEVESH BAJAJ

Origin is from horse-racing (betting system). The dictionary meaning of the word ‘martingale’ is the harness of a horse.

Let  $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a sequence of random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

**Definition 4.0.1.** *A sequence of random variables  $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is said to be a Martingale if*

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_n | Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1) = z_{n-1} \quad \forall n \geq 2 \quad (4.1)$$

Things to understand- conditional expectation for discrete and conditional random variable [?].  
Things we will explore-

1. Examples of  $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  that are martingales.
2. How different are martingales from iid sequences and markov chains?
3. How to interpret 4.1?

**Example.**  $\{S_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  and  $S_0 \equiv 0$ .

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1, & w.p \ 1/2 \\ -1, & w.p \ 1/2 \end{cases}$$

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

Let  $s_{n-1}, s_{n-2}, \dots, s_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1) > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(S_n | S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1) &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k \mathbb{P}(S_n = k | S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1) \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_n = k, S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} + X_n = k, S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_n = k - s_{n-1}, S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_n = k - s_{n-1}) \mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)}{\mathbb{P}(S_{n-1} = s_{n-1}, \dots, S_1 = s_1)} \\
&= (s_{n-1} + 1) \mathbb{P}(X_n = -1) + (s_{n-1} - 1) \mathbb{P}(X_n = 1) \\
&= (s_{n-1} + 1) \frac{1}{2} + (s_{n-1} - 1) \frac{1}{2} = s_{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the summations here are “finite” sums.

As  $s_{n-1}, \dots, s_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  were arbitrary,  $\{S_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a martingale.

**Example.**  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  be an iid sequence on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Let  $Z_n = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $\text{Range}(Z_n) \subset \mathbb{R} \ \forall \ n \geq 1$ .

Let  $z_{n-1}, \dots, z_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1) > 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(Z_n | Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1) &= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(Z_n)} k \mathbb{P}(Z_n = k | Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1) \\
&= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(Z_n)} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_n = k, Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(Z_n)} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} X_n = k, Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(Z_n)} k \frac{\mathbb{P}(z_{n-1} X_n = k, Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)} \\
&= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(Z_n)} k \mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} X_n = k) \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1)} \\
&= \sum_{u \in S^1, \text{Range}(X_n) = S^1} u z_{n-1} \mathbb{P}(X_n = u) \\
&= z_{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_n] = z_{n-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the sums here might be infinite. In the last step we assume  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 1$ . Now since  $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$  were arbitrary,  $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a martingale.

**Example.**

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{w.p. } 1/2 \\ 0, & \text{w.p. } 1/2 \end{cases}$$

Then  $\mathbb{E}(X_i) = 1$ . Therefore,  $Z_n = \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  is a martingale. Range  $(Z_n) = \{2^n, 0\}$ . Note that the mean stays constant and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_n = 0) &= 1 - \frac{1}{2^n} \\ \mathbb{P}(Z_n = 2^n) &= \frac{1}{2^n} \end{aligned}$$

**Intuition-** The first equation shows that the martingale takes a very low value with very high probability and the second one shows that it takes a very large value with very low probability  
Idea behind Markov Chains -

$$"X_n | X_{n-1}, \dots, X_1" \stackrel{d}{=} X_n | X_{n-1}$$

Idea behind Martingales - Expected value of  $Z_n$  conditioned on the past depends only on  $Z_{n-1}$ .  $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in law could depend on the entire past!

**Week 5**

**February 3, 2023**

LECTURER: SIVA ATHREYA

SCRIBE: ATREYA CHOUDHURY, ANKAN KAR

We define  $f : D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where

$$f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1}) = \mathbf{E}[Z_n | Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, Z_{n-2} = z_{n-2}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1]$$

Define  $Y_n : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  where

$$Y_n(\omega) := f(Z_1(\omega), Z_2(\omega), \dots, Z_{n-1}(\omega)) \quad (4.2)$$

You can check that  $\{Y_n\}$  is a random variable.

**Property 4.0.1.** *Some properties of  $\{Y_n\}$*

1.  $A := \{Z_{n-1} = z_{n-1}, Z_{n-2} = z_{n-2}, \dots, Z_1 = z_1\}$

$$\omega \in A \implies Y_n(\omega) = f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n-1})$$

2.  $L := \{Y_n \leq c\} = \{f(Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_{n-1}) \leq c\}$

$$L \in \mathcal{A}_{n-1} \equiv \text{observable events upto } n-1$$

(4.2)  $\iff \{Y_n\}$  has the above two properties

If  $\{Z_n\}$  is martingale,  $Y_n = Z_{n-1}$

**Lemma 4.0.1.** Let  $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  be martingale. Then,

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \mathbf{E}[Z_n | Z_i, Z_{i-1}, \dots, Z_1] = Z_i$$

*Proof.* We fix  $i$  and prove by induction on  $n$ .

We look at  $n = i+1$ . By martingale property,

$$\mathbf{E}[Z_{i+1} | Z_i, Z_{i-1}, \dots, Z_1] = Z_i$$

Let  $k > 0$  and the statement hold for  $n = i + k$ . We look at  $n = i + k + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[Z_{i+k+1} | Z_i, Z_{i-1}, \dots, Z_1] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[Z_{i+k+1} | Z_{i+k}, Z_{i+k-1}, \dots, Z_1] | Z_i, Z_{i-1}, \dots, Z_1] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[Z_{i+k} | Z_i, Z_{i-1}, \dots, Z_1] \quad [\text{using (4.0.1)}] \\ &= Z_i \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is obtained from the induction hypothesis □

The property used in the first equality is called the Tower property. We now formally state and prove the same.

**Property 4.0.2** (Tower Property).

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[X | Y, Z] | Y] = \mathbf{E}[X | Y]$$

*Proof.*

$$\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[X | Y, Z] | Y] = E[h(Y, Z) | Y] = k(Y)$$

Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathbf{P}(Y = y) > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} k(y) &= E[h(Y, Z) | Y] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{m \in \text{Range}(Y) \\ t \in \text{Range}(Z)}} h(m, t) \mathbf{P}(Y = m, Z = t | Y = y) \\ &= \sum_{t \in \text{Range}(Z)} h(y, t) \mathbf{P}(Z = t | Y = y) \\ &= \sum_{t \in \text{Range}(Z)} \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(X)} k \mathbf{P}(X = k | Y = y, Z = t) \mathbf{P}(Z = t | Y = y) \\ &= \sum_{t \in \text{Range}(Z)} \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(X)} k \frac{\mathbf{P}(X = k, Y = y, Z = t)}{\mathbf{P}(Y = y, Z = t)} \frac{\mathbf{P}(Z = t, Y = y)}{\mathbf{P}(Y = y)} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(X)} \sum_{t \in \text{Range}(Z)} k \frac{\mathbf{P}(X = k, Y = y, Z = t)}{\mathbf{P}(Y = y)} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \text{Range}(X)} k \frac{\mathbf{P}(X = k, Y = y)}{\mathbf{P}(Y = y)} \\ &= \mathbf{E}[X | Y = y] \end{aligned}$$

□