

## Exercise 2.4

Yunhua Zhao

September 23, 2020

(a) because

$$x_n(t) = \vartheta^\epsilon(t_n + t)$$

and

$$\vartheta^\epsilon(t) = \theta_{m(t)}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} x_n(t) &= \theta_{m(t+t_n)} \\ x_n(t+s) &= \theta_{m(t+s+t_n)} \end{aligned}$$

then

$$x_n(t+s) - x_n(t) = \theta_{m(t+s+t_n)} - \theta_{m(t+t_n)}$$

which

$$= \sum_{i=m(t_n+t)}^{m(t_n+t+s)-1} \epsilon_i G(\theta_i)$$

Because  $X_\epsilon(\cdot)$  is piecewise point,  $G(X_\epsilon(\cdot))$  is also piecewise constant and its jump times are given by  $t_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \epsilon_k$ . Thus the definite integral on  $[t_n + t, t_n + t + s]$  of  $G(X_\epsilon(\cdot))$  is a sum that can be approximation expressed as

$$\int_{t_n+t}^{t_n+t+s} G[x_\epsilon(u)] du$$

together

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_n+t}^{t_n+t+s} G[x_\epsilon(u)] du &\approx \sum_{i=m(t_n+t)}^{m(t_n+t+s)-1} \epsilon_i G(\theta_i) \\ \int_{t_n+t}^{t_n+t+s} G[x_\epsilon(u)] du &= \sum_{i=m(t_n+t)}^{m(t_n+t+s)-1} \epsilon_i G(\theta_i) + \rho(\epsilon), \quad (2.1) \end{aligned}$$

(b) formula

$$x_n(t+s) - x_n(t) = \theta_{m(t+s+t_n)} - \theta_{m(t+t_n)} = \sum_{i=m(t_n+t)}^{m(t_n+t+s)-1} \epsilon_i G(\theta_i)$$

contains  $m(q) - m(r) - 1$  terms. For  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small, set the  $\epsilon_b$  is the biggest  $\epsilon$  and the  $\epsilon_s$  is the smallest  $\epsilon$  in interval  $(r, q)$  so that the number of terms is bounded by  $(\frac{q-r}{\epsilon_b}, \frac{q-r}{\epsilon_s})$ . This yields, for small  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\|(x_\epsilon(q) - x_\epsilon(r))\|_\infty = \sum_{i=m(r)}^{m(q)-1} \epsilon_i G(\theta_i)$$

Because  $G$  is bounded, let use  $L$  to represent  $G$ 's bounder, so

$$\|x_\epsilon(q) - x_\epsilon(r)\|_\infty = L \sum_{i=m(r)}^{m(q)-1} \epsilon_i < \epsilon_b L(q - r)/\epsilon_s, (2.2)$$

To summarize, for  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small, we have shown that for any  $\eta > 0$ , we may let  $\delta_\eta = \frac{\eta}{L(\epsilon_b/\epsilon_s)}$  so that it follows that  $\|x_\epsilon(q) - x_\epsilon(r)\|_\infty < \eta$  whenever  $\|q - r\| < \delta_\eta(\epsilon_b/\epsilon_s)$ . This establishes equicontinuity in the extended sense.

(c) Let  $a < t$  and  $b > t + s$  and consider  $x_{\epsilon_k}(\cdot)$  on  $(a, b)$ . Set  $x_n(0) = \theta_0$  for all  $k$ . Therefor, for  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small, by (b) formula 2.2,

$$|x_{\epsilon_k}(r)|_\infty < |\theta_0|_\infty + rL \frac{\epsilon_b}{\epsilon_s}$$

for all  $r > 0$ , which suffices to show that  $x_\epsilon$  is uniformly bounder in  $(a, b)$ . This together with equicontinuity of  $x_{\epsilon_k}$  implies by the Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem 2.2 that any infinite subsequence of  $x_{\epsilon_k}$  has a convergent subsequence with a continuous limit on  $(a, b)$ . Consider a convergent subsequence along  $\epsilon_r \rightarrow 0$ , so that  $\hat{x}(\cdot) = \lim_{\epsilon_r \rightarrow 0} x_{\epsilon_r}(\cdot)$  (in the sup norm) and continuous. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon_r \rightarrow 0} (x_{\epsilon_r}(t+s) - x_{\epsilon_r}(t)) &= \lim_{\epsilon_r \rightarrow 0} \int_t^{t+s} G(x_{\epsilon_r}(u)) du \\ &= \int_t^{t+s} \lim_{\epsilon_r \rightarrow 0} G(x_{\epsilon_r}(u)) du \\ &= \int_t^{t+s} G(\hat{x}(u)) du \end{aligned}$$

Where the first formula follows from the fact that  $\rho(\epsilon)$  in (2.1) is bounded by  $L(\epsilon_b + \epsilon_s)$  and thus of order  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ , the second formula follows from Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, and the third formula is a consequence of the continuity of  $G(\hat{x}(\cdot))$  on  $(a, b)$ . We arrive for  $s > 0$  at

$$\frac{\hat{x}(t+s) - \hat{x}(t)}{s} = \frac{1}{s} \int_t^{t+s} G(\hat{x}(u)) du$$

By continuity of  $G(\hat{x}(\cdot))$ , taking the limit as  $s$  goes to zero, the above right-hand side converges to  $G(\hat{x}(t))$ , which establishes the ODE in the question for  $\hat{x}(\cdot)$ . Because  $G$  is continuous and bounded on the trajectory  $\hat{x}$ , it follows from Theorem 2.1 that the ODE has a unique solution for each initial condition, establishing that all accumulation points have the same limit, proving the claim for the unbiased case.