

Martingales and Stochastic Calculus

Alex Rutar^{*}
University of Waterloo

Winter 2020[†]

^{*}*arutar@uwaterloo.ca*

[†]Last updated: January 29, 2020

Contents

Chapter I	Stochastic Calculus	
1	Measure Theory for Probability	1
1.1	Conditional Expectation	1
1.2	Stochastic Processes	1
2	Martingale Theory	2
2.1	Stopping Times	2
2.2	Doob's Upcrossing Inequality	3
2.3	Optimal Sampling Theorems	5
2.4	Martingale Convergence	9
3	Brownian Motion	10
4	Stochastic Integration	12
4.1	Properties of the Stochastic Integral	15

I. Stochastic Calculus

1 MEASURE THEORY FOR PROBABILITY

Definition. Given a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, a measurable function $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a **random variable**. If X is a random variable, then we define the **distribution** of X to be the measure Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} given by $\mu(E) = \mathbb{P}(X^{-1}(E))$.

1.1 CONDITIONAL EXPECTATION

1.1 Theorem. (Kolmogorov) Suppose $X \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is a sub- σ -algebra. Then there exists some $Z \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$ such that for each $A \in \mathcal{G}$

$$\int_A X d\mathbb{P} = \int_A Z d\mathbb{P}.$$

Moreover, if $\tilde{Z} \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$ satisfies the above constraint, then $\mathbb{P}\{x \in \Omega : \tilde{Z}(x) = Z(x)\} = 1$.

Definition. In the context of the above theorem, we write $Z = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$ and call $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$ a **conditional expectation** with respect to \mathcal{G} . Certainly $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$ need not be pointwise unique.

1.2 Theorem. (Properties of Conditional Expectation) Suppose X, Y are random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $X \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Let $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a sub- σ -algebra. Then

1. $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}] \geq 0$ a.s. whenever $X \geq 0$ a.s.
2. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Y \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, $\mathbb{E}[\alpha X + \beta Y|\mathcal{G}] = \alpha \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}] + \beta \mathbb{E}[Y|\mathcal{G}]$ a.s.
3. If $XY \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and Y is \mathcal{G} -measurable, then $\mathbb{E}[XY|\mathcal{G}] = Y \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$
4. If $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{G}$ is a σ -algebra, then $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]|\mathcal{H}] = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{H}]$ a.s.
5. $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]] = \mathbb{E}[X]$
6. If \mathcal{H} is a σ -algebra which is independent of the σ -algebra $\sigma\{\sigma\{X\}, \mathcal{G}\}$, then $\mathbb{E}[X|\sigma\{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}\}] = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}] = \mathbb{E}[X]$ a.s. whenever $\sigma\{X\}$ and \mathcal{H} are independent.

1.2 STOCHASTIC PROCESSES

Definition. A **stochastic process** $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is a collection of random variables defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

Typically, we assume that $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ or $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and equip \mathcal{T} with the order topology. Intuitively, we expect t to be a discrete or continuous time parameter. Given some $\omega \in \Omega$, the map $t \mapsto X_t(\omega)$ is called a **realization** or **path** of this process. One of the goals of this section is to treat $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ as a random element in some path space, equipped with a proper σ -algebra and probability.

Definition. We say that a stochastic process is **L^p** if X_t is L^p for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then we say that a stochastic process is **uniformly L^p** if there exists some $B \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $\int_{\Omega} |X_t|^p d\mathbb{P} \leq B$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Consider $X_t(\omega)$ as a function $X : \mathcal{T} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the product σ -algebra.

Definition. The **distribution** of a stochastic process is the collection of all its finite-dimensional distributions, i.e. the collection of all the distributions of $\{X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_k}\}$ for and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_i \in \mathcal{T}$.

There are a number of ways to say that two processes X and Y are equivalent, which we organize in decreasing order of strength.

Definition. Let $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ and $Y = \{Y_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ be stochastic processes.

- We say that X and Y are called **indistinguishable** if almost all their sample paths agree; in other words,

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega \in \Omega : X_t(\omega) = Y_t(\omega) \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{T}) = 1.$$

- We say that Y is a **modification** of X if for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ we have $\mathbb{P}(\omega \in \Omega : X_t(\omega) = Y_t(\omega)) = 1$.
- Finally, X and Y are said to have the **same distribution** if all the finite dimensional distributions agree. In other words, if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_1 < \dots < t_n$, with $t_i \in \mathcal{T}$, we have $(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n}) \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_{t_1}, \dots, Y_{t_n})$.

Example. Let X be a continuous stochastic process and N a Poisson point process on $[0, \infty)$. Then define

$$Y_t := \begin{cases} X_t & : t \notin N \\ X_t + 1 & : t \in N \end{cases}$$

Thus $\mathbb{P}(X_t = Y_t) = 1$ for all t , so X is a modification of Y . However, $\mathbb{P}(X_t = Y_t, t \geq 0) = 0$, so that X and Y are not indistinguishable.

A filtration formalizes the idea of “information acquired over time”.

Definition. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. A **filtration** is a non-decreasing family $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{F} so that $\mathcal{F}_s \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ for any $s < t$ in \mathcal{T} . We write $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma(\bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{F}_t)$.

Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ be a stochastic process.

Definition. The **filtration generated by $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$** is $\{\sigma(\{X_s : s \leq t\})\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$. In other words \mathcal{F}_t is the smallest σ -algebra which makes X_s measurable for all $s \leq t$ in \mathcal{T} . A stochastic process $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is called **adapted** to a filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ if X_t is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Clearly, the filtration generated by $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is the smallest filtration which makes $(X_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ adapted.

Definition. A filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is said to satisfy the “usual condition” if

- it is right-continuous: $\lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathcal{F}_s = \mathcal{F}_t$, and
- \mathcal{F}_0 contains all the \mathbb{P} -null events in \mathcal{F} .

2 MARTINGALE THEORY

2.1 STOPPING TIMES

Consider a filtered space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}, \mathbb{P})$, i.e. a probability space equipped with a filtration.

Definition. A random time $N : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ is called a **stopping time** if $N^{-1}([0, t]) \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

The philosophy here is that we know that a stopping time happens when it happens.

- Example.* (i) Constants are trivial stopping times.
 (ii) Last hit a constant before some fixed bound is not a stopping time

2.1 Proposition. *If T, S are stopping times, $\min\{T, S\}$, $\max\{T, S\}$, and $T + S$ are stopping times.*

- PROOF • We have $\min\{T, S\}^{-1}([0, t]) = T^{-1}([0, t]) \cap S^{-1}([0, t]) \in \mathcal{F}_t$.
 • Similarly, we have $\max\{T, S\}^{-1}([0, t]) = T^{-1}([0, t]) \cup S^{-1}([0, t]) \in \mathcal{F}_t$.
 • For $T + S$, we have that

$$(T + S)^{-1}((t, \infty)) = (T^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap S^{-1}((t, \infty))) \cup S^{-1}((t, \infty)) \cup (T^{-1}((0, t]) \cap (T + S)^{-1}((t, \infty)))$$

where $T^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap S^{-1}((t, \infty)) \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and $S^{-1}((t, \infty)) \in \mathcal{F}_t$. To finish the proof, since T has a countable dense subset Q , we have

$$T^{-1}((0, t]) \cap (T + S)^{-1}((t, \infty)) = \bigcup_{r \in Q \cap (0, t)} S^{-1}((r, t]) \cap T^{-1}((t - r, \infty))$$

where the expressions in the union are certainly \mathcal{F}_t -measurable. ■

Definition. The σ -algebra generated by a stopping time T is the set of all events A for which $A \cap T^{-1}([0, t]) \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Intuitively, this is the information you collect until the stopping time. Note that this σ -algebra is not the same as the σ -algebra generated by the random variable T . It is left as an exercise to the reader to verify that the above collection is indeed a σ -algebra.

We write $X_{T \wedge t}$ is a random variable evaluated at time $T \wedge t$ (or T); in other words, $(X_{T \wedge t})(\omega) = X_{T \wedge t}(\omega)$. Then $\{X_{T \wedge t}\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$, or X^T , is a stochastic process stopped at time t .

2.2 DOOB'S UPCROSSING INEQUALITY

Definition. Consider a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}, \mathbb{P})$. A $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ -adapted process $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is said to be a **submartingale** if

- (i) for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $X_t \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and
 (ii) for all $s < t$ where $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_t | \mathcal{F}_s) \geq X_s$$

almost surely.

and is said to be a **supermartingale** if condition (ii) above is replaced with

- (ii') for all $s < t$ where $s, t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_t | \mathcal{F}_s) \leq X_s$$

almost surely.

Then $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is a **martingale** if it is both a submartingale and supermartingale.

If X is a submartingale and $0 \leq s < t$ are fixed times, then $\mathbb{E}(X_0) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_s) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_t)$. Similar statements hold in the (super)martingale cases as well. One of the goals of martingale theory is to extend these results with respect to stopping times, rather than with respect to fixed times.

Definition. Let $X = \{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ be a discrete time process and fix levels $a < b$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the **number of upcrossings** of $[a, b]$ by X before time N with respect to the event $\omega \in \Omega$, denoted by $U_N^X([a, b], \omega)$, is the maximal $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that there exists times $0 \leq s_1 < t_1 < s_2 < t_2 < \dots < s_k < t_k \leq N$ such that for all i , $X_{s_i}(\omega) \leq a$ and $X_{t_i}(\omega) \geq b$.

Note that $U_N^X([a, b]) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ given by $\omega \mapsto U_N^X([a, b], \omega)$ is a random variable.

Definition. A process $C = \{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is called **previsible** if C_n is \mathcal{F}_{n-1} -measurable for all $n \geq 1$. Suppose in addition that $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a discrete time process. Then the **martingale transform** of X by C , denoted by $C \cdot X$, is defined by

$$(C \cdot X)_n = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^n C_k (X_k - X_{k-1}) & : n > 0 \\ 0 & : n = 0 \end{cases}$$

2.2 Lemma. Suppose C is a bounded or L^2 previsible process. Then

- (i) Let C be non-negative and X a supermartingale. Then $C \cdot X$ is a supermartingale which is null at 0.
- (ii) Let X be a martingale. Then $C \cdot X$ is a martingale which is null at 0.

PROOF We first treat the case where C is bounded.

- (i) We have by properties of conditional expectation and non-negativity of C

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(C \cdot X)_n - (C \cdot X)_{n-1} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[C_n (X_n - X_{n-1}) | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \\ &= C_n \cdot \mathbb{E}[X_n - X_{n-1} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows since C is previsible. Integrability follows immediately since C is bounded and X_n is L^1 for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

- (ii) Consider $C + k$ where k is a constant and $k \geq |C_n(w)|$ for all n and w .
- (iii) Similar, but the integrability is now guaranteed by Hölder's inequality. ■

We now have the following result:

2.3 Proposition. (Doob's Upcrossing Inequality) (i) Let X be a supermartingale. Then

$$(b - a) \cdot \mathbb{E}[U_N^X([a, b])] \leq \mathbb{E}[(X_N - a)^-].$$

- (ii) Let X be a submartingale. Then

$$(b - a) \cdot \mathbb{E}[U_N^X([a, b])] \leq \mathbb{E}[(X_N - a)^+].$$

PROOF We prove (i); the proof of (ii) is analogous. Define a process $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &:= 0 \\ C_1 &:= \chi_{X_0^{-1}((-\infty, a))} \\ C_n &:= \chi_{C_{n-1}^{-1}(\{1\})} \cdot \chi_{X_{n-1}^{-1}((-\infty, b])} + \chi_{C_{n-1}^{-1}(\{0\})} \cdot \chi_{X_{n-1}^{-1}((-\infty, a))}. \end{aligned}$$

Certainly C is non-negative and bounded; previsibility follows since C_n is a characteristic function depending only on preimages of X_k for $k < n$. Thus set $Y = C \cdot X$, i.e. $Y_n = \sum_{k=1}^n C_k \cdot (X_k - X_{k-1})$ almost surely; by Lemma 2.2, Y is a supermartingale.

Since each finished upcrossing increases the value of Y by at least $b - a$, we have for any $\omega \in \Omega$

$$Y_N(\omega) \geq (b - a)U_N^X([a, b], \omega) - (X_n - a)^-(\omega)$$

where $(X_N - a)^-(\omega)$ is the upper bound for the “loss” due to the last unfinished upcrossing. Since $\mathbb{E}(Y_1) \leq 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}(Y_N) \leq \mathbb{E}(Y_1) \leq 0$. Thus

$$(b - a) \cdot \mathbb{E}[U_N^X([a, b])] \leq \mathbb{E}[(X_n - a)^-]$$

as required. ■

2.3 OPTIMAL SAMPLING THEOREMS

2.4 Theorem. Suppose $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ is uniformly L^2 . Then X_t converge in L^2 to a limit X_∞ .

PROOF Note that we have the result for both discrete and continuous time martingales. By discretization, it is clear that it suffices to prove the result for discrete case.

We have the following orthogonality between the increments of a martingale $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$: if $n_1 < n_2 \leq n_3 < n_4$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_{n_2} - X_{n_1})(X_{n_4} - X_{n_3})] = 0.$$

This result follows by conditioning on \mathcal{F}_{n_3} and applying the law of total expectation.

Now the proof proceeds. Set $Y_n := X_n - X_{n-1}$, so

$$\|X_n\|_2^2 = \mathbb{E}(X_n^2) = \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i\|_2^2$$

and $\sum_{i=0}^n \|Y_n\|_2^2 \leq B$ for all n , so that $\sum_{i=0}^\infty \|Y_n\|_2^2 \leq B$. Thus $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is Cauchy in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. ■

2.5 Theorem. (Optimal Sampling for Bounded Stopping Times in Discrete Times) Let $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$ supermartingale and S, T be $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ -stopping times such that $0 \leq S \leq T \leq N$ for some constant $N < \infty$. Then X_T is integrable and $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$ almost surely.

PROOF Notice that

$$|X_T| \leq |X_0| + |X_1| + \cdots + |X_N|$$

so that $\mathbb{E}(|X_T|) < \infty$. To prove that $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$ a.s., it suffices to prove that $\mathbb{E}(X_T; A) := \int_A X_T d\mathcal{P} \leq \int_A X_S d\mathcal{P} =: \mathbb{E}(X_S; A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_S$. Assuming this, then

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) - X_S; A) \leq 0$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_S$, so we may take $A = A_0 := \{\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) - X_S > 0\}$, so that $\mathbb{P}(A_0) = 0$.

Let's prove the required statement. First note that

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \chi_{\{S < n \leq T\}} (X_n - X_{n-1}) = X_T - X_S$$

and taking expectation over A on both sides

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_T - X_S; A) &= \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(\chi_{\{S < n \leq T\}}(X_n - X_{n-1}); A) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}(X_n - X_{n-1}; A \cap \{S < n \leq T\})\end{aligned}$$

But $A \cap \{S < n \leq T\} = A \cap \{S \leq n-1\} \cap \{n-1 < T\} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}(X_n - X_{n-1}; A \cap \{S < n \leq T\}) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X_n - X_{n-1} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}); A \cap \{S < n \leq T\}) \leq 0$$

so the required statement holds. \blacksquare

Definition. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$ a supermartingale. We say that $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is **closed** by a random variable X_∞ if X_∞ is \mathcal{F}_∞ -measurable and $X_n \geq \mathbb{E}(X_\infty | \mathcal{F}_n)$ almost surely for all $n = 0, 1, \dots$

Similar statements hold with $X_n \leq \mathbb{E}(X_\infty | \mathcal{F}_n)$ for a submartingale, or equality with a martingale.

2.6 Proposition. Suppose that $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$ a non-negative supermartingale, and $X_\infty = 0$. If $S, T : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}^+}$ are $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ -stopping times, $S \leq T$, then

1. $\mathbb{E}(X_T) < \infty$
2. $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$

PROOF 1. Note that $X_T \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_{T \wedge n}$ where $T \wedge n$ and 0 are two bounded stopping times. Thus $\mathbb{E}(X_{T \wedge n}) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_0)$ for all $n = 0, 1, \dots$. Thus by Fatou's lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_T) &\leq \mathbb{E}(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_{T \wedge n}) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X_{T \wedge n}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(X_0) < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

2. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}_S$. For $n = 0, 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_T; A \cap \{T \leq n\}) &= \mathbb{E}(X_{T \wedge n}; A \cap \{T \leq n\}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(X_{T \wedge n}; A \cap \{S \leq n\}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(X_{S \wedge n}; A \cap \{S \leq n\})\end{aligned}$$

Note that $S \wedge n$ and $T \wedge n$ are two bounded stopping times with $S \wedge n \leq T \wedge n$. Also, $A \cap \{S \leq n\} \in \mathcal{F}_{S \wedge n}$. Then apply the optimal sampling theorem for bounded stopping times. By the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(X_T; A \cap \{T \leq n\})$$

and similarly for S . Thus

$$\mathbb{E}(X_T; A \cap \{T < \infty\}) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_S; A \cap \{S < \infty\})$$

so that

$$\mathbb{E}(X_T; A \cap \{T = \infty\}) = \mathbb{E}(X_S; A \cap \{S = \infty\}) = 0$$

and $\mathbb{E}(X_T; A) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_S; A)$. Since this holds for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_S$, $\mathbb{E}(X_T; \mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$. \blacksquare

2.7 Lemma. Let $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a martingale closed by M_∞ . Let $T : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}^+}$ be a stopping time. Then $M_T = \mathbb{E}(M_\infty | \mathcal{F}_T)$.

PROOF First assume $M_\infty \geq 0$. For any $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$,

$$\begin{aligned} E(M_T; A) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(M_n; A \cap \{T = n\}) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(M_\infty; A \cap \{T = n\}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(M_\infty; A). \end{aligned}$$

For the general case, decompose M_∞ into positive and negative parts. ■

2.8 Theorem. (Optimal Sampling for Closed Supermartingales in Discrete Time) Let $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be a $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty, \mathbb{P})$ supermartingale closed by X_∞ . Let $S, T : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}^+}$ be two $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ stopping times with $S \leq T$. Then

1. $\mathbb{E}(|X_T|) < \infty$
2. $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$ almost surely

PROOF 1. Define $M_n = \mathbb{E}(X_\infty | \mathcal{F}_n)$ and $A_n = X_n - M_n$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots, \infty$. Since $\{X_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a supermartingale closed by X_∞ , $A_n \geq 0$, $A_\infty = 0$, and for $m \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(A_n | \mathcal{F}_m) &= \mathbb{E}(X_n - \mathbb{E}(X_\infty | \mathcal{F}_n) | \mathcal{F}_m) \\ &\leq X_m - \mathbb{E}(X_\infty | \mathcal{F}_m) \\ &= A_m \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\{A_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a non-negative supermartingale with $A_\infty = 0$.

One can prove that $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, i.e. $\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}(|X_n|; |X_n| > c) = 0$.

By the previous proposition, $\mathbb{E}(A_T) < \infty$. On the other hand, $\mathbb{E}(|M_T|) < \infty$ by definition of the $\{M_n\}$. Thus $\mathbb{E}(|X_T|) < \infty$.

2. Apply the previous lemma so $\mathbb{E}(M_T | \mathcal{F}_S) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(M_\infty | \mathcal{F}_T) | \mathcal{F}_S) = \mathbb{E}(M_\infty | \mathcal{F}_S) = M_S$ by the optimal sampling theorem for closed martingales. Meanwhile, as $\{A_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a non-negative supermartingale with $A_\infty = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(A_T | \mathcal{F}_S) \leq A_S$ almost surely. Thus $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$ almost surely. ■

To prepare for the optimal sampling theorem for closed supermartingales in continuous time, we introduce one more discrete time notion:

Definition. Denote by $\mathbb{Z}^- = \{z \in \mathbb{Z} : z \leq 0\}$. A **negatively indexed supermartingale** $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-}$ and $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-}$ where $\mathcal{F}_m \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$ for $m \leq n$. Then $X_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, $\{X_n\}$ is adapted and $\mathbb{E}(X_n | \mathcal{F}_m) \leq X_m$.

2.9 Theorem. Let $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-}$ be a negatively indexed supermartingale such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-} \mathbb{E}(X_n) < \infty$. Then $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-}$ is uniformly L^1 .

PROOF Fix $a = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-} \mathbb{E}(X_n)$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, get $N(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}^-$ such that $\mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}) > a - \epsilon$ for $N \leq N(\epsilon)$. Since X is a supermartingale, $0 \leq \mathbb{E}(X_n) - \mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}) \leq \epsilon$ for all $n \leq N(\epsilon)$. For $c > 0$, note that

$$|x|\chi_{|X|>c} = -x\chi_{X<-c} - X\chi_{X \leq c} + x.$$

Since $\{X_n\}$ is a supermartingale, for $n \leq N(\epsilon)$, $\mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}|\mathcal{F}_n) \leq X_n$ and $\{X_n < -c\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Thus $\mathbb{E}(X_n; X_n < -c) \geq \mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}; X_n < -c)$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}(X_n; X_n \leq c) \geq \mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}; X_n \leq c)$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}(X_n) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}) + \epsilon$, so $\mathbb{E}(|X_n|; X_n \leq c) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}; X_n \leq c) + \epsilon$ for all $N \leq N(\epsilon)$. For this $N(\epsilon)$, there exists $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(X_{N(\epsilon)}; A) < \epsilon$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathbb{P}(A) < \delta(\epsilon)$.

Since X is a supermartingale, $\{-2X_n^-\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^-}$ is also a supermartingale. To see this, define $f(x) = 2 \min\{x, 0\}$, so f is increasing and concave. But then for $M \leq n$, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}(f(X_n)|\mathcal{F}_m) \leq f(\mathbb{E}(X_n|\mathcal{F}_m)) \leq f(X_m)$$

and $-2X_n^- = f(X_n)$ is thus a supermartingale, so $\mathbb{E}(-2X_n^-) \geq \mathbb{E}(-2X_0^-)$. We also have $\mathbb{E}(X_n) \leq a$ where a is defined as above. Thus since $|X_n| = X_n + 2X_n^-$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_n|) \leq a - \mathbb{E}(-2X_0^-) = a + 2\mathbb{E}(X_0^-) < \infty.$$

Now, choose c so that $c \cdot \delta(\epsilon) > a + 2\mathbb{E}(X_0^-) \geq \mathbb{E}(|X_n|)$. Then by Markov's inequality, $\mathbb{P}(|X_n| > c) \leq \delta(\epsilon)$. Thus $\mathbb{E}(|X_{N(\epsilon)}|; |X_n| > c) < \epsilon$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^-$ so that $\mathbb{E}(|X_m|; |X_n| > c) < 2\epsilon$ for all $n < N(\epsilon)$. But there are only finitely many terms with $n > N(\epsilon)$, so we are done. ■

2.10 Theorem. (Optimal Sampling Theorem for Closed Supermartingales) Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$ be an $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}, \mathbb{P})$ supermartingale which is right continuous and closed. Let $S, T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be two stopping times with $S \leq T$. Then

- (i) $\mathbb{E}(|X_T|) < \infty$
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}(X_T|\mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$ a.s.

PROOF Define random times $T_n := 2^{-n}(\lfloor 2^n T \rfloor + 1)$. Then the T_n are decreasing stopping times with $T = \lim T_n$ pointwise from above. For each n , $\{X_{m2^{-n}}\}_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a discrete-time closed supermartingale. Thus $\mathbb{E}(X_{T_n-1}|\mathcal{F}_{T_n}) \leq X_{T_n}$ a.s. (optimal sampling theorem for closed supermartingale in discrete time). Set $Y_n = X_{T_n-1}$, so $\{Y_n\}_{n=-1, -2, \dots}$ is a negatively indexed supermartingale and $\mathbb{E}(Y_n) = \mathbb{E}(X_{T_n-1}) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_0) < \infty$. Thus by the previous result, $\{X_{T_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is uniformly L^1 . Since $T_n \rightarrow T$ from above and $X_{T_n} \rightarrow X_T$ a.s., uniform integrability gives that $X_{T_n} \rightarrow X_T$ in L^1 . Thus $\mathbb{E}(|X_T|) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(|X_{T_n}|) < \infty$. Similarly, define $S_n = 2^{-n}(\lfloor 2^n S \rfloor + 1)$. Both S_n and T_n can be regarded as discrete-time stopping times. Thus by the discrete optimal sampling theorem, $\mathbb{E}(X_{T_n}|\mathcal{F}_{S_n}) \leq X_{S_n}$ a.s.

Now for $A \in \mathcal{F}_S \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{S_n}$, $\mathbb{E}(X_{T_n}; A) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_{S_n}; A)$ so

$$|\mathbb{E}(X_{T_n}; A) - \mathbb{E}(X_T; A)| \leq \mathbb{E}(|X_{T_n} - X_T|) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

Also, $|\mathbb{E}(X_{S_n}; A) - \mathbb{E}(X_S; A)| \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, as n goes to infinity,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_T; A) \leq \mathbb{E}(X_S; A)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_S$ so $\mathbb{E}(X_T|\mathcal{F}_S) \leq X_S$. ■

2.11 Corollary. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$ be a $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+})$ martingale which is right continuous and closed. If $S, T : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}^+}$ are two stopping times with $S \leq T$, then X_T is integrable and $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) = X_S$.

2.12 Corollary. Same results hold for bounded S, T and general right continuous martingale.

2.13 Corollary. A right continuous adapted process X is a martingale if and only if for every bounded stopping time T , X_T is L^1 and $\mathbb{E}(X_T) = \mathbb{E}(X_0)$.

PROOF The forward direction is contained in the above theorem. Conversely, for any $s < t$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$, define $T = t\chi_{A^c} + s\chi_A$ which is a stopping time (exercise). Then $\mathbb{E}(X_0) = \mathbb{E}(X_T) = \mathbb{E}(X_t; A^c) + \mathbb{E}(X_s; A)$. On the other hand, $\mathbb{E}(X_0) = \mathbb{E}(X_t) = \mathbb{E}(X_t; A^c) + \mathbb{E}(X_t; A)$ so $\mathbb{E}(X_s; A) = \mathbb{E}(X_t; A)$. But $A \in \mathcal{F}_s$ is arbitrary, so $\mathbb{E}(X_t | \mathcal{F}_s) = \mathbb{E}(X_s)$. ■

2.14 Corollary. Suppose $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ is a martingale and T is a stopping time. Then the stopped process X^T where $X_t^T = X_{t \wedge T}$ for each $t \in T$ is also a martingale.

PROOF The process X^T is clearly adapted. For any bounded stopping time S , $S \wedge T$ is also a bounded stopping time. Then

$$\mathbb{E}(X_s^T) = \mathbb{E}(X_{S \wedge T}) = \mathbb{E}(X_0) = \mathbb{E}(X_0^T)$$

so X^T is a martingale by the previous corollary. ■

2.4 MARTINGALE CONVERGENCE

2.15 Theorem. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ be a supermartingale. If $\sup_t \mathbb{E}(X_t^-) < \infty$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$ exists almost surely.

PROOF Suppose $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$ does not exist a.s. Then there exist levels a and b such that X upcrosses $[a, b]$ infinitely many times with positive probability. In other words, $\mathbb{P}(\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} U_N([a, b]) = \infty) > 0$, so $\mathbb{E}[U_N([a, b])] \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. However,

$$\mathbb{E}(U_N[a, b]) \leq \frac{1}{b-a} \sup_t \mathbb{E}[(X_t - a)^-] \leq \frac{1}{b-a} \sup_t (\mathbb{E}(X_t^-) + |a|) < \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$

2.16 Corollary. A positive supermartingale converges a.s.

2.17 Theorem. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ be a martingale. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$ converges in L^1
- (ii) There is a random variable X_∞ in L^1 such that $X_t = \mathbb{E}(X_\infty | \mathcal{F}_t)$, i.e. X is closed by X_∞
- (iii) X is uniformly L^1 .

PROOF First note that the upcrossing number $U_n^X([a, b], \omega)$ can be defined analogously for a continuous time process. Moreover, the upcrossing inequality still holds in the continuous time case (right continuity + discretization).

(ii \Rightarrow iii) Discussed earlier (find proof)

(iii \Rightarrow i) Exercise: U.I. implies $\sup_t \mathbb{E}(X_t^-) < \infty$. Thus by the supermartingale convergence theorem, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$ exists a.s. Then U.I. converges to X_∞ in L^1 .

(i \Rightarrow ii) $X + t - \mathbb{E}(X_{t+h} | \mathcal{F}_t)$ and take limit as $H \rightarrow \infty$ (??) ■

2.18 Corollary. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ be a U.I. martingale. If $S, T : \Omega \rightarrow \bar{T}$ are two stopping times with $S \leq T$. Then

- (i) $\mathbb{E}(|X_T|) < \infty$
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}(X_T | \mathcal{F}_S) = X_S$

2.19 Corollary. Let $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ be a martingale and let T be a stopping time such that $|X_{t \wedge T}| \leq 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then $\mathbb{E}(X_T) = \mathbb{E}(X_0)$ where $X_T = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_{t \wedge T}$.

PROOF The stopped process X^T is a bounded martingale and hence U.I. Thus $X_T = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_{t \wedge T}$ exists a.s. and $X_t^T \rightarrow X_T$ in L^1 . Thus $\mathbb{E}(X_t^T) = \mathbb{E}(X_0)$ implies $\mathbb{E}(X_T) = \mathbb{E}(X_0)$. ■

3 BROWNIAN MOTION

Definition. An adapted process $B = \{B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is called a (standard, one-dimensional) **Brownian motion** if

- 1. $B_0 = 0$ a.s.
- 2. B has continuous sample paths
- 3. $B_t - B_s \perp \mathcal{F}_s$ (define independent), $B_t - B_s \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t - s)$.

Equivalently:

- 1' $\{B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a Gaussian process
- 2' B has continuous paths
- 3' $\mathbb{E}(B_t) = 0$, $\mathbb{E}(B_s B_t) = s \wedge t$ for $s, t \geq 0$.

(3 \Rightarrow 1') immediate

(1 + 3 \Rightarrow 3') $\mathbb{E}(B_t) = 0$ for $t \geq 0$. Assume $s \leq t$. Then $\mathbb{E}(B_s B_t) = \mathbb{E}(B_s^2) + \mathbb{E}(B_s(B_t - B_s))$, where $\mathbb{E}(B_s(B_t - B_s)) = 0$ by condition on \mathcal{F}_s , and $\mathbb{E}(B_s^2) = s$.

(3' \Rightarrow 1) $\mathbb{E}(B_0^2) = 0$ so $B_0 = 0$ a.s.

(1' + 3' \Rightarrow 3) (3') determines the variance-covariance structure for a Gaussian process, which coincides with the distribution given by (3).

3.1 Theorem. (Levy's Characterization) Let X be a \mathcal{F}_t -adapted continuous process vanishing at 0. Then X is an \mathcal{F}_t -Brownian motion if and only if both X and $X_t^2 - t$ are martingales.

PROOF "only if": Clearly X is a martingale. Then $X_t^2 - t$ is a martingale since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(X_t^2 - t | \mathcal{F}_s) &= \mathbb{E}[(X_t - X_s) + X_s]^2 | \mathcal{F}_s - t \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(X_t - X_s)^2 | \mathcal{F}_s] + X_s^2 - t \\ &= t - s + X_s^2 = X_s^2 - s. \end{aligned}$$

■

3.2 Proposition. Brownian motion is a strong Markov process. Let T be a stopping time; then $B_T^* := \{B_{T+t} - B_T\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion, independent of \mathcal{F}_T .

PROOF Discretization and discussing all the possible values of T . ■

Scaling property of BM: $\{B_{at}\}_{t \geq 0} = \{a^{1/2} B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ in distribution.

3.3 Theorem. Let $B = \{B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a Brownian motion. Then the process $X_0 = 0$ and $X_t = tB(1/t)$ is also a Brownian motion.

TODO: check.

3.4 Corollary. $\mathbb{P}(\inf\{t > 0 : B(t) = 0\} = 0) = 1$, i.e. 0 is almost surely an accumulation point of zeros of $\{B_t\}_{t \geq 0}$.

3.5 Proposition. (Reflection Principle) Let $a > 0$, $\tau_a := \inf\{t : B(t) = a\}$, and $M_t := \sup_{s \in [0, t]} B_s$. Then $\mathbb{P}(M_t \geq a) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t) = 2\mathbb{P}(B_t \geq a)$.

PROOF We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t) &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t, B_t \geq a) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t, B_t < a) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t, B_t - B_{\tau_a} \geq 0) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(B_{t-\tau_a}^* \geq 0 | \tau_a); \tau_a \leq t) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t, B_t < a) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{P}(B_{t-\tau_a}^* < 0 | \tau_a); \tau_a \leq t)$$

and by symmetry

$$\mathbb{P}(B_{t-\tau_a}^* \geq 0 | \tau_a) = \mathbb{P}(B_{t-\tau_a}^* < 0 | \tau_a) = \frac{1}{2}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t, B_t \geq a) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_a \leq t, B_t < a) \quad \blacksquare$$

3.6 Theorem. Almost surely the path of a Brownian motion is of unbounded variation on any compact interval.

PROOF Let $\{\pi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be an increasing sequence of partitions of $[a, b]$ with part size converging uniformly to 0. Consider

$$\sum_{t_i \in \pi_n} (B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 - (b - a) = \sum_{t_i \in \pi_n} \underbrace{[(B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 - (t_{i+1} - t_i)]}_{\text{ind. rvs mean 0}}.$$

Moreover, note that

$$\frac{(B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2}{t_{i+1} - t_i} \sim Z^2$$

where $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t_i \in \pi_n} [(B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 - (t_{i+1} - t_i)] \right)^2 \right] &= \sum_{t_i \in \pi_n} \mathbb{E} \left[((B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 - (t_{i+1} - t_i))^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{t_i \in \pi_n} (t_{i+1} - t_i)^2 \mathbb{E}((Z^2 - 1)^2) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}((Z^2 - 1)^2) \sup_{t_i \in \pi_n} |t_{i+1} - t_i| \cdot (b - a) \end{aligned}$$

which converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $\sum_{t_i \in \pi_n} (B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 \rightarrow b - a$ in L^2 . Thus there exists a subsequence $(\pi_{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $\sum_{t_i \in \pi_{n_k}} (B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 \rightarrow b - a$ almost surely. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t_i \in \pi_{n_k}} (B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i})^2 &\leq \sup_{t_i \in \pi_{n_k}} |B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}| \cdot \sum_{t_i \in \pi_{n_k}} |B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}| \\ &\leq \sup_{t_i \in \pi_{n_k}} |B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}| \cdot TV_{[a,b]}(B) \end{aligned}$$

Since each path B is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$, since the part size of $\pi_{n_k} \rightarrow 0$, $\sup_{t_i \in \pi_{n_k}} |B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}| \rightarrow 0$. Then as $n \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides,

$$b - a \leq 0 \cdot TV_{[a,b]}(B)$$

so that $TV_{[a,b]}(B) = \infty$. ■

4 STOCHASTIC INTEGRATION

Our goal is to define $\int f dB = \int f(t, \omega) dB_t(\omega)$. Since B does not have bounded variation, we cannot define this integral as a pathwise Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral. Let $I = [a, b]$ and define $V = V_I$ be the class of processes $f : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

- (i) f is $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{F}$ -measurable
- (ii) f is \mathcal{F}_t -adapted.
- (iii) $\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b f^2(t, \omega) dt) < \infty$, i.e. $f \in L^2([a, b] \times \Omega)$.

A process $\phi \in V$ is called **elementary** if ϕ has the form

$$\phi = \sum_j A_j \chi_{[t_j, t_{j+1})}(t)$$

where each A_j is a \mathcal{F}_{t_j} -measurable random variable for all j , and $\{t_j\}$ forms a partition of I . We then define

$$\int_I \phi dB = \sum_j A_j (B_{t_{j+1}} - B_{t_j}).$$

Next, we extend this definition to any process in V by approaching the process using elementary process.

4.1 Lemma. *Let $g \in V$ be bounded and continuous. Then there exists $\{g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$, $g_n \in V$ elementary, such that $g_n \rightarrow g$ in L^2 .*

PROOF Fix a partition $\pi_n = \{t_j\}$, we define

$$\phi_n = \sum g(t_j) \mathbf{1}_{[t_j, t_{j+1})}.$$

Since g is $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ -measurable and \mathcal{F}_t -adapted, so is ϕ_n . Moreover, since g is bounded, ϕ_n is also bounded, so $\phi_n \in V$ and ϕ_n is an elementary function. But $\int_a^b (g - \phi_n)^2 dt \rightarrow 0$ pointwise, so that $g \rightarrow \phi_n$ in L^2 by the dominated convergence theorem. ■

4.2 Lemma. *Let $h \in V$ be a bounded process. Then there exists $\{g_n\} \subseteq V$, g_n bounded and continuous, such that $g_n \rightarrow h$ in L^2 .*

PROOF We define mollifiers

$$\rho(t) = \begin{cases} c \cdot \exp\left(\frac{-1}{1-t^2}\right) & : |t| < 1 \\ 0 & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\rho_\epsilon(t) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rho(\epsilon^{-1}t)$$

Define $h(t) = 0$ for $t < a$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} g_\epsilon(t) &= g_\epsilon * h(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{t-2\epsilon}^t \rho\left(\frac{t-s-\epsilon}{\epsilon}\right) h(s) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} \int_{-\epsilon}^\epsilon \rho\left(\frac{z}{\epsilon}\right) h(t-z-\epsilon) dz \\ &= \int_{-\epsilon}^\epsilon \rho_\epsilon(z) h(t-z-\epsilon) dz \end{aligned}$$

We first see that g_ϵ is adapted. By Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b g_\epsilon^2(t) dt &\leq \int_a^b \left(\int_{-\epsilon}^\epsilon \rho_\epsilon(z) dz \cdot \int_{-\epsilon}^\epsilon \rho_\epsilon(z) h^2(t-z-\epsilon) dz \right) dt \\ &\leq \int_{-\epsilon}^\epsilon \rho_\epsilon(z) \left(\int_{a-1}^b h^2(t) dt \right) dz \\ &= \int_a^b h^2(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

and taking expectations, we have that $g_\epsilon \in L^2$.

It is clear that g_ϵ is bounded and continuous for any ϵ .

Next, we show convergence. Fix some $\omega \in \Omega$. Get $(u_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $u_n(t) = 0$ and $u_n(t) \rightarrow h_n(t, \omega)$ in L^2 . Since u_n is uniformly continuous, $\rho_\epsilon * u_n \rightarrow u_n$ uniformly on $[a, b]$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_\epsilon * h(\cdot, \omega) - h(\cdot, \omega)\|_2 &\leq \|\rho_\epsilon * h(\cdot, \omega) - \rho_\epsilon * u_n(\cdot)\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|\rho_\epsilon * u_n - u_n\|_2 + \|u_n - h(\cdot, \omega)\|_2 \\ &\leq 2\|u_n - h(\cdot, \omega)\|_2 + \|\rho_\epsilon * u_n - u_n\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

which both converge to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $g_\epsilon = \rho_\epsilon * h$ and h are uniformly bounded (by the bound of h), dominated convergence applies and we have $\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b (h - g_n)^2 dt) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■

4.3 Lemma. Let $f \in V$. Then there exists a sequence $\{h_n\} \subset V$ such that h_n is bounded for all n and $\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b |f - h_n|^2 dt) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

PROOF Take

$$h_n = \begin{cases} -n & : f < -n \\ f & : |f| \leq n \\ n & : f > n \end{cases}$$

and the result follows by the dominated convergence theorem. ■

Combing the proceeding lemmas, we have:

For any process $f \in V$, there exists elementary processes $\phi_n \in V$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b |f - \phi_n|^2 dt) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We want to define $\int_a^b f dB$ as the limit of $\int_a^b \phi_n dB$. To this end, we still need the existence and uniqueness of the limit.

4.4 Lemma. (Itô's Isometry for Elementary Processes) *Let ϕ be elementary. Then $\mathbb{E}[(\int_a^b \phi(t) dB_t)^2] = \mathbb{E}(\int_a^b \phi^2(t) dt)$.*

PROOF Define $\Delta B_j = B_{j+1} - B_j$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}(A_i A_j \Delta B_i \Delta B_j) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}(A_j^2) \cdot (t_{j+1} - t_j) & : i = j \\ 0 & : i \neq j \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\int_a^b \phi dB)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(\sum_j A_j \Delta B_j)^2] = \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}(A_i A_j \Delta B_i \Delta B_j) \\ &= \sum_j \mathbb{E}(A_j^2)(t_{j+1} - t_j) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_a^b \phi(t)^2 dt \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

By Lemma 4, since ϕ_n is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{P} \times \lambda|_{[a,b]})$, $\int_a^b \phi_n(t) dB_t$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^2(\mathbb{P})$. Hence the limit exists. Moreover, if $\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b |f - \phi_n|^2 dt) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b |f - \phi'_n|^2 dt) \rightarrow 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[(\int_a^b \phi_n(t) dB_t) - (\int_a^b \phi'_n(t) dB_t)]^2 \rightarrow 0$. The limit is unique, i.e. does not depend on the choice of ϕ_n . Thus we can define, for general $f \in V$,

$$\int_a^b f_t dB_t := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b \phi_n(t) dB_t$$

where $\{\phi_n\}$ is a sequence is an elementary process satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}(\int_a^b |f - \phi_n|^2 dt) \rightarrow 0$$

in L^2 .

4.5 Corollary. (Itô's Isometry) *Let $f \in V$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\int_a^b f dB)^2] = \mathbb{E}(\int_a^b f^2 dt)$$

PROOF This works for elementary processes; pass to the limit and use dominated convergence. ■

4.1 PROPERTIES OF THE STOCHASTIC INTEGRAL

The stochastic integral is linear.:

$$\int_a^b (cf + g) dB_t = c \int_a^b f dB_t + \int_a^b g dB_t$$

In particular,

$$\int_a^b f dB_t = \int_a^d f dB_t + \int_d^b f dB_t$$

for any $a < d < b$.

4.6 Proposition. Let $\{M_n\}_{n=0}^N$ be a submartingale. Then for any $\lambda > 0$

$$\lambda \mathbb{P}(\sup_n M_n \geq \lambda) \leq \mathbb{E}(|M_n| \chi_{\{\sup_n M_n \geq \lambda\}})$$

4.7 Theorem. (Doob's Martingale Inequality) Let M_t be a continuous martingale. Then for $p \geq 1$, $T \geq 0$, and $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t| \geq \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^p} \mathbb{E}(|M_T|^p).$$

We first prove some related results in discrete time.

4.8 Theorem. Let $f \in V(0, T)$ for all $T \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then $M_t = \int_0^t f dB$ has a continuous version, which is a \mathcal{F}_t -martingale. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t| \geq \lambda\right) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^T f^2 ds\right)$$

for $\lambda, T > 0$.