

# AMATH 561 Problem Set 5 -

1. Let  $X$  and  $Y_0, Y_1, \dots$  be r.v.s on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  with  $E|X| < \infty$  and define  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$  and  $X_n = E[X | \mathcal{F}_n]$ . We show that  $X_n$  is a martingale w.r.t. the filtration  $\mathcal{F}_n$  by verifying the required axioms.

i.  $E|X_n| = E[|E[X | \mathcal{F}_n]|] \leq E[E[|X| | \mathcal{F}_n]] = E|X| < \infty$ .

This follows from the theorem on slide 4 from lecture 10 by taking  $\phi(x) = |x|$  and the law of total expectation.

ii.  $X_n = E[X | \mathcal{F}_n] \in \mathcal{F}_n$  by the definition of conditional expectation.

iii.  $E[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}] = E[E[X | \mathcal{F}_n] | \mathcal{F}_{n+1}] = E[X | \mathcal{F}_n] = X_n$  because  $\mathcal{F}_{n+1} \subset \mathcal{F}_n$  and the result that the "smaller  $\sigma$ -algebra wins".

$\therefore X_n$  is a martingale.

2. Let  $X_0, X_1, \dots$  be iid Bernoulli r.v.s w/ parameter  $p$  and define  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  with  $S_0 = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_0, \dots, X_n)$ ,

$$Z_n = \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{2S_n - n}, \quad n=0, 1, 2, \dots$$

We show that  $Z_n$  is a martingale w.r.t.  $\mathcal{F}_n$  by verifying the required axioms.

i. Note that  $|2S_n - n| \leq n$ , so  $E|Z_n| < \infty$  must hold because  $Z_n$  is a constant raised to a bounded power.

ii. We know that  $S_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$  and  $Z_n$  is a continuous function of  $S_n$ , so it must also hold that  $Z_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{iii. } E[Z_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] &= E\left[\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{2S_{n+1} - (n+1)} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right] = E\left[\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{2X_{n+1} - 1} \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{2S_n - n} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ &= E\left[\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{2X_{n+1} - 1}\right] E[Z_n | \mathcal{F}_n] = \left(\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right) \cdot p + \left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{-1} (1-p)\right) Z_n \end{aligned}$$

$= ((1-p) + p) Z_n = Z_n$  because  $Z_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$  and  $\left(\frac{1-p}{p}\right)^{2X_{n+1} - 1}$  is independent from  $\mathcal{F}_n$ , because the  $X_i$ s are iid.

$\therefore Z_n$  is a martingale w.r.t.  $\mathcal{F}_n$ .



3. Given a sequence of r.v.s  $\mathcal{Z}_i$  s.t.  $X_n = \mathcal{Z}_0 + \dots + \mathcal{Z}_n$  determine a martingale ( $n \geq 0$ ), we first observe that by definition  $E[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n] = X_n$ . Taking the expectation of both sides,  $E[E[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n]] = E[X_n] \Rightarrow E[X_{n+1}] = E[X_n]$  by the law of total expectation. However, the linearity of expectation implies that  $E[\mathcal{Z}_0] + \dots + E[\mathcal{Z}_n] + E[\mathcal{Z}_{n+1}] = E[\mathcal{Z}_0] + \dots + E[\mathcal{Z}_n]$ , so  $E[\mathcal{Z}_{n+1}] = 0 \forall n \geq 0$ , meaning that  $E[\mathcal{Z}_i] = 0 \forall i \geq 1$ . Now, noting that  $X_{i+1} = X_i + \mathcal{Z}_{i+1}$ ,  $X_i = E[X_{i+1} | \mathcal{F}_i] = E[X_i | \mathcal{F}_i] + E[\mathcal{Z}_{i+1} | \mathcal{F}_i] = X_i + E[\mathcal{Z}_{i+1} | \mathcal{F}_i]$  by the linearity of conditional expectation and the fact that  $X_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ . Thus,  $E[\mathcal{Z}_{i+1} | \mathcal{F}_i] = 0 \forall i \geq 0 \Rightarrow E[\mathcal{Z}_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0 \forall i \geq 1$ . Now, assume WLOG that  $i > j$  (strict inequality because  $i \neq j$ ). Then, by the law of total expectation and the fact that  $\mathcal{Z}_j = X_j - X_{j-1}$  (if  $j=0$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_j = X_j$  so consider the following while taking  $X_{j-1} = 0$  which doesn't affect anything)  $E[\mathcal{Z}_i \mathcal{Z}_j] = E[\mathcal{Z}_i X_j] - E[\mathcal{Z}_i X_{j-1}] = E[E[\mathcal{Z}_i X_j | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]] - E[E[\mathcal{Z}_i X_{j-1} | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]]$ . Now,  $X_{j-1}, X_j \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  because  $\mathcal{F}_{j-1} \subset \mathcal{F}_j \subset \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$  (note that  $j=i-1$  may hold). Thus,  $E[\mathcal{Z}_i \mathcal{Z}_j] = E[X_j E[\mathcal{Z}_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]] - E[X_{j-1} E[\mathcal{Z}_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}]]$ . Now, note that  $i \geq 1$  because we took  $i > j$  WLOG, so  $E[\mathcal{Z}_i | \mathcal{F}_{i-1}] = 0$  and  $E[\mathcal{Z}_i \mathcal{Z}_j] = 0$ . We also have that  $E[\mathcal{Z}_i] = 0$ , so  $0 = E[\mathcal{Z}_i \mathcal{Z}_j] = E[\mathcal{Z}_i] E[\mathcal{Z}_j]$ , meaning that  $\mathcal{Z}_i$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_j$  are mutually uncorrelated.

4. For the branching process with  $p_0 = 1/8, p_1 = 3/8, p_2 = 3/8, p_3 = 1/8$  and  $Z_0 = 1$ ,  $\mu = \frac{3}{8} \cdot 1 + \frac{3}{8} \cdot 2 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 3 = \frac{3}{2} > 1$ , so theorem 4.3.12 in Durrett gives that the extinction probability  $\rho$  is the unique solution in  $[0, 1)$  of the equation  $\frac{1}{8} + \frac{3}{8}s + \frac{3}{8}s^2 + \frac{1}{8}s^3 = s$   $\Rightarrow \frac{1}{8}(s^3 + 3s^2 - 5s + 1) = 0$ . Note that 1 is a root so we can factor  $\frac{1}{8}(s-1)(s^2 + 4s - 1) = 0$ . The quadratic has roots  $-2 \pm \sqrt{5}$ , so  $s = 1, -2 \pm \sqrt{5}$ .  $-2 + \sqrt{5} \in [0, 1)$ , so  $\rho = -2 + \sqrt{5}$ .

The case where families have 2 children has  $p_0 = \frac{1}{4}, p_1 = \frac{1}{2}, p_2 = \frac{1}{4}$  and  $Z_0 = 1$ . Here,  $\mu = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1 + \frac{1}{4} \cdot 2 = 1$  and  $p_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ , so theorem 4.3.11 in Durrett gives that  $Z_n = 0 \forall$  sufficiently large  $n$ , so  $\rho = 1$ .