# Stat 6841 Homework 4

Jacob Hauck October 27, 2024

### Problem 1.

We need to show that  $E[|M_n|] < \infty$  for  $n \ge 1$ , that  $\{M_n\}$  is adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ , and that  $E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = M_n$  for  $n \ge 1$ .

1. We have

$$E[|M_n|] = E[|S_n^2 - v_n|] = E\left[\left|\left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2\right|\right]$$

$$\leq E\left[\left|S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2\right|\right] + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2$$

$$\leq S_0^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n E[\xi_i^2] + \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 < \infty.$$

- 2. Since  $M_n$  is a continuous function of  $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ , and  $\xi_i$  is  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable for  $i = 1, \ldots, n$ , it follows that  $M_n$  is  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable. Thus,  $\{M_n\}$  is adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ .
- 3. We have

$$E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = E\left[\left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \xi_i\right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \sigma_i^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right]$$

$$= E\left[\left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i\right)^2 + 2\left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i\right) \xi_{n+1} + \xi_{n+1}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] - \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \sigma_i^2.$$

Since  $\left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\right)^2$  is a continuous function of  $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ , it is  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable because  $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$  are all  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable. Then

$$E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = \left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 + 2\left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\right) E[\xi_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] + E[\xi_{n+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_n] - \sigma_{n+1}^2.$$

Since  $\xi_{n+1}$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ , it follows that  $\xi_{n+1}^2$  is also independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ , and  $E[\xi_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = E[\xi_{n+1}] = 0$ , and  $E[\xi_{n+1}^2|\mathcal{F}_n] = E[\xi_{n+1}] = \sigma_{n+1}^2$ . Therefore,

$$E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = \left(S_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i\right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = M_n.$$

## Problem 2.

- (a) Let  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . Then  $\{M_n\}$  is a martingale with respect to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ . To show this, we need to show that  $E[|M_n|] < \infty$  for  $n \ge 1$ , that  $\{M_n\}$  is adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ , and that  $E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = M_n$ .
  - 1. We have

$$E[|M_n|] = E[2^n X_n] = 2^n E[U_1 \cdots U_n] = 2^n \prod_{i=1}^n E[U_i] = 1 < \infty$$

because  $U_1, \ldots, U_n$  are independent with  $E[U_i] = \frac{1}{2}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ .

- 2. Let  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ . Then  $M_n$  is a continuous function of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , each of which is  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable, so  $M_n$  is  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable.
- 3. We have

$$E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = E[2^{n+1}X_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = 2^{n+1}E[X_nU_n|\mathcal{F}_n].$$

Since  $U_n$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$  and  $X_n$  is  $\mathcal{F}_n$ -predictable, we have

$$E[M_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = 2^{n+1}X_nE[U_n|\mathcal{F}_n] = 2^{n+1}X_nE[U_n] = 2^nX_n = M_n.$$

(b) Note that  $-\log(U_i)$  is exponentially-distributed with mean 1 because, by the CDF method,

$$P(-\log(U_i) \le x) = P(U_i \le e^{-x}) = e^{-x}, \quad x \ge 0.$$

Then  $E[\log(U_i)] = -E[-\log(U_i)] = -1$ , and, by the Strong Law of Large Numbers,

$$\frac{1}{n}\log(X_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \log(U_i) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} -1$$

as  $n \to \infty$ .

(c) To show that  $M_n \to 0$  almost surely, we must show that P(B) = 1, where  $B = \{M_n \to 0\}$ . Since  $P(B) \le 1$  in any case, we only need to show that  $P(B) \ge 1$ .

To this end, let  $A = \{\frac{1}{n}M_n \to \log(2) - 1\}$ . Then P(A) = 1 because, by (b).

$$\frac{1}{n}\log(M_n) = \log(2) + \frac{1}{n}X_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \log(2) - 1.$$

The natural exponent base e is greater than 2, so  $\log(2) < 1$ , and there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\log(2) + \delta < 1$ . Let  $\omega \in A$ , and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $\omega \in A$ , there exists  $N_1 > 0$  such that

$$\frac{1}{n}\log(X_n(\omega)) < -\log(2) - \delta \quad \text{for all } n > N_1.$$

Choose  $N > \max \left\{ N_1, -\frac{\log(\varepsilon)}{\delta} \right\}$ . Then for all n > N, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\log(X_n(\omega)) < -\log(2) - \delta \implies \log(X_n(\omega)) + n\log(2) < -n\delta$$
$$\implies |M_n(\omega)| < e^{-n\delta} < e^{-N\delta} < \varepsilon.$$

Thus,  $M_n(\omega) \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ , so  $\omega \in B$ . Since  $\omega \in A$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $A \subseteq B$ , and  $1 = P(A) \le P(B)$ . This proves that  $M_n \to 0$  almost surely.

## Problem 3.

 $T_1$  and  $T_1 + 1$  are stopping times, but  $T_1 - 1$  is not.

1.  $T_1$  is a stopping time because

$$\{T_1 \le n\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{M_i = 1\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$$

because  $\{M_i = 1\} \in \mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

2.  $T_1 + 1$  is a stopping time because

$$\{T_1 + 1 \le n\} = \{T_1 \le n - 1\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \{M_i = 1\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$$

because  $\{M_i = 1\} \in \mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \dots, n - 1.$ 

3.  $T_1 - 1$  is not necessarily a stopping time because

$${T_1 - 1 \le n} = {T_1 \le n + 1} = {M_{n+1} = 1} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^n {M_i = 1} = {M_{n+1} = 1} \cup {T_1 \le n}.$$

Since  $\{M_{n+1}=1\}$  may not be in  $\mathcal{F}_n$ , we cannot conclude that  $\{T_1-1\leq n\}\in\mathcal{F}_n$ .

#### Problem 4.

Let  $A_s$  be the event that  $X_t - 1$  for all t > s, for s = 1, 2, ..., that is,

$$A_s = \bigcap_{t>s} \{X_t = -1\}.$$

For an outcome  $\omega \in A_s$ , it is clear that  $M_t(\omega) \to -\infty$ . Thus,  $A_s \subseteq \{M_t \to -\infty\}$  for all s = 1, 2, ... Then  $\{M_t \to -\infty\}^C \subseteq A_s^C$  for all s = 1, 2, ...

By Boole's inequality, it follows that

$$P(A_s^C) = P\left(\bigcup_{t>s} \{X_t = t^2 - 1\}\right) \le \sum_{t>s} P(X_t = t^2 - 1) = \sum_{t>s} \frac{1}{t^2}.$$

Then  $P\left(A_s^C\right) \to 0$  as  $s \to \infty$  because the last expression above is the tail of the convergent sum  $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t^2}$ . Hence, by the squeeze theorem,

$$0 \le P(M_t \nrightarrow -\infty) \le P(A_s^C) \implies P(M_t \nrightarrow -\infty) = 0.$$

This means that  $P(M_t \to -\infty) = 1$ , that is,  $M_t \to -\infty$  almost surely.

### Problem 5.

Since  $\{X_t\}$  is a sub-martingale, there is a filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$  to which  $\{X_t\}$  is adapted.

### Problem 6.

To show that  $\{Y_n\}$  is a martingale with respect to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , we need to show that  $E[|Y_n|] < \infty$  for all n, that  $\{Y_n\}$  is adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ , and that  $E[Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = Y_n$ .

1. We have

$$E[|Y_n|] = E\left[\left|S_n^2 - \sum_{k=1}^n X_k^2\right|\right] \le E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^n X_k\right)^2\right] + \sum_{k=1}^n E[X_k^2] \le E\left[n^2 \sum_{k=1}^n X_k^2\right] + n\sigma^2 \le (n^3 + n)\sigma^2 < \infty.$$

because for any set of real numbers  $\{a_i : i = 1, 2 \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i\right)^2 \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} |a_i|\right)^2 \le \left(n \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} |a_i|\right)^2 = n^2 \max_{i=1,2,\dots,n} a_i^2 \le n^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^2.$$

- 2. It is easy to see that  $Y_n$  is a continuous function of  $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ , so  $Y_n$  is adapted to  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$  for all n.
- 3. Since  $X_{n+1}$  is independent of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , it follows that  $X_{n+1}$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ . Thus,

$$E[Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} X_k\right)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} X_k^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right]$$

$$= E\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k\right)^2 + 2X_{n+1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k + X_{n+1}^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k^2 - X_{n+1}^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right]$$

$$= \left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k\right)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k^2 + 2E[X_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k$$

$$= Y_n + 2E[X_{n+1}] \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k$$

$$= Y_n.$$

We have  $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k^2$ . Since  $\{X_k\}$  are independent, so, too, are  $\{X_k^2\}$ . Furthermore, we have  $E[X_k^2] = \sigma^2$  for all k. Then, by Wald's Equation,

$$E[S_{\tau}] = E[X_1^2]E[\tau] = \sigma^2 E[\tau].$$

#### Problem 7.

Let  $Y_n = e^{2b(S_n - bn)}$ . Then  $\{Y_n\}$  is a martingale with respect to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . To show this, we need to prove that  $E[|Y_n|] < \infty$  for all n, that  $\{Y_n\}$  is adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$ , and that  $E[Y_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = Y_n$ .

1. Since  $X_k$  is standard normal for k = 1, 2, ..., and  $S_n = X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_n$ , it follows that  $S_n$  is also normal with mean 0 and variance n, so that the PDF of  $S_n$  is

$$f(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} e^{-\frac{1}{2n}s^2}.$$

Then

$$E[|Y_n|] = E\left[e^{2b(S_n - bn)}\right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2bs - 2bn} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} e^{-\frac{1}{2n}s^2} \, \mathrm{d}s \lesssim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2n}(s - 2nb)^2} \, \mathrm{d}s < \infty.$$

- 2.  $Y_n$  is a continuous function of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , so  $Y_n$  is adapted to  $\mathcal{F}_n$  for all n.
- 3. Since  $X_{n+1}$  is independent of  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ , it is also independent of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ . Then

$$\begin{split} E[Y_{n+1} \big| \mathcal{F}_n] &= E\left[e^{2b(S_{n+1} - b(n+1))} \big| \mathcal{F}_n\right] = E\left[e^{2b(S_n + X_{n+1} - bn - b)} \big| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ &= E\left[e^{2b(S_n - bn)} e^{2b(X_{n+1} - b)} \big| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ &= Y_n E\left[e^{2b(X_{n+1} - b)}\right] \\ &= Y_n e^{-2b^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2bx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &= Y_n e^{-2b^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x - 2b)^2 + 2b^2} \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &= Y_n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &= Y_n, \end{split}$$

where the second-to-last line follows from the change of variables u = x - 2b, and the last line follows from the fact that the integrand is the PDF of a standard normal random variable.

All martingales are submartingales, so  $\{Y_n\}$  is also a submartingale. Additionally,  $Y_n > 0$  for all n. Hence, by the Doob submartingale inequality,

$$P\left(Y_n > e^{2bc}\right) \le P\left(\max_{1 \le k \le n} Y_k > e^{2bc}\right) \le e^{-2bc}E[Y_n].$$

Since  $Y_n$  is a martingale,

$$E[Y_n] = E[Y_1] = E\left[e^{2b(X_1 - b)}\right] = e^{-2b^2} E\left[e^{2bX_1}\right]$$

$$= e^{-2b^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2bx} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} dx$$

$$= e^{-2b^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x - 2b)^2 + 2b^2} dx$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^2} dx$$

$$= 1$$

Furthermore,

$$\{Y_n = e^{2bc}\} = \left\{e^{2b(S_n - bn)} > e^{2bc}\right\} = \{2b(S_n - bn) > 2bc\} = \{S_n > bn + c\};$$

therefore,

$$P(S_n > bn + c) \le e^{-2bc}.$$