

## Solutions to Homework 14

## Exercise 1.

**Preliminary question.** This question just requires a direct application of the generalized version of Hoeffding's inequality.

## Part I.

a) As  $0 < p < 1/2$ ,  $S$  is a supermartingale. Also,  $\lambda^x = e^{x \log(\lambda)}$  is a convex function  $\forall \lambda > 0$ , but is increasing for  $\lambda \geq 1$  and decreasing for  $\lambda \leq 1$ . Therefore, applying Jensen's inequality gives

$$\mathbb{E}(\lambda^{S_{n+1}} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \lambda^{\mathbb{E}(S_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n)} \geq \lambda^{S_n}$$

only when  $\lambda \leq 1$ .

b) We have

$$\mathbb{E}(\lambda^{S_{n+1}} | \mathcal{F}_n) = \lambda^{S_n} \mathbb{E}(\lambda^{X_{n+1}}) = \lambda^{S_n} (\lambda p + \frac{1}{\lambda}(1-p))$$

which says that  $Y$  is a submartingale if and only if  $E = \lambda p + \frac{1}{\lambda}(1-p) \geq 1$ . Solving this (quadratic) inequation, we obtain the condition:  $\lambda \in ]-\infty, 1] \cup [\frac{1-p}{p}, +\infty[$ . For the martingale condition to hold ( $E = 1$ ), it must be that either  $\lambda = 1$  (trivial case) or  $\lambda = \frac{1-p}{p}$ . Finally,  $Y$  is a supermartingale ( $E \leq 1$ ) if and only if  $\lambda \in [1, \frac{1-p}{p}]$ .

c) By independence, we have  $\mathbb{E}(|Y_n|) = \mathbb{E}(Y_n) = \prod_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}(\lambda^{X_j}) = (\lambda p + \frac{1}{\lambda}(1-p))^n$  and

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_n^2) = \prod_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}(\lambda^{2X_j}) = (\lambda^2 p + \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(1-p))^n$$

d) Using the analysis done in question b), we obtain that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}(|Y_n|) < +\infty \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lambda p + \frac{1}{\lambda}(1-p) \leq 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lambda \in [1, \frac{1-p}{p}]$$

Likewise,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}(Y_n^2) < +\infty \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lambda^2 p + \frac{1}{\lambda^2}(1-p) \leq 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lambda \in [1, \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}]$$

as we simply need to replace  $\lambda$  by  $\lambda^2$  here.

e) Numerically (see the code), we see clearly that  $Y_n \equiv 1$  when  $\lambda = 1$  and that  $Y_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$  a.s. for all  $\lambda > 1$ . Theoretically, this is due to the fact that  $S_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} -\infty$  a.s. (one can use Hoeffding's inequality to justify this fact), so that  $Y_n = \lambda^{S_n}$  converges a.s. to 0 when  $\lambda > 1$  (even though  $Y$  is a submartingale for  $\lambda > \frac{1-p}{p}$ ).

The martingale convergence theorem itself only allows to conclude that  $Y$  converges a.s. when  $\lambda \in [1, \frac{1-p}{p}]$ , i.e., when the first condition in question d) is satisfied.

f) For the process  $Y$  to converge also in  $L^2$  towards its limit, we need the second condition in part d) to hold, i.e.,  $\lambda \in [1, \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}]$  (indeed, if this condition is not met, then  $\mathbb{E}(Y_n^2)$  diverges, so no  $L^2$  convergence can take place).

g) The only value of  $\lambda$  for which the equality  $\mathbb{E}(Y_\infty|\mathcal{F}_n) = Y_n$  is satisfied for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is the trivial case  $\lambda = 1$ . For all the other values of  $\lambda \in [1, \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}]$ ,  $Y$  is a supermartingale, which gives  $\mathbb{E}(Y_\infty|\mathcal{F}_n) \leq Y_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . But in this case, we already know that  $Y_\infty = 0$ , so what the above inequality is actually saying is that  $0 \leq Y_n$ , i.e., not much...

**Part II.** We consider the case  $\lambda = \frac{1-p}{p} (> 1)$ .

a) Method: observe first that  $T_a = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S_n \geq a \text{ or } S_n \leq -a\}$ . Run then  $M = 1'000$  times the process  $S$  for  $N = 1'000$  time steps; count the number of times  $m$  the barrier  $a$  is reached before  $-a$  (see the code for the implementation). The probability  $P = \mathbb{P}(\{Y_{T_a} = \lambda^a\})$  is then approximately given by  $m/M$  (there are of course fluctuations here).

b) It is true that  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{T_a}) = \mathbb{E}(Y_0)$ . The third version of the optional stopping theorem allows to say this, as the martingale  $Y$  makes bounded jumps and is contained in the interval  $[\lambda^{-a}, \lambda^a]$  before the stopping time  $T_a$ .

c) As the martingale convergence theorem applies, we obtain

$$1 = \mathbb{E}(Y_0) = \mathbb{E}(Y_{T_a}) = \lambda^a P + \lambda^{-a} (1 - P)$$

so

$$P = \frac{1 - \lambda^{-a}}{\lambda^a - \lambda^{-a}} = \frac{\lambda^a - 1}{\lambda^{2a} - 1} = \frac{1}{\lambda^a + 1}$$

This probability decays exponentially in  $a$ .

d) Method: Run again  $M = 1'000$  times the process  $S$  for  $N = 1'000$  time steps; count the number of times  $m$  the barrier  $a$  is reached at all (see the code for the implementation). The probability  $P' = \mathbb{P}(\{Y_{T'_a} = \lambda^a\})$  is then approximately given by  $m/M$  (there are of course also fluctuations here).

e) It is also true that  $\mathbb{E}(Y_{T'_a}) = \mathbb{E}(Y_0)$ ! The third version of the optional stopping theorem allows to say this, as the martingale  $Y$  makes bounded jumps and is contained in the interval  $[0, \lambda^a]$  before the stopping time  $T'_a$  (even though the process  $S$  itself is unbounded).

f) As the martingale convergence theorem applies, we obtain

$$1 = \mathbb{E}(Y_0) = \mathbb{E}(Y_{T'_a}) = \lambda^a P' + 0(1 - P')$$

[Comment: if level  $a$  is not reached, this is saying that the process  $S$  goes to  $-\infty$  and never comes back to level  $a$ ; of course, this can only happen with positive probability when  $S$  is a (strict) supermartingale with a negative drift.] Therefore,

$$P' = \frac{1}{\lambda^a}$$

which is strictly greater than  $P$ , but decays also exponentially in  $a$ .