

MATH180C: Introduction to Stochastic Processes II

[Lecture A00: math.ucsd.edu/~ynemish/teaching/180cA](http://math.ucsd.edu/~ynemish/teaching/180cA)

[Lecture B00: math.ucsd.edu/~ynemish/teaching/180cB](http://math.ucsd.edu/~ynemish/teaching/180cB)

Today: Martingales

Next: PK 8.1

Week 8:

- homework 6 (due Monday, May 16, week 8)
- OH Tuesday 3-4:30 PM, APM 7218

Midterm 2: Wednesday, May 18

Martingales

Definition. A stochastic process $(X_n, n \geq 0)$ is a martingale if for $n = 0, 1, \dots$

$$(a) \quad E(|X_n|) < \infty \quad \forall n$$

$$(b) \quad E(X_{n+1} | X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_n$$

After taking the expectation of both sides of (b) we get that

$$E(X_{n+1}) = E(X_n)$$

$(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a martingale $\Rightarrow E(X_n) = E(X_0) \quad \forall n$

- submartingale: $E(X_{n+1} | X_0, \dots, X_n) \geq X_n$ (increases)
- supermartingale: $E(X_{n+1} | X_0, \dots, X_n) \leq X_n$ (decreases)

Examples of martingales

(i) Let X_1, X_2, \dots be independent RV's with $E(|X_k|) < \infty$ and $E(X_k) = 0$. Define $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$, $S_0 = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } E(S_{n+1} | S_0, \dots, S_n) &= E(S_n + X_{n+1} | S_0, \dots, S_n) \\ &= E(S_n | S_0, \dots, S_n) + E(X_{n+1} | S_0, \dots, S_n) \\ &= S_n + E(X_{n+1}) = S_n \quad \forall n \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow (S_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a martingale with $E(S_n) = E(S_0) = 0$

(ii) Let X_1, X_2, \dots be independent RV with $X_k \geq 0$, $E(|X_k|) < \infty$ and $E(X_k) = 1$. Define $M_n = X_1 X_2 \dots X_n$, $M_0 = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } E(M_{n+1} | M_0, \dots, M_n) &= E(M_n \cdot X_{n+1} | M_0, \dots, M_n) \\ &= M_n E(X_{n+1} | M_0, \dots, M_n) = M_n \cdot E(X_{n+1}) = M_n \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow (M_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a martingale with $E(M_n) = E(M_0) = 1$

Example

Stock prices in a perfect market

Let X_n be the closing price at the end of day n of a certain publicly traded security such as a share or stock. Many scholars believe that in a perfect market these price sequences should be martingales. (see PK page 73 for more details).

History and gambling

Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a stochastic process describing your total winnings in n games with unit stake.

Think of $X_n - X_{n-1}$ as your net winnings per unit stake in game n , $n \geq 1$, in a series of games, played at times $n=1, 2, \dots$.

In the martingale case

$$\begin{aligned} E(X_n - X_{n-1} | X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) &= E(X_n | X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) - E(X_{n-1} | X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) \\ &= E(X_n | X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) - X_{n-1} = 0 \quad (\text{fair game}) \end{aligned}$$

Some early works of martingales was motivated by gambling. Note that there exists a betting strategy called the "martingale system" \leftarrow doubling bets after losses

Some basic properties

Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a martingale.

$$\bullet \quad E(X_m | X_0, \dots, X_n) = X_n \quad m > n$$

Proof $X_n = E(X_{n+1} | X_0, \dots, X_n)$

$$X_{n+1} = E(X_{n+2} | X_0, \dots, X_{n+1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &= E(X_{n+1} | X_0, \dots, X_n) = E(E(X_{n+2} | X_0, \dots, X_{n+1}) | X_0, \dots, X_n) \\ &= E(X_{n+2} | X_0, \dots, X_n) \end{aligned}$$

Exercise: $E(E(X | Y, Z) | Z) = E(X | Z)$ (show for discrete r.v.)

• Markov inequality: If $X_n \geq 0 \quad \forall n$, then for any $\lambda > 0$

$$P(X_n \geq \lambda) \leq \frac{E(X_n)}{\lambda} = \frac{E(X_0)}{\lambda}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{For all } n \quad P(X_n \geq \lambda) \leq \frac{E(X_0)}{\lambda}$$

Maximal inequality for nonnegative martingales

Thm. Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a martingale with nonnegative values.

For any $\lambda > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$

$$P\left(\max_{0 \leq n \leq m} X_n \geq \lambda\right) \leq \frac{E(X_0)}{\lambda} \quad (1)$$

and

$$P\left(\max_{n \geq 0} X_n \geq \lambda\right) \leq \frac{E(X_0)}{\lambda} \quad (2)$$

Proof. We prove (1), (2) follows by taking the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Take the vector (X_0, X_1, \dots, X_m) and partition the sample space wrt the index of the first r.v. rising above λ

$$I = \mathbb{1}_{X_0 \geq \lambda} + \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, X_1 \geq \lambda} + \dots + \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_{m-1} < \lambda, X_m \geq \lambda} + \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_m < \lambda}$$

Compute $E(X_m) = E(X_m \cdot I)$ using the above partition

Proof of the maximal inequality

$$E(X_m) = \sum_{h=0}^m E(X_m \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_{n-1} < \lambda, X_n \geq \lambda}) + E(X_m \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_m < \lambda})$$
$$\geq \sum_{h=0}^m E(X_m \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_{n-1} < \lambda, X_n \geq \lambda})$$

→

Compute $E(X_m \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_{n-1} < \lambda, X_n \geq \lambda})$ by conditioning on

$X_0, X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}, X_n$:

$$E(X_m \mathbb{1}_{X_0 < \lambda, \dots, X_{n-1} < \lambda, X_n \geq \lambda})$$

=

=

=

Sum for all n

$$E(X_m) \geq$$