# Unit 5: Almost Sure Convergence

### Instructor: Quan Zhou

## 5.1 Upcrossing inequality

**Definition 5.1.** Consider a stochastic process  $(X_n)_{n\geq 0}$ . Choose constants a < b and we define the upcrossings of [a, b] as follows. Let  $T_0 = -1$ , and for  $k \geq 1$ , let

$$T_{2k-1} = \inf\{n > T_{2k-2} \colon X_n \le a\},\$$
  
$$T_{2k} = \inf\{n > T_{2k-1} \colon X_n > b\}.$$

From time  $T_{2k-1}$  to  $T_{2k}$ , the process X crosses from below a to above b, which is called an upcrossing. Define

$$U_n^{a,b} = \sup\{k \colon T_{2k} \le n\},\$$

which gives the number of completed upcrossings up to time n.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $(X_n)$  be a supermartingale and  $U_n^{a,b}$  as defined above. Then,

$$(b-a)\mathsf{E}[U_n^{a,b}] \le \mathsf{E}[(X_n-a)^-], \quad \text{for any } n \ge 0.$$

*Proof.* Define  $H_n = 1$  if  $T_{2k-1} < n \leq T_{2k}$  for some  $k \geq 1$ , and let  $H_n = 0$  otherwise. That is,

$$H_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{[T_{2k-1}+1, T_{2k}]}(n).$$

Since  $T_k$ 's are stopping times,  $H_n$  is previsible. Further,  $H \cdot X$  can be seen as the return in a stock market, where we always buy some stock once its price drops below a and sell the stock once its price goes above b. Hence,

$$(H \cdot X)_n \ge (b-a)U_n^{a,b} - (X_n - a)^-,$$

where  $(X_n - a)^-$  is an upper bound on the possible loss due to the last ongoing upcrossing. By Theorem 3.1,

$$\mathsf{E}[(H \cdot X)_n] \le 0,$$

which yields the asserted inequality.

**Remark 5.1.** Consider a sequence of real numbers  $(x_n)$ . If  $\liminf x_n < \limsup x_n$ , then there exist rational numbers a < b such that  $\liminf x_n < a < b < \limsup x_n$ , which implies that the sequence  $(x_n)$  completes infinitely many upcrossings of [a, b]. This observation allows us to use Lemma 5.1 to prove an almost sure convergence result for supermartingales.

#### 5.2 Almost sure convergence

**Theorem 5.1.** Let  $(X_n)$  be a supermartingale such that  $\sup_n \mathsf{E}[X_n^-] < \infty$ . Then,  $X_{\infty} = \lim_n X_n$  exists almost surely. Further,  $\mathsf{E}[X_{\infty}] < \infty$ .

*Proof.* Define the event  $A = \{\liminf X_n < \limsup X_n\}$ . By Remark 5.1,

$$A = \bigcup_{a,b\in\mathbb{Q}:\ a$$

where  $U_{\infty}^{a,b} = \lim_{n\to\infty} U_n^{a,b}$  exists by monotone convergence theorem. But Lemma 5.1 yields that

$$\mathsf{E}[U_{\infty}^{a,b}] = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{E}[U_n^{a,b}] \le \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mathsf{E}[(X_n - a)^-]}{b - a} < \infty,$$

where the last step follows from  $(X_n - a)^- \leq X_n^- + |a|$  and the assumption  $\sup_n \mathsf{E}[X_n^-] < \infty$ . Hence,  $U_{\infty}^{a,b} < \infty$  a.s., from which it follows that  $\mathsf{P}(A) = 0$ . This proves that  $X_{\infty}$  exists a.s. (but it may be infinite).

Since  $X_n$  converges to  $X_{\infty}$  implies  $X_n^-$  converges to  $X_{\infty}^-$ , by Fatou's lemma, we have

$$\mathsf{E} X_{\infty}^{-} \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{E} X_{n}^{-} < \infty.$$

It only remains to use the supermartingale property to show  $\mathsf{E}X_n^+ < \infty$ . By Fatou's lemma again,

$$\mathsf{E}X_{\infty}^{+} \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{E}X_{n}^{+} = \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{E}[X_{n}^{-} + X_{n}] \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathsf{E}[X_{n}^{-}] + \mathsf{E}[X_{0}] < \infty.$$

Hence,  $\mathsf{E}|X_{\infty}| < \infty$ , which of course implies that  $X_{\infty}$  is finite, a.s.  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 5.1.** Let  $(X_n)$  be a non-negative supermartingale. Then,  $X_{\infty} = \lim_n X_n$  exists almost surely. Further,  $\mathsf{E}X_{\infty} \leq \mathsf{E}X_0$ .

*Proof.* The first claim follows from Theorem 5.1. By Fatou's lemma,  $\mathsf{E}X_{\infty} \leq \lim \inf_{n} \mathsf{E}X_{n} \leq \mathsf{E}X_{0}$ .

**Example 5.1.** Consider the branching process example given in Unit 1. Let  $\{Z_{n,i}: n \in \mathbb{N}_0, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a collection of i.i.d. random variables taking values in  $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ . Let  $X_0 = 1$ , and for each  $n \ge 1$ ,

$$X_n = \sum_{i=1}^{X_{n-1}} Z_{n-1,i}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ , and  $W_n = X_n/\mu^n$  where  $\mu = \mathsf{E}[Z_{0,1}]$ . Then,  $W_n$  is a martingale, since

$$\mathsf{E}[X_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \mathsf{E}[Z_{n,1} + \dots + Z_{n,X_n} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \mu X_n.$$

Since a martingale is also a supermartingale,  $W_{\infty} = \lim W_n$  exists a.s.. However, we may not have the convergence in  $L^1$ ; see Exercise 5.1 below.

**Example 5.2.** We now give a numerical simulation of the branching process. For simplicity, we let  $X_0 = 1$  and generate  $X_n$  by sampling it from  $\text{Pois}(\mu X_{n-1})$ ; that is, we assume each  $Z_{n,i}$  follows a Poisson distribution with rate  $\mu$ . Results for  $\mu = 1.2$  and  $\mu = 0.95$  are shown in Figure 1. We will prove later that whether  $(X_n)$  converges in  $L^1$  only depends on whether  $\mu > 1$ .



Figure 1: 15 simulated trajectories of  $(W_n)$  in Example 5.2, with  $\mu = 1.2$  in the left panel and  $\mu = 0.95$  in the right.

**Example 5.3.** We give a counterexample which shows that the condition of Theorem 5.1 cannot be replaced by  $\sup_n |X_n| < \infty$ , a.s. Let  $(Z_n)_{n\geq 1}$  be i.i.d. with  $Z_1 \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ . Let  $X_0 = 0$ , and for each  $n \geq 1$ , let

$$X_n = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } X_{n-1} = 0, U_n \ge 1/2, \\ -1, & \text{if } X_{n-1} = 0, U_n < 1/2, \\ 0, & \text{if } X_{n-1} \ne 0, U_n \ge n^{-2}, \\ n^2 X_{n-1}, & \text{if } X_{n-1} \ne 0, U_n < n^{-2}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to show that  $(X_n)$  is a martingale. Borel-Cantelli lemma implies that  $(X_n)$  is bounded a.s.; i.e.,  $\sup_n |X_n| < \infty$  a.s. However, a.s.,  $(X_n)$  is not convergent with  $\limsup_n X_n = 1$  and  $\liminf_n X_n = -1$ .

**Exercise 5.1.** Consider Example 5.1. Suppose  $\mu \leq 1$  and  $\mathsf{P}(Z_{0,1} = 1) < 1$ . Show that  $X_n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$ .

**Exercise 5.2.** Let  $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$  be i.i.d. such that  $\mathsf{P}(Z_1 = 1) = \mathsf{P}(Z_1 = -1) = 1/2$ . Define  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_n)$ , and  $X_n = Z_1 + \cdots + Z_n$  (we set  $X_0 = 0$ ). Let our betting strategy be  $H_1 = 1$ , and

$$H_n = 2^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_1 = \dots = Z_{n-1} = -1\}}, \text{ for each } n \ge 2.$$

Define  $S_n = (H \cdot X)_n = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i Z_i$ . Does  $S_n$  converge a.s.? If  $S_n$  converges a.s., find the limit.

**Exercise 5.3.** Let  $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots$  be i.i.d. non-negative random variables such that  $\mathsf{E}Y_1 = 1$  and  $\mathsf{P}(Y_1 = 1) < 1$ . Let  $X_n = \prod_{i=1}^n Y_i$ . Prove that  $X_n \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\to} 0$ .

## References

- [1] Rick Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [2] Peter Hall and Christopher C Heyde. Martingale limit theory and its application. Academic press, 2014.
- [3] Achim Klenke. *Probability theory: a comprehensive course*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [4] David Williams. *Probability with martingales*. Cambridge university press, 1991.