## RISES AND UPCROSSINGS OF NONNEGATIVE MARTINGALES

BY

LESTER E. DUBINS<sup>1</sup>

## 1. Introduction

Let  $f_n$  be a stochastic process such as one that describes the successive fortunes of a gambler, the successive prices of a stock, or the population of a particular species. Such processes are *nonnegative*. For each positive real number y, the process experiences a *rise* of size y if for some r and s with  $r < s, f_s - f_r \ge y$ . Let x be a positive real number. If  $f_0 \equiv x$ , the process begins at x. In lieu of the semimartingale terminology we sometimes find it suggestive to call a process subfair or (conditional) expectation-decreasing if for all r and s with r < s, the conditional expectation of  $f_s$  given  $f_n$  for  $n \le r$  does not exceed  $f_r$ .

(1.1) THEOREM. Let  $f_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$ , be a nonnegative subfair process that begins at the positive real number x. Then, for each positive real number y, the probability that the process experiences a rise of size y is strictly less than  $1 - e^{-x/y}$ . Moreover, this bound is best possible.

The main purpose of this paper is to prove Theorem (1.1), or rather, its generalization, Theorem (11.1), which gives sharp bounds to the probability that nonnegative expectation-decreasing processes experience several rises. Though the first eleven sections of this paper are needed for the proof of (11.1), some of the intermediate results are of interest in themselves. Some of the ideas used in proving the "concrete" results (1.1) and (11.1) have been isolated, and presented in a somewhat general and abstract form in Sections 3, 4, and 6. These same ideas and techniques are then easily applied in Sections 12, 13, and 14, to find sharp bounds to the probability that nonnegative lower semimartingales have k or more upcrossings or downcrossings. These latter sections make contact with earlier work of Doob and Hunt [4], [10].

## 2. The bound in Theorem (1.1) is best possible

Let  $f_n$  be the fortune at time *n* of a gambler who gambles according to a scheme about to be described. Consider a fair two-valued gamble *g* that wins y > 0 with probability *W*, and that loses s > 0 with probability *L*. Here W + L = 1. Since *g* is fair,

(2.1) 
$$W = \frac{s}{s+y}; \qquad L = \frac{y}{s+y} = \frac{1}{1+s/y}.$$

Received September 19, 1960; received in revised form February 27, 1961.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This paper owes much to an extended collaboration with Leonard J. Savage on related matters. I have also had the benefit of stimulating conversations with David Blackwell and Lucien Le Cam. This research was undertaken while I held a regular post-doctoral National Science Foundation Fellowship.