The Annals of Mathematical Satistics
1971, Vol. 42, No. 5, 1697–1705

A GAMBLING THEOREM AND OPTIMAL STOPPING THEORY

BY WILLIAM D. SUDDERTH
University of Minnesota

A proof is given for a gambling theorem which was stated by Dubins and Savage. Connections are made with optimal stopping theory and the usual abstract stopping problem is generalized to a situation where stopping is allowed only at certain times along a given path.

1. Introduction. Consider a gambling problem in which, at each stage of play, the gambler has at most two choices. He may either gamble his fortune on a given game or, if the house allows it, he may stay with his current fortune. Dubins and Savage (1965) (Theorem 3.9.5) stated a result giving the optimal strategy for such a problem. Here a proof is given in the finitely additive setting of Dubins and Savage. Some results on measurability are then obtained under assumptions of countable additivity. Finally connections are made with optimal stopping theory as presented in Snell (1952), Chow and Robbins (1963), Haggstrom (1966), and Siegmund (1967). A generalization of the usual stopping problem is made to a situation where the player is allowed to stop only at certain times along a given path.

In accordance with Dubins and Savage, the present note treats the case of uniformly bounded random variables. As pointed out in the final section, most of the results here do not require such a strong assumption.

Notation is mostly taken from Dubins and Savage.

2. A gambling theorem. Let F be a set and α a gamble-valued function on F. Assume Γ is a gambling house on F such that, for every f, either $\Gamma(f) = \{\alpha(f)\}$ or $\Gamma(f) = \{\alpha(f), \delta(f)\}$, where $\delta(f)$ is the gamble assigning mass one to f. Let u be a bounded utility function on F and let U and V be the corresponding utility of Γ (Dubins and Savage (1965), page 25) and strategic utility of Γ (*ibid.*, page 41) respectively.

THEOREM 1. *For all* $f \in F$,

$$U(f) = \max \{u(f), \textstyle\int U d\alpha(f)\},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V(f) &= \max \{u(f), \textstyle\int V d\alpha(f)\} \quad \text{if} \quad \delta(f) \in \Gamma(f), \\ &= \textstyle\int V d\alpha(f) \quad \text{if} \quad \delta(f) \notin \Gamma(f). \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. It follows easily from Corollary 3.3.4 of Dubins and Savage that, for any gambling problem and fortune $f \in F$, $V(f) = \sup \{\gamma V : \gamma \in \Gamma(f))$. This formula specializes in the present situation to give the desired functional equation for V. It also yields the desired equation for U if we apply it to the gambling house

Received October 30, 1970.

Γ' defined by $\Gamma'(f) = \{\alpha(f), \delta(f)\}$ for all $f \in F$, since $U = U' = V'$ by Corollaries 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 of Dubins and Savage. □

Let $\bar{\sigma}(\cdot)$ be the stationary family of strategies associated with the map

$$(1) \qquad \gamma(f) = \delta(f) \quad \text{if} \quad u(f) = V(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(f) \in \Gamma(f),$$
$$= \alpha(f) \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

The next theorem is the major result of this section.

THEOREM 2 (Theorem 3.9.5 of Dubins and Savage (1965)). *The strategy $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ is optimal for every f. That is, $u(\bar{\sigma}(f)) = V(f)$ for every f.*

It suffices to prove that the strategies $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ are thrifty and equalizing (*ibid.* Theorem 3.5.1). By Theorem 1, $\gamma(f)V = V(f)$ for all $f \in F$ and, hence, $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ is thrifty for all $f \in F$ (*ibid.*, Theorem 3.6.1). It remains to prove that each $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ is equalizing. The following two lemmas are helpful.

LEMMA 1. *Suppose $\Gamma'(f) = \{\alpha(f), \delta(f)\}$ for every f and also $u' = 1_B$ is an indicator function. Let $\bar{\tau}(\cdot)$ be the stationary family determined by*

$$(2) \qquad \beta(f) = \alpha(f) \quad \text{if} \quad f \notin B$$
$$= \delta(f) \quad \text{if} \quad f \in B.$$

Then, for every f, $\bar{\tau}(f)$ is optimal in Γ' at f.

PROOF. Let $Q(f) = u'(\bar{\tau}(f))$ and apply Theorem 2.12.1 of Dubins and Savage. □

LEMMA 2. *Let Γ be any gambling house on F, u a utility function, and U the corresponding utility of Γ. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and define $B = \{f: u(f) \geqq U(f) - \varepsilon\}$. Then, for the new gambling problem with utility function $u' = 1_B$, Γ has corresponding utility U' identically equal to one.*

PROOF. Let $0 < \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ and let $f \in F$. If $u(f) = U(f)$, then clearly $U'(f) = 1$. So assume $u(f) < U(f)$. Choose σ available at f and a stop rule t such that $u(\sigma, t) > U(f) - (\varepsilon')^2$. Since U is excessive, $U(f) \geqq U(\sigma, t)$. Hence $(U-u)(\sigma, t) < (\varepsilon')^2$. Since $U \geqq u$, we have

$$\sigma[U(f_t) - u(f_t) \geqq \varepsilon] \leqq \sigma[U(f_t) - u(f_t) \geqq \varepsilon'] \leqq \varepsilon'.$$

Thus $U'(f) \geqq 1_B(\sigma, t) \geqq 1 - \varepsilon'$. □

A somewhat deeper result is that Lemma 2 would remain true if U and U' were replaced by V and V' in its statement.

Now we return to the proof that $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ is equalizing.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and s be any stop rule. By Theorem 3.7.2 of Dubins and Savage, it suffices to find a stop rule t such that $t \geqq s$ and $\bar{\sigma}(f)[f_t \in A] \geqq 1 - \varepsilon$, where $A = \{f: u(f) \geqq V(f) - \varepsilon\}$.

Let $g \in F$, $\bar{\tau}(g)$ be as in Lemma 1, and B be as in Lemma 2. Then $A \supseteq B$, since $V \leqq U$, and, by the lemmas,

$$1_A(\bar{\tau}(g)) \geqq 1_B(\bar{\tau}(g)) = U'(g) = 1.$$

In particular, there is a stop rule $r(g)$ such that $\bar{\tau}(g)[f_{r(g)} \in A] \geqq 1-\varepsilon$.

Let

$$t_\varepsilon(f_1, \cdots) = \text{least } k, \quad \text{if any, for which } f_k \in A$$
$$= +\infty \quad \text{if all } f_k \notin A.$$

We may assume $r(g) \leqq t_\varepsilon$. For, if not, we could replace $r(g)$ by $r(g) \wedge t_\varepsilon$ and observe that

$$[f_{r(g)\wedge t_\varepsilon} \in A] \supseteq [f_{r(g)} \in A].$$

But $\bar{\sigma}(g)$ agrees with $\bar{\tau}(g)$ up to time t_ε. Hence, $\bar{\sigma}(g)[f_{r(g)} \in A] \geqq 1-\varepsilon$.

Now let $h = (f_1, \cdots)$ and suppose $s(h) = n$. Define

$$t(h) = n+r(f_n)(f_{n+1}, \cdots).$$

Then

$$\bar{\sigma}(f)[f_t \in A] = \int \bar{\sigma}(f_{s(h)})[f_{r(f_{s(h)})} \in A]d\bar{\sigma}(f)(h)$$
$$\geqq 1-\varepsilon.$$

(*ibid.*, Formula 3.7.1).

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Consider now the stationary family $\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(\cdot)$ determined by

$$\gamma_\varepsilon(f) = \delta(f) \quad \text{if } u(f) \geqq V(f)-\varepsilon \text{ and } \delta(f) \in \Gamma(f),$$
$$= \alpha(f) \quad \text{otherwise.}$$

Let t_ε be the time at which $\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)$ stagnates, the same t_ε which occurs in the proof of Theorem 2.

THEOREM 3. *For every f, $u(\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)) \geqq V(f)-\varepsilon$. Moreover, if $\delta(f) \in \Gamma(f)$ for all f, then $\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)[t_\varepsilon < +\infty] = 1$ for all f.*

PROOF. Clearly, $\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)$ is thrifty. So $V(\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)) = V(f)$. By Lemma 2, given $\varepsilon' > 0$ and a stop rule s, we can find a stop rule $t \geqq s$ such that $\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)\,[u(f_t) > V(f_t)-\varepsilon] \geqq 1-\varepsilon'$. It follows that $u(\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f)) \geqq V(\bar{\sigma}_\varepsilon(f))-\varepsilon$.

The last part of the theorem follows easily from Lemma 2. □

3. A countably additive setting. The new assumptions for this section are that

(*a*) a Borel field $\mathscr{B}$ of subsets of F is given;

(*b*) each gamble γ available in Γ is countably additive when restricted to $\mathscr{B}$ and each γ is identified with its restriction to $\mathscr{B}$;

(*c*) the map α, of the previous section is a regular conditional probability on $(F, \mathscr{B})$ in the sense that the map $f \to \alpha(f)(A)$ is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable for every $A \in \mathscr{B}$;

(*d*) $\{f: \delta(f) \in \Gamma(f)\} \in \mathscr{B}$;

(*e*) the utility function u is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable. Under these regularity assumptions, we have

THEOREM 4. *The strategic utility function V is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable and, hence, the map γ (defined in* (1)) *is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable.*

Before the proof, a definition is necessary. Let $\sigma = \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \cdots$ be a strategy. Suppose σ_0 restricted to $\mathscr{B}$ is countably additive and, for every $n \geqq 1$ and every n-tuple $(f_1, \cdots, f_n)$ of elements of F, $\sigma_n(f_1, \cdots, f_n)$ restricted to $\mathscr{B}$ is countably additive. Suppose also that, for $n \geqq 1$ and $A \in \mathscr{B}$, $\sigma_n(f_1, \cdots, f_n)(A)$ is a $\mathscr{B} \times \cdots \times \mathscr{B}$ (n-factors) measurable function of $(f_1, \cdots, f_n)$. Then σ is said to be a *measurable strategy*. Theorem 4 implies that the strategies $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ of Section 2 are measurable, since $\bar{\sigma}(f)_n(f_1, \cdots, f_n) = \gamma(f_n)$. Thus, for our problem, the optimal strategy is measurable, although in other measurable problems the question of existence of good measurable strategies remains open (cf. Sudderth (1971)).

A measurable strategy σ determines a probability measure on the measurable sets $\mathscr{B} \times \mathscr{B} \times \cdots = \mathscr{B}^\infty$ of $F \times F \times \cdots = H$ as well as on the finitary sets. These measures are consistent and have a common extension (*ibid.*, Section 2) which we also write as σ.

Define u^* on H by

$$u^*(f_1, f_2, \cdots) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} u(f_n). \tag{3}$$

According to Theorem 3.2 of Sudderth (1971).

$$u(\sigma) = \int u^* d\sigma \quad \text{for every measurable strategy} \quad \sigma. \tag{4}$$

LEMMA 3. *Let σ be a measurable strategy. Then*

$$u(\sigma[f_1, \cdots, f_n]) \to u^*(f_1, \cdots, f_n, \cdots) \ \sigma \quad \text{a.s.}$$

as $n \to \infty$. (Recall that $\sigma[f_1, \cdots, f_n]$ denotes the conditional strategy determined by σ given the first n fortunes are $f_1, \cdots, f_n$.)

PROOF. By (4),

$$u(\sigma[f_1, \cdots, f_n]) = \int u^* d\sigma[f_1, \cdots, f_n].$$

Since u^* is shift invariant, the right hand expression is just the conditional expectation of u^* under σ given $f_1, \cdots, f_n$. The lemma now follows from a version of the martingale convergence theorem (Doob (1953) Theorem VII.4.3). □

The next lemma is a special case of Theorem 4.

LEMMA 4. *If $\delta(f) \in \Gamma(f)$, for all f, then V is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable.*

PROOF. Let $U_0(f) = u(f)$ and, for $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, $U_{n+1}(f) = \max\,(U_n(f), \int U_n d\alpha(f))$.

Then each U_n is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable. By Theorem 2.15.5 and Corollary 3.3.2 of Dubins and Savage (1965), $U_n \to V$ as $n \to \infty$. $\square$

It is easy to generalize Lemma 4 to the case where there are countably many gambles available at each f as in Theorem 4.1 of Sudderth (1969).

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 4.

Consider a gambling house Γ' on F given by $\Gamma'(f) = \{\alpha(f), \delta(f)\}$ for every f. Let $\bar{\lambda}(\cdot)$ be the stationary family of measurable strategies determined by the map α. Define

$$u'(f) = \int u^* d\bar{\lambda}(f) \qquad \text{if} \quad \delta(f) \notin \Gamma(f)$$

$$= \max \{u(f), \int u^* d\bar{\lambda}(f)\} \qquad \text{if} \quad \delta(f) \in \Gamma(f).$$

Let V' be the corresponding strategic utility. Then, by Lemma 4, V' is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable. (It is straight forward to check the measurability of u'.) Thus it suffices to show $V = V'$.

For every f, $\bar{\lambda}(f)$ is available at f in Γ. So, by definition of V and (4), $V(f) \geqq u(\bar{\lambda}(f)) = \int u^* d\bar{\lambda}(f)$. Hence, $V \geqq u'$. But V is excessive for Γ and thus for Γ'. By Theorem 2.12.1, Dubins and Savage (1965), $V \geqq V'$.

It remains to prove that $V \leqq V'$. Fix f in F and let $\gamma(f)$ and $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ be as in Section 2. By Theorem 2, $u(\bar{\sigma}(f)) = V(f)$. Now $\bar{\sigma}(f)$ is available at f in Γ'. So it suffices to show

$$u'(\bar{\sigma}(f)) \geqq u(\bar{\sigma}(f)). \tag{5}$$

(In fact, equality holds.)

Let $C = \{f\colon \gamma(f) = \delta(f)\}$ and define

$$t_C(f_1, \cdots) = \text{least } k, \qquad \text{if any, for which} \quad f_k \in C$$

$$= +\infty \qquad \text{if} \quad f_k \notin C \quad \text{for all} \quad k.$$

Then, for any stop rule t,

$$u(\bar{\sigma}(f), t) = u(\bar{\sigma}(f), t \wedge t_C)$$

$$= u(\bar{\lambda}(f), t \wedge t_C) \text{ (by Theorems 3.4.3. and 3.4.4, } \textit{ibid.}\text{)}$$

$$= \int_E u(f_t) d\bar{\lambda}(f) + \int_{E^c} u(f_{t_C}) d\bar{\lambda}(f),$$

where $E = [t \leqq t_C]$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$.

For each positive integer n, let $B_n = \{h\colon \exists\, k \ni k \geqq n \text{ and } u(f_k) > u^*(h) + \varepsilon\}$. Then $B_n \downarrow \varnothing$ and $\bar{\lambda}(f)$ is measurable, so that $\exists\, N_1$ with $\bar{\lambda}(f)(B_{N_1}) < \varepsilon$. Thus, if $t \geqq N_1$,

$$[u(f_t) > u^* + \varepsilon] \subseteq B_{N_1}$$

and

$$\bar{\lambda}(f)[u(f_t) > u^* + \varepsilon] < \varepsilon.$$

Hence,

$$u(\bar{\sigma}(f), t) \leqq \int_E u^* d\bar{\lambda}(f) + \int_{E^c} u(f_{t_C}) d\bar{\lambda}(f) + \varepsilon(2M+1), \tag{7}$$

for $t \geqq N_1$ and $M = \sup |u|$.

Now the equations in (6) remain true if u is replaced by u'. By Lemma 3, $u'(f_n) \geqq \int u^* d\bar{\lambda}(f_n) = u(\bar{\lambda}(f_n)) \to u^*$ as $n \to \infty$ $\bar{\lambda}(f)$ a.s. Hence, $\exists N_2 \ni \bar{\lambda}(f)\{h: \exists k \geqq N_2 \text{ and } u'(f_k) < u^*(h) - \varepsilon\} \leqq \varepsilon$. Notice also that, for every h, $u'(f_{t_C}(h)) \geqq u(f_{t_C}(h))$ since $f \in C \Rightarrow \delta(f) \in \Gamma(f)$.

Thus, for $t \geqq N_2$,

$$u'(\bar{\sigma}(f), t) \geqq \int_E u^* d\bar{\lambda}(f) + \int_{E^c} u(f_{t_C}) d\bar{\lambda}(f) - \varepsilon(2M+1). \tag{8}$$

By (7) and (8),

$$u'(\bar{\sigma}(f), t) \geqq u(\bar{\sigma}(f), t) - 2\varepsilon(2M+1),$$

for $t \geqq \max(N_1, N_2)$, which proves (5) and, hence, the theorem.

4. Stopping theory. Let $(Y_n, \mathscr{B}_n)_{n \geqq 1}$ be a sequence of measurable spaces and, for $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, let

$$(Y^n, \mathscr{B}^n) = (Y_1 \times \cdots \times Y_n, \mathscr{B}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathscr{B}_n)$$

and

$$(Y^\infty, \mathscr{B}^\infty) = (Y_1 \times \cdots, \mathscr{B}_1 \times \cdots).$$

Let P be a countably additive probability measure on $\mathscr{B}^\infty$. We shall assume, for every n, the existence of a regular conditional distribution of the $n+1$st coordinate y_{n+1} given the first n coordinates $y_1, \cdots, y_n$. The assumption is not very restrictive in practice and the existence is guaranteed if the $(Y_n, \mathscr{B}_n)$ are separable standard Borel spaces (Parthasarathy (1967) Theorem V.8.1).

For $n \geqq 1$, let X_n be a $\mathscr{B}^n$-measurable map from Y^n to the Borel line and assume the X_n are uniformly bounded.

A *stopping variable* (sv) is a random variable t on $(Y^\infty, \mathscr{B}^\infty, P)$ with range contained in $\{1, 2, \cdots, +\infty\}$ and such that, for every two elements $y = (y_1, y_2, \cdots)$ and $y' = (y_1', y_2', \cdots)$ of Y^∞, if $t(y) = n$ and $y_i = y_i'$ for $i \leqq n$, then $t(y') = n$. Stopping variables are not assumed here to be finite with probability one. Following Siegmund (1967), we define, for $y \in Y^\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_t(y) &= X_{t(y)}(y) && \text{if } t(y) < \infty, \\ &= \limsup_{n \to \infty} X_n(y) && \text{if } t(y) = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The object is to choose a sv which maximizes EX_t.

We generalize the problem by restricting the sv's allowed. Let $A_n \in \mathscr{B}^n$ for $n \geqq 1$. An sv t is *permissible* iff, for every $y = (y_1, \cdots) \in Y^\infty$, $t(y) = n$ implies $(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in A_n$. (To specialize to the case where all sv's are permissible, take $A_n = Y^n$ for all n.) The object now is to find the optimal sv among the class of permissible sv's. It will be seen that an optimal sv always exists. To obtain this result, we associate a gambling problem with the given stopping problem by means of the following definitions:

$F = (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Y^n) \cup \{f_0\}$ where $f_0 \notin \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Y^n$;

$\mathscr{B}$ = Borel field generated by $(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathscr{B}^n) \cup \{\{f_0\}\}$;

(The unions above can be assumed to be unions of disjoint sets.)

$\alpha(f_0)$ = distribution of y_1;

$\alpha(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ = a version of the regular conditional distribution of $(y_1, \cdots, y_n, y_{n+1})$ given $(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ for $n = 1, 2, \cdots$;

$\Gamma(f_0) = \{\alpha(f_0)\}$;

$\Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$

$= \{\alpha(y_1, \cdots, y_n)\}$ if $(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \notin A_n$,

$= \{\alpha(y_1, \cdots, y_n), \delta(y_1, \cdots, y_n)\}$ if $(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in A_n$ for $n = 1, 2, \cdots$;

(For each $f \in F$, $\alpha(f)$ can be extended, by the Hahn-Banach Theorem, to all subsets of F so as to be a gamble. The particular extension taken is irrelevant for the sequel.)

$u(f_0)$ is an arbitrary real number;

$u(y_1, \cdots, y_n) = X_n(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ for all $(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in Y^n$ and all $n = 1, 2, \cdots$.

The definition of the associated gambling problem is now complete. Notice that the gambling problem is one of the type studied in Section 3.

Now associate to each sv t a gamble-valued function γ_t defined on F by

$$\gamma_t(f_0) = \alpha(f_0); \tag{9}$$

$$\gamma_t(y_1, \cdots, y_n) = \delta(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \quad \text{if} \quad t(y_1, \cdots, y_n, \cdots) = n;$$

$$\gamma_t(y_1, \cdots, y_n) = \alpha(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \quad \text{if} \quad t(y_1, \cdots, y_n, \cdots) \neq n.$$

Let σ_t be the associated stationary strategy at f_0 and notice that σ_t is a measurable strategy.

LEMMA 5. *For every* sv t, $u(\sigma_t) = EX_t$. *If t is permissible, then σ_t is available at f_0 in Γ.*

PROOF. Let $h = (f_1, f_2, \cdots) \in H$ and define

$$Y_t(h) = X_n(f_n) \quad \text{if} \quad f_n = (y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in Y^n \text{ and } t(y_1, \cdots, y_n, \cdots) = n,$$

$$= \limsup_{n\to\infty} X_n(f_n) \quad \text{if} \quad f_n \in Y^n \quad \text{for all} \quad n.$$

Then Y_t is defined on a set of H which has probability one under σ_t. Moreover,

$$\int X_t dP = \int Y_t d\sigma_t,$$

since the distribution of X_t under P is the same as that of Y_t under σ_t.

By Theorem 3.2 of Sudderth (1971), $u(\sigma_t) = \int u^* d\sigma_t$, where u^* is as in (3). Since $\sigma_t[u^* = Y_t] = 1$, the first statement of the lemma is proved. The second is obvious. □

Consider the function s on Y^∞ given by

$$(10)\quad \begin{aligned} s(y_1, y_2, \cdots) &= \text{least } n, \quad \text{if any, such that} \quad u(y_1, \cdots, y_n) = V(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \\ &\qquad \text{and} \quad \delta(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in \Gamma(y_1, \cdots, y_n), \\ &= +\infty \qquad \text{if there is no such} \quad n. \end{aligned}$$

Here V is the strategic utility function for Γ.

The next result is the principal one in this section and overlaps with theorems in Chow and Robbins (1963), Haggstrom (1966), Siegmund (1967) and Snell (1952).

THEOREM 5. *The function s is a permissible* sv *and is optimal.*

PROOF. By Theorem 4, V is $\mathscr{B}$-measurable. It follows that s is $\mathscr{B}^\infty$-measurable and, therefore, a sv. Clearly, s is permissible.

Let $\bar{\sigma}(f_0)$ be the optimal stationary strategy of Theorem 2. Then $\bar{\sigma}(f_0)$ and σ_s agree on a set of histories which has probability one under both. So, by Lemma 5,

$$EX_s = u(\sigma_s) = u(\bar{\sigma}(f_0)) = V(f_0).$$

But, for every permissible sv t,

$$EX_t = u(\sigma_t) \leqq V(f_0),$$

again by Lemma 5. □

It is worth remarking that the proof shows σ_s to be optimal among a larger class of strategies than just the class of σ_t arising from permissible sv's t.

Other results which overlap with previous work in stopping theory can now be easily established. Theorem 3 can be reinterpreted for this section to give information about ε-optimal sv's and Theorem 1 gives a functional equation for V. Finally, an easy application of the fundamental theorem of gambling (Dubins and Savage (1965) Theorem 2.12.1) shows that, if $A_n = Y^n$ for all n then $V(y_1)$, $V(y_1, y_2), \cdots$ is minimal among the class of all expectation decreasing semi-martingales (measurable or not) adapted to $(Y^n, \mathscr{B}^n)$ and satisfying $V(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \geqq X_n(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ for all $(y_1, \cdots, y_n)$. Viewed from this standpoint, Snell's original work (1952), where he used "maximal semi-martingales," seems very much in the spirit of the basic gambling result.

5. Remarks on the assumption of boundedness. The major results of this note would presumably still hold if the utility function u were assumed only to be bounded above. If attention is restricted to a countably additive setting and measurable strategies, then analogues of all the theorems can be proved under this weaker assumption by essentially the arguments already given except that results quoted from Dubins and Savage (1965) must be replaced by similar results from Sudderth (1970). Moreover, in a countably additive setting, it should be possible to weaken the boundedness assumption still further.

Acknowledgment. Research sponsored by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Office of Aerospace Research, United States Air Force, under AFOSR Grant AF-AFOSR-1312-67 and by the National Science Foundation under NSF Grant GP-9556.

REFERENCES

CHOW, Y. S. and ROBBINS, H. E. (1963). On values associated with a stochastic sequence. *Proc. Fifth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.* Univ. of California.

DOOB, J. L. (1953). *Stochastic Processes.* Wiley, New York.

DUBINS, L. E. and SAVAGE, L. J. (1965). *How to Gamble if You Must.* McGraw-Hill, New York.

HAGGSTROM, G. W. (1966). Optimal stopping and experimental design. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **37** 7–29.

PARTHASARATHY, K. R. (1967). *Probability Measures on Metric Spaces.* Academic Press, New York.

SIEGMUND, D. O. (1967). Some problems in the theory of optimal stopping rules. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **38** 1627–1640.

SNELL, J. L. (1952). Applications of martingale system theorems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **73** 293–312.

SUDDERTH, W. D. (1969). On the existence of good stationary strategies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **135** 399–414.

SUDDERTH, W. D. (1970). On the Dubins and Savage characterization of optimal strategies. *Technical Report No.* 138, Dept. of Stat., University of Minnesota.

SUDDERTH, W. D. (1971). On measurable gambling problems. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **42**