

A NOTE ON RISK AND MAXIMAL REGULAR GENERALIZED SUBMARTINGALES IN STOPPING PROBLEMS¹

By H. CHERNOFF

Stanford University

In a recent paper Haggstrom [2] rearranged and amplified on the excellent work of Snell [3] on optimal stopping problems as a preliminary to generalizing the framework to deal with problems in control and experimental design. The purpose of this note is to point out that one of Haggstrom's results can be derived under weaker conditions by using the results of Snell.

Let $\{Z_n, F_n, n \geq 1\}$ be a stochastic process on a probability space (Ω, F, P) with points ω . A stopping variable (sv) is a random variable (rv) t with values in $\{1, 2, \dots, \infty\}$ such that $t < \infty$ a.e. and $\{t = n\} \in F_n$ for each n . For any such sv t , a rv Z_t is defined by $Z_t(\omega) = Z_n(\omega)$ if $t(\omega) = n$ and $Z_t(\omega) = \infty$ if $t(\omega) = \infty$. The optimal stopping problem consists of finding t to minimize the risk $E(Z_t)$.

Random variables are defined in the extended sense, i.e., they can take on the values $+\infty$ and $-\infty$. We regard $E(X)$ as defined as long as either the positive or negative part of X has finite expectation. This extension is usually referred to by the term generalized. The reader is referred to Snell [3] or Haggstrom [2] for detailed discussion of the technical terms used in this note.

Snell [2] obtained results characterizing the solution of the optimal stopping problem in terms of $\{Y_n, F_n, n \geq 1\}$, the maximal regular generalized submartingale relative to $\{Z_n, F_n, n \geq 1\}$. In particular, as part of his Theorem 3.6, he proved that

$$(1) \quad E(Y_n) = \inf_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t)$$

where T_n is the class of sv for which $t \geq n$ a.e. The proof of this theorem used the hypothesis that

$$(2) \quad E(\inf_n Z_n) > -\infty.$$

Haggstrom [1] introduced, and developed his results in terms of,

$$(3) \quad X_n = \text{ess inf}_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t | F_n)$$

which represents the optimal risk at stage n to the player who, for one reason or another, has not stopped previously. The relation between the results of Snell and Haggstrom, and in fact the motivation of Snell, is clarified by Haggstrom's Theorem 3.5 which states,

$$(4) \quad X_n = Y_n \quad \text{a.e.} \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Received 26 September 1966.

¹ This paper was prepared with the partial support of the National Science Foundation Grant GP-5705.

under (2) and the extra condition that $E(|Z_n|) < \infty$ for each n . Haggstrom pointed out that this extra condition can be relaxed to require only that for each n there exist a $\text{sv } t$ in T_n such that $E(Z_t) < \infty$. He referred to the fact that Y. S. Chow independently proved Theorem 3.5 and also proved (4) using $E(|Z_n|) < \infty$ for each n and $E(\sup_n Z_n) < \infty$.

The object of this note is to prove

$$(5) \quad E(Y_n | F_r) = \text{ess inf}_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t | F_r) \quad \text{a.e.} \quad \text{for } n \geq r$$

as a corollary of Snell's theorem using only condition (2). Equation (4) follows by setting $r = n$.

To this end let B be an arbitrary set of F_r . For $n \geq r$, let

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_n^* &= Z_n, & Y_n^* &= Y_n \quad \text{on } B \\ Z_n^* &= 0, & Y_n^* &= 0 \quad \text{on } B^c. \end{aligned}$$

Then $(Z_n^*, F_n, n \geq r)$ is a stochastic process and $(Y_n^*, F_n, n \geq r)$ is the maximal regular generalized submartingale relative to it. Applying Snell's result

$$(7) \quad E(Y_n^*) = \inf_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t^*).$$

Hence, with χ_B the characteristic function of B ,

$$(8) \quad E[\chi_B E(Y_n | F_r)] = \inf_{t \in T_n} E[\chi_B E(Z_t | F_r)].$$

Suppose now that there is a set of positive measure on which $E(Y_n | F_r) > \text{ess inf}_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t | F_r)$. Then there is a subset of positive measure on which $E(Y_n | F_r)$ is bounded away from $-\infty$ and $\text{ess inf}_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t | F_r)$ is bounded away from $+\infty$. Hence there exist $t \in T_n$ and $B \in F_r$ such that B has positive measure, $E(Y_n | F_r) > E(Z_t | F_r)$, $E(Y_n | F_r)$ is bounded away from $-\infty$, and $E(Z_t | F_r)$ is bounded away from $+\infty$ a.e. on B . Then

$$E[\chi_B E(Y_n | F_r)] > E[\chi_B E(Z_t | F_r)]$$

which contradicts (8). Similarly, assuming $E(Y_n | F_r) < \text{ess inf}_{t \in T_n} E(Z_t | F_r)$ on a set of positive measure implies the existence of a set of positive measure $B \in F_r$ such that for all $t \in T_n$, $E(Y_n | F_r)$ is bounded away from $+\infty$, $E(Z_t | F_r)$ is bounded away from $-\infty$, and $E(Y_n | F_r) < E(Z_t | F_r)$ a.e. on B . This also leads to a contradiction of (8). Hence equation (5) holds and (4) follows as a special case.

A conversation with Robbins based on a draft of this note indicated his feeling that the methods of Chow-Robbins [1] could also be applied to derive this result. A letter arrived the next day from D. Seigmund presenting such a derivation.

REFERENCES

- [1] CHOW, Y. S. and ROBBINS, H. (1967). On values to be associated with a stochastic sequence. *Proc. Fifth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.*
- [2] HAGGSTROM, G. E. (1966). Optimal stopping and experimental design. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **37** 7-29.
- [3] SNELL, J. L. (1952). Applications of martingale system theorems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **73** 292-312.