

WHEN DOES THE RAMER FORMULA LOOK LIKE THE GIRSANOV FORMULA?

BY M. ZAKAI¹ AND O. ZEITOUNI²

Technion–Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

Let $\{B, H, P_0\}$ be an abstract Wiener space and for every real ρ , let $T_\rho\omega = \omega + \rho F(\omega)$ be a transformation from B to B . It is well known that under certain assumptions the measures induced by T_ρ or T_ρ^{-1} are mutually absolutely continuous with respect to P_0 and the density function is represented by the Ramer formula. In this formula, the Carleman–Fredholm determinant $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F)$ appears as a factor. We characterize the class of ∇F for which a.s.- P_0 , $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1$ for all ρ in an open subset of \mathbb{R} , in which case the form of Ramer’s expression reduces to the familiar Cameron–Martin–Maruyama–Girsanov form. The proof is based on a characterization of quasinilpotent Hilbert–Schmidt operators.

1. Introduction. Let $\{B, H, P_0\}$ be an abstract Wiener space, let ρ be a real parameter and $T_\rho\omega = \omega + \rho F(\omega)$ be a transformation from B to B . By the work of Ramer [4] and Kusuoka [2], it is well known that if: (i) $I + \rho F(\omega)$ is bijective as an operator from B to B and $F(\omega)$ transforms B to H ; (ii) $F(\omega)$ possesses a weak- H derivative ∇F which is a.s. Hilbert–Schmidt from H to H , and is sufficiently smooth (cf. Theorem 6.4 of [2]); and (iii) $(I_H + \rho \nabla F(\omega))$ is a.s. an invertible operator from H to itself, then both T_ρ and T_ρ^{-1} induce absolutely continuous transformations of measure and, setting

$$Y(\omega) = \left(d(T_\rho^{-1})^* P_0/dP_0 \right)(\omega),$$

where

$$(T_\rho^{-1})^* P_0(A) = P_0\{\omega: T_\rho^{-1}\omega \in A\},$$

then

$$(1) \quad Y(\omega) = |\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F(\omega))| \cdot \exp\{-\delta F(\omega) - \frac{1}{2}\langle F, F \rangle_H\},$$

where δF denotes the divergence of F and \det_2 denotes the Carleman–Fredholm determinant. Note that in the classical Wiener case, if $\nabla_\theta F$ is adapted to the subsigma fields induced by $\{W_\eta, \eta \leq \theta\}$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$, then the divergence δ reduces to the Ito integral (of $d\nabla_\theta F/d\theta$) and $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1$ for all ρ (cf., e.g., [3]). Therefore if for some ρ , $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1$ a.s. – P_0 , then it is natural to say that for this ρ the Ramer formula (1) looks like the Girsanov formula (we remark that the Girsanov formula

Received January 1991; revised August 1991.

¹Research supported in part by the fund for promotion of research at the Technion.

²Research supported in part by the Technion V.P.R. Research fund.

AMS 1980 subject classifications. 60G30, 60H07, 47B10.

Key words and phrases. Girsanov formula, Ramer formula, absolute continuity, quasinilpotent operators.

should probably be referred to as the Cameron–Martin–Maruyama–Girsanov formula; however for clarity we will stick to Girsanov formula). The problem of the characterization of F or ∇F for which, ρ given and fixed, the Ramer formula looks like the Girsanov formula does not seem to be easy. We therefore modify the problem by asking for the characterization of the ∇F for which the Ramer formula looks like the Girsanov formula for all $\rho \in \mathcal{O}$, where \mathcal{O} is an open subset of the real line. The purpose of this note is to present such a characterization (cf. the corollary in Section 3).

2. A preliminary result. Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space and A a Hilbert–Schmidt (HS) operator from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H} . Recall that such an operator is said to be quasinilpotent if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |A^n|^{1/n} = 0$ and this is equivalent to $\sigma(A) = 0$, where $\sigma(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A (cf. Lemma VII.3.4 of [1]). Let A, B be HS and let μ_i denote the eigenvalues of $A \cdot B$ repeated according to their multiplicity. Then the sum $\sum \mu_i$ converges absolutely and $\text{Trace}(A, B) = \sum \mu_i$ (cf. XI.6 of [1]). Theorem XI.6.24 of [1] states that if A is quasinilpotent, then $\text{Trace}(A, A) = 0$. The converse to this theorem is obviously not true (e.g., take A to be a 3×3 real matrix with eigenvalues $\sqrt{2}, i, -i$). We show that under additional conditions, the reverse direction does, however, hold true as follows:

THEOREM. *Let A be a HS operator from \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H} , denote by λ_{\max} the maximal modulus of its eigenvalues and let $C > \lambda_{\max}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) A is quasinilpotent [i.e., $\sigma(A) = 0$ or $|A^n|^{1/n} \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$].
- (b) $\text{Trace}(A^k, A^k) = 0$ for all $k \geq 1$.
- (c) $\text{Trace}(g(A), f(A)) = 0$ for all functions $g(z), f(z)$ which are analytic on $|z| \leq C$ and vanish at $z = 0$.
- (d) $\det_2(I + \rho A) = 1$ for all $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (e) $\det_2(I + \rho A) = 1$ for all ρ in an open set \mathcal{O} .
- (f) $(I + \rho A)^{-1} = I + B_\rho$ for all ρ in some open set \mathcal{O} and B_ρ is HS and quasinilpotent for all ρ in \mathcal{O} .

PROOF. We remark that most of the proof follows results in the literature. The part which is novel is the proof of the implication (b) \Rightarrow (a).

Note that since A is HS, all its eigenvalues λ_i are countable, of finite multiplicity and $\lambda_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sigma(A) = \{\lambda_i, i = 1, 2, \dots\}$. Moreover, if $(I + \rho A)$ is invertible, namely, $\rho \notin \sigma(A)$, setting

$$(2) \quad (I + \rho A)^{-1} = I + B_\rho$$

and using $(I + \rho A)(I + B_\rho) = I$ yields

$$I + B_\rho = I - \rho A \cdot (I + \rho A)^{-1},$$

therefore [since $(I + \rho A)^{-1}$ is bounded] B_ρ is also HS.

(a) \Rightarrow (f): We have to show that B_ρ is quasinilpotent. Assuming otherwise, let λ be a nonzero eigenvalue of B_ρ and v the corresponding eigenvector; $\lambda \neq -1$ since $I + B_\rho$ is invertible. Then, substituting in (2) yields that

$$-\frac{\lambda}{(1 + \lambda)\rho}$$

is a nonzero eigenvalue of A (v being the corresponding eigenvector), which is impossible since $\sigma(A) = 0$.

(f) \Rightarrow (a): Follows by the same arguments as (a) \Rightarrow (f).

(a) \Rightarrow (c): Follows directly from Theorem XI.6.25 of [1].

(c) \Rightarrow (b): Obvious.

(a) \Rightarrow (d): Follows directly from part a of theorem 9.2 of [5].

(d) \Rightarrow (e): Obvious.

(e) \Rightarrow (b): By Theorem XI.6.26 of [1], $\det_2(I + \rho A)$ is an entire function of ρ . Hence, since $\det_2(I + \rho A) = 1$ on an interval in the complex domain it is equal to 1 for all ρ in the complex domain. On the other hand, $\det_2(I + \rho A)$ possesses the following series expansion (cf. page 108 of [5]):

$$\det_2[I + \rho A] = \exp \sum_2^\infty \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{m} \rho^m \text{Trace}(A, A^{m-1})$$

and (b) follows by the analyticity of $\det_2 [I + \rho A]$.

(b) \Rightarrow (a): Let (c') denote the condition

(c') $\text{Trace}(g(A^2), f(A^2)) = 0$ for all functions $g(z), f(z)$ which are analytic on $|z| \leq C$ and vanish at $z = 0$.

Note first that (b) \Rightarrow (c'). Indeed, (b) implies that $\text{Trace}(A^{2k}, A^{2m}) = 0$ for all $m, k \geq 1$. The continuity of the Trace operator and the analyticity of f and g yield (c'). We show next that (c') \Rightarrow (a): Set $f(z) = z$ and

$$g_\epsilon(z) = \frac{z - \lambda_1^2 + \epsilon}{z - \lambda_1^2 - \epsilon} \cdot z,$$

where λ_1 is one of the eigenvalues of A with modulus λ_{\max} . Note that $g_\epsilon(\lambda_1^2) = -\lambda_1^2$ and

$$g_\epsilon(z) - z = \frac{2z\epsilon}{z - \lambda_1^2 - \epsilon}$$

and therefore $g_\epsilon(z) \rightarrow_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} z$ for all $z \neq \lambda_1^2$, uniformly in z outside a small disk around λ_1^2 . Hence, by XI.6.25 of [1],

$$0 = \text{Trace}(A^2, A^2) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i^4,$$

and on the other hand, denoting by m the multiplicity of $\pm \lambda_1$,

$$\text{Trace}(A^2, g_\epsilon(A^2))$$

$$= -m\lambda_1^4 + \sum_{m+1}^\infty \lambda_i^4 + 2\epsilon \sum_{m+1}^\infty \frac{\lambda_i^3}{\lambda_i^2 - \lambda_1^2 - \epsilon} \rightarrow_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} -m\lambda_1^4 + \sum_{m+1}^\infty \lambda_i^4.$$

Consequently, $\lambda_1^4 = 0$ which proves that (b) \Rightarrow (a) and completes the proof of the theorem. \square

3. Ramer's formula. The theorem of the previous section yields the following characterization:

COROLLARY. Let $T_\rho \omega = \omega + \rho F(\omega)$, and assume that for all $\rho \in \mathcal{O}$, where \mathcal{O} is an open set in \mathbb{R} , T_ρ satisfies (i)–(iii) from before. Then a necessary and sufficient condition that for all $\rho \in \mathcal{O}$,

$$Y(\omega) = \exp \left\{ -\rho \delta F - \frac{\rho^2}{2} \langle F, F \rangle_H \right\}$$

[namely, $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1$] is that any of the conditions of the theorem hold for all ρ in \mathcal{O} for almost all $(P_0) \omega$. Furthermore, since $(T_\rho^{-1})^* P_0 \sim P_0$ and T_ρ bijective imply that $(T_\rho)^* P_0 \sim P_0$ with $X(\omega) = Y^{-1}(T_\rho \omega)$ [where $d(T_\rho)^* P_0 / dP_0 = X$ and $d(T_\rho^{-1})^* P_0 / dP_0 = Y$] it follows that if $Y(\omega)$ is of the Girsanov form, so is $X(\omega)$.

Consider now the classical Wiener space: $\omega = \{W_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$, where W stands for the standard Wiener process. Let \mathcal{S}_t denote the subsigma fields generated by $\{W_\theta, 0 \leq \theta \leq t\}$ and assume that $F(\omega)$ satisfies the requirements of Theorem 6.4 of [2]. Writing in this case $F(\omega) = \{F_t(\omega), 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$, further assume that $F_t(\omega)$ is \mathcal{S}_t -measurable; then obviously $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1$ follows from a comparison of the Ramer and Girsanov formulas. Two direct proofs of this result, based on the properties of \det_2 (without any appeal to the Girsanov-type results) will now be pointed out. Note first that since we are dealing with the classical Wiener case we have the representations $F_t = \int_0^t f_s ds$ and

$$\langle \nabla F_t, h \rangle_H = \int_0^1 D_s f_t \cdot h(s) ds,$$

where $D_s f_t$ is a Hilbert Schmidt kernel on $[0, 1]^2$ and, since F_t is \mathcal{S}_t -measurable, $D_s f_t = 0$ whenever $s > t$. In general, for the classical Wiener case, by the Hilbert–Fredholm formula (cf., e.g., Theorem 9.4 of [5]):

$$\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^m}{m} \int_{[0, 1]^m} \det(K(s_i, s_j))_{m \times m} ds_1 \dots ds_m,$$

where $(K(s_i, s_j))_{m \times m}$ is an $m \times m$ matrix with the (i, j) th entry given by 0 if $i = k$ and by $D_{s_i} f_{s_j}$ for $j \neq i$. In our case, since $D_s f_t = 0$ for $s > t$, $(K(s_i, s_j))_{m \times m}$ is a triangular matrix with zeros on the diagonal and its determinant is zero, consequently, $\det_2(I_H + \rho \nabla F) = 1$. The second proof of this result is based on the result of this note: Note that for any $K(s, t), L(s, t)$ which are square integrable on $[0, 1]^2$ and for any complete orthonormal system on $[0, 1], \{\phi_i(t), i = 1, 2, \dots\}$,

$$\text{Trace}(K, L) = \sum_i \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^1 K(s, \theta) \phi_i(s) ds \right) \cdot \left(\int_0^1 L(\theta, t) \phi_i(t) dt \right) d\theta.$$

Hence, by the Parseval theorem,

$$\text{Trace}(K, L) = \int_{[0,1]^2} K(s, \theta) L(\theta, s) d\theta ds.$$

Now, if $K(s, t) = 0$ and $L(s, t) = 0$ for $s > t$, then $\text{Trace}(K, L) = 0$, and moreover $M(s, t) = 0$ for $s > t$, where

$$M(s, t) = \int_0^1 K(s, \theta) L(\theta, t) d\theta.$$

Consequently, if F_t is \mathcal{L}_t -measurable, then $D_s f_t$ satisfies condition (b) of the theorem a.s.- P_0 .

We note that in the abstract Wiener space setup, if ∇F is (a.s.- P_0) both quasinilpotent and of trace class, then $\text{Trace} \nabla F = 0$ and the Fredholm determinant coincides with the Carleman-Fredholm determinant. In the classical Wiener space, the class of Ogawa integrable integrands $\{u_s, 0 \leq s \leq 1\}$ (cf. [3]) is larger than the class of integrands for which $D_t u_s$ is of trace class. *If, however, $D_t u_s$ is both quasinilpotent and of trace class, then the Skorohod integral coincides with the Ogawa integral.*

Acknowledgments. Constructive discussions with A. S. Ustunel and I. Lewkowicz are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] DUNFORD, N. and SCHWARTZ, J. T. (1957). *Linear Operations* 1 and 2. Interscience, New York.
- [2] KUSUOKA, S. (1982). The nonlinear transformation of Gaussian measure on Banach space and its absolute continuity. *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **29** 567-597.
- [3] NUALART, D. and ZAKAI, M. (1986). Generalized stochastic integrals and the Malliavin calculus. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **73** 255-280.
- [4] RAMER, R. (1974). On nonlinear transformations of Gaussian measures. *J. Funct. Anal.* **15** 166-187.
- [5] SIMON, B. (1979). Trace ideals and their applications. *Lecture Notes* **35**. London Math. Soc., Cambridge Univ. Press.

DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING
TECHNION—ISRAEL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
HAIFA 32000
ISRAEL