

ON CONVERGENCE OF SEMIMARTINGALES

by

Martin T. Barlow¹
Statistical Laboratory
16 Mill Lane
Cambridge CB2 15B
England

and

Philip Protter²
Mathematics and
Statistics Departments
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47907
U.S.A.

Technical Report #89-07

Department of Statistics
Purdue University

April 1989

¹ Supported by a NSF grant while visiting Cornell University

² Supported in part by NSF grant #DMS-8805595

ON CONVERGENCE OF SEMIMARTINGALES

by

Martin T. Barlow¹
Statistical Laboratory
16 Mill Lane
Cambridge CB2 15B
England

and Philip Protter²
Mathematics and
Statistics Departments
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47907
U.S.A.

Let X be a semimartingale. A norm commonly used on the space of semimartingales is the \mathcal{H}^p norm: One defines

$$j_p(M, A) = \|[M, M]_\infty^{1/2} + \int_0^\infty |dA_s|\|_{L^p}$$

for any decomposition $X = M + A$ with M a local martingale and A an adapted, right continuous process with paths of finite variation on compacts. Then

$$\|X\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} = \inf_{X=M+A} j_p(M, A)$$

where the infimum is taken over all such decompositions of X . Then as is well known (see, for example, Emery [2] or Protter [7], Theorem 2 of Chapter V):

$$\|X^*\|_{L^p} \leq c_p \|X\|_{\mathcal{H}^p} \quad (1 \leq p < \infty)$$

where $X^* = \sup_t |X_t|$, and c_p is a universal constant. An immediate consequence is that if a sequence of semimartingales X^n converges to X in \mathcal{H}^1 , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\{(X^n - X)^*\} = 0$$

as well.

In this paper we examine the converse question: if $X^n = M^n + A^n$ is a sequence of semimartingales converging uniformly in L^1 to a process X , what can be said about the convergence of the M^n and A^n processes of the decompositions? Such a question

¹ Supported by a NSF grant while visiting Cornell University

² Supported in part by NSF grant #DMS-8805595

is closely related to recent work on weak convergence of semimartingales: In particular Jacod-Shiryaev [3], Jakubowski-Mémin-Pages [4], and Kurtz-Protter [5].

The examination of two simple examples illustrates the problems that arise and shows that one cannot expect a full converse.

Let Y be any continuous, adapted process with $Y_0 = 0$ and Y constant on $[1, \infty)$; set

$$X_t^n = n \int_{t-1/n}^t Y_s ds 1_{\{t > 1/n\}}.$$

Then X^n is a differentiable function of t in $[\frac{1}{n}, \infty)$ for each n and in particular each X^n is of finite variation (and hence it is a semimartingale). However the limit Y need not be a semimartingale.

The preceding example indicates that we have to impose some type of uniform bound on the total variation of the A^n processes. But even if we do this we cannot hope always to obtain convergence of the A^n processes in total variation norm. Indeed, let $0 \leq t \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, and define $A_t^n = \frac{1}{n} \sin nt$. Then $\int_0^{\pi/2} |dA_s^n| = 1$, but $(A^n)^*$ converges to zero.

The following theorem avoids the pathologies of the two preceding examples. Recall that a semimartingale X in \mathcal{H}^1 is special: that is, it always has a unique decomposition $X = X_0 + M + A$, where $M_0 = A_0 = 0$, and the finite variation process A is predictable. Such a decomposition is said to be the canonical decomposition.

Theorem 1. Let X^n be a sequence of semimartingales in \mathcal{H}^1 with canonical decomposition $X^n = X_0^n + M^n + A^n$, satisfying for some constant K ,

$$(1a) \quad E\left\{\int_0^\infty |dA_s^n|\right\} \leq K$$

$$(1b) \quad E\{(M^n)^*\} \leq K.$$

Let X be a process, and suppose that

$$(2) \quad E\{(X^n - X)^*\} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then X is a semimartingale in \mathcal{H}^1 , and if $X = X_0 + M + A$ is its canonical decomposition we have

$$(3) \quad E\{M^*\} \leq K, \quad E\left\{\int_0^\infty |dA_s|\right\} \leq K$$

and

$$(4a) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M^n - M\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0,$$

$$(4b) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\{(A^n - A)^*\} = 0.$$

Corollary 2. Let (X^n) be a sequence of special semimartingales with canonical decomposition $X^n = X_0^n + M^n + A^n$, where the A^n satisfy (1a). Then if X is a process such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|(X^n - X)^*\|_{L^1} = 0$, X is a special semimartingale. Further if $X = X_0 + M + A$ is its canonical decomposition, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|M^n - M\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\{(A^n - A)^*\} = 0, \quad E\left\{\int_0^\infty |dA_s|\right\} \leq K.$$

Proof. By deleting a finite number of terms in the sequence (X^n) , we may suppose that $E\{(X^n - X)^*\} \leq K$ for $n \geq 1$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} E\{(M^n - M^1)^*\} &\leq E\{|X_0^n - X_0^1|\} + E\{(X^n - X)^*\} + E\{(A^n - A^1)^*\} \\ &\leq 4K. \end{aligned}$$

So write $\tilde{X}^n = X^n - M^1 = X_0^n + (M^n - M^1) + A^n$, $\tilde{X} = X - M^1$. Then the hypotheses of Theorem 1 hold for \tilde{X}^n , \tilde{X} and the conclusion follows easily. \square

The proof of Theorem 1 uses some ideas from Kurtz and Protter [5], and it also needs the following martingale inequality.

Proposition 3. Let $p \geq 1/2$, M be a martingale in \mathcal{H}^{2p} and K be a predictable process with $K^* \in L^{2p}$. Then

$$\|(K \cdot M)^*\|_{L^p} \leq c_p \|K^*\|_{L^{2p}} \|M^*\|_{L^{2p}}.$$

Proof. Recall the Davis decomposition of M — see Meyer [6, p. 80–81]. Let $\Delta M_s = M_s - M_{s-}$. Let $A_t = \sup_{s \leq t} |\Delta M_s|$: then $M = N + U$, where N is a martingale with $|\Delta N_t| \leq A_{t-}$, and U is a martingale with paths of integrable variation satisfying

$$\left\| \int |dU_s| \right\|_{L^q} \leq c_q \|A_\infty\|_{L^q}, \quad q \geq 1.$$

Further, we have the pointwise inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} A_\infty &\leq 2M^*, \\ [N]_\infty^{1/2} &\leq [M]_\infty^{1/2} + [U]_\infty^{1/2}, \\ [U]_\infty^{1/2} &\leq 4A_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now $(K \cdot M)^* \leq (K \cdot N)^* + (K \cdot U)^*$, and $|\Delta(K \cdot N)_t| \leq K_t^* A_t$. Hence, by Meyer [6], Theorem 2 on p. 76,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(K \cdot M)^*\|_{L^p} &\leq c_p (\|([K \cdot N]_\infty + (K^* A_\infty)^2)^{1/2}\|_{L^p} + \|(K \cdot U)^*\|_{L^p}) \\ &\leq c_p (\|[K \cdot N]_\infty^{1/2} + K^* A_\infty\|_{L^p} + \|(K \cdot U)^*\|_{L^p}) \\ &\leq c_p (\|K^* [N]_\infty^{1/2}\|_{L^p} + \|K^* M^*\|_{L^p} + \left\| \int |K_s| |dU_s| \right\|_{L^p}) \\ &\leq c_p (\|K^* [M]_\infty^{1/2}\|_{L^p} + \|K^* M^*\|_{L^p} + \|K^* \int |dU_s|\|_{L^p}). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is concluded by applying Holder's inequality, and noting that $\left\| \int |dU_s| \right\|_{L^{2p}} \leq c_p \|M^*\|_{L^{2p}}$. (The constant c_p changes from place to place in the preceding.) \square

Remarks. 1. Of course, for $p \geq 1$ this inequality is an immediate consequence of the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities.

2. This inequality is not true in general for $0 < p < 1/2$.

Proof of Theorem 1. First note that as X is the a.s. uniform limit of a subsequence of the X^n , X is cadlag. Also, as $\|X_0^n - X_0\|_{L^1} \rightarrow 0$, we may take $X_0^n = X_0 = 0$.

Let H be an elementary predictable process, that is a process of the form

$$H_t = \sum_{i=1}^k h_i 1_{(t_i, t_{i+1}]}(t),$$

where $h_i \in \mathcal{F}_{t_i}$, $|h_i| \leq 1$, and $t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_k$. Then writing $H \cdot X$ for the elementary stochastic integral of H with respect to X , $t_{k+1} = \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\{(H \cdot X)_\infty\} &= E\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} h_i(X_{t_{i+1}} - X_{t_i})\right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} h_i(X_{t_{i+1}}^n - X_{t_i}^n)\right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\left\{\int_0^\infty H_t dA_t^n\right\} \leq K. \end{aligned}$$

So by the Bichteler-Dellacherie theorem (e.g., Dellacherie-Meyer [1]) X is a quasimartingale, and therefore a special semimartingale. Hence X has a canonical decomposition $X = M + A$, with M a local martingale and A a predictable finite variation process. Choose a sequence (T_k) reducing M . Then, if H is an elementary predictable process, $E\{(H \cdot A)_{T_k}\} = E\{(H \cdot X)_{T_k}\} = \lim_n E\{(H \cdot X^n)_{T_k}\} \leq K$. Thus

$$E\left\{\int_0^{T_k} |dA_s|\right\} \leq K, \quad \text{for each } k \geq 1,$$

and hence $E\left\{\int_0^\infty |dA_s|\right\} \leq K$.

Now $M = X - A = (X - X^n) + (M^n + A^n) - A$, and so

$$M^* \leq (X - X^n)^* + (M^n)^* + \int_0^\infty |dA_s^n| + \int_0^\infty |dA_s|.$$

Thus $E\{M^*\} \leq 3K < \infty$, and M is a martingale in \mathcal{H}^1 . Set $Y^n = X^n - X$, $N^n = M^n - M$, $B^n = A^n - A$: We have

$$E\left\{\int_0^\infty |dB_s^n|\right\} \leq 2K, \quad E\{(N^n)^*\} \leq 2K, \quad \lim_n E\{(Y^n)^*\} = 0.$$

To complete the proof it is enough to prove that

$$(5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\{[Y^n]_\infty^{1/2}\} = 0.$$

For then, by Dellacherie and Meyer [1], section VII.95, we have $E\{[B^n]^{1/2}\} \leq 2E\{[Y^n]^{1/2}\}$. Hence, as $[N^n]^{1/2} \leq [B^n]^{1/2} + [Y^n]^{1/2}$, $E\{[N^n]_\infty^{1/2}\} \leq 3E\{[Y^n]_\infty^{1/2}\}$, so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|N^n\|_{\mathcal{H}^1} = 0$. This implies that $E\{(M^n - M)^*\} \rightarrow 0$, and hence that $\infty E\{(A^n - A)^*\} \rightarrow 0$. Finally, $E\{M^*\} \leq K$ follows from (4a) and (1b).

To show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\{[Y^n]_\infty^{1/2}\} = 0$, use integration by parts to conclude

$$[Y^n]_\infty = (Y_\infty^n)^2 - 2 \int_0^\infty Y_{s-}^n dN_s^n - 2 \int_0^\infty Y_{s-}^n dA_s^n,$$

and so, writing $U^n = Y_-^n \cdot N^n$,

$$(6) \quad E\{[Y^n]_\infty^{1/2}\} \leq E\{(Y^n)^*\} + 2^{1/2} E\{((U^n)^*)^{1/2}\} + 2^{1/2} E\left\{\left(\int_0^\infty |Y_{s-}^n| |dA_s^n|\right)^{1/2}\right\}.$$

By Proposition 2

$$\begin{aligned} E\{((U^n)^*)^{1/2}\} &\leq c(E\{(Y^n)^*\})^{1/2} (E\{(N^n)^*\})^{1/2} \\ &\leq cK^{1/2} (E\{(Y^n)^*\})^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the third term in (6) is dominated by

$$\begin{aligned} E\{((Y^n)^* \int_0^\infty |dA_s^n|)^{1/2}\} &\leq (E\{(Y^n)^*\})^{1/2} (E\{\int_0^\infty |dA_s^n|\})^{1/2} \\ &\leq K^{1/2} (E\{(Y^n)^*\})^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\{[Y^n]_\infty^{1/2}\} = 0$. □

References

1. C. Dellacherie, P. A. Meyer, "Probabilities and Potential B," North-Holland, Amsterdam New York (1982).
2. M. Emery, Stabilité des solutions des équations différentielles stochastiques; applications aux intégrales multiplicatives stochastiques; Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie 41 (1978), 241–262.
3. J. Jacod, A. N. Shiryaev, "Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes," Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York (1987).
4. A. Jakubowski, J. Mémin, G. Pages, Convergence en loi des suites d'intégrales stochastiques sur l'espace D^1 de Skorohod; to appear in Probability Theory and Related Fields.
5. T. Kurtz, P. Protter, Weak limit theorems for stochastic integrals and stochastic differential equations; preprint.

6. P. A. Meyer, "Martingales and Stochastic Integrals I," Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 284 (1972).
7. P. Protter, "Stochastic Integration and Differential Equations: A New Approach," Springer-Verlag, forthcoming.