

EXPONENTIAL MARTINGALES AND CHANGES OF MEASURE FOR COUNTING PROCESSES

ALEXANDER SOKOL AND NIELS RICHARD HANSEN

ABSTRACT. We give sufficient criteria for the Doléans-Dade exponential of a stochastic integral with respect to a counting process local martingale to be a true martingale. The criteria are adapted particularly to the case of counting processes and are sufficiently weak to be useful and verifiable, as we illustrate by several examples. In particular, the criteria allow for the construction of for example nonexplosive Hawkes processes as well as counting processes with stochastic intensities depending on diffusion processes.

1. Introduction

Statistical counting processes models are fundamental for the modeling of events occurring in continuous time. The simplest such process is the Poisson process, where the intensity of new events is constant. For more complex phenomena, it is necessary to consider models based on counting process with stochastic intensities, see e.g. [1]. Such models find applications in subjects as diverse as observational studies, neuronal spike trains, molecular biology and corporate defaults, see e.g. [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Therefore, as discussed by Gjessing et al. in [7], for the purpose of statistical modeling using counting processes, it is of interest to formulate generic statistical models based on counting processes with stochastic intensity in terms of a family of candidate intensities, and it is then essential to be able to verify that the intensities result in well-defined nonexplosive models.

The purpose of this paper is to obtain results for constructing nonexplosive counting processes with stochastic intensities via a change of measure on the background probability space. The objective is to derive verifiable conditions in a counting process context for an appropriate exponential martingale to be a true martingale. Using a change of measure, this allows for construction of nonexplosive counting processes.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60G44; Secondary 60G55.

Key words and phrases. Counting process, Exponential martingale, Girsanov, Intensity, Uniform integrability.

To this end, we need conditions on the candidate intensities. If the intensity is adapted to the filtration generated by the counting process itself, precise results are obtainable by transferring the problem to a canonical setup, see e.g. Theorem 5.2.1 in [8]. If N is a counting process, which, under some probability measure P , is a homogeneous Poisson counting process, this theorem shows that given a candidate intensity process λ satisfying $\lambda_t \leq a(N_{t-})$ for a sequence $a(n)$ such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/a(n)$ diverges, then there is a measure Q with likelihood process with respect to P being an exponential martingale, such that N is a nonexplosive counting process with intensity λ under Q . This result is mentioned in [7] as the Jacobsen condition. It holds on the canonical spaces considered in [8] and allows for the construction of a counting process on bounded intervals with intensity λ by a change of measure.

Alternative approaches to ensure the existence of a nonexplosive counting process with a given intensity are surveyed in [7], but a general yet verifiable condition is difficult to obtain. The most general, explicit condition mentioned in [7] is (25). This is a growth condition on λ_t^a with $a > 1$, which is typically too strong or difficult to verify in practice. A consequence of our results is that a growth condition with $a = 1$ is sufficient, which is much more useful.

The starting point for our sufficient criteria is the paper by Lépingle and Mémin, [9], and their general results, which we adapt to the specific case of Doléans-Dade exponentials of stochastic integrals with respect to counting process local martingales. Decomposing the appropriate exponential martingale into two factors, we apply a predictable criterion (based on a moment condition for a predictable process) and an optional criterion (based on a moment condition for an optional process) appropriately for each part. For the particular case where the initial counting process is a homogeneous Poisson process, the part of the moment condition initiated by the predictable criterion ultimately vanishes, yielding a useful criterion for the exponential martingale to be a true martingale which has no direct analogue in the literature for general martingales.

As we demonstrate by example, our criterion suffices to prove nonexplosion of counting processes for a variety of stochastic intensity processes. In particular, due to the technique based on changes of measure, our criterion is applicable not only for intensities depending on the counting process itself, but also for intensities depending on auxiliary processes such as diffusions, allowing for the construction of models with interacting diffusion and jump processes.

2. Summary of results

In this section, we state and discuss our main results, postponing proofs to Section 4. Consider a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, P)$ satisfying the usual conditions, see [10], Section I.1 for the definition of this as well as other standard

probabilistic concepts. We say that N is a nonexplosive d -dimensional counting process if N is càdlàg and piecewise constant with jumps of size one, and no coordinates of N jump at the same time. We say that a process X is locally bounded if there is a sequence of stopping times increasing almost surely to infinity such that $X^{T_n} 1_{(T_n > 0)}$ is bounded. Let λ be a nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded d -dimensional process. Then λ is almost surely integrable on compacts with respect to the Lebesgue measure. We say that N is a counting process with intensity λ if it holds that $N_t^i - \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$ is a local martingale for each i . Note in particular that since the predictable σ -algebra considered is the one generated by the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$, the intensity is allowed to depend on other processes than just N .

We recall the definition of Doléans-Dade exponentials. In the following, all semimartingales X are assumed to have càdlàg paths, that is, $X(\omega)$ is càdlàg for all $\omega \in \Omega$. By X_{t-} , we denote the limit of X_s as s tends to t from below, and we write $\Delta X_t = X_t - X_{t-}$ for the jump of X at t . Assume given a semimartingale X with initial value zero. By Theorem II.37 of [10] and Theorem I.4.61 of [11], the stochastic differential equation $Z_t = 1 + \int_0^t Z_{s-} dX_s$ has a càdlàg adapted solution, unique up to indistinguishability, and the solution is

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{E}(X)_t = \exp\left(X_t - \frac{1}{2}[X^c]_t\right) \prod_{0 < s \leq t} (1 + \Delta X_s) \exp(-\Delta X_s),$$

where X^c is the continuous martingale part of X , see Proposition I.4.27 of [11], and $[X^c]$ denotes the quadratic variation process. If X is a local martingale, $\mathcal{E}(X)$ is a local martingale as well, and in this case, we refer to $\mathcal{E}(X)$ as an exponential martingale. The case where $\Delta X \geq -1$ will be of particular importance to us. In this case, $\mathcal{E}(X)$ is nonnegative, and we may put $R = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid \Delta X_t = -1\}$ and obtain

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{E}(X)_t = 1_{(t < R)} \exp\left(X_t - \frac{1}{2}[X^c]_t + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \log(1 + \Delta X_s) - \Delta X_s\right).$$

Now assume given a d -dimensional nonexplosive counting process N with nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded intensity λ , and assume given another d -dimensional nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded process μ .

Definition 2.1. We say that μ is λ -compatible if it holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$ that $\mu_t^i(\omega) = 0$ whenever $\lambda_t^i(\omega) = 0$, and if the process γ defined by $\gamma_t^i = \mu_t^i(\lambda_t^i)^{-1}$ for $i \leq d$ is locally bounded.

In Definition 2.1, we use the convention that zero divided by zero is equal to one. Now assume that μ is λ -compatible. Define M to be the d -dimensional local martingale given by $M_t^i = N_t^i - \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$. Put $\gamma_t^i = \mu_t^i(\lambda_t^i)^{-1}$ and $H_t^i = \gamma_t^i - 1$ for $t \geq 0$. As we have assumed that μ is λ -compatible, γ and H are both well-defined

and locally bounded real-valued processes. We define $(H \cdot M)_t = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t H_s^i dM_s^i$, $H \cdot M$ is then a one-dimensional process.

The following lemma shows that given λ and μ , $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is the relevant exponential martingale to consider for changing the distribution of N from a counting process with intensity λ to a counting process with intensity μ , where $H_t^i = \mu_t^i (\lambda^i)_t^{-1} - 1$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let T be a stopping time and assume that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)^T$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. With Q being the probability measure with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)_T$ with respect to P , it holds that N is a counting process under Q with intensity $1_{[0,T]} \mu + 1_{(T,\infty)} \lambda$. In particular, if $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale, it holds for any $t \geq 0$ and with Q_t being the probability measure with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)_t$ with respect to P that N is a counting process under Q_t with intensity $1_{[0,t]} \mu + 1_{(t,\infty)} \lambda$.*

In general, we cannot expect $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ to be a uniformly integrable martingale, only an ordinary martingale, because the distributions of counting processes with intensities which differ sufficiently will in general be singular. For example, the distributions of two homogeneous Poisson processes with different intensities are singular, see Proposition 3.24 of [12].

As an aside, note that the measure Q_T obtained in Lemma 2.2 of course always will be absolutely continuous with respect to P . A natural question to ask is when Q_T and P will be equivalent. This is the case when the Radon-Nikodym derivative is almost surely positive. Lemma 2.3 gives a condition for this to be the case.

Lemma 2.3. *If the set of zeroes of μ has Lebesgue measure zero, $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is almost surely positive.*

Finally, we state our sufficient criteria for $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ to be a true martingale. Defining $\log_+ x = \max\{0, \log x\}$ for $x \geq 0$, with the convention that the logarithm of zero is minus infinity, our main results are the following.

Theorem 2.4. *Assume that λ and μ are nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded. Assume that μ is λ -compatible. It holds that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale if there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that whenever $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$, one of the following two conditions are satisfied:*

$$(2.3) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t (\gamma_s^i \log \gamma_s^i - (\gamma_s^i - 1)) \lambda_s^i ds \right) < \infty \quad \text{or}$$

$$(2.4) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \lambda_s^i ds + \int_u^t \log_+ \gamma_s^i dN_s^i \right) < \infty.$$

Corollary 2.5. *Assume that $\lambda = 1$ and assume that μ is nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded. Then μ is λ -compatible. It holds that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale*

if there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that whenever $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$, one of the following two conditions are satisfied:

$$(2.5) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds \right) < \infty \quad \text{or}$$

$$(2.6) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \log_+ \mu_s^i dN_s^i \right) < \infty.$$

The immediate use of Theorem 2.4 and its corollary is as an existence result for nonexplosive counting processes with particular intensities, as the change of measure obtained from the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ yields the existence of a nonexplosive counting process distribution with given intensity μ on a bounded time interval $[0, t]$. That this is the case may be seen from Lemma 2.2, which shows that under the measure Q_t with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)_t$ with respect to P , N is a counting process with intensity $1_{[0,t]}\mu + 1_{(t,\infty)}\lambda$.

Note that it is not necessarily possible to use the family (Q_t) to obtain the existence of a limiting probability measure Q_∞ under which N has intensity μ on all of \mathbb{R}_+ . Such a limiting probability would require extension results as discussed in the appendix of [13]. See also the discussion following Example 3.3.

As a specific application of our results, let us assume that we are interested in constructing a statistical model for a nonexplosive counting processes. We assume given a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, P)$ and a d -dimensional counting process N such that under P , N^i has intensity $\lambda_t^i = 1$. Fix a timepoint t and let us assume that we are interested in considering a statistical model on the time interval $[0, t]$ based on a family of intensities $(\mu_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$. If μ_θ satisfies the criteria of Corollary 2.5, we find that $\mathcal{E}(H_\theta \cdot M)$ is a martingale, and so $\mathcal{E}(H_\theta \cdot M)_t$ has unit mean. Letting Q_θ be the probability measure with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(H_\theta \cdot M)_t$ with respect to P , it holds that under Q_θ , N is a counting process with intensity, and the intensity is μ_θ on $[0, t]$. Furthermore, the family $(Q_\theta)_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is dominated by P , and the likelihood function is known in explicit form. Thus, Corollary 2.5 has allowed us to construct the statistical model and prove that explosion does not occur.

As regards checking the criteria in practice, an important property to note is that the criteria only need to be checked locally, in the sense that it is only necessary to find some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the criteria holds for $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$. This makes it possible to apply the criteria in several interesting situations. In particular, it allows us to extend the criterion (25) of [7] from $a > 1$ to $a \geq 1$, see Example 3.3.

Instead of considering Theorem 2.4 as a criterion for nonexplosion, we may also think of it simply as a sufficient criterion for the Doléans-Dade exponential $\mathcal{E}(M)$

of a particular type of local martingale M to be a true martingale. For M a local martingale with $\Delta M \geq -1$ and initial value zero, the question of when $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale or a true martingale has been treated many times in the literature, see for example [14, 15, 16, 17] for results in the case of continuous M , and [9, 18, 19, 20, 21] for results in the general case.

In particular, a considerable family of criteria related to this problem is discussed in [19]. We remark that the proof of Theorem 2.4 applies Theorem III.1 and Theorem III.7 of [9]. In the parlance of [19], Theorem III.1 of [9] corresponds to condition $I(0, 1)$. There exists a slight improvement of condition $I(0, 1)$, namely condition $I(0, 1-)$, also proven in [19]. Applying this condition instead of condition $I(0, 1)$ would not lead to significant improvements of our results. We further remark that Theorem III.7 of [9] does not have an analogue in the hierarchy of [19]. In general, the criteria on which the results of Theorem 2.4 are built are among the strongest known, and optimality properties of these criteria are known, see [9]. Therefore, we expect that no significant improvements of Theorem 2.4 will be possible. Furthermore, we remark that while the conditions (2.3) and (2.5) are rather straightforward localised versions of results of [9], the conditions (2.4) and particularly the simplified variant (2.6) do not have direct analogues in the hierarchy of [19].

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 3, we give some examples of applications of the results. In Section 4, we present the proof of the main results. Appendix A contains supplementary results for Section 3.

3. Examples

In this section, we give examples where the conditions in Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.5 may be verified. Our first example shows how Theorem 2.4 under certain circumstances allows for changes of the intensity where the new intensity is an affine function of the old intensity. Such criteria were also discussed in Theorem 2 of [2], where the new intensity μ was assumed to be related to the initial intensity λ by the relationship $|\mu_t - \lambda_t| \leq \theta\sqrt{\lambda_t}$.

Example 3.1. Assume that d is equal to one. Assume that $\lambda_s \geq \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ and that $\mu_t \leq \alpha + \beta\lambda_s$. If there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$, $\int_u^t \lambda_s ds$ has an exponential moment of order $(1 + (\alpha\delta^{-1} + \beta) \log_+(\alpha\delta^{-1} + \beta))$, then $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale. \circ

Proof of Example 3.1: By our assumptions, $\gamma_t = \alpha\lambda_t^{-1} + \beta \leq \alpha\delta^{-1} + \beta$. Using that $x \log x - (x - 1) \leq 1 + x \log x \leq 1 + x \log_+ x$ for any $x \geq 0$, we then obtain

$$(3.1) \quad \int_u^t (\gamma_s^i \log \gamma_s^i - (\gamma_s^i - 1)) \lambda_s ds \leq (1 + (\alpha\delta^{-1} + \beta) \log_+(\alpha\delta^{-1} + \beta)) \int_u^t \lambda_s ds,$$

so the first criterion of Theorem 2.4 yields the result. \square

In the remainder of the examples, we will assume that $\lambda = 1$, such that N is a d -dimensional standard Poisson process, and give particular cases where Corollary 2.5 may be applied. For Example 3.2 below, we first introduce some notation. Let X be a semimartingale. If the quadratic variation process $[X]$ is locally integrable, the dual predictable projection $\Pi_p^*[X]$ is well-defined, see Definition 5.21 of [22] and Section III.5 of [10]. In this case, we put $\langle X \rangle = \Pi_p^*[X]$ and refer to $\langle X \rangle$ as the predictable quadratic variation process of X . It then holds that $\langle X \rangle$ is predictable, and in the case where X is a locally square-integrable local martingale, both $[X] - \langle X \rangle$ and $X^2 - \langle X \rangle$ are local martingales, see also Section I.4 of [11].

Example 3.2. Assume that μ is a nonnegative, predictable and locally integrable process, and assume that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\exp(\varepsilon \langle H \cdot M \rangle_t)$ is integrable for all $t \geq 0$. In this case, the first criterion of Corollary 2.5 may be applied to show that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale. \circ

Proof of Example 3.2: Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given such that $\exp(\varepsilon \langle H \cdot M \rangle_t)$ is integrable for all $t \geq 0$. Pick $K > 0$ so large that $x \log_+ x \leq \varepsilon(x - 1)^2$ holds for $x \geq K$, then $E \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds) \leq \exp(dtC) E \exp(\varepsilon \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (H_s^i)^2 ds)$, where $C = \sup_{-1 \leq x \leq K} x \log_+ x$. As N has no common jumps, however, we have $[H \cdot M]_t = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (H_s^i)^2 dN_s^i$. Therefore, as H is predictable, we obtain

$$(3.2) \quad \langle H \cdot M \rangle_t = \Pi_p^* \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (H_s^i)^2 dN_s^i = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (H_s^i)^2 d\Pi_p^* N_s^i = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (H_s^i)^2 ds.$$

All in all, we conclude

$$(3.3) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds \right) \leq \exp(dtC) E \exp(\varepsilon \langle H \cdot M \rangle_t) < \infty,$$

and the result follows by Corollary 2.5. \square

Example 3.2 is noteworthy because of the following. In [23], applying the results of [9], the following Novikov-type criterion is demonstrated: If M is a locally square integrable local martingale with $\Delta M \geq -1$ and $\exp(\frac{1}{2} \langle M^c \rangle_\infty + \langle M^d \rangle_\infty)$ is integrable, then $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Here, M^c and M^d denote the continuous and purely discontinuous parts of the local martingale, respectively, see Theorem 7.25 of [22]. Furthermore, in [23] it is argued by example that the constant 1 in front of $\langle M^d \rangle_\infty$ cannot in general be exchanged with $1 - \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. See also [20] for more results of this type. Example 3.2, however, shows that when proving the martingale property instead of the uniformly integrable martingale property, for the particular type of local martingale considered here, the constant 1 may in fact be exchanged with any positive number.

Example 3.3. Assume that μ is a nonnegative, predictable and locally integrable process satisfying $\mu_t^i \leq \alpha + \beta \sum_{j=1}^d N_{t-}^j$. Then both criteria of Corollary 2.5 may be applied to obtain that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale. \circ

Proof of Example 3.3: Consider first using the first moment condition of Corollary 2.5. As $x \log_+ x$ is increasing in x , it suffices to consider the case where $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta > 0$, such that μ is positive. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$. We then obtain, with $N_t^S = \sum_{j=1}^d N_t^j$,

$$(3.4) \quad \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds \right) \leq \exp \left(\varepsilon d (\alpha + \beta N_t^S) \log(\alpha + \beta N_t^S) \right).$$

Now, for k large enough, $\varepsilon d (\alpha + \beta k) \log(\alpha + \beta k) \leq 4\varepsilon d \beta k \log k$. Therefore, $\exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \mu_s^i \log \mu_s^i ds)$ is integrable if only $\exp(4\varepsilon d \beta N_t^S \log N_t^S)$ is integrable. N_t^S is Poisson distributed with parameter dt , so by choosing ε with $4\varepsilon d \beta < 1$, we obtain the desired integrability using Lemma A.1. The first moment condition of Corollary 2.5 now yields the result.

If we instead wish to use the second moment condition of Corollary 2.5, define a mapping $\varphi : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi(n) = E \exp(\int_0^{t-u} \log \beta(n + N_s^S) dN_s^S)$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta m$, we then obtain $\alpha + \beta x \leq \beta(m + x)$. By a conditioning argument, it then holds that $E \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \log \mu_s^i dN_s^i) \leq E \varphi(m + N_u^S)$. By elementary calculations and a standard hypergeometric summation formula, see formula (15.1.8) of [24], we obtain that whenever $\beta(t - u)d < 1$, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \varphi(n) = \frac{\exp(-(t - u)d)}{(1 - \beta(t - u)d)^{n+1}}.$$

Further calculations then yield the bound

$$(3.6) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \log \mu_s^i dN_s^i \right) \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \beta(t - u)d)^{m+1}} \exp \left(-td + \frac{ud}{1 - \beta(t - u)d} \right).$$

We conclude that the second moment condition of Corollary 2.5 yields the result, using ε such that $\beta\varepsilon d < 1$. \square

The above is the extension of criterion (25) of [7] from $a > 1$ to $a \geq 1$ mentioned earlier. For the case of intensities predictable with respect to the filtration generated by N , the existence of nonexplosive counting processes with intensities affinely bounded by the total number of jumps as in Example 3.3 is well known, see Example 4.4.5 of [8]. The abstract construction of Example 3.3 covers the general case of intensities predictable with respect to (\mathcal{F}_t) and yields a family $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, Q_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of probability spaces such that $(N_s)_{s \leq t}$ has intensity μ on $[0, t]$ under Q_t , here Q_t is the measure with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)_t$ with respect to P . Additional structure on the probability space is needed to guarantee the existence of the inverse limit $(\Omega, \sigma(\cup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_t), Q)$ with the restriction of Q to \mathcal{F}_t

being equal to Q_t , such that $(N_s)_{s \geq 0}$ has intensity μ under Q , see [25] and [13]. Such conditions can usually be assumed fulfilled in concrete cases by working with a suitable canonical choice of Ω , but we will not pursue this any further.

If the process μ is exactly affine in the sense that $\mu_t^i = \alpha + \beta \sum_{j=1}^d N_{t-}^j$, and N is a homogeneous Poisson process, the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ may be obtained by direct calculation. However, this does not in itself imply that the same result holds when we only have the inequality $\mu_t^i \leq \alpha + \beta \sum_{j=1}^d N_{t-}^j$. In general, such ‘‘monotonicity’’ properties of the martingale property for exponential martingales do not hold, see for example [16], Example 1.13.

Next, we consider two examples involving intensities given as solutions to stochastic differential equations. Such intensities allow for the construction of models with interacting counting processes and diffusions as discussed in for example [6]. In both cases, we assume given a Brownian motion relative to the given filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) , meaning in the d -dimensional case that $(W^i)_t^2 - t$ is an (\mathcal{F}_t) martingale for $i \leq d$ and $W_t^i W_t^j$ is an (\mathcal{F}_t) martingale for $i, j \leq d$ with $i \neq j$. We denote such a process an (\mathcal{F}_t) Brownian motion. By Lévy’s characterisation of Brownian motion for general filtered probability spaces, see Theorem IV.33.1 of [26], this requirement ensures that the characteristic properties of the Brownian motion interact well with the filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) . By $\mathbb{M}(d, d)$, we denote the set of $d \times d$ matrices with real entries.

Example 3.4. Consider mappings $A : \mathbb{N}_0^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $B : \mathbb{N}_0^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}(d, d)$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{N}_0^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}(d, d)$ such that for all $\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $A(\eta, \cdot)$, $B(\eta, \cdot)$ and $\sigma(\eta, \cdot)$ are continuous and bounded and such that σ always is positive definite. With T_n^i denoting the n ’th jump time for N^i and $Z_t^i = t - T_{N_t^i}^i$, let X be a solution to the d -dimensional stochastic differential equation

$$(3.7) \quad dX_t = (A(N_t, Z_t) + B(N_t, Z_t)X_t) dt + \sigma(N_t, Z_t) dW_t$$

with initial value x_0 in \mathbb{R}^d , where W is an (\mathcal{F}_t) Brownian motion independent of N . Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$ be Lipschitz and put $\mu_t = \phi(X_t)$. Assume that there are $\delta > 0$ and $c_A, c_B, c_\sigma > 0$ such that

$$(3.8) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|A(\eta, t)\|_2 \leq c_A \|\eta\|_1^{1-\delta}$$

$$(3.9) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|\sigma(\eta, t)\|_2 \leq c_\sigma \|\eta\|_1^{(1-\delta)/2}$$

$$(3.10) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \|B(\eta, t)\|_2 \leq c_B,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ in the first case denotes the Euclidean norm and in the two latter cases denote the operator norm induced by the Euclidean norm, and $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the \mathcal{L}^1 norm in \mathbb{N}_0^d . Then, the first criterion of Corollary 2.5 may be applied to obtain that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale. \circ

The interpretation of this example is as follows. The evolution of the diffusion process depends on the counting process with mean reversion level, mean reversion speed and diffusion coefficient which are deterministic between jumps. The Q -measure, as described in Lemma 2.2, yields a model with feedback from the diffusion to the counting process by letting the intensity be a function of the diffusion.

Proof of Example 3.4: We need to show that the first criterion of Corollary 2.5 is applicable. We may assume without loss of generality that $0 < \delta < 1$. It suffices to prove that for any $t > 0$, $E \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds)$ is finite. Fix $t > 0$. By Jensen's inequality, we find

$$(3.11) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds \right) \leq \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t E \exp \left(t \sum_{i=1}^d \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i \right) ds.$$

We wish to bound the expectation inside the integral by an expression depending continuously on s . Recall that we have assumed that ϕ is Lipschitz, so there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\|\phi(x)\|_\infty \leq \gamma \|x\|_2$, yielding $\phi^i(x) \leq \gamma \|x\|_2$ for all $i \leq d$, and so $E \exp(t \sum_{i=1}^d \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i) \leq E \exp(td\gamma \|X_s\|_2 \log_+ \gamma \|X_s\|_2)$. Next, let $0 < \zeta < 1$. It holds for all $x \geq 0$ that $\log_+ x \leq \zeta^{-1} x^\zeta$. Therefore, defining $\rho = td\gamma^{1+\zeta} \zeta^{-1}$, we conclude

$$(3.12) \quad E \exp \left(t \sum_{i=1}^d \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i \right) \leq E \exp \left(\rho \|X_s\|_2^{\zeta+1} \right).$$

We will calculate this expectation by conditioning on N . Let η denote a point process path, and let (τ_n) denote the event times of η . By the explicit representation in Lemma A.2 as well as the results on pathwise stochastic integration in [27], it holds that conditionally on $N = \eta$, X_s has the same distribution as Y_s^η , where

$$(3.13) \quad Y_s^\eta = C_s^{-1} \left(x_0 + \int_0^s C_v A(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v}) dv + \int_0^s C_v \sigma(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v}) dW_v \right),$$

which is a normal distribution with mean ξ_s^η and variance Σ_s^η , where

$$(3.14) \quad \xi_s^\eta = C_s^{-1} \left(x_0 + \int_0^s C_v A(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v}) dv \right)$$

$$(3.15) \quad \Sigma_s^\eta = C_s^{-1} \int_0^s (C_v \sigma(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v}))^t (C_v \sigma(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v})) ds (C^{-1})_s^t,$$

and where $C_s = \exp(-\int_0^s B(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v}) dv)$. With $\|\cdot\|_2$ denoting the matrix operator norm induced by the Euclidean norm, Lemma A.3 yields

$$(3.16) \quad E \exp(\rho \|X_s\|_2^{1+\zeta}) = \int E \left(\exp(\rho \|X_s\|_2^{1+\zeta}) \Big| N = \eta \right) dN(P)(\eta) \\ \leq k_d E \exp(a(\rho, \zeta) \|\xi_s^\eta\|^{1+\zeta}) \exp \left(b(\rho, \zeta) \|\Sigma_s^\eta\|_2^{\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}} \right),$$

with a and b as in the statement of the lemma. Next, we consider bounds for $\|\xi_s^\eta\|$ and $\|\Sigma_s^\eta\|_2$. Note that $\|C_s\|_2 \leq \exp(\int_0^s \|B(\eta_v, v - \tau_{\eta_v})\|_2 dv) \leq \exp(sc_B)$, where we have applied standard norm inequalities, see Theorem 10.10 of [28] and Lemma

1.4 of [29], and similarly, $\|C_s^{-1}\|_2 \leq \exp(sc_B)$. Therefore, recalling that $0 < \delta < 1$ so that $x \mapsto x^{1-\delta}$ is increasing,

$$(3.17) \quad \|\xi_s^\eta\|_2 \leq \exp(sc_B) (\|x_0\|_2 + sc_A \exp(sc_B) \|\eta_s\|_1^{1-\delta}).$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$(3.18) \quad \|\Sigma_s^\eta\|_2 \leq s \exp(4sc_B) c_\sigma^2 \|\eta_s\|_1^{1-\delta}.$$

In particular, for appropriate continuous functions a_ξ , b_ξ and b_Σ from \mathbb{R}_+ to \mathbb{R} , depending on ζ , we obtain the two bounds

$$(3.19) \quad \|\xi_s^\eta\|_2^{1+\zeta} \leq a_\xi(s) + b_\xi(s) \|\eta_s\|_1^{(1-\delta)(1+\zeta)}$$

$$(3.20) \quad \|\Sigma_s^\eta\|_2^{\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}} \leq b_\Sigma(s) \|\eta_s\|_1^{(1-\delta)\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}}.$$

We then conclude

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & E \exp(\rho \|X_s\|_2^{1+\zeta}) \\ & \leq k_d E \exp \left(a(\rho, \zeta) \left(a_\xi(s) + b_\xi(s) \|N_s\|_1^{(1-\delta)(1+\zeta)} \right) + b(\rho, \zeta) b_\Sigma(s) \|N_s\|_1^{(1-\delta)\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}} \right) \\ & \leq k_d \exp(a(\rho, \zeta) a_\xi(s)) E \exp \left((a(\rho, \zeta) b_\xi(s) + b(\rho, \zeta) b_\Sigma(s)) \|N_s\|_1^{(1-\delta)\frac{1+\zeta}{1-\zeta}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The above depends on given constants δ , c_A , c_B and c_σ , as well as the constant ζ which we may choose arbitrarily in the open interval between zero and one. We now choose ζ so small in $(0, 1)$ that $(1-\delta)(1+\zeta)(1-\zeta)^{-1} \leq 1$. Recalling that for any Poisson distributed variable Z with intensity λ and any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds that $E \exp(cZ) = \exp((\exp(c) - 1)\lambda)$, we may then conclude

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & E \exp(\rho \|X_s\|_2^{1+\zeta}) \\ & \leq k_d \exp(a(\rho, \zeta) a_\xi(s)) E \exp((a(\rho, \zeta) b_\xi(s) + b(\rho, \zeta) b_\Sigma(s)) \|N_s\|_1) \\ & = k_d \exp(a(\rho, \zeta) a_\xi(s)) \exp((\exp(a(\rho, \zeta) b_\xi(s) + b(\rho, \zeta) b_\Sigma(s)) - 1) ds). \end{aligned}$$

All in all, we may now define, for $0 \leq s \leq t$,

$$(3.23) \quad \varphi(s) = k_d \exp(a(\rho, \zeta) a_\xi(s)) \exp((a(\rho, \zeta) \exp(b_\xi(s) + b(\rho, \zeta) b_\Sigma(s)) - 1) ds),$$

and obtain $E \exp(t \sum_{i=1}^d \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i) \leq \varphi(s)$ for all such s . The functions a_ξ , b_ξ and b_Σ depends continuously on s . Therefore, φ is a continuous function of s . In particular, the integral of φ over $[0, t]$ is finite. Recalling our first estimates, this leads us to conclude that for any $t \geq 0$, it holds that $E \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t \mu_s^i \log_+ \mu_s^i ds)$ is finite, and so the first integrability criterion of Corollary 2.5 is satisfied. \square

Example 3.5. Let $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 0}$, $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $(b_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be sequences in \mathbb{R} . Assume that $b_n \neq 0$ for $n \geq 0$ and assume that X satisfies the one-dimensional stochastic differential equation

$$(3.24) \quad dX_t = a_{N_t} + b_{N_t} X_t dt + \sigma dW_t + (\xi_{N_t} - X_{t-}) dN_t,$$

with initial value ξ_0 and $\sigma > 0$, where W is an (\mathcal{F}_t) Brownian motion independent of N . Put $\mu_t = |\bar{X}_{t-}|$. Assume that there are $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that

$$(3.25) \quad |\xi_n| \leq \alpha + \beta n$$

$$(3.26) \quad |a_n/b_n| \leq \alpha + \beta n$$

$$(3.27) \quad |b_n| \leq \alpha.$$

Then, the second criteria of Corollary 2.5 may be applied to obtain that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale. \circ

The interpretation of this example is similar to Example 3.4 with the intensity under the Q -measure evolving as the absolute value of a linear diffusion process with constant coefficients between jumps. The intensity is, however, in this example reset to the level ξ_n at the n 'th jump of N .

Proof of Example 3.5: We want to show that the second moment condition of Corollary 2.5 is applicable. To this end, we first construct an explicit solution to the stochastic differential equation defining X . With T_n denoting the n 'th event time for N , define the process W^n by $W_t^n = W_{T_n+t} - W_{T_n}$ and define $\mathcal{F}_t^n = \mathcal{F}_{T_n+t}$. By Theorem I.12.1 of [30], W^n is independent of \mathcal{F}_{T_n} and has the distribution of a Brownian motion. Again using Theorem I.12.1 of [30] with the stopping time $T_n + s$, we have for $0 \leq s \leq t$ that

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} E(W_t^n | \mathcal{F}_s^n) &= E(W_{T_n+t} - W_{T_n} | \mathcal{F}_{T_n+s}) \\ &= E(W_{T_n+t} - W_{T_n+s} | \mathcal{F}_{T_n+s}) + W_{T_n+s} - W_{T_n} \\ &= W_{T_n+s} - W_{T_n} = W_s^n, \end{aligned}$$

and Lévy's characterisation Theorem for Brownian motion relative to a filtration, see [26], Theorem IV.33.1, shows that W^n is an (\mathcal{F}_t^n) Brownian motion. We may then use the Itô existence and uniqueness theorem, see Theorem 11.2 of [26], concluding that on the same probability space that carries the Poisson process N , the Brownian motion W and in particular the (\mathcal{F}_t^n) Brownian motion W^n , there exist unique processes X^n satisfying the stochastic differential equations $dX_t^n = a_n + b_n X_t^n dt + \sigma dW_t^n$ with constant initial values ξ_n . Whenever $T_n \leq t < T_{n+1}$, we then have

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} X_{t-T_n}^n &= \xi_n + \int_0^{t-T_n} a_n + b_n X_s^n ds + \int_0^{t-T_n} \sigma dW_s^n \\ &= \xi_n + \int_{T_n}^t a_n + b_n X_{s-T_n}^n ds + \int_{T_n}^t \sigma dW_s. \end{aligned}$$

The process $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X_{t-T_n}^n 1_{[T_n, T_{n+1})}(t)$ thus satisfies the same stochastic differential equation as X . By pathwise uniqueness for each X^n , $X_t = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X_{t-T_n}^n 1_{[T_n, T_{n+1})}(t)$.

The above deliberations yield an explicit representation for the stochastic differential equation defining the intensity. Next, we check that the second moment condition of Corollary 2.5 is applicable. With $S_k = T_k - T_{k-1}$ denoting the sequence

of interarrival times, we then obtain for the moment condition to be investigated that

(3.30)

$$\begin{aligned} E \exp \left(\int_u^t \log_+ |X_{s-}| dN_s \right) &\leq E \exp \left(\int_u^t \log(1 + |X_{s-}|) dN_s \right) \\ &= E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} (1 + |X_{T_k - T_{k-1}}^{k-1}|) = E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} (1 + |X_{S_k}^{k-1}|). \end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain the finiteness of this expression, we wish to condition on N . Given a counting process trajectory η , we refer to the event times of η by (τ_n) , $\tau_0 = 0$, and we let (s_n) be the corresponding interarrival times, $s_n = \tau_n - \tau_{n-1}$. We then have

$$(3.31) \quad E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} (1 + |X_{S_k}^{k-1}|) = \int E \left(\prod_{k=\eta_u+1}^{\eta_t} (1 + |X_{s_k}^{k-1}|) \middle| N = \eta \right) dN(P)(\eta).$$

Next, we argue that given N , the variables $(X_{s_k}^{k-1})_{k \geq 1}$ are mutually independent, in the sense that it $N(P)$ almost surely holds that the conditional distribution of the variables $(X_{s_k}^{k-1})_{k \geq 1}$ given $N = \eta$ is the product measure of each of the marginal conditional distributions.

Applying Theorem V.10.4 of [26] and the Doob-Dynkin Lemma, see the first lemma of Section A.IV.3 of [31], there is a measurable mapping $G_{k-1} : C[0, s_k] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $X_{s_k}^{k-1}$ is the transformation under G_{k-1} of the first s_k coordinates of W^{k-1} . We apply this result to obtain the conditional independence of $X_{s_k}^{k-1}$ given $N = \eta$. As $X_{s_k}^{k-1}$ is a transformation of $(W^{k-1})^{s_k}$, it will suffice to show that the processes $(W^{k-1})^{s_k}$ are conditionally independent given $N = \eta$. To this end, we recall that W is independent of N , and note that $(W^{k-1})_t^{s_k} = W_{(\tau_{k-1}+t) \wedge \tau_k} - W_{\tau_{k-1}}$. Therefore, $(W^{k-1})^{s_k}$ is \mathcal{F}_{τ_k} measurable. By Theorem I.12.1 of [30], W^{k-1} is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_{k-1}}$. Inductively, it follows that conditionally on $N = \eta$, the sequence of processes $(W^{k-1})^{s_k}$ are mutually independent. Therefore, conditionally on N , the variables $(X_{s_k}^{k-1})_{k \geq 1}$ are mutually independent.

Applying this conditional independence, we may now conclude

$$\begin{aligned} E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} (1 + |X_{S_k}^{k-1}|) &= \int E \left(\prod_{k=\eta_u+1}^{\eta_t} (1 + |X_{s_k}^{k-1}|) \middle| N = \eta \right) dN(P)(\eta) \\ (3.32) \quad &= E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} E(1 + |X_{S_k}^{k-1}| | N). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we develop a simple bound for $E(|X_{S_k}^{k-1}| | N)$. Consider again a counting process path η , we then almost surely have $E(|X_{S_k}^{k-1}| | N = \eta) = E|X_{s_k}^{k-1}|$, where $X_{s_k}^{k-1}$ is given by $X_{s_k}^{k-1} = \xi_{k-1} + \int_0^{s_k} a_{k-1} + b_{k-1} X_t^{k-1} dt + \sigma W_{s_k}^{k-1}$. By (3.42) of

[32], we then find that $X_{s_k}^{k-1}$ is normally distributed with mean and variance given by

$$(3.33) \quad EX_{s_k}^{k-1} = -\frac{a_{k-1}}{b_{k-1}} + \exp(s_k b_{k-1}) \left(\xi_{k-1} + \frac{a_{k-1}}{b_{k-1}} \right).$$

$$(3.34) \quad VX_{s_k}^{k-1} = \sigma^2 \int_0^{s_k} \exp(2b_{k-1}(s_k - u)) \, du.$$

By our assumptions on a_k , b_k and ξ_k , we then obtain

$$(3.35) \quad \begin{aligned} E|X_{s_k}^{k-1}| &\leq |EX_{s_k}^{k-1}| + \sqrt{VX_{s_k}^{k-1}} E(X_{s_k}^{k-1} - EX_{s_k}^{k-1}) / \sqrt{VX_{s_k}^{k-1}} \\ &\leq \left| \frac{a_{k-1}}{b_{k-1}} \right| + \exp(s_k b_{k-1}) \left(|\xi_{k-1}| + \left| \frac{a_{k-1}}{b_{k-1}} \right| \right) + \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma \sqrt{s_k} \exp(2s_k b_{k-1}) \\ &\leq \alpha + \beta(k-1) + 2 \exp(s_k \alpha) (\alpha + \beta(k-1)) + \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma \sqrt{s_k} \exp(2s_k \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we see that by defining $\alpha^*(v) = \alpha + 2\alpha \exp(v\alpha) + \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma \sqrt{v} \exp(2v\alpha)$ and $\beta^*(v) = \beta + 2\beta \exp(v\alpha)$, we have $E|X_{s_k}^{k-1}| \leq \alpha^*(s_k) + \beta^*(s_k)(k-1)$. Next, note that for $k \leq N_t$, it holds that $T_k \leq T_{N_t} \leq t$. Therefore, for any k with $N_u + 1 \leq k \leq N_t$, it holds that $S_k \leq t$. As α^* and β^* are increasing, we then find

$$(3.36) \quad \begin{aligned} E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} E(1 + |X_{S_k}^{k-1}| | N) &\leq E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} (1 + \alpha^*(S_k) + \beta^*(S_k)(k-1)) \\ &\leq E \prod_{k=N_u+1}^{N_t} (1 + \alpha^*(t) + \beta^*(t)(k-1)) \\ &= E \exp \left(\int_u^t \log(1 + \alpha^*(t) + \beta^*(t)N_{s-}) \, dN_s \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding as in the the proof of Example 3.3 using the second moment condition of Corollary 2.5, it follows that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough and $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t-u \leq \varepsilon$, the above is finite, and so the moment condition is satisfied. \square

Examples 3.4 and 3.5 show how Corollary 2.5 may be used to construct counting processes with intensities not adapted to the filtration induced by N itself. Note that by Corollary 11.5.3 of [33], W is always independent of N , so the independence requirements in the above are mentioned only for clarity. Also note that in Example 3.4, the required bounds on the coefficients hold independently of the norms on \mathbb{N}_0^d , \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathbb{M}(d, d)$ chosen, since all norms on finite-dimensional vector spaces are equivalent.

Our next result, Example 3.6, yields a change of measure to a probability measure where the counting process is a multidimensional Hawkes process. Such results are of interest in the context of models such as those considered in e.g. [5]. In general, many specifications of ϕ and h will yield exploding counting processes and there will exist no measure change yielding the required intensity change.

Example 3.6. Consider mappings $\phi_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and $h_{ij} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Define

$$(3.37) \quad \mu_t^i = \phi_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{t-} h_{ij}(t-s) dN_s^j \right).$$

If ϕ_i is Borel measurable with $\phi_i(x) \leq |x|$ and h_{ij} is bounded, then $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale. \circ

Proof of Example 3.6: By Lemma A.4, the process $\sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{t-} h_{ij}(t-s) dN_s^j$ is predictable. As ϕ_i is Borel measurable, it then follows that μ^i is predictable. As ϕ_i is nonnegative, μ is nonnegative. And by stopping at event times, we find that μ is locally bounded. Thus, μ is nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded. Letting $c > 0$ be such that $\|h_{ij}\|_\infty \leq c$ for all $i, j \leq d$, we obtain

$$(3.38) \quad \mu_t^i \leq \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{t-} h_{ij}(t-s) dN_s^j \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^{t-} |h_{ij}(t-s)| dN_s^j \leq c \sum_{j=1}^d N_{t-}^j,$$

and the result follows from Example 3.3. \square

The above examples all give various types of sufficient criteria for the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ using Corollary 2.5. As an aside, we may ask whether the classical necessary and sufficient criterion for nonexplosion for piecewise constant intensities, see Theorem 2.3.2 of [34], may be replicated as a criterion for the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$. The following example shows that this is the case.

Example 3.7. Let $d = 1$, let (α_n) be a sequence of positive numbers and let $\mu_t = \alpha_{N_{t-}}$. Then $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale if and only if $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_n}$ is divergent. \circ

Proof of Example 3.7: Let T_n be the n 'th jump time of N , then (T_n) is a localising sequence. We have

$$(3.39) \quad \begin{aligned} E\mathcal{E}(\mu \cdot M - M)_{T_n} &= E \exp \left(T_n - \int_0^{T_n} \mu_s ds + \int_0^{T_n} \log \mu_s dN_s \right) \\ &= E \exp \left(- \sum_{k=1}^n (\alpha_{k-1} - 1)(T_n - T_{n-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^n \log \alpha_{k-1} \right) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^n \alpha_{k-1} (1 - (1 - \alpha_{k-1}))^{-1} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

so $\mathcal{E}(M)^{T_n}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale by Lemma 4.2. Therefore, by Lemma A.5, $\mathcal{E}(\mu \cdot M - M)$ is a martingale if and only if $\lim_n E\mathcal{E}(\mu \cdot M - M)_{T_n} 1_{(T_n \leq t)}$ is zero for all $t \geq 0$. Now let $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', P')$ be an auxiliary probability space endowed with a sequence (U_n) of independent exponentially distributed variables, where U_n has intensity α_n . Let P_n be the measure with Radon-Nikodym derivative

$\mathcal{E}(\mu \cdot M - M)_{T_n}$ with respect to P . By Lemma 2.2, under P_n , N has intensity $\mu 1_{[0, T_n]} + 1_{(T_n, \infty)}$. In particular, the distribution of T_n under P_n is then the same as the distribution of $\sum_{k=1}^n U_k$ under P' , and so

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_n E\mathcal{E}(M)_{T_n} 1_{(T_n \leq t)} &= \lim_n P_n(T_n \leq t) \\ &= \lim_n P' \left(\sum_{k=1}^n U_k \leq t \right) = P' \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k \leq t \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} (\sum_{k=1}^n U_k \leq t) = (\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k \leq t)$. Now, as $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha_k}$ diverges, Theorem 2.3.2 of [34] shows that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k$ is almost surely infinite, so $P'(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k \leq t) = 0$. The result now follows from Lemma A.5. \square

4. Proofs of the main results

In this section, we present the proofs of the results stated in Section 2. We begin by recalling two folklore results on supermartingales and exponential martingales.

Lemma 4.1. *Let X be a nonnegative supermartingale. Then X is a uniformly integrable martingale if and only if $EX_{\infty} = EX_0$, and X is a martingale if and only if it holds for all $t \geq 0$ that $EX_t = EX_0$.*

Recall that if M is a local martingale with $\Delta M \geq -1$ and initial value zero, $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a nonnegative local martingale and a supermartingale, $E\mathcal{E}(M)_t \leq 1$ and $\mathcal{E}(M)_{\infty}$ always exists as an almost sure limit with $E\mathcal{E}(M)_{\infty} \leq 1$. Applying Lemma 4.1 to the case of Doléans-Dade exponentials then yields the following useful result.

Lemma 4.2. *Let M be a local martingale with $\Delta M \geq -1$ and initial value zero. $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale if and only if $E\mathcal{E}(M)_{\infty} = 1$, and $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a martingale if and only if $E\mathcal{E}(M)_t = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$.*

Now consider given a d -dimensional nonexplosive counting process N with nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded intensity λ as well as another nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded process μ which is λ -compatible. As in Section 2, M is the d -dimensional local martingale defined by $M_t^i = N_t^i - \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$. Furthermore, we also use the notation that $\gamma^i = \mu_t^i (\lambda_t^i)^{-1}$ and $H_t^i = \gamma_t^i - 1$. Recall that the assumption that μ is λ -compatible by convention implies that both γ and H are locally bounded. Integrals are vector integrals in the sense that $H \cdot M$ denotes the one-dimensional process defined by $H \cdot M = \sum_{i=1}^d H^i \cdot M^i$.

We first prove Lemma 2.2, the result stated in Section 2 as the reason for taking interest in the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ when considering changing the intensity of a counting process. Recall that Π_p^* denotes the dual predictable projection, see Definition 5.21 of [22].

Lemma 4.3. *Let M be a local martingale with $\Delta M \geq -1$ and let T be a stopping time. Assume that $\mathcal{E}(M)^T$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Let Q be the probability measure having Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(M)_T$ with respect to P . If L is a local martingale under P such that $[L, M^T]$ is locally integrable under P , then $L - \langle L, M^T \rangle$ is a local martingale under Q , where the angle bracket is calculated under P .*

Proof. Assume given a process L which is a local martingale under P such that $[L, M^T]$ is locally integrable under P . We then find that Theorem III.41 of [10] applies and yields that the process given by $L_u - \int_0^u \mathcal{E}(M^T)_{s-}^{-1} d\langle \mathcal{E}(M^T), L \rangle_s$ is a Q local martingale, where the angle bracket is calculated under P . Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} L_u - \int_0^u \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}(M^T)_{s-}} d\langle \mathcal{E}(M^T), L \rangle_s &= L_u - \int_0^u \frac{1}{\mathcal{E}(M^T)_{s-}} d\langle \mathcal{E}(M^T)_- \cdot M^t, L \rangle_s \\ (4.1) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= L_u - \langle L, M^T \rangle_u, \end{aligned}$$

the result follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.2: Fix a stopping time T . By definition, Q has Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)_T$ with respect to P . We wish to apply Lemma 4.3. We first check that $[M^i, (H \cdot M)^T]$ is locally integrable under P . Note that $[M^i, M^j]_t = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \Delta M_s^i \Delta M_s^j = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \Delta N_s^i \Delta N_s^j = [N^i, N^j]$, since M^i has finite variation, in particular $[M^i] = N^i$. As the coordinates of N have no common jumps, we have $[M^i, (H \cdot M)^T] = H^i 1_{[0, T]} \cdot [N^i]$. Because we have assumed that H is locally bounded, this is locally integrable. From Lemma 4.3, we then conclude that $M^i - \langle M^i, (H \cdot M)^T \rangle$ is a local martingale under Q . Next, under P , we have $(\Pi_p^* N^i)_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$, and H and $1_{[0, T]}$ are predictable. Therefore, we obtain $\langle M^i, (H \cdot M)^T \rangle_s = \Pi_p^*(H^i 1_{[0, T]} \cdot [N^i])_s = \int_0^s H_u^i 1_{(u \leq T)} \lambda_u^i du$, which allows us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} M_s^i - \langle M^i, (H \cdot M)^T \rangle_s &= N_s^i - \int_0^s \lambda_s^i ds - \int_0^s H_u^i 1_{(u \leq T)} \lambda_u^i du \\ (4.2) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= N_t^i - \int_0^s \mu_u^i 1_{[0, T]}(u) + \lambda_u^i 1_{(T, \infty)}(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that under Q , N has intensity $1_{[0, T]} \mu + 1_{(T, \infty)} \lambda$. The results for the case where $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is a martingale then follows by considering stopping times which are constant. \square

Next, we prove Lemma 2.3, which yields a sufficient criterion for the probability measure Q constructed using an exponential martingale to be equivalent to our starting probability measure P . For this purpose, we first require the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let N have intensity λ . If X is a process which is nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded, and it holds almost surely that pathwisely, the set*

of zeroes of X has Lebesgue measure zero, then it almost surely holds that the zeroes of X are disjoint from the jump times of N^i for all i .

Proof. As X is predictable, the set of zeroes of X is a predictable set. Thus, the integral process $\int_0^t 1_{(X_s=0)} dM_s^i$ is a local martingale. Let (T_n) be a localising sequence such that $\int_0^t 1_{(X_s=0)} 1_{(t \leq T_n)} dN_s^i$ is bounded and $\int_0^t 1_{(X_s=0)} 1_{(t \leq T_n)} dM_s^i$ is a true martingale. Then $E \int_0^t 1_{(X_s=0)} 1_{(t \leq T_n)} dM_s^i = 0$, and so by our assumptions, $E \int_0^t 1_{(X_s=0)} 1_{(t \leq T_n)} dN_s^i = 0$ as well, leading us to conclude that $\int_0^\infty 1_{(X_s=0)} dN_s^i$ is almost surely zero. This implies that almost surely, the set of zeroes of X is disjoint from the jump times of N^i . As the coordinate i was arbitrary, the result follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.3: Note that $\Delta(H \cdot M)_t = \sum_{i=1}^d H_t^i \Delta N_t^i$. By Lemma 4.4, the set of zeroes of μ^i is disjoint from the jump times of N^i . Therefore, the set of zeroes of γ^i is disjoint from the jump times of N^i as well, and so the set where H^i is -1 is disjoint from the jump times of N^i . We conclude that almost surely, $H \cdot M$ has no jumps of size -1 . Theorem I.4.61 of [11] then shows that $\mathcal{E}(H \cdot M)$ is almost surely positive. \square

Finally, we prove Theorem 2.4 and its corollary. We first state the two main theorems of [9] which we will apply to integrals of compensated counting processes in order to obtain our results. The two main theorems from that article are Theorem III.1 and Theorem III.7, given below.

Theorem 4.5. *Let M be a local martingale with initial value zero and jumps satisfying $\Delta M \geq -1$. Let $R = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid \Delta M_t = -1\}$. Define B by putting $B_t = \frac{1}{2}[M^c]_{t \wedge R} + \sum_{0 < s \leq t \wedge R} (1 + \Delta M_s) \log(1 + \Delta M_s) - \Delta M_s$. If B is locally integrable and $\exp(\Pi_p^* B_\infty)$ is integrable, then $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale.*

Theorem 4.6. *Let M be a local martingale with initial value zero and $\Delta M > -1$. Define A by putting $A_t = \frac{1}{2}[M^c]_t + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \log(1 + \Delta M_s) - \frac{\Delta M_s}{1 + \Delta M_s}$. If $\exp(A_\infty)$ is integrable, then $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale.*

The following two lemmas are ingredients for the proof of Theorem 2.4. The first lemma allows us to restrict our attention to small deterministic time intervals when proving the martingale property of exponential martingales. This technique is well-known, see for example Corollary 3.5.14 of [35], and so we omit the proof. The second lemma decomposes an exponential martingale into the product of two exponential martingales, corresponding to successive changes of intensity from λ to μ and μ to $\mu + \nu$. This will, colloquially speaking, allow us to consider the large and small parts of μ separately when proving the martingale property.

Lemma 4.7. *Let M be a local martingale with $\Delta M \geq -1$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. If $\mathcal{E}(M^t - M^u)$ is a martingale whenever $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$, where M^t denotes the process M stopped at time t , then $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a martingale.*

Lemma 4.8. *Let ν be nonnegative, predictable and locally bounded. Assume that μ is λ -compatible and that $\mu + \nu$ is μ -compatible. Then $\mu + \nu$ is also λ -compatible. Define three processes $(H_\lambda^{\mu+\nu})_t^i = (\mu_t^i + \nu_t^i)(\lambda_t^i)^{-1} - 1$, $(H_\lambda^\mu)_t^i = \mu_t^i(\lambda_t^i)^{-1} - 1$ and $(H_\mu^{\mu+\nu})_t^i = (\mu_t^i + \nu_t^i)(\mu_t^i)^{-1} - 1$. Define d -dimensional processes M^λ and M^μ by putting $(M^\lambda)_t^i = N_t^i - \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$ and $(M^\mu)_t^i = N_t^i - \int_0^t \mu_s^i ds$. It then holds that $\mathcal{E}(H_\lambda^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\lambda) = \mathcal{E}(H_\lambda^\mu \cdot M^\lambda)\mathcal{E}(H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\mu)$.*

Proof. That $\mu + \nu$ is λ -compatible follows as $\mu + \nu$ is μ -compatible and μ is λ -compatible. Furthermore, M^λ and M^μ are processes of finite variation, so we find $[H_\lambda^\mu \cdot M^\lambda, H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\mu]_t = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (H_\lambda^\mu)_s^i (H_\mu^{\mu+\nu})_s^i dN_s^i$. Therefore, we obtain $\mathcal{E}(H_\lambda^\mu \cdot M^\lambda)\mathcal{E}(H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\mu) = \mathcal{E}(H_\lambda^\mu \cdot M^\lambda + H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\mu + H_\lambda^\mu H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot N)$ by Theorem II.38 of [10]. By elementary calculations,

$$(4.3) \quad H_\lambda^\mu \cdot M^\lambda + H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\mu + H_\lambda^\mu H_\mu^{\mu+\nu} \cdot N = H_\lambda^{\mu+\nu} \cdot M^\lambda,$$

and so the result holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4: By Lemma 4.7, it suffices to show the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}((H \cdot M)^t - (H \cdot M)^u)$ when $0 \leq u \leq t$ with $t - u \leq \varepsilon$. Let such a pair of u and t be given and let $L = (H \cdot M)^t - (H \cdot M)^u$. With R and B as in Theorem 4.5, we have for $r \geq 0$ that

$$(4.4) \quad B_r = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^r 1_{[0,R]}(s) 1_{[u,t]}(s) ((1 + H_s^i) \log(1 + H_s^i) - H_s^i) dN_s^i.$$

From this, we obtain that B is locally integrable, and as $1_{[0,R]}$ is a predictable process, we have

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} (\Pi_p^* B)_\infty &= \sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t 1_{[0,R]}(s) (\gamma_s^i \log \gamma_s^i - (\gamma_s^i - 1)) \lambda_s^i ds \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t (\gamma_s^i \log \gamma_s^i - (\gamma_s^i - 1)) \lambda_s^i ds. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if the first integrability criterion is satisfied, $\mathcal{E}(L)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale by Theorem 4.5, in particular a martingale. This proves the first claim.

Next, we consider the case where the second integrability criterion is satisfied. We will use Lemma 4.8 to prove that $\mathcal{E}((H \cdot M)^t - (H \cdot M)^u)$ is a martingale in this case. To this end, we define predictable d -dimensional processes μ^- and μ^+ by

$$(4.6) \quad (\mu^-)_s^i = \mu_s^i 1_{(\mu_s^i \leq \lambda_s^i)} + \lambda_s^i 1_{(\mu_s^i > \lambda_s^i)}$$

$$(4.7) \quad (\mu^+)_s^i = (\mu_s^i - \lambda_s^i) 1_{(\mu_s^i > \lambda_s^i)}.$$

We then have $\mu = \mu^+ + \mu^-$. Also define two processes $(\gamma^*)^i = (\mu^-)^i (\lambda^i)^{-1}$ and $(\gamma^{**})^i = \mu^i ((\mu^-)^i)^{-1}$, and $H^* = \gamma^* - 1$ and $H^{**} = \gamma^{**} - 1$. Now, as λ and μ

are predictable, μ^- and μ^+ are predictable as well. Furthermore, μ^- and μ^+ are both nonnegative and locally bounded. By inspection, μ^- is λ -compatible and μ is μ^- -compatible. Now define $(M^-)_t^i = N_t^i - \int_0^t (1_{(u,t]}(s)(H^*)_s^i + 1)\lambda_s^i ds$. Put $L^* = (H^* \cdot M)^t - (H^* \cdot M)^u$ and $L^{**} = (H^{**} \cdot M^-)^t - (H^{**} \cdot M^-)^u$. Note that $L^* = H^* 1_{(u,t]} \cdot M$, $L^{**} = H^{**} 1_{(u,t]} \cdot M^-$ and $L = H 1_{(u,t]} \cdot M$. Invoking Lemma 4.8, we obtain $\mathcal{E}(L) = \mathcal{E}(L^*)\mathcal{E}(L^{**})$. We will apply Theorem 4.5 to the local martingale L^* . By the same calculations as earlier, noting that $(1+x)\log(1+x) \leq 0$ when $-1 \leq x \leq 0$, we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \lambda_s^i ds \right) \leq E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \lambda_s^i ds + \int_u^t \log_+ \gamma_s^i dN_s^i \right) < \infty,$$

so Theorem 4.5 shows that $\mathcal{E}(L^*)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Let Q be the measure with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathcal{E}(L^*)_\infty$ with respect to P . We then have $E^P \mathcal{E}(L)_\infty = E^Q \mathcal{E}(L^{**})_\infty$. To show that $\mathcal{E}(L)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, it suffices to show that this is equal to one. To do so, we will apply Theorem 4.6 to show that $\mathcal{E}(L^{**})$ is a uniformly integrable martingale under Q . To this end, first note that by Lemma 2.2, N^i has intensity $(1_{(u,t]}(H^*)_s^i + 1)\lambda_s^i$ under Q . Therefore, M^- is a local martingale under Q , and so L^{**} is a local martingale under Q as well. Next, $(H^{**})_t^i = (\gamma^{**})_t^i - 1 = 1_{(\mu_t^i \leq \lambda_t^i)} + \gamma_t^i 1_{(\mu_t^i > \lambda_t^i)} - 1 \geq 0$, so $\Delta L^{**} \geq 0 > -1$, and therefore Theorem 4.6 is applicable. Now, with A as in Theorem 4.6, we have

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} A_\infty &= \frac{1}{2}[(L^{**})^c]_\infty + \sum_{0 < s} \log(1 + \Delta L_s^{**}) - \frac{\Delta L_s^{**}}{1 + \Delta L_s^{**}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \log \frac{\mu_s^i}{(\mu^-)_s^i} dN_s^i = \sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \log_+ \gamma_s^i dN_s^i. \end{aligned}$$

Also, since $-1 \leq H^* \leq 0$, we find $\mathcal{E}(L^*)_\infty \leq \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \lambda_s^i ds)$, which leads to

$$(4.10) \quad E^Q \exp(A_\infty) = E \mathcal{E}(L^*)_\infty \exp(A_\infty) \leq E \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \lambda_s^i ds + \int_u^t \log_+ \gamma_s^i dN_s^i \right),$$

which is finite by assumption. Theorem 4.6 then shows that L^{**} is a uniformly integrable martingale under Q , so $E^Q \mathcal{E}(L^{**})_\infty = 1$, from which we conclude $E^P \mathcal{E}(L)_\infty = 1$. Thus, $\mathcal{E}(L)$ is a uniformly integrable martingale, in particular a martingale. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.5: First note that

$$(4.11) \quad x \log x - (x - 1) \leq 1 + x \log x \leq 1 + x \log_+ x$$

for $x \geq 0$. Therefore, as $\lambda = 1$, the first moment condition of Theorem 2.4 reduces to the first moment condition in the statement of the corollary. Furthermore, we have $E \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \lambda_s^i ds + \int_u^t \log_+ \gamma_s^i dN_s^i) = e^{d(t-u)} E \exp(\sum_{i=1}^d \int_u^t \log_+ \gamma_s^i dN_s^i)$ as $\lambda = 1$, and so the result for the second moment condition of the corollary follows. This completes the proof. \square

Appendix A. Supplementary results

Lemma A.1. *Let Z be Poisson distributed with parameter μ . Then $\exp(\varepsilon Z \log Z)$ is integrable whenever $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$.*

Proof. This follows by an application of Stirling's formula, see (6.11.2) of [36], and comparison with a geometric series. \square

Lemma A.2. *Consider $A : \mathbb{N}_0^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $B : \mathbb{N}_0^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}(d, d)$ and $\sigma : \mathbb{N}_0^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^d \rightarrow \mathbb{M}(d, d)$ such that $A(\eta, \cdot)$, $B(\eta, \cdot)$ and $\sigma(\eta, \cdot)$ are bounded and continuous for $\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. Let W be a d -dimensional (\mathcal{F}_t) Brownian motion. Let T_n^i be the n 'th event time for N^i and let $Z_t^i = t - T_{N_t^i}^i$. The stochastic differential equation*

$$(A.1) \quad dX_t = (A(N_t, Z_t) + B(N_t, Z_t)X_t) dt + \sigma(N_t, Z_t) dW_t$$

is exact, in the sense that for any initial value, it has a pathwise unique solution. Defining $C_t = \exp(-\int_0^t B(N_s, Z_s) ds)$, the solution is

$$(A.2) \quad X_t = C_t^{-1} \left(X_0 + \int_0^t C_s A(N_s, Z_s) ds + \int_0^t C_s \sigma(N_s, Z_s) dW_s \right).$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{A}_s = A(N_s, Z_s)$, and define \tilde{B} and $\tilde{\sigma}$ analogously. Note that as N and Z are adapted, \tilde{A} is adapted as well, since $A(\eta, \cdot)$ is continuous and so Borel measurable for all $\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. As the process also is right-continuous and locally bounded, all integrals are well-defined, and similarly for \tilde{B} and $\tilde{\sigma}$. Let X_0 be some initial value. Assume that X is a solution to the stochastic differential equation. Note that each entry of C_t is differentiable as a function of t , and $\frac{d}{dt} C_t^{ij} = (-\tilde{B}_t C_t)^{ij}$. The integration-by-parts formula yields

$$(A.3) \quad (C_t X_t)_i = X_0^i + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t C_s^{ij} dX_s^j - \int_0^t X_s^j (\tilde{B}_s C_s)^{ij} ds.$$

This implies $(C_t X_t)_i = X_0^i + \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^t C_s^{ij} \tilde{A}_s^j ds + \int_0^t C_s^{ij} \sum_{k=1}^d \tilde{\sigma}_s^{jk} dW_s^k$, since X is a solution, leading to

$$(A.4) \quad X_t = C_t^{-1} \left(X_0 + \int_0^t C_s A(N_s, Z_s) ds + \int_0^t C_s \sigma(N_s, Z_s) dW_s \right).$$

This proves pathwise uniqueness. Applying the integration-by-parts formula to the above shows that the proposed solution in fact is a solution, yielding existence. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let X be a d -dimensional normally distributed variable with mean ξ and positive definite variance Σ . Let $c > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then $\exp(c\|X\|_2^{1+\varepsilon})$ is integrable. Furthermore, defining $a(c, \varepsilon) = 2^{1+\varepsilon}c$ and $b(c, \varepsilon) = 16^{(1+\varepsilon)/(1-\varepsilon)}c^{2/(1-\varepsilon)}$, it holds that*

$$(A.5) \quad E \exp(c\|X\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}) \leq k_d \exp(a(c, \varepsilon)\|\xi\|^{1+\varepsilon}) \exp\left(b(c, \varepsilon)\|\Sigma\|_2^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}}\right),$$

where $k_d = A_d m_{d-1} (\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\pi^{d-1}})^{-1}$, A_d is the area of the unit sphere in d dimensions and m_d is the d 'th absolute moment of the standard normal distribution.

Proof. By [37], p. 181, Σ has a unique symmetric positive definite square root $\Sigma^{1/2}$ such that $\Sigma = (\Sigma^{1/2})^2$. Furthermore, with $Y = \Sigma^{-1/2}(X - \xi)$, it holds that $X = \xi + \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}Y$, where Y is d -dimensionally standard normally distributed. With $\|\cdot\|_2$ denoting the operator norm induced by the Euclidean norm, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \exp(c\|X\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}) &= E \exp(c\|\xi + \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}Y\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}) \leq E \exp(c(\|\xi\|_2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}Y\|_2)^{1+\varepsilon}) \\ &\leq E \exp(c2^{1+\varepsilon}(\|\xi\|_2^{1+\varepsilon} + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}Y\|_2^{1+\varepsilon})) \\ (A.6) \quad &\leq \exp(c2^{1+\varepsilon}\|\xi\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}) E \exp\left(c2^{1+\varepsilon}\|\Sigma\|_2^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}\|Y\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Switching to polar coordinates, we obtain, with A_d denoting the area of the unit sphere in d dimensions and $C = c2^{1+\varepsilon}\|\Sigma\|_2^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &E \exp\left(c2^{1+\varepsilon}\|\Sigma\|_2^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}\|Y\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}\right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(C\|x\|_2^{1+\varepsilon}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|x\|_2^2\right) dx \\ (A.7) \quad &= \frac{A_d}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{d-1}}} \int_0^\infty \exp(Cr^{1+\varepsilon}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}r^2\right) r^{d-1} dr. \end{aligned}$$

Using a change of variables, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \exp(Cr^{1+\varepsilon}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}r^2\right) r^{d-1} dr \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty r^{d-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}r^2\right) dr \sup_{s \geq 0} \exp\left(Cs^{1+\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{4}s^2\right) \\ (A.8) \quad &= 2^{d/2} \int_0^\infty r^{d-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}r^2\right) dr \sup_{s \geq 0} \exp\left(Cs^{1+\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{4}s^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

With m_d denoting the d 'th absolute moment of the standard normal distribution, we have $\int_0^\infty r^{d-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}r^2\right) dr = \frac{1}{2}m_{d-1}$. Also, defining $\phi(r) = Cr^{1+\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{4}r^2$ for $r \geq 0$, ϕ has a global maximum at $r^* = (2C(1+\varepsilon))^{1/(1-\varepsilon)}$ which satisfies $\phi(r^*) \leq 4^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}} C^{\frac{2}{1-\varepsilon}}$. This allows us to conclude

$$(A.9) \quad \int_0^\infty \exp(Cr^{1+\varepsilon}) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}r^2\right) r^{d-1} dr \leq 2^{d/2-1} m_{d-1} \exp\left(4^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}} C^{\frac{2}{1-\varepsilon}}\right).$$

Recalling our definition of C , we have $4^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}} C^{\frac{2}{1-\varepsilon}} = 16^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}} c^{\frac{2}{1-\varepsilon}} \|\Sigma\|_2^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}}$. Therefore, defining $a(c, \varepsilon) = 2^{1+\varepsilon}c$ and $b(c, \varepsilon) = 16^{(1+\varepsilon)/(1-\varepsilon)} c^{2/(1-\varepsilon)}$, we finally obtain the result. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let N be a point process, let $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Borel measurable and define $\mu_t = \int_0^{t-} h(t-s) dN_s$. Then μ is a predictable process.*

Proof. This follows by monotone convergence and Dynkin class arguments. \square

Lemma A.5. *Let (T_n) be a localising sequence and assume that $\mathcal{E}(M)^{T_n}$ is a martingale. $\mathcal{E}(M)$ is a martingale if and only if $\lim_n E\mathcal{E}(M)_{T_n}1_{(T_n \leq t)} = 0$ for each $t \geq 0$.*

Proof. By our assumptions on the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(M)^{T_n}$, it holds that $E\mathcal{E}(M)_{T_n}1_{(T_n \leq t)} = 1 - E\mathcal{E}(M)_t1_{(T_n > t)}$. By the Dominated Convergence Theorem, $\lim_n E\mathcal{E}(M)_t1_{(T_n > t)} = E\mathcal{E}(M)_t$. Thus, $\lim_n E\mathcal{E}(M)_{T_n}1_{(T_n \leq t)} = 1 - E\mathcal{E}(M)_t$, and so Lemma 4.2 yields the result. \square

References

- [1] P. Brémaud. *Point processes and queues*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1981.
- [2] K. Røysland. A martingale approach to continuous-time marginal structural models. *Bernoulli*, 17(3):895–915, 2011.
- [3] W. Truccolo, U. T. Eden, M. R. Fellows, J. P. Donoghue, and E. N. Brown. A point process framework for relating neural spiking activity to spiking history, neural ensemble, and extrinsic covariate effects. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 93(2):1074–1089, 2005.
- [4] M. S. Masud and R. Borisjuk. Statistical technique for analysing functional connectivity of multiple spike trains. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 196(1):201–219, 2011.
- [5] L. Carstensen, A. Sandelin, O. Winther, and N. R. Hansen. Multivariate hawkes process models of the occurrence of regulatory elements. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 11, 2010.
- [6] S. Azizpour, K. Giesecke, and G. Schwenkler. Exploring the sources of default clustering. *Preprint*, pages 1–28, 2014.
- [7] H. K. Gjessing, K. Røysland, E. A. Pena, and O. O. Aalen. Recurrent events and the exploding Cox model. *Lifetime Data Anal.*, 16(4):525–546, 2010.
- [8] M. Jacobsen. *Point process theory and applications*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2006. Marked point and piecewise deterministic processes.
- [9] D. Lépingle and J. Mémin. Sur l'intégrabilité uniforme des martingales exponentielles. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 42(3):175–203, 1978.
- [10] P. E. Protter. *Stochastic integration and differential equations*, volume 21 of *Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Second edition. Version 2.1, Corrected third printing.
- [11] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003.
- [12] A. F. Karr. *Point processes and their statistical inference*, volume 7 of *Probability: Pure and Applied*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, second edition, 1991.
- [13] H. Föllmer. The exit measure of a supermartingale. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 21:154–166, 1972.
- [14] A. A. Novikov. A certain identity for stochastic integrals. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 17:761–765, 1972.
- [15] N. Kazamaki and T. Sekiguchi. Uniform integrability of continuous exponential martingales. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 35(2):289–301, 1983.
- [16] N. Kazamaki. *Continuous exponential martingales and BMO*, volume 1579 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [17] A. Cherny and A. N. Shiryaev. On criteria for the uniform integrability of Brownian stochastic exponentials. In *Optimal Control and Partial Differential Equations*, pages 80–92. IOS Press, 2001.

- [18] M. Izumisawa, T. Sekiguchi, and Y. Shiota. Remark on a characterization of BMO-martingales. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)*, 31(3):281–284, 1979.
- [19] J. Kallsen and A. N. Shiryaev. The cumulant process and Esscher’s change of measure. *Finance Stoch.*, 6(4):397–428, 2002.
- [20] A. Sokol. Optimal Novikov-type criteria for local martingales with jumps. *Elec. Comm. Prob.*, 18:1–8, 2013.
- [21] F. Klebaner and R. Lipster. When a stochastic exponential is a true martingale: Extension of the benes method. *Theo. Prob. Appl.*, 58(1):38–62, 2014.
- [22] S. W. He, J. G. Wang, and J. A. Yan. *Semimartingale theory and stochastic calculus*. Kexue Chubanshe (Science Press), Beijing, 1992.
- [23] P. E. Protter and K. Shimbo. No arbitrage and general semimartingales. In *Markov processes and related topics: a Festschrift for Thomas G. Kurtz*, volume 4 of *Inst. Math. Stat. Collect.*, pages 267–283. Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, 2008.
- [24] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, editors. *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1984. Reprint of the 1972 edition, Selected Government Publications.
- [25] J. R. Choksi. Inverse limits of measure spaces. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 8:321–342, 1958.
- [26] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams. *Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 2*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. Itô calculus, Reprint of the second (1994) edition.
- [27] R. L. Karandikar. On pathwise stochastic integration. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 57(1):11–18, 1995.
- [28] N. J. Higham. *Functions of matrices*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2008. Theory and computation.
- [29] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986. Characterization and convergence.
- [30] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams. *Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 1*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. Foundations, Reprint of the second (1994) edition.
- [31] J. L. Doob. *Classical potential theory and its probabilistic counterpart*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1984 edition.
- [32] P. Glasserman. *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering*, volume 53 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.
- [33] S. E. Shreve. *Stochastic calculus for finance. II*. Springer Finance. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004. Continuous-time models.
- [34] J. R. Norris. *Markov chains*, volume 2 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. Reprint of 1997 original.
- [35] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [36] D. Zwillinger. *CRC standard mathematical tables and formulae*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, thirty-first edition, 2012.
- [37] P. Lancaster and M. Tismenetsky. *The theory of matrices*. Computer Science and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press Inc., Orlando, FL, second edition, 1985.

ALEXANDER SOKOL: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, 2100 COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, ALEXANDER@MATH.KU.DK

NIELS RICHARD HANSEN: INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, 2100 COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, NIELS.R.HANSEN@MATH.KU.DK